Teton County Community Survey, 2008

WYSAC Technical Report No. SRC-805

May 2008

Teton County Community Survey, 2008

By
Thomas A. Furgeson, M.A., Assistant Research Scientist

With the assistance of

Bistra Anatchkova, Ph.D., Survey Research Center Manager
Brian Harnisch, Assistant Research Scientist
Mike Dorssom, Assistant Research Scientist

Wyoming Survey & Analysis Center
University of Wyoming
1000 E. University Ave, Dept. 3925
Laramie, WY 82071
(307) 766-2189 • wysac@uwyo.edu
www.uwyo.edu/wysac

Under contract to

Teton County Planning & Development Office
Teton County Administration Building
200 South Willow Street
Jackson, WY 83001

Citation for this document: WYSAC (2008) *Teton County Community Survey, 2008,* by T. Furgeson, WYSAC Technical Report No. SRC-803. Laramie, WY: Wyoming Survey & Analysis Center, University of Wyoming.

Short reference: WYSAC (2008), *Teton County Survey 2008*.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Teton County Community Survey, 2008

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

In February of 2008 a contract was executed between the Teton County Planning & Development Office and the Wyoming Survey & Analysis Center (WYSAC) to conduct a community survey of Teton County residents, inclusive of Town of Jackson. The survey was to capture the opinion of the public on several issues of importance to the Planning & Development Office as they develop their Comprehensive Plan. The survey was administered by phone and mail between February 27 and April 14. A total of 584 surveys were completed.

1.2. Organization of this Report

This document contains four main sections and one section of appendices. *Section 1* contains the project background and the outline of the organization of this report. *Section 2* contains survey design and administration, as well as data compilation and analysis. *Section 3* displays the synopsized key findings of the survey, and *Section 4* contains the frequency counts and percentage distributions for responses to each survey item, which are presented in the original order and with the exact wording as used in the survey instrument. *Section 5* contains selected, statistically significant, cross-tabulations. *Section 6* is the report appendices section.

2. Methods

2.1. Survey Design and Administration

The instrument for this survey was developed by officials from the Teton County Planning & Development Office and WYSAC's Survey Research Center (SRC). An original set of questions was presented to the SRC by Teton County officials; these questions were discussed and refined into the final survey instrument in late February. This survey instrument took two forms: it was encoded for telephone interviewing using Windows computer assisted telephone interviewing (WinCATI) software; and it was formatted into an easily-readable, hard-copy for distribution by mail.

By design, a dual sampling frame was to be used for the survey. The bulk of the surveys were to be completed from a random digit dialing (RDD) sample of land-line phone numbers representative of Teton County households. The latter was to be supplemented by a random sample of cell phone numbers broadly representative of Teton County cell phone users. The samples were purchased from two of the leading national vendors specializing in the generation of scientific samples. The land line sample was enhanced with reverse look-up of names and addresses.

This sample design was to enable us to follow up with households that, a) did not respond to the phone survey and, b) for which an address was on file by mailing a hard copy version of the survey instrument. Thus, in addition to using a dual sampling frame (land-line and cell-only households), the study was designed to employ mixed-mode data collection.

Additionally, officials from Teton County provided the SRC with a Spanish-language version of the survey, and this was administered by telephone to households determined to be primarily Spanish-speaking during the telephone screening process.

Experienced SRC telephone interviewers conducted the telephone surveys between February 27 and April 10. All data collection efforts concluded on April 14. Mail surveys received after that date were not included in the project database. The calling schedule was set for interviews to be attempted at times that were optimal to reach Teton County residents at home. WYSAC's WinCATI system and its sample management module ensured that numerous attempts were made to each sample phone number in order to complete a survey. Numbers were called up to 15 times, occasionally more than that, if previous attempts did not result in a completed survey, an ineligible number, or an irate refusal. Soft refusals were called a second time by specially trained interviewers in an attempt at refusal conversion. Cell phone contacts were invited to take the interview only if they reported to be cell-only households. This approach ensures that no household is over represented in the sample.

Phone numbers (barring outright refusals) from which completed surveys were not obtained and for which addresses were available were used to generate a sub-sample to which the survey was administered via the USPS. The procedure used was to send a hard copy of the questionnaire accompanied by a cover letter. The cover letter explained the purpose and importance of the study and solicited participation. It also provided for households to indicate if they had completed the survey online[1] and were thus ineligible to complete it again. This letter was supposed to be returned to us in the provided postage-paid envelope. The purpose of that provision was dual: first, to prevent confusion; second, to allow for better tracking of non-responses. In about 10 days, non-responding households (those for which it was *not* established that the address we had on file was invalid) were sent a reminder post card encouraging them to respond. Unfortunately, from the total 714 mail pieces sent (10 of those were sent in response to explicit requests from respondents with whom a phone contact was established, but whose preference was to receive the survey in the mail), 73% were returned as *undeliverable mail*. (All phone numbers associated with these returns, which during the efforts preceding the mailing were *not* determined to be disconnected, were added back to the phone sample in a further effort to complete a telephone interview.) We received a total of 43 completed surveys in the mail as a result of this effort (three of these were from the *special request pool*), for a response rate of about 23%. The goal was to receive not less than 100 completed surveys as a result of the mail-out.

At this point, and after consultation with Teton County officials, we resorted to employing a database of "mailable addresses," known as the *DFS database*, available from our sampling companies. This database is separate from the databases of phone numbers and/or of physical addresses. Eighty percent of the mailable addresses in Teton County available through this database were P.O. box addresses. The sample was purchased from the same vendor (Marketing Systems Group) from whom we purchased our RDD sample of land line phone numbers. This step introduced another dimension to the sampling frame of the study. Now we had to manage a tri-fold sampling frame, consisting of land-line phone numbers, cellular phone numbers, and mailable addresses. Due to budgetary and time constraints, the data collection administration design for this sub-sample envisioned only two mailings (two attempts at contact)—questionnaire accompanied by cover letter, and reminder post card to non-respondents. Not using a four mailing sequence as

[1] Teton County had made the survey available online through their web site. This effort was not part of our data collection.

prescribed in the professional literature on survey research, as well as not allowing enough time before closing the data collection, resulted in a lower response rate than that potentially achievable. Nevertheless, the goal of having over 100 surveys completed through mail administration was exceeded. We received 126 surveys from this supplemental sample, bringing the total number of surveys received in the mail to 169. For reference purposes, only 73 mail pieces belonging to the sub-sample of mailable addresses were returned to us as undeliverable, mainly due to vacant P.O. boxes, which represents only 8% of the total mailed. The cover letter included in this mailing allowed the recipient to indicate if, and by what method, they had already completed the survey. De-duplicating this sample with our initial sample was not entirely possible, and there was the small chance that a questionnaire could be sent to someone who had already completed the survey over the phone. Also, as indicated, we had no way of knowing whether they had taken advantage of the option to complete the online survey provided on Teton County's website. Eleven mail survey recipients indicated that they had already completed the survey online or by phone.

As a result of all efforts described, 34 interviews were completed in Spanish, 106 interviews were completed from the cell phone sub-sample, and, as indicated, a total of 169 surveys were received in the mail (126 from the mailing to the RDD sample, and 43 from the supplemental mailable addresses (DSF) sample).

All told, as of the closing data of April 14[2], the SRC received a total of 584 completed surveys, using telephone interviewing (in English and Spanish) and mail-based data collection. A random sample of this size yields a margin of error of about plus or minus 4 percentage points with 95% confidence.

Two preliminary reports were delivered to the Teton County Planning & Development Office. The first is dated March 18, when 327 completed surveys were available; the second was delivered to County officials at the 400-complettion mark, on March 25.

2.2. Data Collection, Compilation and Analysis

Completed telephone interviews were exported from WinCATI to the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS); likewise, all hard-copy questionnaires received by the SRC were entered into the same SPSS database. These data were analyzed using the SPSS program; results from these analyses are contained in the remainder of the report.

Both simple frequencies and cross-tabulations by background variables were run. The cross-tabulations were tested for statistical significance ($p < 0.05$) of the differences observed using either, or both, the Pierson's chi-square and the linear-by-linear tests, as appropriate.

As stated, a random sample of the size of 584 yields a margin of error of about plus or minus 4 percentage points with 95% confidence.

[2] Quite a few surveys were received in the mail after the closing date. As indicated, these were not included in the database used for the analyses presented in this report.

3. Key Findings

- Chosen as a higher priority than *build more deed restricted affordable housing* by higher percentages of Teton County residents[3] are *preserve more open space* (46% to 31%); *preserve more wildlife habitat and wildlife migration corridors* (60% to 21%); and *limit overall growth in the Valley* (53% to 37%). For all of these items, substantial percentages (not under 10%) of residents consider these priorities to be *equally important.*

- More than twice the percentage (55%) of residents considers *preserving wildlife migration corridors* to be a higher priority than *solving traffic problems* (26%).

- Over twice (61%) the percentage of residents considers *increasing transit services* to be a higher priority than *increasing road capacity for all uses* (25%).

- A higher percentage (58%) of residents think it a higher priority to c*entralize housing and services in Jackson* than to *expand deed restricted affordable housing opportunities and community services in outlying population centers* (31%).

- 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.*

- There was nearly equal agreement among residents that, *"Jackson and Teton County should provide deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley for ALL workers"* (44%), and, *"Jackson and Teton County should provide deed restricted affordable housing PRIMARILY for emergency service and other ESSENTIAL workers in the Valley"* (40%). Around 16% agree that, *"Jackson and Teton County should NOT provide more deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley."*

- There was also 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%). Around 24% agree that, *"Careful redevelopment outside of the town square should be allowed, with up to 4-storey buildings."*

- Clear majorities of residents agree that,
  A) *In order to limit development in rural areas of Teton County, more development and population growth should be allowed in certain county centers.* (64%)
  B) *It is acceptable to allow the expansion of town-level density within a half mile of High School Road…to provide more housing IF an equal amount of land somewhere else in the county is preserved from development.* (63%)
  C) *It is acceptable to allow expansion of town-level density within a half mile of High School Road…IF this provides more deed restricted affordable housing.* (60%)

- While 51% of Teton County residents agree that g*rowth and development in the county should be limited even if it reduces the ability to provide deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley*, 38% disagree with this statement.

[3] "Teton County resident" is inclusive of *all* County residents (i.e., all towns within the County in addition to non-municipal residents).

- Clear majorities of residents agree that,
  A) *Development should be increased in the Jackson downtown area outside of town square and the Jackson "Y"…as a tradeoff for conserving natural resources.* (69%)
  B) *The Town and County should make the availability of deed restricted affordable housing a priority over additional commercial or resort development.* (71%)
  C) *There should be long-term redevelopment of the Jackson "Y"…to improve transportation corridors, make the area more pedestrian-oriented, and also provide additional deed restricted affordable housing.* (73%)
  D) *Both overall development in rural parts of Teton County and redevelopment in the Town of Jackson should be limited.* (61%).

- Roughly even percentages of Teton County residents agree (43%) and disagree (40%) that, *future change in downtown Jackson as well as in residential neighborhoods of Jackson should be minimized.* There is a high level (17%) of neutrality on this issue.

- More (51%) residents disagree than agree (37%) that *Teton County and Jackson should depend on affordable housing to be provided outside of the county in neighboring communities (such as Teton County, Idaho), as a trade-off for limiting development in Teton County and Jackson*.

- Majorities of residents agree that,
  A) *In order to reduce development of agricultural lands and wildlife habitat, landowners should be able to shift their right to develop one parcel of land to a different parcel of land…* (59%)
  B) *The County should establish a funding source (… a bond, fees, sales tax or property tax) in order to acquire open space or conservation areas for critical wildlife habitat.* (60%)
  C) *The County should have stronger standards for new developments in order to protect natural resource areas…* (80%)
  D) *The County and the Town of Jackson should require a higher amount of deed restricted affordable housing to be built as part of new developments.* (69%).

- Though 50% of Teton County residents agree that *Teton County and the Town of Jackson should continue to use incentives rather than requirements to encourage more deed restricted affordable housing in new developments*, fully 40% disagree with this statement.

- While 51% of residents agree that *the County and the Town of Jackson should allow increased density in order to provide deed restricted affordable housing*, 36% disagree.

- Nearly even percentages of Teton County residents agree (44%) and disagree (42%) with the statement: *In order to protect natural resources and rural character, the County should reduce the allowed amount of potential development in remote unplatted areas to 1 unit per 35 acres.*

- Though 48% of Teton County residents agree that *there should be a restriction on the amount of annual growth allowed in Jackson and the county (for example, a 1% or 2% increase per year),* fully 39% disagree with this statement.

- A strong majority (78%) of residents agree that *the County and the Town of Jackson should promote walking, bicycling, transit, and carpooling as alternatives to widening roads.*

- A bare majority (54%) disagree that *roads in Jackson should be widened for transit and carpool lanes.* A third (33%) of Teton County residents agree with this statement.

- A slight majority (55%) of residents disagree that *roads throughout the county should be widened for transit and carpool lanes*, while just over a third (34%) agree with this statement.

- While the highest percentage (48%) of residents disagree that *more lanes should be added to existing roads and intersections…to relieve traffic for all modes of travel*, a similar percentage (41%) agrees with this statement.

- There is a substantially higher percentage (50%) of disagreement than agreement (39%) among Teton County residents that *new roads should be constructed in the county and Jackson to provide traffic relief for all modes of travel.*

4. Frequency Counts and Percentage Distributions

Below are the frequency counts and percentage distributions of responses to all survey items in the verbatim wording, in the original order, and with the question numbers from the survey instrument. For each appropriate item, missing values (e.g., *Don't know/ Not sure*; *No answer/Refused*, etc.) are excluded from the percentage calculations to yield valid percentage distributions. This section contains results from the main survey questions and the demographic questions on the survey.

Q1. Which of the following two goals do you think is a higher priority for the Town of Jackson and Teton County?

[If needed:] *Both goals may be highly important to you, however we would like to know which ONE, in your view, should have higher priority.*

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Preserve more open space OR	263	45.0%	**46.2%**
2. Build more deed restricted affordable housing	175	30.0%	**30.8%**
3. (Equally important)	131	22.4%	**23.0%**
Total Valid	569	97.4%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't know/Not sure)	3	0.5%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	12	2.1%	
Total Missing	15	2.6%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q2. Which of the following two goals do you think is a higher priority for the Town of Jackson and Teton County?

[If needed:] *Both goals may be highly important to you, however we would like to know which ONE, in your view, should have higher priority.*

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Preserve more wildlife habitat and wildlife migration corridors OR	339	58.0%	**59.5%**
2. Build more deed restricted affordable housing	118	20.2%	**20.7%**
3. (Equally important)	113	19.3%	**19.8%**
Total Valid	570	97.6%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't know/Not sure)	2	0.3%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	12	2.1%	
Total Missing	14	2.4%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q3. What about…?

[If needed:] *Both goals may be highly important to you, however we would like to know which ONE, in your view, should have higher priority for the Town of Jackson and Teton County.*

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Limit overall growth in the Valley OR	294	50.3%	**53.2%**
2. Build more deed restricted affordable housing	202	34.6%	**36.5%**
3. (Equally important)	57	9.8%	**10.3%**
Total Valid	553	94.7%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't know/Not sure)	14	2.4%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	17	2.9	
Total Missing	31	5.3%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q4 What about…?

[If needed:] *Both goals may be highly important to you, however we would like to know which ONE, in your view, should have higher priority for the Town of Jackson and Teton County.*

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Solve traffic problems OR	149	25.5%	**26.3%**
2. Preserve wildlife migration corridors	310	53.1%	**54.7%**
3. (Equally important)	108	18.5%	**19.0%**
4. Total Valid	567	97.1%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't know/Not sure)	3	0.5%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	14	2.4%	
Total Missing	17	2.9%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q5: And which of these two goals do you think is a higher priority?

[If needed:] *Both goals may be highly important to you, however we would like to know which ONE, in your view, should have higher priority for the Town of Jackson and Teton County.*

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Increase transit services OR	348	59.6%	**61.3%**
2. Increase road capacity for all uses	144	24.7%	**25.4%**
3. (Equally important)	76	13.0%	**13.4%**
Total Valid	568	97.3%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't know/Not sure)	9	1.5%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	7	1.2%	
Total Missing	16	2.7%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q6. What about…

[If needed:] *Both goals may be highly important to you, however we would like to know which ONE, in your view, should have higher priority for the Town of Jackson and Teton County.*

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Expand deed restricted affordable housing opportunities and community services in outlying population centers OR	169	28.9%	**31.2%**
2. Centralize housing and services in Jackson	312	53.4%	**57.6%**
3. (Equally important)	61	10.4%	**11.3%**
Total Valid	542	92.8%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't know/Not sure)	26	4.5%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	16	2.7%	
Total Missing	42	7.2%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q7: What about…

[If needed:] *Both goals may be highly important to you, however we would like to know which ONE, in your view, should have higher priority for the Town of Jackson and Teton County.*

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Build more deed restricted affordable housing OR	405	69.3%	**78.2%**
2. Allow additional commercial or resort development	64	11.0%	**12.4%**
3. (Equally important)	49	8.4%	**9.5%**
Total Valid	518	88.7%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't know/Not sure)	33	5.7%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	33	5.7%	
Total Missing	66	11.3%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q8. With which ONE of the following 3 statements about deed restricted affordable housing do you agree?

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. "Jackson and Teton County should provide deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley for ALL workers."	244	41.8%	**43.7%**
2. "Jackson and Teton County should provide deed restricted affordable housing PRIMARILY for emergency service and other ESSENTIAL workers in the Valley."	223	38.2%	**40.0%**
3. "Jackson and Teton County should NOT provide more deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley."	91	15.6%	**16.3%**
Total Valid	558	95.5%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't know/Not sure)	15	2.6%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	11	1.9%	
Total Missing	26	4.5%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q9. With which ONE of the following 3 statements about development in the Town of Jackson do you agree?

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. "Current building heights in town today should be maintained. No change."	224	38.4%	**39.6%**
2. "Careful redevelopment outside of the town square should be allowed, with up to 3-storey buildings."	207	35.4%	**36.6%**
3. "Careful redevelopment outside of the town square should be allowed, with up to 4-storey buildings."	134	22.9%	**23.7%**
Total Valid	565	96.7%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't know/Not sure)	12	2.1%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	7	1.2%	
Total Missing	19	3.3%	
Total	584	100.0%	

For the following several statements, please indicate whether you strongly agree, agree, are neutral, disagree, or strongly disagree.

Q10. "In order to limit development in rural areas of Teton County, more development and population growth should be allowed in certain county centers (such as Aspen/Teton Pines, Wilson, South Park, Hoback, Teton Village, Town of Jackson)."

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	110	18.8%	**19.6%**
2. Agree	250	42.8%	**44.6%**
3. Neutral	58	9.9%	**10.3%**
4. Disagree	100	17.1%	**17.8%**
5. Strongly disagree	43	7.4%	**7.7%**
Total Valid	561	96.1%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	15	2.6%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	8	1.4%	
Total Missing	23	3.9%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q11. "It is acceptable to allow the expansion of town-level density within a half mile of High School Road (near the Smith's Shopping Center) to provide more housing IF an equal amount of land somewhere else in the county is preserved from development." Would you say you…

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	95	16.3%	**16.8%**
2. Agree	260	44.5%	**45.9%**
3. Neutral	64	11.0%	**11.3%**
4. Disagree	98	16.8%	**17.3%**
5. Strongly disagree	50	8.6%	**8.8%**
Total Valid	567	97.1%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	10	1.7%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	7	1.2%	
Total Missing	17	2.9%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q12. "It is acceptable to allow expansion of town-level density within a half mile of High School Road (near the Smith's Shopping Center) IF this provides more deed restricted affordable housing." Would you say you…

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	107	18.3%	**19.0%**
2. Agree	233	39.9%	**41.3%**
3. Neutral	62	10.6%	**11.0%**
4. Disagree	99	17.0%	**17.6%**
5. Strongly disagree	63	10.8%	**11.2%**
Total Valid	564	96.6%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	11	1.9%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	9	1.5%	
Total Missing	20	3.4%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q13. "Growth and development in the county should be limited even if it reduces the ability to provide deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley." Would you say you…

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	116	19.9%	**20.4%**
2. Agree	174	29.8%	**30.6%**
3. Neutral	61	10.4%	**10.7%**
4. Disagree	149	25.5%	**26.2%**
5. Strongly disagree	68	11.6%	**12.0%**
Total Valid	568	97.3%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	10	1.7%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	6	1.0%	
Total Missing	16	2.7%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q14. "Development should be increased in the Jackson downtown area outside of town square and the Jackson "Y" (in the Albertson's area at WY 22 and Broadway) as a tradeoff for conserving natural resources." Would you say you…

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	129	22.1%	**23.0%**
2. Agree	260	44.5%	**46.3%**
3. Neutral	49	8.4%	**8.7%**
4. Disagree	94	16.1%	**16.8%**
5. Strongly disagree	29	5.0%	**5.2%**
Total Valid	561	96.1%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	12	2.1%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	11	1.9%	
Total Missing	23	3.9%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q15. "The Town and County should make the availability of deed restricted affordable housing a priority over additional commercial or resort development." Would you say you…

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	189	32.4%	**33.4%**
2. Agree	213	36.5%	**37.6%**
3. Neutral	69	11.8%	**12.2%**
4. Disagree	63	10.8%	**11.1%**
5. Strongly disagree	32	5.5%	**5.7%**
Total Valid	566	96.9%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	8	1.4%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	10	1.7%	
Total Missing	18	3.1%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q16. "There should be long-term redevelopment of the Jackson "Y" (in the Albertson's area at WY 22 and Broadway) to improve transportation corridors, make the area more pedestrian-oriented, and also provide additional deed restricted affordable housing." Would you say you…

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	129	22.1%	**22.9%**
2. Agree	281	48.1%	**49.9%**
3. Neutral	65	11.1%	**11.5%**
4. Disagree	60	10.3%	**10.7%**
5. Strongly disagree	28	4.8%	**5.0%**
Total Valid	563	96.4%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	12	2.1%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	9	1.5%	
Total Missing	21	3.6%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q17. "Both overall development in rural parts of Teton County and redevelopment in the Town of Jackson should be limited." Would you say you…

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	112	19.2%	**19.9%**
2. Agree	230	39.4%	**40.9%**
3. Neutral	54	9.2%	**9.6%**
4. Disagree	114	19.5%	**20.2%**
5. Strongly disagree	53	9.1%	**9.4%**
Total Valid	563	96.4%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	14	2.4%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	7	1.2%	
Total Missing	21	3.6%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q18. "Future change in downtown Jackson as well as in residential neighborhoods of Jackson should be minimized." Would you say you…

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	82	14.0%	**14.4%**
2. Agree	164	28.1%	**28.7%**
3. Neutral	94	16.1%	**16.5%**
4. Disagree	188	32.2%	**32.9%**
5. Strongly disagree	43	7.4%	**7.5%**
Total Valid	571	97.8%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	7	1.2%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	6	1.0%	
Total Missing	13	2.2%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q19. "Teton County and Jackson should depend on affordable housing to be provided outside of the county in neighboring communities (such as Teton County, Idaho), as a trade-off for limiting development in Teton County and Jackson." Would you say you…

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	61	10.4%	**10.8%**
2. Agree	148	25.3%	**26.1%**
3. Neutral	69	11.8%	**12.2%**
4. Disagree	179	30.7%	**31.6%**
5. Strongly disagree	110	18.8%	**19.4%**
Total Valid	567	97.1%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	11	1.9%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	6	1.0%	
Total Missing	17	2.9%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q20. "In order to reduce development of agricultural lands and wildlife habitat, landowners should be able to shift their right to develop one parcel of land to a different parcel of land (for example, from agricultural land to designated areas with County or Town services)." Would you say you…

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	57	9.8%	**11.0%**
2. Agree	247	42.3%	**47.7%**
3. Neutral	97	16.6%	**18.7%**
4. Disagree	96	16.4%	**18.5%**
5. Strongly disagree	21	3.6%	**4.1%**
Total Valid	518	88.7%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	55	9.4%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	11	1.9%	
Total Missing	66	11.3%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q21. "The County should establish a funding source (for example, a bond, fees, sales tax or property tax) in order to acquire open space or conservation areas for critical wildlife habitat." Would you say you…

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	109	18.7%	**19.1%**
2. Agree	232	39.7%	**40.7%**
3. Neutral	63	10.8%	**11.1%**
4. Disagree	117	20.0%	**20.5%**
5. Strongly disagree	49	8.4%	**8.6%**
Total Valid	570	97.6%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	8	1.4%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	6	1.0%	
Total Missing	14	2.4%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q22. "The County should have stronger standards for new developments in order to protect natural resource areas (for example, tighter restrictions on development on steep slopes, in floodplains, or wildlife habitat areas)." Would you say you…

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	227	38.9%	**39.3%**
2. Agree	237	40.6%	**41.1%**
3. Neutral	47	8.0%	**8.1%**
4. Disagree	47	8.0%	**8.1%**
5. Strongly disagree	19	3.3%	**3.3%**
Total Valid	577	98.8%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	3	0.5%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	4	0.7%	
Total Missing	7	1.2%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q23. "The County and the Town of Jackson should require a higher amount of deed restricted affordable housing to be built as part of new developments." Would you say you…

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	151	25.9%	**26.3%**
2. Agree	246	42.1%	**42.9%**
3. Neutral	44	7.5%	**7.7%**
4. Disagree	79	13.5%	**13.8%**
5. Strongly disagree	54	9.2%	**9.4%**
Total Valid	574	98.3%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	3	0.5%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	7	1.2%	
Total Missing	10	1.7%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q24. "Teton County and the Town of Jackson should continue to use incentives rather than requirements to encourage more deed restricted affordable housing in new developments." Would you say you…

[If needed:] *Incentives make use of bonuses that encourage developers to include deed restricted affordable housing in their developments, while requirements would take the form of regulations to mandate that developers provide a certain amount of deed restricted affordable housing in new developments.*

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	60	10.3%	**10.7%**
2. Agree	223	38.2%	**39.6%**
3. Neutral	54	9.2%	**9.6%**
4. Disagree	152	26.0%	**27.0%**
5. Strongly disagree	74	12.7%	**13.1%**
Total Valid	563	96.4%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	18	3.1%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	3	0.5%	
Total Missing	21	3.6%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q25. "The County and the Town of Jackson should allow increased density in order to provide deed restricted affordable housing." Would you say you...

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	78	13.4%	**13.9%**
2. Agree	209	35.8%	**37.2%**
3. Neutral	72	12.3%	**12.8%**
4. Disagree	134	22.9%	**23.8%**
5. Strongly disagree	69	11.8%	**12.3%**
Total Valid	562	96.2%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	16	2.7%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	6	1.0%	
Total Missing	22	3.8%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q26. "In order to protect natural resources and rural character, the County should reduce the allowed amount of potential development in remote unplatted areas to 1 unit per 35 acres." Currently 1 main unit and 1 accessory unit per 35 acres are allowed. Would you say you...

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	72	12.3%	**13.2%**
2. Agree	169	28.9%	**30.9%**
3. Neutral	79	13.5%	**14.4%**
4. Disagree	173	29.6%	**31.6%**
5. Strongly disagree	54	9.2%	**9.9%**
Total Valid	547	93.7%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	28	4.8%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	9	1.5%	
Total Missing	37	6.3%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q27. "There should be a restriction on the amount of annual growth allowed in Jackson and the county (for example, a 1% or 2% increase per year)." Would you say you...

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	92	15.8%	**16.5%**
2. Agree	176	30.1%	**31.5%**
3. Neutral	74	12.7%	**13.3%**
4. Disagree	160	27.4%	**28.7%**
5. Strongly disagree	56	9.6%	**10.0%**
Total Valid	558	95.5%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	17	2.9%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	9	1.5%	
Total Missing	26	4.5%	
Total	584	100.0%	
	92	15.8%	

Q28. "The County and the Town of Jackson should promote walking, bicycling, transit, and carpooling as alternatives to widening roads." Would you say you...

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	241	41.3%	**41.9%**
2. Agree	205	35.1%	**35.7%**
3. Neutral	40	6.8%	**7.0%**
4. Disagree	61	10.4%	**10.6%**
5. Strongly disagree	28	4.8%	**4.9%**
Total Valid	575	98.5%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	2	0.3%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	7	1.2%	
Total Missing	9	1.5%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q29. "Roads in Jackson should be widened for transit and carpool lanes." Would you say you...

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	33	5.7%	**5.8%**
2. Agree	156	26.7%	**27.4%**
3. Neutral	71	12.2%	**12.5%**
4. Disagree	231	39.6%	**40.5%**
5. Strongly disagree	79	13.5%	**13.9%**
Total Valid	570	97.6%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	8	1.4%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	6	1.0%	
Total Missing	14	2.4%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q29a. "Roads throughout the county should be widened for transit and carpool lanes." Would you say you...

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	32	5.5%	**5.6%**
2. Agree	159	27.2%	**28.0%**
3. Neutral	63	10.8%	**11.1%**
4. Disagree	233	39.9%	**41.0%**
5. Strongly disagree	81	13.9%	**14.3%**
Total Valid	568	97.3%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	11	1.9%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	5	0.9%	
Total Missing	16	2.7%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q30. "More lanes should be added to existing roads and intersections (for example, at the Jackson "Y" in the Albertson's area, at WY 22 and Broadway) to relieve traffic for all modes of travel." Would you say you...

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	57	9.8%	**10.1%**
2. Agree	174	29.8%	**30.7%**
3. Neutral	66	11.3%	**11.7%**
4. Disagree	206	35.3%	**36.4%**
5. Strongly disagree	63	10.8%	**11.1%**
Total Valid	566	96.9%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	10	1.7%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	8	1.4%	
Total Missing	18	3.1%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q31. "New roads should be constructed in the county and Jackson to provide traffic relief for all modes of travel." Would you say you...

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Strongly agree	58	9.9%	**10.3%**
2. Agree	159	27.2%	**28.3%**
3. Neutral	62	10.6%	**11.1%**
4. Disagree	198	33.9%	**35.3%**
5. Strongly disagree	84	14.4%	**15.0%**
Total Valid	561	96.1%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	13	2.2%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	10	1.7%	
Total Missing	23	3.9%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q32. Finally, we have just a few more questions about you and your household. What is your age?

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. 18-29	63	10.8%	**11.0%**
2. 30-44	174	29.8%	**30.3%**
3. 45-64	268	45.9%	**46.6%**
4. 65 years or older	70	12.0%	**12.2%**
Total Valid	575	98.5%	**100.0%**
9. (No answer/Refused)	9	1.5%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q33. Which of the following best describes you?

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Full-time resident of Teton County, Wyoming	533	91.3%	**91.4%**
2. Part-time resident of Teton County, Wyoming	35	6.0%	**6.0%**
3. Work but don't live in Teton County, Wyoming	15	2.6%	**2.6%**
Total Valid	583	99.8%	**100.0%**
Total Missing	1	0.2%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q34. Where in Teton County, Wyoming do you live (full or part-time)?

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Buffalo Valley or Kelly	17	2.9%	**3.0%**
2. Town of Jackson	233	39.9%	**41.2%**
3. Wilson	85	14.6%	**15.0%**
4. Alta	1	0.2%	**0.2%**
5. Teton Village	20	3.4%	**3.5%**
6. South Park area	93	15.9%	**16.4%**
7. Hoback Junction area	31	5.3%	**5.5%**
8. Other part of Teton County, Wyoming	86	14.7%	**15.2%**
Total Valid	566	96.9%	**100.0%**
9. Outside of Teton County, Wyoming (specify)	14	2.4%	
10. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	1	0.2%	
11. (No answer/Refused)	3	0.5%	
Total Missing	18	3.1%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q35. How many years have you lived in Teton County, Wyoming, full or part-time?

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Less than 1 year	11	1.9%	**1.9%**
2. 1-2 years	40	6.8%	**6.9%**
3. 3-5 years	65	11.1%	**11.2%**
4. 6-10 years	104	17.8%	**18.0%**
5. 11-20 years	135	23.1%	**23.3%**
6. Over 20 years	224	38.4%	**38.7%**
Total Valid	579	99.1%	**100.0%**
7. Do not live in Teton County, Wyoming	4	.7%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	1	.2%	
Total	5	.9%	

Q36. Including yourself, how many people, adults and children, currently live in your household?

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
One	121	20.7%	**21.0%**
Two	213	36.5%	**36.9%**
Three to five	230	39.4%	**39.9%**
Six or more	13	2.2%	**2.3%**
Total Valid	577	100.0%	**100.0%**
(No answer)	7	1.2	
Total	584	100.0	

Q37. What is your household's income? Please choose the range that best describes your household's total income before taxes in 2007. Please include all members of your household, related or unrelated, who have a regular income (from full time or part time jobs).

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Less than $15,000	17	2.9%	**3.4%**
2. $15,000 to $25,000	20	3.4%	**4.0%**
3. $25,000 to $50,000	86	14.7%	**17.2%**
4. $50,000 to $75,000	122	20.9%	**24.4%**
5. $75,000 to $100,000	99	17.0%	**19.8%**
6. $100,000 to $150,000	71	12.2%	**14.2%**
7. Over $150,000	86	14.7%	**17.2%**
Total Valid	501	85.8%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	17	2.9%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	66	11.3%	
Total Missing	83	14.2%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Q38. How much would you be willing to pay in taxes to conserve open space and natural resource areas?

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. Nothing	154	26.4%	**28.8%**
2. $100 per year	153	26.2%	**28.7%**
3. $250 per year	106	18.2%	**19.9%**
4. $500 per year	54	9.2%	**10.1%**
5. More than $500 per year	67	11.5%	**12.5%**
Total Valid	534	91.4%	**100.0%**
8. (Don't Know/Not Sure)	37	6.3%	
9. (No answer/Refused)	13	2.2%	
Total Missing	50	8.6%	
Total	584	100.0%	

Code without asking respondent's gender.

	Frequency	Percent	**Valid Percent**
1. (Male)	292	50.0%	**50.8%**
2. (Female)	283	48.5%	**49.2%**
Total Valid	575	98.5%	**100.0%**
8. (Can't tell)	9	1.5%	
Total Missing	0	0%	
Total	400	100.0%	

This is the end of the survey. Thank you for you time. Do you have any comments that you would like to make?

See Appendix 2 for complete text listings.

5. Cross-tabulations

This section contains cross-tabulations between selected background variables and survey items of interest. Only relevant cross-tabulations that returned statistically significant Pearson chi-square or linear-by-linear test results ($p < 0.05$), as appropriate, are presented. Certain of the background variables were recoded to facilitate analysis. For example, the "Where in Teton County…" variable (question 34) was recoded to reflect residents of the Town of Jackson versus all other (i.e., Teton County outside of Jackson) residents. Each survey item is presented with the original wording of the telephone questionnaire, and is preceded with an indication of the appropriate question number (e.g., "Q8" is the designation for survey question "8").

5.1. Full-time or Part-time Resident, cross-tabulations

Q8: With which ONE of the following 3 statements about deed restricted affordable housing do you agree?

Statement 1: **"Jackson and Teton County should provide deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley for ALL workers."**

Statement 2: **"Jackson and Teton County should provide deed restricted affordable housing PRIMARILY for emergency service and other ESSENTIAL workers in the Valley."**

Statement 3: **"Jackson and Teton County should NOT provide more deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley."**

Table 1: Full-time or Part-time resident status X Question 8

		Statement 1	Statement 2	Statement 3	Total
Full-time Resident	Count	213	208	89	510
	%	41.8%	40.8%	17.5%	100.0%
Part-time Resident	Count	20	10	2	32
	%	62.5%	31.3%	6.3%	100.0%
Total	Count	233	218	91	542
	%	43.0%	40.2%	16.8%	100.0%

A far higher percentage (63%) of part-time residents than full-time residents (42%) agree with statement 1 for this question (that deed restricted housing should be provided by the Town and County for all workers); while full-timers are about evenly split on whether such housing should be provided to all residents (42%) or only to primarily emergency or other essential personnel (41%). About three times as many (18%) full-time residents as part-time residents (6%) oppose providing more deed restricted housing at all.

Q31. "New roads should be constructed in the county and Jackson to provide traffic relief for all modes of travel." Would you say you...

Table 2: Full-time or Part-time resident status X Question 31

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Full-time Resident	Count	55	148	51	184	77	515
	%	10.7%	28.7%	9.9%	35.7%	15.0%	100.0%
Part-time Resident	Count	1	6	9	12	4	32
	%	3.1%	18.8%	28.1%	37.5%	12.5%	100.0%
Total	Count	56	154	60	196	81	547
	%	10.2%	28.2%	11.0%	35.8%	14.8%	100.0%

About half of both full-time residents (51%) and part-time residents (50%) either *disagree* or *strongly disagree* that new roads should be constructed in the county and Jackson to provide traffic relief for all modes of travel. There is far more variance between these two groups when it comes to *agreement* for building new roads for traffic relief: around 39% of full-time residents *agree* or *strongly agree* that roads should be built, while only around 22% of part-timers do. Well over a quarter (28%) of part-time residents are neutral on this issue.

5.2. Teton County or Town of Jackson resident, cross-tabulations

Q1. Which of the following two goals do you think is a higher priority for the Town of Jackson and Teton County?

Table 3: County or TOJ resident X Survey Question 1

		Preserve more open space OR	Build more deed restricted affordable housing	Equally important	Total
Teton County, outside TOJ	Count	168	83	73	324
	%	51.9%	25.6%	22.5%	100.0%
Town of Jackson	Count	92	79	56	227
	%	40.5%	34.8%	24.7%	100.0%
Total	Count	260	162	129	551
	%	47.2%	29.4%	23.4%	100.0%

Around a quarter of each of the groups of county resident (23%) and town resident (25%) feel that there is equal importance to preserving more open space and building more deed restricted housing. When it comes to each of these issues independently, far more (52%) town residents than county residents (41%) think that preserving open space is the more important issue, while around 35% of Town of Jackson residents feel that building more deed restricted housing is the more important issue, more so than county residents (26%).

Q2. Which of the following two goals do you think is a higher priority for the Town of Jackson and Teton County?

Table 4: County or TOJ resident X Survey Question 2

		Preserve more wildlife habitat and wildlife migration corridors OR	Build more deed restricted affordable housing	Equally important	Total
Teton County, outside TOJ	Count	208	60	58	326
	%	63.8%	18.4%	17.8%	100.0%
Town of Jackson	Count	123	53	51	227
	%	54.2%	23.3%	22.5%	100.0%
Total	Count	331	113	109	553
	%	59.9%	20.4%	19.7%	100.0%

Majorities of both county (64%) and town (54%) residents think it is more important to preserve more wildlife habitat and wildlife migration corridors than to build more deed restricted housing. However, a higher percentage (23%) of town residents than county residents (18%) consider building more deed restricted housing the more important issue. Considerable percentages of both groups (county: 18%; town: 23%) think these issues are equally important.

Q3: What about…?

Table 5: County or TOJ resident X Survey Question 3

		Limit overall growth in the Valley OR	Build more deed restricted affordable housing	Equally important	Total
Teton County, outside TOJ	Count	185	98	32	315
	%	58.7%	31.1%	10.2%	100.0%
Town of Jackson	Count	101	95	25	221
	%	45.7%	43.0%	11.3%	100.0%
Total	Count	286	193	57	536
	%	53.4%	36.0%	10.6%	100.0%

A clear majority (59%) of county residents think that limiting overall growth in the Valley to be a more important issue than building more deed restricted housing, while Town of Jackson residents are fairly split between limiting overall Valley growth (46%) and building more deed restricted housing (43%) as the more important issue. Fairly modest percentages of both groups (county: 10%; town: 11%) think these issues are equally important.

Q6. What about…

Table 6: County or TOJ resident X Survey Question 6

		Expand deed restricted affordable housing opportunities	Centralize housing and services	Equally important	Total
Teton County, outside TOJ	Count	80	197	36	313
	%	25.6%	62.9%	11.5%	100.0%
Town of Jackson	Count	83	106	23	212
	%	39.2%	50.0%	10.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	163	303	59	525
	%	31.0%	57.7%	11.2%	100.0%

The highest percentages of both county residents (63%) and town residents (50%) think that centralizing housing and services is more important than expanding deed restricted housing opportunities. More (39%) Town of Jackson residents than county residents (26%) think that expanding deed restricted housing opportunities is the more important issue.

Q8: With which ONE of the following 3 statements about deed restricted affordable housing do you agree?

Statement 1: **"Jackson and Teton County should provide deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley for ALL workers."**

Statement 2: **"Jackson and Teton County should provide deed restricted affordable housing PRIMARILY for emergency service and other ESSENTIAL workers in the Valley."**

Statement 3: **"Jackson and Teton County should NOT provide more deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley."**

Table 7: County or TOJ resident X Survey Question 8

		Statement 1	Statement 2	Statement 3	Total
Teton County, outside TOJ	Count	120	134	64	318
	%	37.7%	42.1%	20.1%	100.0%
Town of Jackson	Count	116	80	27	223
	%	52.0%	35.9%	12.1%	100.0%
Total	Count	236	214	91	541
	%	43.6%	39.6%	16.8%	100.0%

Far more (52%) Town of Jackson residents than county residents (38%) agree with the statement, "Jackson and Teton County should provide deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley for ALL workers." More county residents (42%) than town residents (36%) agree with the statement, "Jackson and Teton County should provide deed restricted affordable housing primarily for emergency service and other essential workers in the Valley." Far more (20%) county residents than Town of Jackson residents (12%) agree that the Town and County should *not* provide more deed restricted housing in the Valley.

Q10. "In order to limit development in rural areas of Teton County, more development and population growth should be allowed in certain county centers (such as Aspen/Teton Pines, Wilson, South Park, Hoback, Teton Village, Town of Jackson)."

Table 8: County or TOJ resident X Survey Question 10

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Teton County, outside TOJ	Count	59	139	26	64	33	321
	%	18.4%	43.3%	8.1%	19.9%	10.3%	100.0%
Town of Jackson	Count	45	101	31	36	9	222
	%	20.3%	45.5%	14.0%	16.2%	4.1%	100.0%
Total	Count	104	240	57	100	42	543
	%	19.2%	44.2%	10.5%	18.4%	7.7%	100.0%

Strong majorities of county residents (62%) and town residents (66%) agree (either *agree* or *strongly agree*) that more development and population growth should be allowed in certain county centers in order to limit development in rural Teton County areas. Substantially more (30%) county residents than Town of Jackson residents (20%) *disagree* or *strongly disagree* with this.

Q14. "Development should be increased in the Jackson downtown area outside of town square and the Jackson "Y" (in the Albertson's area at WY 22 and Broadway) as a tradeoff for conserving natural resources." Would you say you…

Table 9: County or TOJ resident X Survey Question 14

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Teton County, outside TOJ	Count	77	153	30	43	14	317
	%	24.3%	48.3%	9.5%	13.6%	4.4%	100.0%
Town of Jackson	Count	45	100	18	49	15	227
	%	19.8%	44.1%	7.9%	21.6%	6.6%	100.0%
Total	Count	122	253	48	92	29	544
	%	22.4%	46.5%	8.8%	16.9%	5.3%	100.0%

Strong majorities of county (73%) and town (64%) residents agree (either *agree* or *strongly agree*) that development should be increased in the Jackson downtown area outside of town square and the Jackson "Y". Disagreement on this issue is higher among town residents (28%) than county residents (18%). Relatively low percentages of both groups are neutral on this issue.

Q24. "Teton County and the Town of Jackson should continue to use incentives rather than requirements to encourage more deed restricted affordable housing in new developments." Would you say you…

Table 10: County or TOJ resident X Survey Question 24

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Teton County, outside TOJ	Count	33	128	33	97	27	318
	%	10.4%	40.3%	10.4%	30.5%	8.5%	100.0%
Town of Jackson	Count	26	86	20	50	45	227
	%	11.5%	37.9%	8.8%	22.0%	19.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	59	214	53	147	72	545
	%	10.8%	39.3%	9.7%	27.0%	13.2%	100.0%

High percentages of both county residents (51%) and town residents (49%) either *agree* or *strongly agree* that Teton County and the Town of Jackson should continue to use incentives rather than requirements to encourage more deed restricted affordable housing in new developments. A slightly higher percentage (42%) of town residents disagree with this issue than do county residents (39%),while relatively modest percentages of both groups are neutral.

Q25. "The County and the Town of Jackson should allow increased density in order to provide deed restricted affordable housing." Would you say you...

Table 11: County or TOJ resident X Survey Question 25

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Teton County, outside TOJ	Count	36	106	47	87	42	318
	%	11.3%	33.3%	14.8%	27.4%	13.2%	100.0%
Town of Jackson	Count	38	94	24	45	26	227
	%	16.7%	41.4%	10.6%	19.8%	11.5%	100.0%
Total	Count	74	200	71	132	68	545
	%	13.6%	36.7%	13.0%	24.2%	12.5%	100.0%

The highest percentages of both county (45%) and town (58%) residents either *agree* or *strongly agree* that Teton County and the Town of Jackson should allow increased density in order to provide deed restricted affordable housing. However, more county residents (41%) than Town of Jackson residents (31%) *disagree* or *strongly disagree* with this.

Q37. What is your household's income? Please choose the range that best describes your household's total income before taxes in 2007. Please include all members of your household, related or unrelated, who have a regular income (from full time or part time jobs).

Table 12: County or TOJ resident X Survey Question 37

		<$15K	$15K to $25K	$25K to $50K	$50K to $75K	$75K to $100K	$100K to $150K	>$150K	Total
Teton County, outside TOJ	Count	3	7	47	57	63	44	60	281
	%	1.1%	2.5%	16.7%	20.3%	22.4%	15.7%	21.4%	100.0%
Town of Jackson	Count	13	13	37	61	31	26	24	205
	%	6.3%	6.3%	18.0%	29.8%	15.1%	12.7%	11.7%	100.0%
Total	Count	16	20	84	118	94	70	84	486
	%	3.3%	4.1%	17.3%	24.3%	19.3%	14.4%	17.3%	100.0%

The highest percentages of county residents fall the within the income brackets of $75K-$100K (22%) and >$150K (21%), while the highest percentage (30%) of those in the Town of Jackson fall within the $50K-$75K range. Well over one-third (37%) of county residents are contained within the two highest income brackets ($100K-$150K; >$150K), while under one-quarter (24%) of Town of Jackson residents fall within these two categories. Also, similar percentages of county residents (59%) and Jackson residents (63%) are contained within the three central income brackets ($25K-$50K; $50K-$75K; $75K-$100K). Notably, only around 4% of county residents fall within the two lowest income categories (<$15K; $15K-$25K), while far more (13%) Jackson residents do.

Q38. How much would you be willing to pay in taxes to conserve open space and natural resource areas?

Table 13: County or TOJ resident X Survey Question 38

		Nothing	$100 per year	$250 per year	$500 per year	More than $500 per year	Total
Teton County, outside TOJ	Count	85	74	64	37	49	309
	%	27.5%	23.9%	20.7%	12.0%	15.9%	100.0%
Town of Jackson	Count	66	76	37	15	17	211
	%	31.3%	36.0%	17.5%	7.1%	8.1%	100.0%
Total	Count	151	150	101	52	66	520
	%	29.0%	28.8%	19.4%	10.0%	12.7%	100.0%

Majorities of both county (51%) and town (67%) residents state that they would be willing to pay either nothing or $100 a year in taxes to conserve open space and natural resource areas. Based on the income data seen in the table above for Q37, it is not surprising that higher percentages (28%) of county residents are willing to pay either $500 or more per year in taxes than are Town of Jackson residents (15%), as there is a higher income skew for county residents. Not insubstantial percentages of both groups state that they are willing to pay $250 per year (county: 21%; town: 18%).

5.3. Years Lived in Teton County, cross-tabulations

Q1. Which of the following two goals do you think is a higher priority for the Town of Jackson and Teton County?

Table 14: Years Lived in Teton County X Survey Question 1

		Preserve more open space OR	Build more deed restricted affordable housing	Equally important	Total
<1	Count	7	3	1	11
	%	63.6%	27.3%	9.1%	100.0%
1-5	Count	35	43	25	103
	%	34.0%	41.7%	24.3%	100.0%
6-10	Count	39	41	21	101
	%	38.6%	40.6%	20.8%	100.0%
11-20	Count	66	36	27	129
	%	51.2%	27.9%	20.9%	100.0%
>20	Count	115	49	56	220
	%	52.3%	22.3%	25.5%	100.0%
Total	Count	262	172	130	564
	%	46.5%	30.5%	23.0%	100.0%

For this variable, all categories except those who have lived in the Teton County for under a year stated that *preserving more open space* and *building more deed restricted housing* are equally important issues (between 21% and 26%; only 9% for those who have lived in Teton County for under a year). Groups that feel the more important issue is to preserve more open space include those who have lived in Teton County for under a year (64%), 11-20 years (51%), and over 20 years (52%). Those groups whose highest percentages feel that building more deed restricted housing is the more important issue include those who have lived in Teton County for 1-5 years (42%), and 6-10 years (41%).

Q2. Which of the following two goals do you think is a higher priority for the Town of Jackson and Teton County?

Table 15: Years Lived in Teton County X Survey Question 2

		Preserve more wildlife habitat and wildlife migration corridors	Build more deed restricted affordable housing	(Equally important)	Total
<1	Count	7	1	3	11
	%	63.6%	9.1%	27.3%	100.0%
1-5	Count	52	36	15	103
	%	50.5%	35.0%	14.6%	100.0%
6-10	Count	56	21	25	102
	%	54.9%	20.6%	24.5%	100.0%
11-20	Count	84	27	23	134
	%	62.7%	20.1%	17.2%	100.0%
>20	Count	137	32	46	215
	%	63.7%	14.9%	21.4%	100.0%
Total	Count	336	117	112	565
	%	59.5%	20.7%	19.8%	100.0%

Across the board, higher percentages for all categories of residents for this variable believe it to be a more important issue to preserve more wildlife habitat and migration corridors than to build more deed restricted housing. However, the category of 1-5 years of residence has the highest percentage (35%) of all categories for believing the building of more deed restricted housing to be of higher importance.

Q3. What about…?

Table 16: Years Lived in Teton County X Survey Question 3

		Limit overall growth in the Valley OR	Build more deed restricted affordable housing	Equally important	Total
<1	Count	7	3	0	10
	%	70.0%	30.0%	0.0%	100.0%
1-5	Count	42	48	10	100
	%	42.0%	48.0%	10.0%	100.0%
6-10	Count	44	42	13	99
	%	44.4%	42.4%	13.1%	100.0%
11-20	Count	71	45	12	128
	%	55.5%	35.2%	9.4%	100.0%
>20	Count	128	61	22	211
	%	60.7%	28.9%	10.4%	100.0%
Total	Count	292	199	57	548
	%	53.3%	36.3%	10.4%	100.0%

There is a fairly even split between residents who have lived in Teton County for 1-5 years and from 6-10 years about whether limiting overall growth in the Valley or building more deed restricted housing is the most important issue. However, majorities of all other length-of-residence categories think that limiting overall growth in the Valley is the more important issue.

Q8: With which ONE of the following 3 statements about deed restricted affordable housing do you agree?

Statement 1: **"Jackson and Teton County should provide deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley for ALL workers."**

Statement 2: **"Jackson and Teton County should provide deed restricted affordable housing PRIMARILY for emergency service and other ESSENTIAL workers in the Valley."**

Statement 3: **"Jackson and Teton County should NOT provide more deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley."**

Table 17: Years Lived in Teton County X Survey Question 8

		Statement 1	Statement 2	Statement 3	Total
<1	Count	3	5	2	10
	%	30.0%	50.0%	20.0%	100.0%
1-5	Count	58	33	10	101
	%	57.4%	32.7%	9.9%	100.0%
6-10	Count	51	43	8	102
	%	50.0%	42.2%	7.8%	100.0%
11-20	Count	56	59	14	129
	%	43.4%	45.7%	10.9%	100.0%
>20	Count	71	83	57	211
	%	33.6%	39.3%	27.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	239	223	91	553
	%	43.2%	40.3%	16.5%	100.0%

Higher percentages of those who have lived in Teton County from under one year, 11-20 years, and over 20 years agree that, “Jackson and Teton County should provide deed restricted affordable housing primarily for emergency service and other essential workers in the Valley”, than with the other statements. Those who have lived in Teton County from 1-5 years and 6-10 years agree that, “Jackson and Teton County should provide deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley for all workers.” Substantial percentages of those who have lived in the County for under a year (20%) and over 20 years (27%) agree that, “Jackson and Teton County should NOT provide more deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley.”

Q9. With which ONE of the following 3 statements about development in the Town of Jackson do you agree?

Statement 1: **"Current building heights in town today should be maintained. No change."**

Statement 2: **"Careful redevelopment outside of the town square should be allowed, with up to 3-storey buildings."**

Statement 3: **"Careful redevelopment outside of the town square should be allowed, with up to 4-storey buildings."**

Table 18: Years Lived in Teton County X Survey Question 9

		Statement 1	Statement 2	Statement 3	Total
<1	Count	5	3	2	10
	%	50.0%	30.0%	20.0%	100.0%
1-5	Count	30	37	34	101
	%	29.7%	36.6%	33.7%	100.0%
6-10	Count	39	32	31	102
	%	38.2%	31.4%	30.4%	100.0%
11-20	Count	52	50	31	133
	%	39.1%	37.6%	23.3%	100.0%
>20	Count	97	83	34	214
	%	45.3%	38.8%	15.9%	100.0%
Total	Count	223	205	132	560
	%	39.8%	36.6%	23.6%	100.0%

Those groups who agree in higher percentages with the statement, “Current building heights in town today should be maintained. No change,” than the other statements are those who have lived in Teton County for under a year (50%), 6-10 years (38%), and over 20 years (45%). Those who agree that, “Careful redevelopment outside of the town square should be allowed, with up to 3-storey buildings,” include only those who have lived in Teton County for 1-5 years. While no group had its highest percentage of agreement focusing on the statement, “Careful redevelopment outside of the town square should be allowed, with up to 4-storey buildings,” all groups had substantial percentages agreeing with this statement. Of note, more than a third (34%) of those who have lived in Teton County 1-5 years agree with this latter statement.

Q10. "In order to limit development in rural areas of Teton County, more development and population growth should be allowed in certain county centers (such as Aspen/Teton Pines, Wilson, South Park, Hoback, Teton Village, Town of Jackson)."

Table 19: Years Lived in Teton County X Survey Question 10

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
<1	Count	2	6	1	2	0	11
	%	18.2%	54.5%	9.1%	18.2%	0.0%	100.0%
1-5	Count	33	40	6	16	6	101
	%	32.7%	39.6%	5.9%	15.8%	5.9%	100.0%
6-10	Count	23	47	11	16	2	99
	%	23.2%	47.5%	11.1%	16.2%	2.0%	100.0%
11-20	Count	21	61	18	19	11	130
	%	16.2%	46.9%	13.8%	14.6%	8.5%	100.0%
>20	Count	30	93	22	47	23	215
	%	14.0%	43.3%	10.2%	21.9%	10.7%	100.0%
Total	Count	109	247	58	100	42	556
	%	19.6%	44.4%	10.4%	18.0%	7.6%	100.0%

Clear majorities for every length-of-residence category agree (either *agree* or *strongly agree*) that, "In order to limit development in rural areas of Teton County, more development and population growth should be allowed in certain county centers…" However, those with the highest percentage (33%) of disagreement (either *disagree* or *strongly disagree*) with this statement have lived in Teton County for 20 years or more.

Q11. "It is acceptable to allow the expansion of town-level density within a half mile of High School Road (near the Smith's Shopping Center) to provide more housing IF an equal amount of land somewhere else in the county is preserved from development." Would you say you…

Table 20: Years Lived in Teton County X Survey Question 11

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
<1	Count	0	7	2	2	0	11
	%	0.0%	63.6%	18.2%	18.2%	0.0%	100.0%
1-5	Count	21	47	19	8	8	103
	%	20.4%	45.6%	18.4%	7.8%	7.8%	100.0%
6-10	Count	21	53	9	15	5	103
	%	20.4%	51.5%	8.7%	14.6%	4.9%	100.0%
11-20	Count	28	62	12	20	10	132
	%	21.2%	47.0%	9.1%	15.2%	7.6%	100.0%
>20	Count	23	88	22	53	27	213
	%	10.8%	41.3%	10.3%	24.9%	12.7%	100.0%
Total	Count	93	257	64	98	50	562
	%	19.6%	44.4%	10.4%	18.0%	7.6%	100.0%

As with the previous item, clear majorities for every length-of-residence category agree (either *agree* or *strongly agree*) that, "It is acceptable to allow the expansion of town-level density within a half mile of High School Road (near the Smith's Shopping Center) to provide more housing if an equal amount of land somewhere else in the county is preserved from development." Again, those with the highest percentage (38%) of disagreement (either *disagree* or *strongly disagree*) with this statement have lived in Teton County for over 20 years. It is notable that substantial percentages of some groups are neutral on this issue (those who have lived in the County for under 1 year and from 1-5 years are both 18% for neutrality on this issue).

Q12. "It is acceptable to allow expansion of town-level density within a half mile of High School Road (near the Smith's Shopping Center) IF this provides more deed restricted affordable housing." Would you say you…

Table 21: Years Lived in Teton County X Survey Question 12

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
<1	Count	3	3	3	2	0	11
	%	27.3%	27.3%	27.3%	18.2%	0.0%	100.0%
1-5	Count	28	43	9	8	14	102
	%	27.5%	42.2%	8.8%	7.8%	13.7%	100.0%
6-10	Count	26	50	7	14	5	102
	%	25.5%	49.0%	6.9%	13.7%	4.9%	100.0%
11-20	Count	23	51	23	25	11	133
	%	17.3%	38.3%	17.3%	18.8%	8.3%	100.0%
>20	Count	26	83	19	50	33	211
	%	12.3%	39.3%	9.0%	23.7%	15.6%	100.0%
Total	Count	106	230	61	99	63	559
	%	19.0%	41.1%	10.9%	17.7%	11.3%	100.0%

Following the previously identified pattern, majorities in all length-of-residence categories agree that, “It is acceptable to allow expansion of town-level density within a half mile of High School Road (near the Smith's Shopping Center) if this provides more deed restricted affordable housing.” Those residing within Teton County for more than 20 years have the highest level (40%) of disagreement with this statement. Those who are substantially neutral on this issue have lived within Teton County for less than a year (27%) and 11-20 years (17%).

Q13. "Growth and development in the county should be limited even if it reduces the ability to provide deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley." Would you say you…

Table 22: Years Lived in Teton County X Survey Question 13

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
<1	Count	4	2	2	3	0	11
	%	36.4%	18.2%	18.2%	27.3%	0.0%	100.0%
1-5	Count	14	24	15	35	14	102
	%	13.7%	23.5%	14.7%	34.3%	13.7%	100.0%
6-10	Count	17	29	10	31	15	102
	%	16.7%	28.4%	9.8%	30.4%	14.7%	100.0%
11-20	Count	29	37	13	38	12	129
	%	22.5%	28.7%	10.1%	29.5%	9.3%	100.0%
>20	Count	52	80	20	41	26	219
	%	23.7%	36.5%	9.1%	18.7%	11.9%	100.0%
Total	Count	116	172	60	148	67	563
	%	20.6%	30.6%	10.7%	26.3%	11.9%	100.0%

All length-of-residence categories tended toward agreement with the statement, “Growth and development in the county should be limited even if it reduces the ability to provide deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley.” Those who have lived within Teton County for more than 20 years had the highest percentage of agreement (over 60%). Those categories with the highest levels of disagreement with this statement include those who have lived within Teton County for 1-5 years (48%) and 6-10 years (45%). It is notable that, excepting the agreement of those of 20+ years’ residence, there are not strong majorities in particular categories for this issue, and there is a generalized, wide variety of opinion among most of the length-of-residence categories.

Q14. "Development should be increased in the Jackson downtown area outside of town square and the Jackson "Y" (in the Albertson's area at WY 22 and Broadway) as a tradeoff for conserving natural resources." Would you say you…

Table 23: Years Lived in Teton County X Survey Question 14

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
<1	Count	0	9	1	0	1	11
	%	0.0%	81.8%	9.1%	0.0%	9.1%	100.0%
1-5	Count	33	40	9	15	4	101
	%	32.7%	39.6%	8.9%	14.9%	4.0%	100.0%
6-10	Count	33	46	9	10	3	101
	%	32.7%	45.5%	8.9%	9.9%	3.0%	100.0%
11-20	Count	23	64	10	24	9	130
	%	17.7%	49.2%	7.7%	18.5%	6.9%	100.0%
>20	Count	38	98	20	45	12	213
	%	17.8%	46.0%	9.4%	21.1%	5.6%	100.0%
Total	Count	127	257	49	94	29	556
	%	22.8%	46.2%	8.8%	16.9%	5.2%	100.0%

Strong majorities in all length-of-residence categories agree (either *agree* or *strongly agree*) with the statement that, "Development should be increased in the Jackson downtown area outside of town square and the Jackson "Y"…as a tradeoff for conserving natural resources." Relatively low percentages in all categories are neutral on this issue. Categories with the highest percentages of disagreement are those who have lived within Teton County for 11-20 years (25%) and over 20 years (27%).

Q16. "There should be long-term redevelopment of the Jackson "Y" (in the Albertson's area at WY 22 and Broadway) to improve transportation corridors, make the area more pedestrian-oriented, and also provide additional deed restricted affordable housing." Would you say you…

Table 24: Years Lived in Teton County X Survey Question 16

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
<1	Count	5	3	2	1	0	11
	%	45.5%	27.3%	18.2%	9.1%	0.0%	100.0%
1-5	Count	34	48	8	7	5	102
	%	33.3%	47.1%	7.8%	6.9%	4.9%	100.0%
6-10	Count	30	54	10	8	1	103
	%	29.1%	52.4%	9.7%	7.8%	1.0%	100.0%
11-20	Count	23	70	18	16	3	130
	%	17.7%	53.8%	13.8%	12.3%	2.3%	100.0%
>20	Count	36	102	27	28	19	212
	%	17.0%	48.1%	12.7%	13.2%	9.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	128	277	65	60	28	558
	%	22.9%	49.6%	11.6%	10.8%	5.0%	100.0%

This survey item skews very strongly toward agreement for all length-of-residence categories (the lowest percentage for combined *agree* and *strongly agree* is 65% for those who have lived within Teton County for over 20 years). Those who disagree in the greatest percentages are those who have lived within the county for over 20 years (22%) and 11-20 years (15%). Three of the five length-of-residence categories register neutral percentages in excess of 12%.

Q17. "Both overall development in rural parts of Teton County and redevelopment in the Town of Jackson should be limited." Would you say you…

Table 25: Years Lived in Teton County X Survey Question 17

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
<1	Count	3	6	0	2	0	11
	%	27.3%	54.5%	0.0%	18.2%	0.0%	100.0%
1-5	Count	12	43	10	25	13	103
	%	11.7%	41.7%	9.7%	24.3%	12.6%	100.0%
6-10	Count	18	37	9	26	13	103
	%	17.5%	35.9%	8.7%	25.2%	12.6%	100.0%
11-20	Count	19	62	16	20	10	127
	%	15.0%	48.8%	12.6%	15.7%	7.9%	100.0%
>20	Count	59	82	18	39	16	214
	%	27.6%	38.3%	8.4%	18.2%	7.5%	100.0%
Total	Count	111	230	53	112	52	558
	%	19.9%	41.2%	9.5%	20.1%	9.3%	100.0%

This survey item ("Both overall development in rural parts of Teton County and redevelopment in the Town of Jackson should be limited") also tends toward agreement for all categories, the strongest being those who have lived within Teton County for less than a year (83%) and over 20 years (66%). Those most in disagreement are those who have lived within Teton County for 1-5 years (37%) and 6-10 years (38%).

Q18. "Future change in downtown Jackson as well as in residential neighborhoods of Jackson should be minimized." Would you say you…

Table 26: Years Lived in Teton County X Survey Question 18

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
<1	Count	2	2	5	2	0	11
	%	18.2%	18.2%	45.5%	18.2%	0.0%	100.0%
1-5	Count	11	23	18	40	11	103
	%	10.7%	22.3%	17.5%	38.8%	10.7%	100.0%
6-10	Count	12	30	18	36	8	104
	%	11.5%	28.8%	17.3%	34.6%	7.7%	100.0%
11-20	Count	17	37	20	47	11	132
	%	12.9%	28.0%	15.2%	35.6%	8.3%	100.0%
>20	Count	40	71	32	61	12	216
	%	18.5%	32.9%	14.8%	28.2%	5.6%	100.0%
Total	Count	82	163	93	186	42	566
	%	14.5%	28.8%	16.4%	32.9%	7.4%	100.0%

Agreement with the statement, “Future change in downtown Jackson as well as in residential neighborhoods of Jackson should be minimized,” increases in percentage as length-of residence increases. There is more comparability among the categories when considering disagreement, excepting those who have lived within Teton County for under a year, from whom there is the least disagreement (18%). All categories have substantial percentages claiming to be neutral about this statement: 46% of those within Teton County for under a year are neutral on this issue.

Q21. "The County should establish a funding source (for example, a bond, fees, sales tax or property tax) in order to acquire open space or conservation areas for critical wildlife habitat." Would you say you…

Table 27: Years Lived in Teton County X Survey Question 21

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
<1	Count	3	6	1	0	1	11
	%	27.3%	54.5%	9.1%	0.0%	9.1%	100.0%
1-5	Count	18	48	12	14	11	103
	%	17.5%	46.6%	11.7%	13.6%	10.7%	100.0%
6-10	Count	24	48	10	16	3	101
	%	23.8%	47.5%	9.9%	15.8%	3.0%	100.0%
11-20	Count	21	52	18	36	6	133
	%	15.8%	39.1%	13.5%	27.1%	4.5%	100.0%
>20	Count	43	76	20	50	28	217
	%	19.8%	35.0%	9.2%	23.0%	12.9%	100.0%
Total	Count	109	230	61	116	49	565
	%	19.3%	40.7%	10.8%	20.5%	8.7%	100.0%

Majorities of all length-of-residence categories agree with this survey item. However, those with the highest percentages of disagreement are those who have lived within Teton County for 11-20 years (32%) and over 20 years (36%).

Q23. "The County and the Town of Jackson should require a higher amount of deed restricted affordable housing to be built as part of new developments." Would you say you…

Table 28: Years Lived in Teton County X Survey Question 23

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
<1	Count	5	3	1	1	1	11
	%	45.5%	27.3%	9.1%	9.1%	9.1%	100.0%
1-5	Count	35	41	8	8	12	104
	%	33.7%	39.4%	7.7%	7.7%	11.5%	100.0%
6-10	Count	31	50	7	12	3	103
	%	30.1%	48.5%	6.8%	11.7%	2.9%	100.0%
11-20	Count	32	59	11	25	6	133
	%	24.1%	44.4%	8.3%	18.8%	4.5%	100.0%
>20	Count	47	90	17	32	32	218
	%	21.6%	41.3%	7.8%	14.7%	14.7%	100.0%
Total	Count	150	243	44	78	54	569
	%	26.4%	42.7%	7.7%	13.7%	9.5%	100.0%

Strong majorities within every length-of-residence category agree with the statement, "The County and the Town of Jackson should require a higher amount of deed restricted affordable housing to be built as part of new developments," with the lowest being among those in Teton County for over 20 years (63%). Highest disagreement tends to occur among those who have lived within Teton County the longest, though it is notable that those who have lived within Teton County for 6-10 years disagree in the lowest percentage (15%).

Q25. "The County and the Town of Jackson should allow increased density in order to provide deed restricted affordable housing." Would you say you...

Table 29: Years Lived in Teton County X Survey Question 25

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
<1	Count	1	5	1	2	2	11
	%	9.1%	45.5%	9.1%	18.2%	18.2%	100.0%
1-5	Count	26	42	11	14	8	101
	%	25.7%	41.6%	10.9%	13.9%	7.9%	100.0%
6-10	Count	22	41	14	18	5	100
	%	22.0%	41.0%	14.0%	18.0%	5.0%	100.0%
11-20	Count	13	51	20	26	19	129
	%	10.1%	39.5%	15.5%	20.2%	14.7%	100.0%
>20	Count	16	67	26	73	35	217
	%	7.4%	30.9%	12.0%	33.6%	16.1%	100.0%
Total	Count	78	206	72	133	69	558
	%	14.0%	36.9%	12.9%	23.8%	12.4%	100.0%

Agreement with the statement, “The County and the Town of Jackson should allow increased density in order to provide deed restricted affordable housing,” tends to drop as length-of-residence increases; 50% of those who have lived in Teton County for over 20 years disagree. There is a substantial amount of neutrality on this issue: more than 10% for all but one category.

Q28. "The County and the Town of Jackson should promote walking, bicycling, transit, and carpooling as alternatives to widening roads." Would you say you...

Table 30: Years Lived in Teton County X Survey Question 28

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
<1	Count	5	5	1	0	0	11
	%	45.5%	45.5%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
1-5	Count	56	29	4	8	7	104
	%	53.8%	27.9%	3.8%	7.7%	6.7%	100.0%
6-10	Count	47	37	10	8	1	103
	%	45.6%	35.9%	9.7%	7.8%	1.0%	100.0%
11-20	Count	53	54	9	13	6	135
	%	39.3%	40.0%	6.7%	9.6%	4.4%	100.0%
>20	Count	76	80	16	31	14	217
	%	35.0%	36.9%	7.4%	14.3%	6.5%	100.0%
Total	Count	237	205	40	60	28	570
	%	41.6%	36.0%	7.0%	10.5%	4.9%	100.0%

There tends to be high agreement with this survey item for all length-of-residence categories (no category is under 72% for *agree* and *strongly agree*), and no category exceeds 10% in neutrality on this issue. The category in highest disagreement (*disagree* and *strongly disagree*) with this issue is that of residents of over 20 years, 21% of whom disagree.

Q29. "Roads in Jackson should be widened for transit and carpool lanes." Would you say you...

Table 31: Years Lived in Teton County X Survey Question 29

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
<1	Count	0	2	1	6	2	11
	%	0.0%	18.2%	9.1%	54.5%	18.2%	100.0%
1-5	Count	8	17	15	43	20	103
	%	7.8%	16.5%	14.6%	41.7%	19.4%	100.0%
6-10	Count	2	31	12	36	20	101
	%	2.0%	30.7%	11.9%	35.6%	19.8%	100.0%
11-20	Count	9	36	16	56	14	131
	%	6.9%	27.5%	12.2%	42.7%	10.7%	100.0%
>20	Count	14	68	27	88	22	219
	%	6.4%	31.1%	12.3%	40.2%	10.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	33	154	71	229	78	565
	%	5.8%	27.3%	12.6%	40.5%	13.8%	100.0%

Majorities in all length-of-residence categories *disagree* with the statement that, “Roads in Jackson should be widened for transit and carpool lanes.” There is a relatively high incidence of neutrality (all but one category is *neutral* in excess of 11%). For three categories, a third or more agree with this statement (6-10 years: 33%; 11-20 years: 34%; over 20 years: 37%).

Q29a. "Roads throughout the county should be widened for transit and carpool lanes." Would you say you...

Table 32: Years Lived in Teton County X Survey Question 29a

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
<1	Count	0	2	1	5	3	11
	%	0.0%	18.2%	9.1%	45.5%	27.3%	100.0%
1-5	Count	7	22	10	43	19	101
	%	6.9%	21.8%	9.9%	42.6%	18.8%	100.0%
6-10	Count	3	28	16	36	19	102
	%	2.9%	27.5%	15.7%	35.3%	18.6%	100.0%
11-20	Count	9	35	13	57	16	130
	%	6.9%	26.9%	10.0%	43.8%	12.3%	100.0%
>20	Count	13	70	23	90	23	219
	%	5.9%	32.0%	10.5%	41.1%	10.5%	100.0%
Total	Count	32	157	63	231	80	563
	%	5.7%	27.9%	11.2%	41.0%	14.2%	100.0%

Majorities in all length-of-residence categories likewise *disagree* with the statement that, “Roads throughout the county should be widened for transit and carpool lanes,” with disagreement decreasing as length-of residence increases. All categories but one are a least 10% neutral on this issue; and, as expected, agreement with this issue increases as length-of-residence increases.

Q37. What is your household's income? Please choose the range that best describes your household's total income before taxes in 2007. Please include all members of your household, related or unrelated, who have a regular income (from full time or part time jobs).

Table 33: Years Lived in Teton County X Survey Question 37

		<$15K	$15K to $25K	$25K to $50K	$50K to $75K	$75K to $100K	$100K to $150K	>$150K	Total
<1	Count	1	0	2	1	3	1	1	9
	%	11.1%	0.0%	22.2%	11.1%	33.3%	11.1%	11.1%	100.0%
1-5	Count	7	8	13	18	14	12	15	87
	%	8.0%	9.2%	14.9%	20.7%	16.1%	13.8%	17.2%	100.0%
6-10	Count	3	3	22	21	10	17	16	92
	%	3.3%	3.3%	23.9%	22.8%	10.9%	18.5%	17.4%	100.0%
11-20	Count	2	6	11	30	20	20	26	115
	%	1.7%	5.2%	9.6%	26.1%	17.4%	17.4%	22.6%	100.0%
>20	Count	3	3	38	50	51	21	28	194
	%	1.5%	1.5%	19.6%	25.8%	26.3%	10.8%	14.4%	100.0%
Total	Count	16	20	86	120	98	71	86	497
	%	3.2%	4.0%	17.3%	24.1%	19.7%	14.3%	17.3%	100.0%

While the pattern for this cross-tabulation is not entirely distinct, it is the case that, in general, income ranges tend to be higher as length-of-residence increases.

Q38. How much would you be willing to pay in taxes to conserve open space and natural resource areas?

Table 34: Years Lived in Teton County X Survey Question 38

		Nothing	$100 per year	$250 per year	$500 per year	More than $500 per year	Total
<1	Count	0	5	4	0	2	11
	%	0.0%	45.5%	36.4%	0.0%	18.2%	100.0%
1-5	Count	23	32	27	5	9	96
	%	24.0%	33.3%	28.1%	5.2%	9.4%	100.0%
6-10	Count	17	31	13	12	19	92
	%	18.5%	33.7%	14.1%	13.0%	20.7%	100.0%
11-20	Count	35	34	22	15	19	125
	%	28.0%	27.2%	17.6%	12.0%	15.2%	100.0%
>20	Count	79	49	39	22	18	207
	%	38.2%	23.7%	18.8%	10.6%	8.7%	100.0%
Total	Count	154	151	105	54	67	531
	%	29.0%	28.4%	19.8%	10.2%	12.6%	100.0%

In general, as length-of-residence increases, the willingness to pay tax to conserve open space and natural resource areas decreases. For those unwilling to pay any tax at all, the percentage is highest (38%) among those who have lived within Teton County for over 20 years. Majorities for all length-of-residence categories, except for those who have lived within the County for under a year, either fall into the *nothing* or *$100 per year* categories.

5.4. Income, cross-tabulations

Q6. What about…

Table 35: Annual Income X Survey Question 6

		Expand deed restricted affordable housing opportunities	Centralize housing and services	Equally important	Total
Less than $15K	Count	8	6	1	15
	%	53.3%	40.0%	6.7%	100.0%
$15K- $25K	Count	10	7	2	19
	%	52.6%	36.8%	10.5%	100.0%
$25K- $50K	Count	25	42	11	78
	%	32.1%	53.8%	14.1%	100.0%
$50K- $75K	Count	33	63	13	109
	%	30.3%	57.8%	11.9%	100.0%
$75K- $100K	Count	31	56	7	94
	%	33.0%	59.6%	7.4%	100.0%
$100K-$150K	Count	14	41	10	65
	%	21.5%	63.1%	15.4%	100.0%
Over $150K	Count	17	57	9	83
	%	20.5%	68.7%	10.8%	100.0%

Those with annual incomes of $25K or below tend to think that expanding deed restricted housing opportunities is more important than centralizing housing and services, the latter being considered as more important by majorities of those making over $25K annually. Many income categories have substantial percentages of respondents stating that these issues are equally important.

Q7: What about…

Table 36: Annual Income X Survey Question 7

		Build more deed restricted affordable housing OR	Allow additional commercial or resort development	Equally important	Total
Less than $15K	Count	8	6	1	15
	%	53.3%	40.0%	6.7%	100.0%
$15K- $25K	Count	10	7	2	19
	%	52.6%	36.8%	10.5%	100.0%
$25K- $50K	Count	25	42	11	78
	%	32.1%	53.8%	14.1%	100.0%
$50K- $75K	Count	33	63	13	109
	%	30.3%	57.8%	11.9%	100.0%
$75K- $100K	Count	31	56	7	94
	%	33.0%	59.6%	7.4%	100.0%
$100K-$150K	Count	14	41	10	65
	%	21.5%	63.1%	15.4%	100.0%
Over $150K	Count	17	57	9	83
	%	20.5%	68.7%	10.8%	100.0%

Majorities of those with annual incomes of $25K or below tend to think that building more deed restricted housing is more important than allowing additional commercial or resort development. Again, the latter is considered more important by majorities of those making over $25K annually. Many categories have substantial percentages that state that these issues are equally important.

Q8: With which ONE of the following 3 statements about deed restricted affordable housing do you agree?

Statement 1: **"Jackson and Teton County should provide deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley for ALL workers."**

Statement 2: **"Jackson and Teton County should provide deed restricted affordable housing PRIMARILY for emergency service and other ESSENTIAL workers in the Valley."**

Statement 3: **"Jackson and Teton County should NOT provide more deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley."**

Table 37: Annual Income X Survey Question 8

		agree with statement 1	agree with statement 2	agree with statement 3	Total
Less than $15K	Count	12	3	1	16
	%	75.0%	18.8%	6.3%	100.0%
$15K- $25K	Count	12	5	1	18
	%	66.7%	27.8%	5.6%	100.0%
$25K- $50K	Count	43	30	9	82
	%	52.4%	36.6%	11.0%	100.0%
$50K- $75K	Count	50	47	22	119
	%	42.0%	39.5%	18.5%	100.0%
$75K- $100K	Count	41	34	20	95
	%	43.2%	35.8%	21.1%	100.0%
$100K-$150K	Count	26	34	8	68
	%	38.2%	50.0%	11.8%	100.0%
Over $150K	Count	26	41	15	82
	%	31.7%	50.0%	18.3%	100.0%

Majorities of those with annual incomes of $50K or below agree with statement 1 ("Jackson and Teton County should provide deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley for all workers."), as well as the highest percentages for those in the income categories of $50K- $75K (42%) and $75K- $100K (43%). The highest percentages (50% each) for the two highest income categories ($100K-$150K and Over $150K) agree with statement 2 ("Jackson and Teton County should provide deed restricted affordable housing primarily for emergency service and other essential workers in the Valley"). The highest percentage (21%) agreeing with statement 3 ("Jackson and Teton County should NOT provide more deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley") are in the $75K- $100K income range.

Q9. With which ONE of the following 3 statements about development in the Town of Jackson do you agree?

Statement 1: **"Current building heights in town today should be maintained. No change."**

Statement 2: **"Careful redevelopment outside of the town square should be allowed, with up to 3-storey buildings."**

Statement 3: **"Careful redevelopment outside of the town square should be allowed, with up to 4-storey buildings."**

Table 38: Annual Income X Survey Question 9

		agree with statement 1	agree with statement 2	agree with statement 3	Total
Less than $15K	Count	12	3	2	17
	%	70.6%	17.6%	11.8%	100.0%
$15K- $25K	Count	6	7	6	19
	%	31.6%	36.8%	31.6%	100.0%
$25K- $50K	Count	44	28	10	82
	%	53.7%	34.1%	12.2%	100.0%
$50K- $75K	Count	44	47	28	119
	%	37.0%	39.5%	23.5%	100.0%
$75K- $100K	Count	32	35	27	94
	%	34.0%	37.2%	28.7%	100.0%
$100K-$150K	Count	21	28	20	69
	%	30.4%	40.6%	29.0%	100.0%
Over $150K	Count	25	36	24	85
	%	29.4%	42.4%	28.2%	100.0%

Only two income categories actually registered majorities of agreement for any of the three statements offered for this item. A large majority (71%) of those who make less than $15K annually agree that, “Current building heights in town today should be maintained. No change.” A majority (54%) of those with annual incomes of $25K- $50K also agree with this statement. Statement 2 (“Careful redevelopment outside of the town square should be allowed, with up to 3-storey buildings”) was agreed to by the highest percentages of those with annual incomes of $100K-$150K (41%) and over $150K (42%). For other income categories, agreement is rather evenly distributed between the three options.

Q15. "The Town and County should make the availability of deed restricted affordable housing a priority over additional commercial or resort development." Would you say you…

Table 39: Annual Income X Survey Question 15

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Less than $15K	Count	3	10	2	1	0	16
	%	18.8%	62.5%	12.5%	6.3%	0.0%	100.0%
$15K- $25K	Count	9	8	1	1	1	20
	%	45.0%	40.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	100.0%
$25K- $50K	Count	34	36	6	6	1	83
	%	41.0%	43.4%	7.2%	7.2%	1.2%	100.0%
$50K- $75K	Count	40	46	14	19	2	121
	%	33.1%	38.0%	11.6%	15.7%	1.7%	100.0%
$75K- $100K	Count	34	30	13	10	9	96
	%	35.4%	31.3%	13.5%	10.4%	9.4%	100.0%
$100K-$150K	Count	22	24	11	6	7	70
	%	31.4%	34.3%	15.7%	8.6%	10.0%	100.0%
Over $150K	Count	22	29	13	13	4	81
	%	27.2%	35.8%	16.0%	16.0%	4.9%	100.0%

Strong majorities of all income categories agree (either *agree* or *strongly agree*) that, "The Town and County should make the availability of deed restricted affordable housing a priority over additional commercial or resort development," with no category falling below 63%. There are substantial percentages for neutrality on this issue for several categories (five are above 11%).

Q18. "Future change in downtown Jackson as well as in residential neighborhoods of Jackson should be minimized." Would you say you…

Table 40: Annual Income X Survey Question 18

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Less than $15K	Count	4	6	1	5	1	17
	%	23.5%	35.3%	5.9%	29.4%	5.9%	100.0%
$15K- $25K	Count	3	6	2	7	0	18
	%	16.7%	33.3%	11.1%	38.9%	0.0%	100.0%
$25K- $50K	Count	18	25	13	23	6	85
	%	21.2%	29.4%	15.3%	27.1%	7.1%	100.0%
$50K- $75K	Count	14	37	19	40	9	119
	%	11.8%	31.1%	16.0%	33.6%	7.6%	100.0%
$75K- $100K	Count	8	30	15	37	8	98
	%	8.2%	30.6%	15.3%	37.8%	8.2%	100.0%
$100K-$150K	Count	9	9	18	29	5	70
	%	12.9%	12.9%	25.7%	41.4%	7.1%	100.0%
Over $150K	Count	11	19	18	25	10	83
	%	13.3%	22.9%	21.7%	30.1%	12.0%	100.0%

Agreement with the statement, “Future change in downtown Jackson as well as in residential neighborhoods of Jackson should be minimized,” generally decreases as income increases; likewise, disagreement generally increases as income increases. However, there is also a high degree of neutrality on this issue (only one income category falls below 11%), and this, too, generally increases as income increases. Fully 26% of those with annual incomes of $100K-$150K are neutral.

Q22. "The County should have stronger standards for new developments in order to protect natural resource areas (for example, tighter restrictions on development on steep slopes, in floodplains, or wildlife habitat areas)." Would you say you…

Table 41: Annual Income X Survey Question 22

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Less than $15K	Count	7	9	0	1	0	17
	%	41.2%	52.9%	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%	100.0%
$15K- $25K	Count	9	8	0	3	0	20
	%	45.0%	40.0%	0.0%	15.0%	0.0%	100.0%
$25K- $50K	Count	41	34	4	5	2	86
	%	47.7%	39.5%	4.7%	5.8%	2.3%	100.0%
$50K- $75K	Count	44	54	12	10	1	121
	%	36.4%	44.6%	9.9%	8.3%	0.8%	100.0%
$75K- $100K	Count	42	36	6	8	7	99
	%	42.4%	36.4%	6.1%	8.1%	7.1%	100.0%
$100K-$150K	Count	29	24	10	7	0	70
	%	41.4%	34.3%	14.3%	10.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Over $150K	Count	26	35	9	7	7	84
	%	31.0%	41.7%	10.7%	8.3%	8.3%	100.0%

Very substantial majorities agree (either *agree* or *strongly agree*) that, "The County should have stronger standards for new developments in order to protect natural resource areas…," with no income category falling below 73% in agreement for this item. The highest disagreement with this statement is among three income categories: 17% for those with annual incomes over $150K, and 15% each for those with annual incomes of $15K-$25K and $75K-$100K.

Q23. "The County and the Town of Jackson should require a higher amount of deed restricted affordable housing to be built as part of new developments." Would you say you…

Table 42: Annual Income X Survey Question 23

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Less than $15K	Count	6	8	1	1	1	17
	%	35.3%	47.1%	5.9%	5.9%	5.9%	100.0%
$15K- $25K	Count	8	9	2	0	1	20
	%	40.0%	45.0%	10.0%	0.0%	5.0%	100.0%
$25K- $50K	Count	34	35	5	10	1	85
	%	40.0%	41.2%	5.9%	11.8%	1.2%	100.0%
$50K- $75K	Count	32	59	7	14	10	122
	%	26.2%	48.4%	5.7%	11.5%	8.2%	100.0%
$75K- $100K	Count	24	43	6	14	11	98
	%	24.5%	43.9%	6.1%	14.3%	11.2%	100.0%
$100K-$150K	Count	16	27	6	13	9	71
	%	22.5%	38.0%	8.5%	18.3%	12.7%	100.0%
Over $150K	Count	15	28	12	17	11	83
	%	18.1%	33.7%	14.5%	20.5%	13.3%	100.0%

Majorities from each income category agree (either *agree* or *strongly agree*) that, "The County and the Town of Jackson should require a higher amount of deed restricted affordable housing to be built as part of new developments." However, this is a bare majority (52%) for those with annual incomes over $150K. Over a third (34%) of those with annual incomes over $150K *disagree* with this statement, followed closely by those in the $100K-$150K range (31% disagreement).

Q27. "There should be a restriction on the amount of annual growth allowed in Jackson and the county (for example, a 1% or 2% increase per year)." Would you say you...

Table 43: Annual Income X Survey Question 27

		Strongly agree	Agree	Are neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Less than $15K	Count	4	6	1	4	2	17
	%	23.5%	35.3%	5.9%	23.5%	11.8%	100.0%
$15K- $25K	Count	5	6	3	3	2	19
	%	26.3%	31.6%	15.8%	15.8%	10.5%	100.0%
$25K- $50K	Count	18	28	14	15	6	81
	%	22.2%	34.6%	17.3%	18.5%	7.4%	100.0%
$50K- $75K	Count	18	39	17	34	9	117
	%	15.4%	33.3%	14.5%	29.1%	7.7%	100.0%
$75K- $100K	Count	11	31	15	27	12	96
	%	11.5%	32.3%	15.6%	28.1%	12.5%	100.0%
$100K-$150K	Count	9	21	9	23	8	70
	%	12.9%	30.0%	12.9%	32.9%	11.4%	100.0%
Over $150K	Count	15	19	10	28	10	82
	%	18.3%	23.2%	12.2%	34.1%	12.2%	100.0%

Majorities from the three lowest annual income categories (under $15K; $15K- $25K; $25K- $50K) agree (either *agree* or *strongly agree*) that, "There should be a restriction on the amount of annual growth allowed in Jackson and the county (for example, a 1% or 2% increase per year)." Also, the highest percentages of the next two highest income groups ($50K- $75K; $75K- $100K) also agree with this statement, though the second category is statistically split with disagreement. Those with the highest levels of *disagreement* include the two highest annual income categories of $100K-$150K (44% disagree) and over $150K (46% disagree; again, a statistical split with agreement). There is substantial neutrality on this issue, with all but one annual income category (less than $15K) exceeding 12%.

Q38. How much would you be willing to pay in taxes to conserve open space and natural resource areas?

Table 44: Annual Income X Survey Question 38

		Nothing	$100 per year	$250 per year	$500 per year	More than $500 per year	Total
Less than $15K	Count	6	7	0	2	1	16
	%	37.5%	43.8%	0.0%	12.5%	6.3%	100.0%
$15K- $25K	Count	6	12	2	0	0	20
	%	30.0%	60.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
$25K- $50K	Count	25	32	12	5	2	76
	%	32.9%	42.1%	15.8%	6.6%	2.6%	100.0%
$50K- $75K	Count	36	33	28	8	8	113
	%	31.9%	29.2%	24.8%	7.1%	7.1%	100.0%
$75K- $100K	Count	23	30	21	7	12	93
	%	24.7%	32.3%	22.6%	7.5%	12.9%	100.0%
$100K- $150K	Count	12	19	18	8	8	65
	%	18.5%	29.2%	27.7%	12.3%	12.3%	100.0%
Over $150K	Count	18	7	10	18	28	81
	%	22.2%	8.6%	12.3%	22.2%	34.6%	100.0%

The highest annual income category (over $150K) is the only one to have the highest percentage of respondents willing to pay more than $500 a year to conserve open space and natural resource areas. For most categories, the *$100 per year* category captures the highest percentages. However, there is some substantial variation: equal percentages (22%) of those with annual incomes over $150K would pay *nothing* or would pay *$500 per year*. Next to the *$100 per year* category, the payment category that garners the highest percentages is *nothing*.

6. Appendices: Open-ended and *other* responses.

6.1. Appendix 1: *Other* responses to Question 34: *Where in Teton County, Wyoming do you live (full or part-time)?*

- Alpine (3)
- Between the Snake River and Jackson
- Dairy ranches
- Melody Ranch
- Star Valley (3)
- Teton Valley
- Victor (2)

6.2. Appendix 2: Do you have any comments that you would like to make?

• A bike path to Wilson would be nice. A lot of people don't commute so they aren't crammed up with big cars.
• A phone survey with that detail is difficult to answer accurately.
• About the taxes for open space: it seems that I was recommending that we use the bid tax. If we should vote for the bid tax, it should be for conservation and open space.
• Affordable housing is important, but open spaces even more important.
• Applaud them for doing this.
• As far as the affordable housing goes, 3% per year of equity does not equal rising interest rates. Affordable housing is not ownership, it is only paying rent.
• Because of the unique environment of Jackson Hole where only two percent of land is privately owned but overall impact from overbuilding and uncontrolled growth, there will be nothing left for future generations to build upon. The County Planners, the people in charge, have allowed too much growth too fast, and Teton County cannot sustain this rate of growth. Living in Teton County should be a challenge for people who are willing to sacrifice in order to live here and preserve our wildlife and environment.
• Both of the development of deed restricted affordable housing and development of commercial and resort development feed into the same seed, so you cannot really choose between them. So the question is poorly worded.
• Deed restricted affordable housing is a joke. It drives up the free market real estate. It is a worthless enterprise. It just causes more problems with the housing situation here.
• Deed restricted housing was attached to too many statements, making the whole thing highly biased.
• Does believe in affordable housing but does not want the Town overcrowded because of it, either. They should include teachers in the "essential" workers that could qualify for affordable housing. These questions need to be more specific about the exact locations that they are thinking of developing or changing.
• First, Teton County should provide for both the widening of our roadways for both public transportation and pedestrian traffic. The development outside of the town square in the Town of Jackson should be emphasized to alleviate congestion in the heart of town and the expansion of our roadways and [to lessen] road kill when you have less traffic on the road. Affordable

housing should be provided for emergency personnel, armed law professionals, teachers, and government workers, someone who works for the Clerk's Office. Secondly, instead of deed restricted, affordable housing should not be deed restricted; affordable housing should be a participant program. Essentially, I don't think it is fair, instead of restricting it.
• How about a bridge from Teton to the airport across the Snake?
• I am a born and raised local. I graduated in the class of 2002 at JHHS. I can't afford to live in my own hometown if something isn't done. Please help us hardworking locals who don't have trust funds but love to live in our beautiful town.
• I am against my tax dollars going for wildlife conservation but I am for my tax dollars going to improve housing.
• I am not against growth, but I am against throwing away the values and the karma of this area for increased density of any kind. The environment and the animal life should be protected at all costs.
• I am reluctant to support affordable housing because it seems that that kind of thing never works, but I don't know what an alternative would be.
• I am very, very, very grateful for affordable housing.
• I did the survey online. The County and Town need to look very carefully at growth and development. Deed restricted affordable housing is not the whole answer. I'm against all that's going on out here. They're managing growth very poorly. The growth should not be in rural areas, but in the towns, because the services are in town; that's where the services are.
• I don't agree with the whole concept of providing low cost housing, it's a joke. The only true "low cost housing" is a well-designed, well-maintained and well-managed mobile home community. True to form, Teton County will only consider a "Comprehensive Plan" designed to place an undue tax burden on the taxpayer. It's no wonder that the rest of Wyoming believes that Teton County is an "elitist, rich and fanatical group" who consider themselves too special to allow "trailer trash" in their community.
• I don't think that the Town of Jackson should approve Teton Meadows.
• I feel like if they are going to have affordable housing, it should be affordable housing and high quality. The houses are very poor quality. Also, we are restricted from giving our land to our children or building on it because of concerns about sub-dividing. Our rights are further and further restricted in favor of rich part-time residents and tourists.
• I found the questions at the beginning objectionable because different areas with different characters are in the same bracket. One area (the Jackson area) is good for housing and County areas are critical for wildlife and migration. I object lumping them together because that does not give good reading. I find the questions regarding road widths should have alternatives given in the answers because those were technical questions that are difficult to answer for a layperson.
• I have lived here all my life and I have seen this place explode in last thirty years. I don't like my money being used up to conserve open space. I'd just like to see everyone go home. I know that can't happen but that's the way I look at it.
• I have strong feelings about new development in this place. We already allowed a lot. Open spaces need to be conserved for wildlife. The open space near the High School Road should not be developed. It was decided three years ago by a vote that it will not be developed. I am strictly against developing that open space near High School Road, and so are a lot of people who are against developing that area.
• I hope that they give everything equal weight: open space, development, affordable housing. Alternative uses of transportation: biking, walking, mass transit, carpooling: we need to provide more of them.
• I hope that they value wildlife more than anything else.

• I hope that whatever decision is wrought that it will be done with consideration, and I hope we can solve the traffic problems while still maintaining wildlife corridors, because the wildlife is why this place is of such value in the first place. I also hope we can solve the traffic problems without having developers come in and build a lot of units that are not needed.
• I just think that it's really important to conserve land and wildlife migration routes and habitat.
• I just think that many of the questions needed to be taken into context; you can't go in and spend a million dollars and say you are going to fix the "Y" or Albertson's and the "Y." There has to be a plan, not just High School Road, not just the "Y." What is the overall plan for three to five years? And that's probably minimal.
• I know that Teton County has a challenge in front of it over the next few years.
• I live in a deed restricted house.
• I pay a little too much in property taxes and I would be willing to put some in tax for open space. I'd rather put money into open space rather than in property taxes. The employee housing should be made available for immigrant workers seasonally.
• I probably would have answered few questions differently if they did not stick deed restricted housing at the end.
• I strongly agree on traffic problems here.
• I suggest senior housing (for 55 and up).
• I think a lot of the questions were not well drafted and therefore the results of this survey will not be very reliable.
• I think it is funny. I take the gondola and see the lights all spread out in Jackson and I know that one day they will connect and look like Denver. It is true. I am not too into preserving a herd of fifteen deer when I know there are fifteen thousand elk in Yellowstone. If the people that make these laws ever left Jackson, they would realize they live in a huge Yellowstone ecosystem. They need to get out more. Those are tricky questions because if you develop a little at a time, you keep people working for longer time.
• I think it took longer than 10 minutes.
• I think that affordable housing is necessary and there is not enough of it. I think the County suffered from lack of zoning in the past. There should be a greater concentration of developments in Jackson, so that it preserves more habitat for wildlife in other places.
• I think that in regards to how the amount of taxes would be paid and how to help fund these things, I think an increase in the sales tax is the best way to accomplish that and an increase in property tax is the worst way to accomplish that. Also, in addition to higher requirements for deed restricted affordable housing, I would also support incentives for developers to go above and beyond what is required.
• I think that in terms of Jackson, they should be looking at gap housing and provide housing to essential persons. There is more need for gap housing than there is for deed restricted.
• I think that the deed restricted affordable housing, as much as they think it's helping people, it's not really. Because the market continues to increase for regular housing and so the people that live in deed restricted affordable housing are not able to move up into regular housing. The deed restricted housing is not big enough for them, so they end up leaving the Valley. I don't think deed restricted affordable housing is the right answer. I think we can do other things like rent out small homes, etc., instead of building deed restricted affordable housing. I just don't think it's the answer to the problem.
• I think that the survey was full of somewhat "loaded" questions. I am not in favor of affordable or retainable housing being provided by the County. It should be provided by the employer. If it's an emergency service (the police, firefighters, government affiliated jobs), their homes should be provided by their employers. Increasing taxes is okay if that's what is needed in the

form of a bond or something. We need to return to a free market in the housing market, not a government-controlled market. They should not be able to change property rights. What they were when you bought them is what it should remain. People should be able to develop their property as it was zoned.
• I think that the widening of roads is a non-issue because it is the timing that seems to be the problem. I live near the highway and it is not crowded most of the time. Only at certain, specific times is it crowded. We do not need to widen the roads or make major changes to the roads. People just need to change the time they are on the road. Work later or leave earlier.
• I think that with the problems that we have our Chamber of Commerce should stop promoting Jackson. Hard to see the small town where you could walk to school by yourself; we now have safety concerns because of the big money and low wages that bring in transient problems where big crime is coming from.
• I think that you have to allow affordable housing in Jackson. It can't be just for rich people. Poor people are struggling to find jobs here, so if we do not make accommodations we are going to lose services.
• I think the affordable housing is great but the parking layout makes it difficult for the snow to be removed, so that should somehow be addressed with the affordable housing. They should stick to the list and no special treatment for anybody. It's a great program.
• I think the survey is very well thought-out.
• I think there's a lot of open land they can develop without hurting anything.
• I think this is the same survey Teton County has on their website.
• I think we should increase development requirements for affordable housing, but I do believe we should put wildlife before that. We should have better, safer rental properties in Teton County. Also, the government should not be involved in affordable housing. We need more economists, bankers (more creative people) in the mix to decide the solutions to these problems. Many of the people who live here and apply for affordable housing, like those in resorts, don't really deserve it, and they take up the housing for those who do deserve it.
• I think you should focus more on creative housing instead of more roads. Something more efficient.
• I would like to point out the fact that the survey is a little misleading because deed restricted affordable housing, although the term is correct, has a sunset clause which means after a certain amount of time the housing will go up in smoke and go back on the market. If the County wants us to stand behind them and deed restricted affordable housing, they need to make deed restricted affordable housing permanent, and I mean really permanent.
• I would like to see less biased questions. The questions seem to have some bias.
• I would like to see more of a distinction made between widening roads and the construction of separate pathways; more of a distinction in the questioning.
• I would like to strive for zero growth in this County.
• I would rather see more development, denser development, downtown and less sprawl.
• I'd like to cap resort development. I am not willing to pay taxes for bike paths and transit. It's recreational and I don't think I want to pay anything in taxes for recreation.
• I'm glad you called. I think it's important to get people's opinions. Otherwise, it's hard to be heard.
• I'm not sure who wrote the questions but they're tough to answer
• I'd like to see more apartment-style housing. I'd like to see some high rises. Favor dropping the high density, and all over the County, for targeting areas like Aspen, and the current development centers.
• I'm a "no-growth" person and against free or subsidized housing. Everyone should be a self-

made person and not rely on hand-outs.
• I'm a Ph.D. I love Jackson. I'm skewed by liking what we have now. I know that change is coming. I could not envision what the best kind of change would be. It's too populated now. Am I willing to sacrifice changing the Town to increase opportunities for development? My answer is no. I don't know whether I'm going to like what's coming.
• I'm a strong supporter of the University of Wyoming and these questions don't seem to address other some very significant issues and many of the questions are not well phrased. Well, I think it's a terrible mistake to have the Planning Department phrase the questions; the University should have the ability of how to responsibly phrase the questions.
• I'm glad someone asked me.
• I'm glad someone's looking into it.
• I'm glad you're doing it.
• I'm in a position where we need to provide for our employees and it never worked. We bought land so that we could provide for our employees, and it was vacant most of the time, so I just don't believe for having to compensate. I don't think the City or Town should be involved with affordable housing. I've been there and done that.
• I'm just glad they're doing the survey, I saw in the newspaper that we should be expecting calls from you guys, and I hope people are taking the time to do it. It's a passionate subject, so I hope people are being kind to you callers.
• Important survey that is being done.
• Important to concentrate housing and limit sprawl.
• In favor of deed restricted affordable housing, but the housing is demeaning for many people because they are so tightly controlled. They need to be able to express themselves, in order to have a good living experience. Also wildlife areas and conservation areas are great, but many places are just benefiting the people that have their houses on the edge of the land, rather than benefiting the animals.
• In my opinion, it's gone to pot. It is not as friendly as it used to be. There were five or six deer killed on highway 390 in November. That was before any skiers were here. I was very upset about that. It is obvious people are just not paying attention to what they are doing.
• In regards to the downtown area, it was once to be kept as a western theme with wooden facades. Stick with the western town appeal. You see something like the Art Center and its parking garage go up it's a bit shocking, and certainly not in keeping with the western theme. It's a case of money talks. The affordable housing: it's critical that we adjust income levels and make amenities for our emergency response people, etc.
• Increased density in areas where density already exists would create more affordable and attainable housing. We own two properties and would prefer to get a bigger, single house and can't because it's nearly impossible to get new housing. All workers, professional and service, need affordable housing. I have lived in the region nearly all my life and it has changed significantly, and is so different than other parts of the region.
• It was hard to answer the first ten questions. They didn't seem like it was one or the other.
• It's a good way to get a reading on the way people feel so that you can plan more accurately.
• It's redundant to do this as well as an on-line survey.
• It's wonderful that someone is going to do this.
• Just some of those questions are not good questions, they asked two questions in one that are diametrically opposed.
• Just that they need to clarify, especially the one about expanisons for Albertson's: it definitely needs expansion through those roads, so people can ride bikes.

• Make bike travel safer within the Town of Jackson and out to Teton Village. Make fees in lieu of providing housing higher for businesses; make businesses more accountable to provide their own housing, though that's rather sticky because that would make the costs of running a business higher. Maybe if there were a sliding scale for how much tax residents should pay, so people who have more should pay more, as in property tax.
• Many questions are too vague.
• Market forces are out of control in our area.
• Maybe just one: roads should be widened not for additional vehicles, but roads should be widened to accommodate paths for bicycles and other modes of transit transportation.
• Maybe we could add in there that some of the questions are not clear enough and I had problems with the terms used in the questions.
• Minimize the amount of apartments to condominiums.
• More of the burden of deed restricted housing should fall on employers rather than government. And if it means higher living expenses in Teton County, then that's the price people need to pay to live there.
• My concern is building houses and not owning the land, that's just nuts to me. There's no security in that.
• My suggestion would be to always read the "if needed" on the question concerning incentives vs. requirements, because otherwise it is a very confusing and unfair question.
• Ninety-percent of Teton County is owned by the federal government, so that the land will never be developed. The whole issue of keeping open space is ridiculous, because we're losing teachers, policemen, and hospital staff because they can't afford to live here. I don't want my or nurse to be on call. If she is over the pass and the pass is closed she can't get in; that jeopardizes people's health. When your workforce is outside the Valley and the pass is closed, the consequences can be far-reaching.
• No matter how many people you build deed restricted housing for, it will never be enough. There will always be someone who wants to move here and own something. Right now the Town is full. The infrastructure is right now pushed to the limit. There is nothing to be done with it. You can't widen the roads. It's built up as much as it can be.
• No widening roads.
• No, nothing other than they should have been self-explanatory.
• No. I think the questions were all very accurate. The questions represent an accurate concern on what's going on here in Teton County.
• No. Thank you for calling. Very interesting questions. Thank you for your time.
• Not a big advocate of government-sponsored for affordable housing because it discriminates against people like his children who are teachers, and aren't qualified and since it keeps people at 3% cap. They aren't able to improve their situation.
• Not impressed with the quality of the effort put into this survey. Housing is not a specific trade-off to the many other desirable issues as they were phrased. Let the market work things out on its own.
• Now, this is not going to be used. I want it to be confidential.
• Obtainable housing and limiting growth are in opposition to each other. So, I favor Star Valley and providing transportation alternatives.
• One priority would be to take care of the Town in winter better (better snow removal). Alternative modes of transportation (bicycling, walking) are difficult with the present roads condition, so one is forced to use cars.
• Overall sentiment is that it is better to use existing structures and increase town density for deed

restricted affordable housing rather than develop wildlife areas.
• Questions in the survey are ambiguous. The only jobs available are jobs that people don't make enough money in to live in that area. People need to work their way up in order to live there.
• Seeing as this survey is driven by the Town and County, he is glad that they are looking into it. It's a Catch-22 situation and the Town needs a good employment base, but most can't afford to live there. Many are immigrants and live fifteen to a small apartment in order to afford the housing. His housing costs are double of what it costs for him to live in Las Vegas. The only thing that keeps him there [in Teton County] is that he loves his job and needs to stay there. He probably couldn't afford to own anything in Teton County and could only possibly rent there.
• She heard last week that Jackson Hole Community Housing Trust had a donation of land that was given to employees that work for them and there were two teachers that were pushed down to spot 7 to get housing. There is a lot of abuse of the deed restricted housing restrictions.
• She thinks that some of the questions are too simplistic for the issue. Right in the beginning, in terms of juxtaposing different issues, it had the overtone of opposing one of the other. Doesn't like how it had you choose sides. Maybe have the questions that are in the beginning towards the end or even adding a choice to the option. Feels that it will make the person choose a side early on in the survey and not have unbiased thoughts.
• Should go back to the drawing board and come up with something that works for the affordable housing. There seems to be several loopholes. A co-worker cannot afford the affordable housing. The affordable housing does not seem to be as affordable as they make it seem.
• Solve the traffic problems. Would rather see a human life saved than an animal's life. After the ski hill went in the Town completely changed. The questions seem to be skewed to get the answers that the creator is looking for.
• Some of the questions are too general. I don't know what the half mile from High School Road is. Thank you, Teton County for doing this survey. It pertains exactly to what the problems in our community are and are critical. I appreciate it.
• Some of the questions involving the housing, transit and carpool lanes need to be expanded. There needs to be more definition between commercial and residential development in the questions. We are lacking jobs and have growing resorts, which makes no sense.
• Some of the questions need to be rewritten. A lot of them presume you are in favor of something like affordable housing even if you aren't.
• Some of the questions were kind of confusing.
• Some of the questions were not well designed, because at the beginning there were not options for neither of two options. She felt that the survey needs to define "all modes of travel" as well as "mass transit" better.
• Sometimes the people seeking the affordable housing don't need it. If they want to live here, they should be able to do it like we are: on our salary. The animals are already having a hard time surviving here with all the development.
• South Park Loop Road should be extended as originally planned.
• Suggests bridges, so that the wildlife corridors are not bothered by traffic.
• Teton County is the highest tax paying County in Wyoming. Our tax has gone up in the year; all they do is put up for the wild animals. So many people have to live in Idaho or Alpine, because they can't find homes here. My husband is fifth-generation, and I know that there are so many old-timers that have to leave, because they can't afford the taxes here.
• Teton County property values have gone up outrageously, and no one with normal income can buy anything, and it is getting worse every year.
• Teton County residents need to be prepared to attain the services they need outside of town.
• Thanks for conducting the survey. I'm glad someone is taken a look at it.

• Thanks for taking the time to do this survey.
• That's very interesting, and I hope they do get affordable housing.
• The bundling of some of the options makes it difficult for the answer to be relevant. I'm really glad you called.
• The first thing is how we can avoid bribery in our Town Commission. I would like to see more people have their say in developments; developments should be beautiful. Concentration in Jackson should be critical. I would like the community to take care of itself more in the future.
• The growth in downtown should not happen the way it's going. They should not build up to three or four stories. They're ruining our corner of the world, and the way they're going they'll destroy it.
• The idea of affordable housing in not a bad option, but the housing does more bad than good for those people that buy the housing. Redevelopment should be done in a way that people can buy into condos or apartments, rather than the affordable housing. So they don't have to deal with the negative circumstances around affordable housing.
• The inclusion of deed restricted housing really skews the survey. There were a lot of favorable responses but once deed restricted affordable housing was included, suddenly the option became UNFAVORABLE...deed restricted affordable housing is a way to keep down those who are competing. It is going to do harm to the economy because the economy will grow but the houses will still be capped at 3% per year. Keep poor people poor.
• The money to conserve open space and natural resource areas should come from those who develop in large ways. Resorts?
• The one question you didn't ask was would I support any density for any reason whatsoever? I don't support any zoning of the Town.
• The only thing I question is this is going to be redundant because I filled out a Teton County survey online and in that sense I got to vote twice.
• The only thing I'd like to correct is the way they may have to go back to four stories in Jackson. I may have said three stories but I think it could be made four. They should put the density in core centers in areas like Jackson and Hoback, and they should limit growth in rural areas. Deed restricted affordable housing should be made available to all workers.
• The questions about the housing are kind of misleading. They should be more selective when approving people for deed restricted housing, because a lot of people are falling through the cracks and have property in town and elsewhere. I don't know how they are checking it right now.
• The questions are not very long, and some of them I couldn't make any intelligent answers to. The questionnaire could have been posted so we could review it, read through it, and go through it more slowly. If this is sponsored by Teton County, maybe post it on the website.
• The questions are pretty vague about areas. A lot of my answers could have been different based on the situation. The questions are based on what deed restricted affordable housing is as it is run now, but what about changing how we operate deed residential affordable housing? Then my answers would change significantly.
• The questions assume that Teton County has the authority to do what each of the answers suggests that they could do, and they can't.
• The questions do not provide enough information to be able to be answered clearly. Allowing the questions to be so vague may be intentionally misleading.
• The survey has very ambiguous questions. I think in-town mail delivery would solve a lot of the problems addressed in this survey.
• The survey is pretty good, but many of the questions are very black or white and require blanket answers.

• The survey is very confusing.
• The survey questions are very vague. It mixes many issues in one statement. I agree with some and disagree with others, so I had to go with neutral with some questions. It creates unclear picture.
• The Town has allowed 'way too much resort and commercial development. Proposed developments will not solve our employee housing dilemma. I am concerned about the South Park Road impact, the impact on our entire school system, and about the Teton Meadows subdivision. They have put in there a spot for a school, but I can see that it's also going to impact our middle school and high school. We already are building a new elementary school. If they want to put a school in Teton Meadows, we're going to have to deal with providing school for those children when they get older. I would hate to see the cottonwood trees cut down. South Park has always been the place where affordable housing and developments have been approved for the County, whereas on the west bank and Teton Village they've not.
• There are not very many opportunities in Teton County.
• There were a lot of questions. There needs to be more affordable housing for people that make under $50,000.
• These questions, how do you do these surveys? The questions are very similar, so they're hard to follow. Instead of degrees of agreement and disagreement, make them simpler, such as asking for "yes" or "no." You have to pay too close attention to the questions as they are. Instead of widening Teton Village Road, do not widen it. Rather, build the north bridge. There should be a direct connection from Teton Village to the airport.
• They can't have affordable housing. They have to have high density
• They need to employ an economist to review the questionnaire.
• They need to improve the Pearl and Broadway intersection.
• They should do more of these surveys on more topics, specifically in Wyoming. I believe that the University of Wyoming should do more of these surveys, pretty much for the whole state. These surveys deserve the people's voice and surveys are a good way of polling people.
• They should make the transit system free. Maybe a gas tax or the County could have a tax. Less congestion would benefit everybody. There should be more look [sic] into recycling and composting. Bigger taxes on private jets landing in the park. Affordable and attainable lots placed throughout the County in private neighborhoods, but no backyards. Should be split among all residents in the County. We would all make better neighbors. There should be some kind of counter to wildlife killed by cars and that should be posted.
• They should not put the burden of all this on the backs of property owners. The burden should be through bonds and not property taxes.
• They're trying to push affordable housing and I don't think the city should have affordable housing because it is a waste of my tax dollars. The Town or the County should not be landlords.
• This affordable housing issue should not take precedent over protecting wildlife habitat and our current way of life. At some point this community is going to reach is maximum capacity. We have to face that or we'll ruin it.
• This survey is poorly written and skewed. We do not need social engineering in affordable housing. These people need to earn their way like everyone else.
• Those questions were a little misleading. He doesn't want to see what was here 10 years ago destroyed. Whatever Jackson was, has changed.
• Throughout, the questions refer to Jackson and Teton County. Is it referring to the local government, or is it a combination of the local government? To me, it seems as if these questions are geared. Should the Town government be doing any of the questions that you ask,

or the Town government, the County government and the general public? In the readdress of the Comprehensive Plan, for both the Town and County, they must eliminate fees in lieu of employee housing and parking. They have to get rid of them, and they must eliminate the ability for potential developers to continually go back to whether it's the County or the Town time after time after time, that ends up taking the process two to three years. And what that's getting is developers continually asking for variances.
• Uncertain how this information is going to be used, because this information can be manipulated very easily. And I am worried that answers will be reflected in the wrong way.
• Want to see more low-income-only housing.
• We do have organizations that strive to preserve open space throughout Teton County. That's why there should not be a tax. They do a good job. Also, I don't think that we have to compromise the ability for the working class to live within Jackson Hole and Teton County, but there should be a solution where we can have both. Also, at this point, we do have transportation congestion. Small things can be done to take care of that, but that doesn't mean we have to build more highways. Finally, people who have supported this County for generations should not be penalized by not being able to develop their land (primarily referring to the High School Road questions). The natural direction of the growth of the Town of Jackson is to the south and has been for the past fifty years.
• We do need to provide affordable housing, but it needs to be done within the limits of the infrastructure that we have. Open space and wildlife have to be taken into consideration.
• We fall in an interesting category because we are the only people that live in the town square right downtown. We also only have one car. We take the bus and walk. We have tried to minimize the impact by living in the downtown core so we don't have to drive. They want to have people living downtown and have a vital community downtown. But there is no accommodation and it is not affordable or feasible. So I feel that there should be redevelopment downtown and in the core. Redo some buildings and provide housing.
• We need to restrict development and maintain the character of Jackson Hole and not sell out to big businesses. I think our elected officials need to respect the unique character of the area and work harder to maintain it.
• We want our kids to be able to afford to live here.
• What they need to restrict are all of these homes that are in wildlife areas of people that don't live in Teton County full-time.
• When are we going to take care of the illegal immigration problem? I would also like to suggest some type of bypass around the Town of Jackson.
• When will your surveys be completed? When will the results be provided to the public?
• Who dreamed up this mess?
• Why doesn't Teton County look into purchasing the Forest Service parcel that is going up for sale to do a possible affordable housing development? It's in town and would not be disturbing wildlife corridors, etc., and increasing vehicle traffic as much. Teton County should not be in the residential construction business using taxpayer dollars.
• With the oil situation and the migratory animals, Teton County must do as much as they can to help out this situation. The wildlife pattern is getting destroyed and it is a large concern.
• Would like to see the results of the survey published in the newspaper or on the news. Thinks is is very complete.
• WYDOT should provide more winter parking on Teton pass, for trucks.
• Yes. I think it is a very bad survey. It's very one-sided and it is pretty obvious to it. So many people make too much money to qualify [sic], I think it is a very biased survey. The road transit question did not ask what would be the option of a third lane. I did not feel it was a very good

survey.
• Your form for answering questions does not allow for written opinions. You allow only what you suggest. This eliminates freedom of speech.
• You're trying to take away the property owners' rights, to sell their property to make a profit. Teton County has done this for years. That's why land prices are so high.

6.3. Appendix 3: Cover letter accompanying mail-version questionnaire

UNIVERSITY
OF WYOMING

Survey Research Center
Wyoming Survey & Analysis Center
Dept. 3925 • 1000 E. University Avenue • Laramie, WY 82071
(307) 742-2223 • fax (307) 742-3058 • e-mail: wysac@uwyo.edu

March 25th, 2008

Dear Resident of Teton County, Wyoming,

Teton County and the **Town of Jackson** are interested in what you and other Teton County residents think about important issues concerning growth and future development in your county. Jackson and Teton County currently are working on the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan update, and invite you to share your opinions using the enclosed questionnaire.

The Wyoming Survey & Analysis is conducting this survey on behalf of Teton County Planning & Development. Your address is part of a randomly drawn sample of Teton Country residents for participation in this study. It is our hope that you will take the few minutes to complete the enclosed survey and mail it back to the Survey Research Center using the postage-paid envelope provided. Residents who do so will be actively providing the planning team and elected officials with a clearer understanding of community perspectives, which will guide them as they develop the Comprehensive Plan.

This survey is voluntary. Your responses will be reported only as summaries in which no individual's answers can be identified.

If you already have participated in this study by way of telephone interview, a mail survey or on-line, please mark one of the boxes below and return this letter in the enclosed postage paid envelope. If you have any questions or comments about this study, we would be happy to talk with you. Please call me at (307) 760-2621. Thank you very much for helping us with this important study!

Sincerely,

Thomas Furgeson
Project Manager
WYSAC, Survey Research Center

If you have already completed this survey, please check a box below and return this letter in the postage paid envelope.

I have already completed this survey by way of: ☐ *Telephone* ☐ *Mail* ☐ *On-line*

6.4. Appendix 4: Mail-version questionnaire

Questions for Teton County Community Survey 2008
Mail Draft February 27, 2008

Throughout this survey, you will encounter the phrase, "deed restricted affordable housing." Deed Restricted Affordable Housing is ***housing that is priced to be affordable to households working in Teton County who fall within set income and asset ranges. The appreciation of the value of the home is capped at 3% per year.*** If at any time in the survey you need to review this definition, please ask me, and I will repeat the definition.

Below are several paired options that have to do with priorities. We ask that you identify which one of the two should have, in your opinion, higher priority for Teton County and the Town of Jackson. If you believe that the two choices are equally important, please indicate this.

For the following sets of priorities, please indicate which you think is a higher priority for the Town of Jackson and Teton County. The goals in each set may be highly important to you, however we would like to know your opinion about which should have higher priority.

Select one per pair

	Priorities	Equally Importance	Don't know / Not sure
☐ ☐	1. Preserve more open space OR 2. Build more deed restricted affordable housing	☐	☐
☐ ☐	1. Preserve more wildlife habitat and wildlife migration corridors OR 2. Build more deed restricted affordable housing	☐	☐
☐ ☐	1. Limit overall growth in the Valley OR 2. Build more deed restricted affordable housing	☐	☐
☐ ☐	1. Solve traffic problems OR 2. Preserve wildlife migration corridors	☐	☐
☐ ☐	1. Increase transit services OR 2. Increase road capacity for all uses	☐	☐
☐ ☐	1. Expand deed restricted affordable housing opportunities and community services in outlying population centers OR 2. Centralize housing and services in Jackson	☐	☐
☐ ☐	1. Build more deed restricted affordable housing OR 2. Allow additional commercial or resort development	☐	☐

8. With which ONE of the following 3 statements about deed restricted affordable housing do you agree?

Select One

☐	*"Jackson and Teton County should provide deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley for ALL workers."*
☐	*"Jackson and Teton County should provide deed restricted affordable housing PRIMARILY for emergency service and other ESSENTIAL workers in the Valley."*
☐	*"Jackson and Teton County should NOT provide more deed restricted affordable housing in the Valley."*

☐ (Don't know / Not sure)

9. With which ONE of the following 3 statements about development in the Town of Jackson do you agree?

Select One

☐	*"Current building heights in town today should be maintained. No change. "*
☐	*"Careful redevelopment outside of the town square should be allowed, with up to 3-storey buildings."*
☐	*"Careful redevelopment outside of the town square should be allowed, with up to 4-storey buildings."*

☐ (Don't know / Not sure)

For the following several statements, please indicate whether you strongly agree, agree, are neutral, disagree, or strongly disagree.

Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD	Dk/ ns
10. "In order to limit development in rural areas of Teton County, more development and population growth should be allowed in certain county centers (such as Aspen/Teton Pines, Wilson, South Park, Hoback, Teton Village, Town of Jackson)."	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. "It is acceptable to allow the expansion of town-level density within a half mile of High School Road (near the Smith's Shopping Center) to provide more housing IF an equal amount of land somewhere else in the county is preserved from development."	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. "It is acceptable to allow expansion of town-level density within a half mile of High School Road (near the Smith's Shopping Center) IF this provides more deed restricted affordable housing."	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. "Growth and development in the county should be limited even if it reduces the ability to provide deed restricted	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

affordable housing in the Valley."						
14. "Development should be increased in the Jackson downtown area outside of town square and the Jackson "Y" (in the Albertson's area at WY 22 and Broadway) as a tradeoff for conserving natural resources."	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. "The Town and County should make the availability of deed restricted affordable housing a priority over additional commercial or resort development."	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. "There should be long-term redevelopment of the Jackson "Y" (in the Albertson's area at WY 22 and Broadway) to improve transportation corridors, make the area more pedestrian-oriented, and also provide additional deed restricted affordable housing."	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD	Dk/ ns
17. "Both development overall in rural parts of Teton County and redevelopment in the Town of Jackson should be limited."	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. "Future change in Downtown Jackson as well as in residential neighborhoods of Jackson should be minimized."	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. "Teton County and Jackson should depend on affordable housing to be provided outside of the county in neighboring communities (such as Teton County, Idaho), as a trade-off for limiting development in Teton County and Jackson."	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. "In order to reduce development of agricultural lands and wildlife habitat, landowners should be able to shift their right to develop one parcel of land to a different parcel of land (for example, from agricultural land to designated areas with County or Town services)."	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. "The County should establish a funding source (for example, a bond, fees, sales tax or property tax) in order to acquire open space or conservation areas for critical wildlife habitat."	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. "The County should have stronger standards for new developments in order to protect natural resource areas (for example, tighter restrictions on development on steep slopes, in floodplains, or wildlife habitat areas)."	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23. "The County and the Town of Jackson should require a higher amount of deed restricted affordable housing to be built as part of new developments."	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24. "Teton County and the Town of Jackson should continue to use incentives rather than requirements to encourage more deed restricted affordable housing in new developments."*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
25. "The County and the Town of Jackson should allow increased density to provide deed restricted affordable housing."	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
26. "In order to protect natural resources and rural character, the County should reduce the allowed amount of potential development in remote unplatted areas to 1 unit per 35 acres." *Currently 1 main unit and 1 accessory unit per 35 acres are allowed.*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
27. "There should be a restriction on the amount of annual growth allowed in Jackson and the county (for example, a 1%	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

or 2% increase per year)."						
28. "The County and the Town of Jackson should promote walking, bicycling, transit, and carpooling as alternatives to widening roads."	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

* *incentives* make use of *bonuses* that encourage developers to include deed restricted affordable housing in their developments, while *requirements* would take the form of regulations to mandate that developers provide a certain amount of deed restricted affordable housing in new developments.

Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD	Dk/ ns
29. "Roads in Jackson should be widened for transit and carpool lanes."	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
29a. "Roads throughout the county should be widened for transit and carpool lanes."	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
30. "More lanes should be added to existing roads and intersections (for example, at the Jackson "Y" in the Albertson's area, at WY 22 and Broadway) to relieve traffic for all modes of travel."	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
31. "New roads should be constructed in the county and Jackson to provide traffic relief for all modes of travel."	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

32: What is your age?

- ☐ 18-29 years
- ☐ 30-44 years
- ☐ 45-64 years
- ☐ 65 years or older

- ☐ No answer/Refused

33. Which of the following best describes you?

- ☐ Full-time resident of Teton County, Wyoming
- ☐ Part-time resident of Teton County, Wyoming
- ☐ Work but don't live in Teton County, Wyoming

- ☐ Don't know / Not sure

34. Where do you live (full or part-time)?

- ☐ Buffalo Valley or Kelly
- ☐ Town of Jackson
- ☐ Wilson
- ☐ Alta
- ☐ Teton Village
- ☐ South Park Area
- ☐ Hoback Junction Area
- ☐ Other part of Teton County, Wyoming☐ Outside of Teton County, Wyoming (please specify_____)

- ☐ Don't know / Not sure

35. How many years have you lived in Teton County, Wyoming (full or part-time)?

- ☐ Less than 1 year
- ☐ 1-2 years
- ☐ 3-5 years
- ☐ 6-10 years
- ☐ 11- 20 years
- ☐ Over 20 years

- ☐ Not applicable, does not live in Teton County, Wyoming
- ☐ Don't know / Not sure

36. Including yourself, how many people, adults and children, currently live in your household?

(Please count all people that live in your house, apartment, mobile home, or other residence, whether you are related to them or not. People who live in the same building but in a different apartment should not be counted.)

_____ Number of household members

88. (Don't know / Not sure)

37. What is your household's income? Please choose the range that best describes your household's total income before taxes in 2007.

- ☐ Less than $15,000
- ☐ $15,000 to $25,000
- ☐ $25,000 to $50,000
- ☐ $50,000 to $75,000
- ☐ $75,000 to $100,000
- ☐ $100,000 to $150,000
- ☐ Over $150,000

- ☐ Don't know/Not sure

38. How much would you be willing to pay in taxes to conserve open space and natural resource areas?

- ☐ Nothing
- ☐ $100 per year
- ☐ $250 per year
- ☐ $500 per year
- ☐ More than $500 per year

- ☐ Don't know / Not sure

39. What is your gender?

- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male