

| Topic                                  | Comment   | Author            | Date            |
|--|---|-------------------|-----------------|
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | I attempted to send a recommendation under the East Jackson section and got an error message. Hopefully I can send the recommendation here. My recommendation is that for the residential low classification the square footage allowed for buildings be limited to 15% of the lot. Also I recommend that no more than two buildings be permitted for each 50ft. by 150 ft. lot. My rationale is that 85% of the lot would be available for open space or yard where children could safely play and not be forced to play in the adjacent street.   | Alan F. Galbraith | 4/23/2009 23:45 |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | I have family living in Jackson and have been following the new comprehensive plan. I have found the land use map to be shocking. Everything seems to be geared toward growth and development at the expense of the wildlife and uniqueness of the area. I hope that this is just a poorly misguided preliminary plan and that the end plan will reflect a drastic reduction in the density numbers. As it now reads, it seems to be a mockery of the public meetings and comments that were to direct this plan. Thank you for taking these comments into consideration.   | Bonnie B. Propst  | 5/14/2009 0:00  |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | Again, this needs to read "Limit Growth Responsibly". Growth will happen, let's slow it down and limit it as much as we can. The use of "Town Level Development" should be eliminated completely. This is a vague term that could potentially be detrimental to the nodes. Town development almost crept in to northern South Park. Please redefine and rename. Possibly call it "Community Needs Level Development."   | Brian Remlinger   | 5/8/2009 17:10  |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | Nodes? These are employee housing for developers in town and Teton Village. No justification has been presented to justify shifting the burden of development from those doing the building to us out in your new "nodes".<br>We did not vote to become nodes.<br>We bought in the Aspens (or in Wilson) because we chose not to buy in town. So the smart guys brought in for this bring the town to us. GREAT! Fire 'em.  | C Schwender       | 5/11/2009 21:43 |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | The draft Comprehensive Master Plan does not reflect community input. It calls for too much growth and will cost too much to implement. We don't want our taxes going up. We need a sustainable community that's not dependant on growth. To do that we must:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manage our population growth rate to no more than the national average</li> <li>• Limit commercial growth. It's the major JH growth-engine and it causes our housing shortage.</li> </ul> Focus the Plan on the values that are near and dear to all of us:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of wildlife and preservation of wildlife habitat</li> <li>• Open space that preserves our scenic views throughout JH, not just in select locations</li> <li>• Preservation of our rural way of life.</li> </ul> I respect property rights and by-right zoning, but not the "density bonus options" that were rejected in the community surveys. That extra density adds too much traffic, congestion, and sprawl.<br>I support an affordable housing program that is both sustainable and fully mitigates the entire development impact of each project within that project.<br>Please do not approve any more 3 story buildings right downtown, within 3 blocks of the square. It is beginning to make us feel like we are living in a CITY instead of a town. Tourists come here because they like the small town atmosphere.  | Carol Colglazier  | 5/4/2009 0:00   |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | There seems to be a basic premise here.....that growth is desirable. I seriously question that assumption. I would maintain that balance and equilibrium are what we should be striving for. You cited sustainability as a guiding concept but there is no definition of the term. We should have one. Also, the term "human needs" is repeatedly used, again, with no definition. A definition is needed. Actually the community should be involved in determining these human needs. Regarding growth: The community was never asked about a 'no growth' option. What we did say clearly is that we wanted a "limited growth" plan. This is NOT a limited growth plan. Basically, there is far too much growth, both residential and non-residential. However, I do believe that the nodal concept is a good one, IF handled with restraint. But the proposed level of growth is too extreme and will make it impossible to achieve our stated top priority, Theme I. In addition, to concentrate so much growth in the swath of Wilson, The Aspens and Teton Village also makes it impossible for this plan to succeed in its stated priority to "promote stewardship of wildlife and natural resources in 10.06 District 6: Westbank."pg. 98 since these three nodes are in the middle of the Westbank District. To develop on the scale and in the manner proposed will result in permanent fragmentation of crucial ( recent Game and Fish evaluation ) winter moose habitat as well as the serious compromising of movement patterns. Permeability should be protected in the entire Westbank district. To double the size of the Aspens and quadruple the size of Wilson is far too much growth. The total amount of residential units proposed could result in a doubling of the current population. That is too much. I would like to see a total increase of not more than 25% of the present number of residences in the town and county. The proposed amount of non-residential or commercial, at 8.8 million sq. ft. seems beyond belief. Why would that amount ever be desirable or necessary? That level of increase would generate about 35,000 new jobs, about 27,000 new employees and thus a severe need for additional housing. We will only be digging the hole ever deeper if we expand the commercial any where near that amount. Let's cut that down to 25% of 8.8 or 2.2 million sq. ft. I am very concerned that there is NO attempt to determine the carrying capacity of the valley. It seems to be only common sense to do so before proposing any growth plan. I ask that this be done immediately, before continuing. That's all I'm able to comment on at present. I'll will follow up with further comments within the near future. | Carol Wauters     | 5/18/2009 1:39  |

| Topic                                  | Comment   | Author      | Date            |
|--|---|-------------|-----------------|
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>In general, the draft plan takes too much of a growth approach. The plan itself could be paraphrased as "let's just double". Our community can choose to give much less. Many of the parameters in the document are overly general and would be subject to moving targets. What does it specifically mean to manage growth in a responsible and sustainable manner?</p> <p>My biggest issue with the draft plan is the nodal development thesis.</p> <p>While the nodal plan makes sense in spirit, it is not consistent with reality. If the intention is to increase density at the "nodes," beyond current zoning levels for "workforce" housing, the thesis of a node falls apart. It would be in the economic interest of all of those living in workforce housing to travel to town for literally every gallon of milk they purchase. The potential inhabitants of the workforce housing in the Aspens are not likely to go to dinner at Mizu Sushi, pay \$3.00 for a latte, golf at the Pines, or buy their groceries at the Westside Store. They are also not going to pay bus fare to town to buy groceries and carry them back on the bus.</p> <p>The Comprehensive Plan cannot mandate how much is charged for commercial rents nor dictate commercial tenants or their pricing. The same analogy could be made for Teton Village, the Aspens and Wilson.</p> <p>What was the data used to develop the "nodal strategy"? Did anyone interview the residents at Millward or Wilson Meadows to determine where they purchase their goods and services? WYDOT's traffic demand model was used, although the veracity of WYDOT's model was not questioned nor supported with data.</p> <p>The workforce in Teton County is much more likely to use public transportation to commute to and from work than they are to use public transportation for their personal needs.</p> <p>If we are going to change the current agreement with the community for zoning densities, it should be done in a least impactful way for the environment and the entire community. The community would be far better off locating "workforce housing" closer to "workforce shopping" and "workforce activities".</p> <p>11% of the new residential buildout is proposed for highly dense nodes on the Westbank, where there are no appreciable community services for our "workforce". The result will be impermeable barriers for wildlife on both Hwy 390 and Hwy 22.</p> <p>The planning staff report for the Osprey Creek development proposal on Hwy 390, suggested that each dwelling would make 11 vehicular trips/day. It is fairly likely that each incremental dwelling at each of the new designated rural nodes is likely to make a similar number of trips, largely to town and back.</p> <p>The community was asked innocuous questions in the survey of whether it would support "additional development" in certain areas. If the question had been whether the community would support doubling or tripling the current densities in what are now proposed to be "nodes", I doubt the response to the question would have been favorable. The draft plan stuffs 30-50 years of forecasted residential development and density bonuses in areas that are newly deemed to be nodes in this plan. Why should the community be giving 30-50 years of density bonuses at once - especially when we don't even know if the "nodal concept" is a valid one?</p> <p>The only way to effectively mitigate impacts on our transportation system and the environmental is to shift more development toward town. The nodal system sounds wonderful in spirit, but is likely to compound our challenges in practice.</p> | Cathy Kehr  | 5/14/2009 14:35 |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>People When we left the meetings last year I was under the impression that most everybody was in agreement that we donot want growth and the growth we will get here will be slow growth. now I hear we get 500 new houses in Wilson, did nobody hear what the people of Wilson said</p>   | Clay Hoyt   | 4/30/2009 9:30  |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>We can manage growth responsibly only when we have an idea of what goal we are managing. This theme just talks about accomodating growth and monitoring growth--and when it's too much figure out what to do. I think the community felt in the meetings that WHAT is too much would be identified. It is not....and the ranges in appendix 1 are so confusing and flawed that it is impossible to figure out what is proposed. Some of the districts now have new names (particularly in town) so it is confusing to figure out what will actually be happening.</p> <p>It is a great idea to monitor growth--but that was supposed to happen with the 94 plan and it fell through the cracks. With budget crunches and staff shortages, it will be the first thing thing to be dropped UNLESS it is a required finding for the staff with EVERY application for development. But, this too has to be measured against some numerical goal and that is what is lacking in this whole theme.</p>   | Diane Hazen | 5/15/2009 15:18 |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>Pg. 28 Add bullet: Reduction of energy consumption and reduction of the production of global climate change elements</p> <p>Principle 2.4: "...congestion, <u>energy use</u>, environmental degradation,..."</p> <p>Policy 2.4.b: "A hierarchy of protection shall be established preserving National Parks and Wildlife refuges first and foremost, followed by other appropriate Federal Lands, and State Wildlife areas and then neighboring private lands."</p> <p>Add # 5: Indicator - Rate of growth coupled with energy consumption Goal - Decrease per capita energy consumption Review Period - 5 yr</p>  | EEAB LAUT   | 5/19/2009 0:00  |

| Topic                                  | Comment  | Author         | Date            |
|--|--|----------------|-----------------|
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>Why is this theme addressed? I feel the wording should be changed to reflect a limited buildout which is consistent with the public comment: This Plan recognizes that the amount of growth allowed in this Plan will be limited to no more than existing base entitlements supported by 2009 zoning.</p> <p>Theme 7 should be included in this theme. There is no responsible growth management if you do not consider Theme 7.</p> <p>There is no mention of relating the amount of Commercial square footage currently entitled to the amount of workforce housing needed for the employees for the new business uses. Amounts of residential and non-residential development should be tied to each other.</p> <p>Page 28. The second to the last paragraph should be stricken as it represents the planners desires and not the community's public comment that insisted on buildout numbers and limited growth not to exceed what could be allowed in our current plan. This wording is not the community's plan. Who wrote this?</p> <p>What the community has said about this theme. Let us be clear what the community said: Public comment was clear that a maximum buildout be consistent or less than what could occur in our current plan without incentives. Who wrote this wording?</p> <p>Generally agree with Principle 2.1.</p> <p>Policy 2.1.a. This wording is confusing. The community is concerned with the overall buildout number for the entire county including Town. The charts shown in Appendix I do not support this statement. Yes if the incentive tools are eliminated then in the rural zones the rural buildout will be reduced. I am only aware of the Town of Jackson as "incorporated".</p> <p>Policy 2.1.c. Doesn't the land owner in a node have the right to say no to higher densities?</p> <p>Policy 2.1.d. I agree with this concept but only at densities that are predetermined and do not increase the overall county planned buildout.</p> <p>Policy 2.1.e. This would be important but how will the affordable housing residents in the nodes be able to shop at local convenience stores that are historically very expensive. Few can afford to shop at the Westside Store for their groceries.</p> <p>Policy 2.3.b. Use of density bonus incentives should not increase the buildout maximum for town or a specific node.</p> <p>Policy 2.4.c This whole idea is not based in reality. Communting has been a viable option for many working in Jackson for many years. We should embrace and develop strategies instead of thinking we can be completely independent of our regional neighbors.</p> <p>Strategy 2.1 Update zoning maps and development right regulations to be consistent with the overall buildout number that reflects the 2009 base development right.</p> <p>Eliminate the incentive tools and instead specify maximum densities in all nodes, town and districts.</p> <p>Indicators - What level triggers what action. Why monitor if nothing happens?</p> | Gail Jensen    | 5/17/2009 21:39 |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>Even though Appendix I states that "Buildout is not projected growth," the Comprehensive Plan appears to endorse a significant increase (100%) in the population in fifty to sixty years despite the results of the planning survey showed that 53% of the people preferred least growth.</p> <p>The buildout projects a ten year increase in units for Jackson to be 540 (14%) and for the County Nodes 220 (22%), a total of 36%. Based on this calculation in thirty years the build out could then be a 103% increase in units and with a potential population increase of 4,560 with two people per unit. Based on the ten year projection, the actual Future Maximum could be 216% in 60 years. None of the questions in the survey asked whether residents would like to see a 100 to 200% increase in population. That doesn't sound like responsibly managed growth.</p>   | James Hawley   | 5/15/2009 18:02 |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>I am a constituent of Teton County and would hope that you will address the issue of growth that is all inclusive of all walks of life. I have been here three years and have noticed an increase of homelessness of male caucasians between the age of 28-52, and females to a smaller percentage.</p> <p>There is one domestic violence housing for women and children, however they must have been beaten or abused to be allowed housing. Additionally, there is only one mission in town which is extremely secular. Responsible growth to me means that this issue needs to be addressed by making sure that along side of this growth, we as a humanitarian community build additional homeless facilities that would be more helpful to the present economic situation that only promises to beget more homelessness.</p>   | Jamie Dakis    | 5/12/2009 20:44 |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>I am very disappointed in your conscious pro-growth stance. This is out of step with the core values of residents.</p> <p>It's been stated (Jeff Daugherty) that surveys are but one of many factors in deciding direction in the plan. Residents pay taxes and are most significant stakeholders. Why are they under-valued and under represented?</p> <p>It appears that pro-growth special interests are leading your charge.</p>  | Julie McIntyre | 5/17/2009 12:20 |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>I agree with the idea of clustered residential development within the county, including the possibility of "local convenience" businesses. However I do not agree that the county nodes need to be developed to the same density standards as the town of Jackson.</p>  | Karen Jerger   | 5/15/2009 2:55  |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>This must be consistent and carry from one Commissioner to the next and not be changed everytime a different person is "in the seat" with a new/better idea or an agenda to make major changes. Develop this plan so it has "Staying Power" and not be a 20 year plan with annual changes. We always seem to have to reinvent the wheel.</p>  | Ken Koster     | 4/24/2009 15:58 |

| Topic                                  | Comment  | Author           | Date          |
|--|--|------------------|---------------|
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>In reviewing the draft of the new Comp Plan it is obvious that its authors have caved in to the interests of those who stand to profit most, economically, by the continued growth and sell-off of Jackson Hole. This document fails to retard the same development path we have experienced the last few decades. Multiple surveys and neighborhood meetings notwithstanding, the concerned citizen with little or nothing to gain monetarily cannot begin to compete with the desires of those who control the land in Teton County – whether it be by inheritance, purchase or option. Landowners have effectively partnered with our real estate agencies, to advertise and invite the world to own a piece of our valley. As a result, tourism has been replaced by growth and development as the primary economic engine of the valley.</p> <p>Real estate, finance, (often our own banks), architects, attorneys, right down to our planning departments, planning commissions and often our elected representatives have been complicit. None of these interests enjoy the words “low growth” or “no growth” in their vocabularies. What started out as an effort to limit our growth in favor of wildlife and open space has failed. I was foolish to think I could help make some difference.</p>   | Larry Kummer     | 5/8/2009 0:00 |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>I am a part-time resident of Jackson Hole living in the South Park area of town. I have read with interest the document referred to above and would like to offer my comments.</p> <p>The 1994 Comprehensive Plan was designed to guide community planning in such a way as to "promote economic sustenance that does not depend on population growth" While this was a worthy objective, that Plan did little to deter population growth due largely to Jackson's intrinsic qualities of scenic beauty and abundant wildlife, coupled with the proximity of skiing, hiking and outdoor activities, making it one of if not the most desirable small communities in the country.</p> <p>The current draft Plan seems unlikely to protect and preserve the qualities that make the Jackson Valley unique. Nowhere does the draft Plan recognize the kind of qualities that caused the Rockefeller family to aggregate land and place it in trust as parklands. The central premise of the draft Plan should recognize above all that the rate of growth the Valley has experienced over the past several decades cannot be sustained if we are to sustain the quality of life that Jackson residents and tourists alike cherish.</p> <p>Specifically, the draft Plan allows for population growth from the current 20,000 to around 40,000 and for designated housing units to increase from the current 10,000 to 20,000. Specific areas, such as South Park, allow large buildouts with density incentives to permit workforce housing, while the commercial buildout infers some nine million square feet of proposed commercial space. To call the draft Plan "responsible" growth is irresponsible and erroneous. It presumes the sort of upzoning that has ruined other communities seeking additional sources of income at the expense of the qualities that led to demand in the first place.</p> <p>Responsible growth would instead emphasize the upgrading and infilling of existing growths in areas that are already served by current infrastructure and services. Commercial projects should likewise largely be restricted to replacing and making more sustainable older existing projects rather than projects that extend workplace housing further from town since such housing will ultimately require additional infrastructure and services that constitute additional expenses for the host community.</p> <p>The draft Plan shows little in the way of acknowledgement that natural systems such as watersheds and wildlife corridors have a carrying capacity that planners exceed at their peril. Simply referring to "human needs" and "community benefits" does little to help evaluate the merits of proposed projects. Instead, planners need to work with wildlife biologists and other experts to produce indices that portend which are desirable and which will produce harm to these natural systems.</p> <p>I gather that the Jackson community have emphasized this vision of Jackson but their comments have largely gone unheard at staff levels. I am writing elected officials in the hopes that you recognize the the structural changes that have and are taking place in the economy that not only have fundamentally changed the way we do business but the danger of adopting a draft Plan based on future growth. The current recession has brought about a shift towards sustainability and yearning for ways of life that are not predicated on untrammelled growth. Where growth occurs it should be incremental and respectful. For Jackson to adhere to a growth model betrays a fundamental misunderstanding of the evolving socioeconomic realities around us.</p> <p>Indeed, the fragility of the Jackson economy and the current recession offer planners and citizens a rare opportunity to plan for the future without the attendant pressures of earlier years. Attention to the replacement and modernization of existing infrastructure (Jackson Airport, the Y Intersection etc.) should be prioritized. Projects like the limited expansion and upgrading of Teton Village are good examples of responsible growth as it directly impacts the tourist economy.</p> <p>I am a real estate developer in California and can attest to the fact that recreational and resort developments are labor intensive and must be judged within the local economy on a long-term basis.</p> <p>To conclude, I am writing elected officials in Jackson to encourage you to use the "breathing room" that the current recession affords you to revise the draft Plan in ways that will insure Jackson's future as a "last great place." Failure to produce an appropriate Comprehensive Plan this time around, unlike 1994, will have dire and perhaps irreversible consequences. A Comprehensive Plan is a visionary document. Please demonstrate to current residents and future generations that you are indeed men and women who can match your wonderful mountains.</p> | Leon G. Campbell | 5/4/2009 0:00 |

| Topic                                  | Comment  | Author          | Date            |
|--|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>The draft Comprehensive Master Plan does not reflect community input. It calls for too much growth and will cost too much to implement. We don't want our taxes going up.</p> <p>We need a sustainable community that's not dependant on growth. To do that we must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manage our population growth rate to no more than the national average</li> <li>• Limit commercial growth. It's the major JH growth-engine and it causes our housing shortage.</li> </ul> <p>Focus the Plan on the values that are near and dear to all of us:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of wildlife and preservation of wildlife habitat</li> <li>• Open space that preserves our scenic views throughout JH, not just in select locations</li> <li>• Preservation of our rural way of life.</li> </ul> <p>I respect property rights and by-right zoning, but not the "density bonus options" that were rejected in the community surveys. That extra density adds too much traffic, congestion, and sprawl.</p> <p>I support an affordable housing program that is both sustainable and fully mitigates the entire development impact of each project within that project.</p>  | Lori Tillemans  | 5/7/2009 0:00   |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>Mange growth responsibly does not equate with encourage growth. The plan allows for growth that is detrimental to the existing community and our resources. We should acknowledge that this area can not sustain a growing population without sacrificing our wildlife. While focusing development in Jackson and the nodes is better than growth throughout the county, the amount of growth this plan proposes is too much. There needs to be much better cooperation and coordination between the town and county on all the themes in this document.</p>  | Louise Lasley   | 5/14/2009 13:32 |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>The draft Comprehensive Master Plan does not reflect community input. It calls for too much growth and will cost too much to implement. We don't want our taxes going up.</p> <p>We need a sustainable community that's not dependant on growth. To do that we must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manage our population growth rate to no more than the national average</li> <li>• Limit commercial growth. It's the major JH growth-engine and it causes our housing shortage.</li> </ul> <p>Focus the Plan on the values that are near and dear to all of us:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of wildlife and preservation of wildlife habitat</li> <li>• Open space that preserves our scenic views throughout JH, not just in select locations</li> <li>• Preservation of our rural way of life.</li> </ul> <p>I respect property rights and by-right zoning, but not the "density bonus options" that were rejected in the community surveys. That extra density adds too much traffic, congestion, and sprawl.</p> <p>I support an affordable housing program that is both sustainable and fully mitigates the entire development impact of each project within that project.</p> <p>This Update was to be an open process. To have the respect of the community you should disclose all the inputs that went into this April, 3 draft Comp Plan Update.</p> | Luis Wang       | 4/29/2009 0:00  |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>Policy 2.2.c: "Update the Tuture Use Plan every five years" I suggest that this is too long to wait, for a number of important reasons, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. in 5 years, the variances granted by the wide authority of the LDR's will have become the new norm; the clock can never be rolled back.</li> <li>2. even assuming that 5 years is appropriate, it will surely take a year or more to gather the information, the write and approve new rules. In effect, this will mean review only every 6 or seven years.</li> </ol> <p>In my view, this should be not less than every 3 years. I believe the cost to the community of waiting longer will be far greater than the \$\$\$ cost of more aggressive review.</p> <p>Policy 2.2.d: "...if monitoring indicates that growth rate management is needed." Growth Rate Management must be required from the outset! If it is not, who will decided that it is needed? And, when? And, of course, by then it will likely be too late. The only way to know if a plan is working is to monitor it regularly, which is being established in the Plan, and compare it to SPECIFIC CRITERIA.</p>  | Michael Faraday | 5/17/2009 14:32 |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>The community has repeatedly said that we cannot sustain our wildlife and open spaces, and our quality of life with the densities and buildout being proposed in this plan. We compromise the present as well as the future if our buildout population is not less that the 1994 Comp Plan.</p> <p>Any development must be entirely predictable by identifying exactly what the community can expect on all properties.</p> <p>"Smart Growth" is an oxymoron, considering the impacts of growth on our quality of life. Growth results in higher taxes, the need for more schools, more roads, more utility needs such as sewer, water, electricity, more congestion.</p> <p>According to the Key Expectations published by the Town and County Staff last fall, the community said in its public comment over that past year that a "growth rate regulation should be implemented to slow the impacts of development to natural resources and community infrastructure." This theme does NOT reflect that input.</p>   | Patty Ewing     | 5/18/2009 0:34  |

| Topic                                  | Comment   | Author                 | Date           |
|--|---|------------------------|----------------|
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the plan proposal before hearings begin. An incredible amount of study and work has gone into planning efforts in this community for years and this effort may present the opportunity to simplify the issue and resolve it. My interest in land use and the pace of development goes back over 40 years when I was one of three local families who developed the Skyline Ranch development in the 1960's. This 600 acre development was accomplished on 200 of those acres with no bonus incentives. The remaining 400 acres constituted the first Wyoming Nature Conservancy easement, permanently protecting both the open meadow along Wyoming State Highway 22 and the entire riparian strip of land bordering the Snake River.</p> <p>Since that time I have served as an engineering, surveying and land planning consultant to other developments in the valley.</p> <p>In the early 1980's I served as local coordinator for the RUDAT Land Use Planning study for South Park, copies of which I believe are still existent. That intense three day planning effort brought together national planning professionals and involved the entire community of interests. The conclusions of that study and all subsequent studies, surveys, and elections when planning was involved, have supported the desire of the Teton County populace to limit build out growth and focus on "Town as Heart".</p> <p>With that in mind it seems the following scenario might satisfy Teton County's citizens desires:</p> <p><b>Modify those portions of the current plan which authorize PUD's, clusters, or higher densities beyond the base densities to restrict such additional density procedures throughout the county EXCEPT in new developments on lands adjacent to the existing Town of Jackson as that town boundary runs along High School Road from US Highway 89 westerly to the Spring Gulch Road. This would be a focused fix to the current plan while additional debate or study may continue. The southerly extent of that new development and affordable housing component within it could be worked out as a next step.</b></p> <p>This would have the immediate effect of removing higher densities from the majority of the county and concentrating it as a logical expansion, or node, within the Town of Jackson. Exactly what I understand "Town As Heart" to represent. This node would be within walking, biking and START system access to all necessary support services to such a density node. There does not seem to be any demonstrable need , except probably the inexorable development push, for any other such nodes in the county.</p> <p>The need for affordable housing seems to be a frequent justification for the proposed additional nodes throughout the county. The fact is that any affordable housing must be either privately or publically subsidized. The very granting of nodes away from the Town of Jackson places impact costs on Teton County ranging from transportation to schools and support businesses. If such additional subsidized housing is proposed, a funding estimate and source must be identified - otherwise the costs will by default fall to the citizens of Teton County in some way.</p> <p>The fact is that a quantity of affordable housing which may be desired beyond what could be accommodated in the area south of High School Road is clearly beyond the tolerance of the community for increased taxes, either directly or indirectly. The Housing Trust and Housing Authority have made and continue to make effective investments for some affordable housing and that should be encouraged. This unsatisfied demand, or need, will be satisfactorily addressed in our neighboring communities of Alpine, Star Valley, Victor and Driggs. This is more true this year than last with much more affordable land available within reasonable commuting distance of Jackson - all serviced by the START system and subsidized by the state and local governments. Not a bad arrangement.</p> <p>In the current economic downturn effecting the world, nation, state and local governments it is important for us in Northwest Wyoming to remember that tourism is the second largest industry in Wyoming. In consideration the state's extractive energy revenues appearing to revert to year 2003 levels it is desirable that locally we assure that our tourism attractions - natural values such as wildlife, scenic vistas, clean water and low congestion - are protected. These values differentiate Northwest Wyoming attractions from nearly all other such resort towns in the United States.</p> <p>My experience over the last 7 years in the Wyoming Legislature has convinced me that only in Teton County is there the possibility of finding the political will on the part of the County Commissioners (the entity with land use authority in counties) to identify and establish the regulations to assure that Northwest Wyoming remains the community able to live with, and benefit from a healthy, a truly sustainable economy based on the values on public lands while at the same time being careful not to become a parasite on those values for individual economic gain at the expense of those values.</p> | Pete Jorgensen         | 5/17/2009 0:00 |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>I admit to not being well acquainted with the time lines in the Teton County planning process. How long would such the above modification of the existing Comprehensive Plan take to accomplish, assuming both the Planning Commission and the County Commissioners found it desirable? Just an estimate of the time required is all I'm looking for.</p>  | Pete Jorgensen (cont.) | 5/17/2009 0:00 |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>I find it difficult to put into words the bewilderment and dismay that I feel about the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan, which fly in the face of the wishes of the people who live in this community. Why must we provide housing for another 15 or 20 thousand people who would move here only because of another 9 million square feet of commercial space. I think it's appropriate to provide for the ability to house the work force that we now have, but why invite more jobs, congestion, stress on the infrastructure and, most importantly, stress on the wildlife which are already being pushed to their limits. How can we blame the coyotes for eating our cats and dogs when we have left them so little of their natural hunting areas? And now we are warned that bears are becoming a problem in residential areas. That, of course, will inevitably result in the elimination of "problem bears", and so on. Please recognize that endless growth, like cancer, ends in destroying the host.</p>  | Petie Bennett          | 5/18/2009 0:00 |

| Topic                                  | Comment  | Author                     | Date            |
|--|--|----------------------------|-----------------|
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>This appears to be "deja vu all over again." There is no way to maintain wildlife and community character while allowing for growth. These things are mutually exclusive. Coupled with the fact that growth never pays it's way, this is a very depressing conclusion to have come to (again!).</p> <p>I've watched these plans since the first attempt at a Comp plan decades ago. These plans end up being driven by the "players." Who are the players? The entities that are at every meeting and are paid (either directly or indirectly) to be there. Those are almost entirely development interests. They are NOT the general, working public who largely make up this community and cannot be at all the meetings. These are the folks that frustrate planners and commissioners time and again because they aren't up to speed and end up wasting time at meetings going over already covered ground and making unspecific comments about wildlife values and small town character. But this is what the majority of residents want. The specifics have to relate back to these general principles. The public has always wanted these concepts to guide the plan.</p> <p>The future is going to be a very different place from the past. The economy won't be so consumer oriented. Old modes of doing business (including planning) will prove to be devastating both financially and ecologically. We need to find sustainable ways to maintain this community as a viable place and I would argue that that means contraction as opposed to growth. I say no more commercial space, or reconfigure what is already allowed. The scale of everything will be smaller and more localized in the future. It will have to be.</p> | Phil Round                 | 5/14/2009 15:19 |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>Managing growth responsibly is very important and we must protect our character and resources. New development must take in to account open space and transportation issues and not compromise wildlife or natural resources.</p>   | Robin McGee                | 5/12/2009 11:42 |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p><b>If no reporting is done on the promised data, it is evidence that growth is out of control and must be brought under control regardless of the actual rate.</b></p> <p>-I am not convinced that plan reduces overall build out in the unincorporated county.</p> <p>-Plan does not implement a rate of growth mechanism until a problem is identified. It will be too late then. We need mechanism now and adjust threshold as we go. People were not happy with the growth rate of the 90s. We should keep below that rate.</p> <p>-Need to monitor what has been built, what is approved but not built, and 'budget or estimated under current zoning.' This should be done for dwelling units, commercial square footage and APO.</p> <p>-A simple LOS to monitor is the time to process building permits for citizens and average time for completion after a building permit is issued. When they start to go up, we are growing too fast.</p> <p>-The number of FLUP amendments is not meaningful data.</p> <p>-A useful metric for measuring and managing growth is comparing new work force dwelling units created to new jobs created. Jobs created could be estimated yearly from new commercial sq ft and adjusted with census data as it becomes available.</p>  | Save Historic Jackson Hole | 5/15/2009 11:01 |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>I have not seen anything discussing how the rate of growth will be monitored. How about adding something that indicates when approximately X% (e.g., 20%) of the planned development has occurred (preferably on a district by district basis), that the plan will be reviewed to see if it needs to be revised due to too rapid development.</p> <p>Remember that development was determined to NOT be a priority of the citizens. The plan needs to include a way to make sure that the development occurring under it is in line with what the citizens want.</p>  | Shelley Sundgren           | 5/6/2009 21:42  |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>The draft Comprehensive Master Plan does not reflect community input. It calls for too much growth and will cost too much to implement. We don't want our taxes going up.</p> <p>We need a sustainable community that's not dependant on growth. To do that we must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manage our population growth rate to no more than the national average</li> <li>• Limit commercial growth. It's the major JH growth-engine and it causes our housing shortage.</li> </ul> <p>Focus the Plan on the values that are near and dear to all of us:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of wildlife and preservation of wildlife habitat</li> <li>• Open space that preserves our scenic views throughout JH, not just in select locations</li> <li>• Preservation of our rural way of life.</li> </ul> <p>I respect property rights and by-right zoning, but not the "density bonus options" that were rejected in the community surveys. That extra density adds too much traffic, congestion, and sprawl.</p> <p>I support an affordable housing program that is both sustainable and fully mitigates the entire development impact of each project within that project.</p>  | Sonja Boehne               | 4/30/2009 0:00  |

| Topic                                  | Comment   | Author                 | Date           |
|--|---|------------------------|----------------|
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>The draft Comprehensive Master Plan does not reflect community input. It calls for too much growth and will cost too much to implement. We don't want our taxes going up.</p> <p>We need a sustainable community that's not dependant on growth. To do that we must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manage our population growth rate to no more than the national average</li> <li>• Limit commercial growth. It's the major JH growth-engine and it causes our housing shortage.</li> </ul> <p>Focus the Plan on the values that are near and dear to all of us:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of wildlife and preservation of wildlife habitat</li> <li>• Open space that preserves our scenic views throughout JH, not just in select locations</li> <li>• Preservation of our rural way of life.</li> </ul> <p>I respect property rights and by-right zoning, but not the "density bonus options" that were rejected in the community surveys. That extra density adds too much traffic, congestion, and sprawl.</p> <p>I support an affordable housing program that is both sustainable and fully mitigates the entire development impact of each project within that project.</p> <p>My biggest concern is with respect to the growth permitted in the "growth areas" in town and the four growth "nodes" in the county. I think the monitoring component of the plan is a big improvement from the previous plan. If you reduced the potential build-out in the "nodes" by 60% (e.g. the NW corner of South Park is reduced from a max of 1,500 to a max of 600), I would support the proposed plan.</p> | Steve Sharkey          | 4/30/2009 0:00 |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>I hope you will vote against the density proposed by the new plan. Density of this proportion undermines the kind of natural habitat that is necessary to support the amazing variety of wildlife that we enjoy living with. We live in a truly unique place. Please, support the open space that makes this uniqueness possible. We have more species sharing this ecosystem than anywhere in the lower 48. Please stand up for wildlife. It's what the majority wants. If we need affordable housing, then let's find a way to build that without extreme density. We should not be controlled by the greed of developers.</p>   | Sue Mortensen          | 5/15/2009 0:00 |
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>We live in the Aspens since 1989. What attracted us to this valley was the fact that there are still more animals around than human beings. Your comprehensive plan is pushing numbers and development, which are in no way an enhancement to the delicate balance of Wildlife / Natural Resources and human interaction.</p> <p>I don't need to tell you that Jackson Hole is an environmentally marginal area that does NOT support a growth explosion as your plan is laying the groundwork for. Unless you want to destroy it all, we need to stress a low impact policy.</p> <p>We like your nodes/cluster approach, surrounded by open spaces / green belts, and we support healthy growth to benefit ALL, and not a few selected - as your proposal favors. Your plan proposes numbers that can not possibly be absorbed by the existing INFRA STRUCTURE.</p> <p>The "Aspens Node" is a necessary convenience center for the entire Westbank. We have plenty of workforce people renting timeshare condos, in fact we are a mixed community as it is, with visitors, short- and long- term tennants walking the neighborhood; allow this growth to flourish in moderation, but don't choke it with too much of one kind.</p> <p>It was dirty business when the Lake Creek Condominiums were built in -what we were told- were dedicated wetlands. The 100yr flood plain line was arbitrarily drawn and altered to allow business to happen! Your Plan is opening flood gates to the-like business allowing densities that will move new people in affordable units in and others out!</p>   | Verena and Rod Cushman | 5/9/2009 20:46 |



| Topic                                  | Comment   | Author             | Date            |
|--|---|--------------------|-----------------|
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>Although new Jackson-area residents, we've been coming to the region for winter vacations for more than 25 years. In fact, my first glimpse of the Rockies was looking at the Tetons as my plane landed in Jackson Hole in 1982. Every time we returned to the region, the build-up was shocking. Two years ago, we finally decided to buy, fearing that we would never be able to find a permanent home here if we waited any longer. Fate was with us when we made that decision, since my husband found a position here and we were able to move much sooner than expected.</p> <p>We are concerned about the inclusion of Wilson as one of the nodes slated for expansion by the Comprehensive Plan. According to the Plan, Wilson already has mixed-use facilities that have locally oriented non-residential uses, which provide local residents with basic services. The Plan states that the intensity of any development would be higher in town where the locally oriented uses serve the entire community and limit dependence on trips into town. In terms of building form and orientation, further development would include two- and three-storey buildings located fronting the street with mixed uses that provide for morning-through-evening vibrancy and where pedestrian corridors could be utilized while accommodating automobile transport. The Plan calls for the development of mixed-type residences that include single family, duplex, triplex, and fourplex construction, along with limited retail facilities in appropriate locations. According to the Plan, the building form and orientation of such structures will be compatible with neighborhood character. We respectfully ask where tri- and fourplex housing is compatible with the character of Wilson, or where additional retail facilities would be appropriate? Even though the Plan states that single family mixed development is only appropriate to provide workforce housing, we are puzzled as to where such structures would fit in with Wilson as it has evolved over the past 150 years.</p> <p>According to the Plan's discussion of managing growth responsibly in District 11 (Wilson), the Wilson node comprises an area within ~1/4 mile of the Wilson commercial core that is deemed appropriate for town-level densities. The buildout calculations call for increasing nonresidential existing floor area from 51,000 to as much as 171,000 or greater. Buildout numbers also call for increasing residential development from 170 dwelling units to as many as 520 dwelling units, which would increase residential density from 0.94 to as much 3.08. Essentially, the Plan suggests that Wilson expand at least three-fold. How can such expansion possibly preserve the character of Wilson?</p> <p>The Comprehensive Plan states that "the priority in Wilson is the provision of housing opportunities to benefit the community." Is this meant to benefit the Wilson community or the Jackson/Teton County community? Expansion of Wilson to provide for the housing needs of the broader community would exploit the educational, commercial, sewer, emergency, recreational, and transportation services of the immediate community. While it would appear on paper that the vibrancy and sustainability of Wilson would be enhanced, a three-fold residential expansion would certainly strain existing services beyond the breaking point. Furthermore, the Plan states that "all development in Wilson should be designed to protect riparian corridors." Any expansion within ~1/4 mile of the Wilson commercial core would involve riparian habitats.</p> <p>In the Introduction to the Comprehensive Plan we read about the community vision adopted in 1994 and confirmed in 2008. We agree with every one of the points made: protection of scenic vistas and wildlife habitat for generations to come; maintenance and enhancement of environmental quality; promotion of and support for a diverse social and economic population, including provisions for a resident work force; preservation of the traditions and character of the Rocky Mountain West and Wyoming; and assurance that development on private lands in Teton County was compatible with surrounding public land values and uses. We also understood that the community recognized that a new plan should map areas appropriate for certain land uses in order to give landowners, developers, neighbors, and elected officials a measure of predictability regarding land use decisions and actions, so that priorities of and relationship between community values would be addressed. We particularly appreciate that measurable indicators would be developed with any new plan that would hold everyone involved accountable for the cumulative impacts of decisions made.</p> | Vicki L. Rosenberg | 5/11/2009 23:15 |

| Topic                                  | Comment  | Author                     | Date            |
|--|--|----------------------------|-----------------|
| 04 Manage Growth Responsibly (Theme 2) | <p>We understand that the development of a new Comprehensive Plan particularly addresses the issue of sustainability within our region, so that development meets the needs of the present community without compromising the ability of communities that evolve in the future to meet their own needs. It is notable that the proposed Comprehensive Plan guarantees that decisions about development extend to the preservation and protection of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. Specifically, the Plan states that, while recognizing that growth and development are necessary to meet the human needs of the community, the impact of local decisions must be understood in a regional context because of the ecological significance of our surroundings. To this end, two foremost priorities were developed that drive the focal community themes around which the Comprehensive Plan was formulated: 1) promotion of wildlife and natural resources stewardship, and 2) responsible management of growth.</p> <p>The second priority of the Plan details how growth in this region will be managed responsibly. We agree with the Plan's statement that future development, including redevelopment and infill, must occur in a measured, deliberate, and predictable way so it does not detract from the existing natural environment and community character. While the Plan does not define the carrying capacity of the region, it does describe a 10 Future Land Use Plan that will direct decisions related to growth in this community. In fact, those who developed the Comprehensive Plan have provided excellent maps and other visuals that depict how the Plan's themes, principles, and policies will be implemented in both the areas appropriate for conservation and those appropriate for development in such a way that community-wide priorities will be honored.</p> <p>We are impressed with the detailed breadth and depth of the Comprehensive Plan. Certainly, the developers of the Plan have exercised due diligence in bringing to the community such a well-structured design for growth, development, and conservation within the region. Of grave concern to us, however, is that the Plan states that this design will be used to inform future zoning and land development. We understand that community members called for buildout projections and some means of gauging the process of growth. The Plan reports that the community supports more population in the Town of Jackson in order to preserve the agricultural and natural resources in the county. It also states that "a large majority of the community agrees to limit development in rural parts of Teton County while allowing more development and population growth in certain county nodes such as Aspen/Pines, Teton Village, Wilson, South Park, and Hoback." Nowhere in the plan does it explain how or why these areas were selected for expansion. Time and again, spokespersons for the Comprehensive Plan have emphasized that the Plan is only a plan, and does not define zoning maps or land development regulations. Yet, a strategy referred to repeatedly within the chapters of the Plan states that zoning maps and base development right regulations should be updated and amended to be consistent with the 10 Future Land Use Plan. The 10 Future Land Use Plan, or "FLUP," is an integral part of the Comprehensive Plan. The plans for residential and unit developments, for affordable housing developments, and for mixed use developments appear to already be in place under the guise of "just a plan."</p> <p>If adopted, will the Comprehensive Plan adhere to its stated principle that new development regulations will protect existing character and promote sustainability? Will it truly consider "how well a proposed development 'fits' into the setting in which it is to be located?" When it states that "incentives that promote desired conservation and development are also needed," does it mean that administrators of the Plan will pay off residents within county nodes and the Town of Jackson to expand housing and local convenience commercial? The Plan also states that annexations will be used for town expansion, and that criteria will be adopted to guide such seizure appropriately.</p> <p>As new, but passionately involved members of the Wilson and Jackson/Teton County communities we wish to express our hope that planners, administrators, and elected officials read closely the Comprehensive Plan before adopting it as the absolute paradigm for future development in this region. The Plan is a work of art and its intricate detail is staggering. Unfortunately, it appears that a number of the Plan's expectations have not yet been met: updated mapping of wildlife habitats and migration corridors; updated zoning maps and amended base development right regulations; coordination between Jackson/Teton County planners and WYDOT; determination of congruence between stated plans and local character. Surging forward to adopt this Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan without careful consideration of these and other issues significant to the residents of the varied parts of this community can only be detrimental to all concerned in the long run.</p> | Vicki L. Rosenberg (cont.) | 5/11/2009 23:15 |
|  |  |                            |                 |