ANALYSIS OF DATABASE FOR DISTRICT SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Jackson / Teton County Comprehensive Plan
Analysis of Database for District Specific Comments
October 13, 2011

All comments collected as a part of the Comprehensive Plan process since April 2009 have been recorded in a Microsoft Access database and categorized by topic, district, date, project phase and other groupings. Comments can be organized based on any of these groupings and summarized in various ways, allowing the database to serve as a valuable tool for informed decision-making. The database represents a snapshot of all comments received at any point in time, and will be continuously updated as additional comments are collected. Currently, the database contains 433 comments relating to at least one specific Character District.

Comments were organized into the 15 Character Districts. Attached to this summary is each comment that applies to each district. A single comment may be applicable to multiple districts, which is why the sum of the comments on each district does not equal the total number of comments. Because the comment database was originally developed prior to the creation of the Character Districts, comments are organized in the database by 2009 Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) District. The number(s) of the FLUP district(s) that comprise each Character District are shown in parentheses in the below table.

Comments Regarding a Specific FLUP District 4/13/09-10/13/11					
	Total	**Public**		**Joint PC**	**STAG**
Character District (FLUP District)	**Comments**	Comments	Commenters	Recs	Recs
Total	**433**	**380**	**233**	**8**	**45**
1. Town Square (16)	**14**	9	9	-	5
2. Town Commercial Core (21, 23, 24, 25)	**14**	7	5	1	6
3. Town Residential Core (15, 19, 20)	**31**	25	21	-	6
4. Mid-Town (17, 18)	**18**	11	8	2	5
5. West Jackson (13)	**30**	27	9	-	3
6. Town Periphery (13 + “connector”, 14)	**17**	13	6	-	4
7. South Highway 89 (7, 22)	**10**	8	4	1	1
8. River Bottom (4, 8)	**13**	10	9	-	3
9. County Valley (4, 5, 6)	**20**	14	13	-	6
10. South Park (12)	**133**	131	76		2
11. Wilson (11)	**107**	105	91	1	1
12. Aspens/Pines (10)	**41**	40	38	-	1
13. Teton Village (9)	**20**	16	13	3	1
14. Alta (1)	**11**	9	9	-	2
15. County Periphery (2, 3, 4)	**15**	10	9	-	5

The following 15 tables further analyze the comments for each Character District. The topic(s) of each comment pertaining to a district are summarized. A single comment can apply to multiple comments, which is why the sum of the comments on each topic does not necessarily equal the total number of comments.

Town Square Character District Comments by Topic				
Topic	**Total**	Public	Joint PC	STAG
Total	**14**	**9**		**5**
Building Design	**8**	5		3
Alternate Modes of Travel	**4**	3		1
Community Character	**3**	3		
Commercial Buildout	**1**	1		
Community Facilities	**1**			1
Growth	**1**	1		
Growth Rate	**1**	1		
Housing Mitigation Rates	**1**	1		
Lodging Overlay	**1**			1
Natural Resource Quality	**1**	1		
Plan Update Process	**1**	1		
Predictability	**1**			1
Residential Commercial Balance	**1**	1		
Town Redevelopment	**1**	1		
Wildlife	**1**	1		
Workforce Housing	**1**			1

Town Commercial Core Character District Comments by Topic				
Topic	**Total**	Public	Joint PC	STAG
Total	**14**	**7**	**1**	**6**
Building Design	**6**	4		2
Alternate Modes of Travel	**3**	2		1
Community Character	**3**	3		
Lodging Overlay	**3**	2		1
Town Redevelopment	**3**	2		1
Community Facilities	**2**			2
Residential Commercial Balance	**2**	1		1
Housing Mitigation Rates	**1**	1		
Impact Exactions	**1**	1		
Natural Resource Quality	**1**			1
Residential Buildout	**1**	1		
Residential Density	**1**	1		
Resorts	**1**		1	
Scenic Resources	**1**	1		
Town Infill	**1**	1		
Traffic	**1**	1		
Wildlife	**1**	1		
Workforce Housing	**1**			1

Town Residential Core Character District Comments by Topic				
Topic	**Total**	Public	Joint PC	STAG
Total	**31**	**25**		**6**
Community Facilities	**10**	7		3
Community Character	**9**	9		
Residential Density	**5**	4		1
Town Redevelopment	**5**	3		2
Traffic	**5**	5		
Building Design	**4**	4		
Residential Commercial Balance	**4**	4		
Growth	**3**	3		
Wildlife	**3**	2		1
Commercial Buildout	**2**	2		
Open Space Conservation	**2**	2		
Predictability	**2**	2		
Prioritization of Values	**2**	1		1
Town Infill	**2**	2		
Workforce Housing	**2**	2		
Alternate Modes of Travel	**1**	1		
Fiscal Impacts	**1**	1		
Housing Mitigation Rates	**1**	1		
Impact Exactions	**1**	1		
Lodging Overlay	**1**	1		1
Nodes	**1**	1		
Plan Update Process	**1**	1		
Regionalism	**1**	1		
Residential Buildout	**1**	1		
Scenic Resources	**1**	1		
Sustainability	**1**	1		

Mid-Town Character District Comments by Topic				
Topic	**Total**	Public	Joint PC	STAG
Total	**18**	**11**	**2**	**5**
Wildlife	**7**	5		2
Residential Density	**6**	4		2
Road Project	**3**	2		1
Traffic	**3**	3		
Alternate Modes of Travel	**2**	1		1
Workforce Housing	**2**	1	1	
Building Design	**1**			1
Natural Resource Quality	**1**	1		
Residential Buildout	**1**	1		
Residential Commercial Balance	**1**		1	

West Jackson Character District Comments by Topic				
Topic	**Total**	Public	Joint PC	STAG
Total	**30**	**27**		**3**
Growth	**12**	12		
Traffic	**11**	10		1
Road Project	**9**	7		2
Community Facilities	**7**	7		
Community Character	**6**	6		
Open Space Conservation	**5**	5		
Wildlife	**5**	5		
Workforce Housing	**5**	5		
Energy Conservation	**3**	3		
Plan Update Process	**3**	3		
Predictability	**3**	3		
Residential Commercial Balance	**3**	2		1
Scenic Resources	**3**	3		
Economic Development	**2**	2		
Natural Resource Quality	**2**	2		
Plan Organization	**2**	2		
Prioritization of Values	**2**	2		
Town Infill	**2**	2		
Alternate Modes of Travel	**1**	1		
Building Design	**1**	1		
Fiscal Impacts	**1**	1		
Nodes	**1**	1		
Plan Accountability	**1**	1		
PRD	**1**	1		
Sustainability	**1**	1		
(none)	**1**	1		

Town Periphery Character District Comments by Topic				
Topic	**Total**	Public	Joint PC	STAG
Total	**17**	**13**		**4**
Growth	**8**	8		
Road Project	**7**	5		2
Traffic	**7**	6		1
Wildlife	**5**	4		1
Community Character	**4**	4		
Community Facilities	**4**	4		
Open Space Conservation	**3**	3		
Prioritization of Values	**3**	2		1
Scenic Resources	**3**	3		
Workforce Housing	**3**	3		
Plan Organization	**2**	2		
Town Infill	**2**	2		
Alternate Modes of Travel	**1**			
Economic Development	**1**	1		1
Energy Conservation	**1**	1		
Natural Resource Quality	**1**	1		
Plan Accountability	**1**	1		
PRD	**1**	1		
Predictability	**1**	1		
Residential Commercial Balance	**1**	1		
Residential Density	**1**	1		
Sustainability	**1**	1		
(none)	**1**	1		

South Highway 89 Character District Comments by Topic				
Topic	**Total**	Public	Joint PC	STAG
Total	**10**	**8**	**1**	**1**
Economic Development	**5**	4	1	
(none)	**2**	2		
Growth	**1**			1
Open Space Conservation	**1**			1
Plan Update Process	**1**	1		
Resorts	**1**	1		
Town Redevelopment	**1**	1		
Workforce Housing	**1**	1		

River Bottom Character District Comments by Topic				
Topic	**Total**	Public	Joint PC	STAG
Total	**13**	**10**		**3**
Growth	**8**	6		2
Wildlife	**4**	4		
Natural Resource Quality	**3**	3		
Open Space Conservation	**3**	1		2
Residential Commercial Balance	**2**	1		1
Community Facilities	**1**	1		
Economic Development	**1**	1		
Prioritization of Values	**1**	1		
Public Land Impacts	**1**	1		
Residential Buildout	**1**	1		
Workforce Housing	**1**	1		

County Valley Character District Comments by Topic				
Topic	**Total**	Public	Joint PC	STAG
Total	**20**	**14**		**6**
Growth	**8**	5		3
Open Space Conservation	**5**	2		3
Road Project	**4**	3		1
Traffic	**4**	3		1
Wildlife	**4**	4		
Community Facilities	**2**	2		
Nodes	**2**	2		
Plan Update Process	**2**	2		
Residential Commercial Balance	**2**	1		1
Scenic Resources	**2**	2		
Workforce Housing	**2**	2		
Predictability	**1**	1		
Prioritization of Values	**1**	1		
Residential Density	**1**	1		

South Park Character District Comments by Topic				
Topic	**Total**	Public	Joint PC	STAG
Total	**133**	**131**		**2**
Wildlife	**59**	59		
Growth	**58**	57		1
Open Space Conservation	**40**	40		
Nodes	**27**	26		1
Traffic	**26**	26		
Plan Update Process	**23**	23		
Prioritization of Values	**20**	20		
Scenic Resources	**19**	19		
Residential Commercial Balance	**14**	14		
Community Character	**12**	12		
Road Project	**12**	11		1
Workforce Housing	**12**	12		
Town Infill	**11**	11		
Community Facilities	**10**	10		
Natural Resource Quality	**8**	8		
Residential Density	**8**	8		
’94 Plan	**6**	6		
Plan Organization	**6**	6		
Predictability	**6**	6		
Growth Rate	**5**	5		
PRD	**5**	5		
Residential Buildout	**5**	5		
Agriculture	**4**	4		
Commercial Buildout	**4**	4		
Economic Development	**4**	4		
Sustainability	**4**	4		
Alternate Modes of Travel	**3**	2		1
Energy Conservation	**3**	3		
Housing Mitigation Rates	**3**	3		
Regionalism	**3**	3		
Building Design	**2**	2		
Employee Generation	**2**	2		
Fiscal Impacts	**2**	2		
General	**2**	2		
Impact Exactions	**1**	1		
Plan Accountability	**1**	1		
Plan Measurability	**1**	1		
Town as Heart	**1**	1		
Town Redevelopment	**1**	1		

Wilson Character District Comments by Topic				
Topic	**Total**	Public	Joint PC	STAG
Total	**107**	**105**	**1**	**1**
Growth	**64**	63		1
Wildlife	**45**	45		
Traffic	**29**	28		1
Nodes	**28**	26	1	1
Community Character	**22**	21		1
Plan Update Process	**18**	18		
Residential Density	**16**	16		
Workforce Housing	**13**	13		
Community Facilities	**10**	10		
Natural Resource Quality	**9**	9		
Predictability	**7**	7		
Alternate Modes of Travel	**6**	6		
Prioritization of Values	**5**	5		
Open Space Conservation	**4**	4		
Residential Commercial Balance	**4**	4		
Town as Heart	**4**	4		
Housing Mitigation Rates	**3**	3		
Residential Buildout	**3**	3		
Scenic Resources	**3**	3		
Sustainability	**2**	2		
’94 Plan	**1**	1		
Building Design	**1**	1		
Energy Conservation	**1**	1		
Growth Rate	**1**	1		
Plan Accountability	**1**	1		
Plan Organization	**1**	1		
Town Redevelopment	**1**	1		
(none)	**1**	1		

Wilson Character District Comments by Topic				
Topic	**Total**	Public	Joint PC	STAG
Total	**41**	**40**		**1**
Growth	**25**	24		1
Wildlife	**16**	16		
Traffic	**13**	13		
Nodes	**10**	9		1
Residential Density	**10**	10		
Community Character	**8**	8		
Workforce Housing	**7**	7		
Community Facilities	**4**	4		
Plan Update Process	**4**	4		
Town as Heart	**4**	4		
Alternate Modes of Travel	**3**	3		
Road Project	**3**	2		1
Predictability	**2**	2		
Residential Commercial Balance	**2**	2		
Scenic Resources	**2**	2		
(none)	**1**	1		
Building Design	**1**	1		
Energy Conservation	**1**	1		
Housing Mitigation Rates	**1**	1		
Natural Resource Quality	**1**	1		
Plan Organization	**1**	1		
Sustainability	**1**	1		
Town Redevelopment	**1**	1		

Teton Village Character District Comments by Topic				
Topic	**Total**	Public	Joint PC	STAG
Total	**20**	**16**	**3**	**1**
Workforce Housing	**7**	7		
Residential Commercial Balance	**6**	3	2	1
Growth	**5**	5		
Alternate Modes of Travel	**4**	4		
Housing Mitigation Rates	**3**	3		
Nodes	**3**	3		
Commercial Buildout	**2**	1	1	
Economic Development	**2**	2		
General	**2**	2		
Natural Resource Quality	**2**	2		
Open Space Conservation	**2**	2		
Residential Density	**2**	2		
Resorts	**2**	2		
Road Project	**2**	1		1
Town Redevelopment	**2**	2		
Traffic	**2**	2		
Community Facilities	**1**	1		
Energy Conservation	**1**	1		
Fiscal Impacts	**1**	1		
Growth Rate	**1**	1		
Plan Accountability	**1**	1		
Plan Measurability	**1**	1		
Plan Update Process	**1**	1		
Scenic Resources	**1**	1		
Sustainability	**1**	1		
Town as Heart	**1**	1		
Town Infill	**1**	1		
Wildlife	**1**	1		

Alta Character District Comments by Topic				
Topic	**Total**	Public	Joint PC	STAG
Total	**11**	**9**		**2**
Commercial Buildout	**2**	2		
Community Facilities	**2**	1		1
Economic Development	**2**	2		
Road Project	**2**	2		
Agriculture	**1**	1		
Alternate Modes of Travel	**1**	1		
Growth	**1**			1
Natural Resource Quality	**1**	1		
Open Space Conservation	**1**			1
Plan Accountability	**1**	1		
Public Land Impacts	**1**	1		
Residential Commercial Balance	**1**	1		
Scenic Resources	**1**	1		
Sustainability	**1**	1		

County Periphery Character District Comments by Topic				
Topic	**Total**	Public	Joint PC	STAG
Total	**15**	**10**		**5**
Growth	**8**	4		4
Open Space Conservation	**4**	1		3
Wildlife	**3**	3		
Residential Commercial Balance	**2**	1		1
Alternate Modes of Travel	**1**	1		
Community Facilities	**1**	1		
Plan Update Process	**1**	1		
Road Project	**1**	1		

DISTRICT 1: TOWN SQUARE

Town Square Comment (4/13/09 - 10/13/11)

Date	Name	Comment
10/4/2011	Flosbach, Amanda Interested Public	A note of thanks for inviting the community to participate in your feedback sessions last week. I attended late Thursday evening and was part of a group led by Mike, and I enjoyed not only the opportunity to share my vision for Jackson, but also the well-organized format and engaged facilitators - it was both effective and fun. I wanted to follow up by putting the thoughts I shared in writing and sending it to you. Here are my two cents, focused primarily on the Town Square business character district: •Preference for development up, not out - the land has already been "broken" so since it's very unlikely anyone is going to "undevelop" it and restore it to its natural state, let's do something interesting and ALIVE with it. •Desire to encourage complete neighborhoods whenever possible (walk to services, grocery, restaurant, activities w/in .5 mile radius) •Recommendation to expand zoning restrictions to encourage greater vibrancy in select neighborhoods of higher density: Allow for all types of mixed use to include Restaurant and other vibrant, people-filled businesses that serve visitors and locals (AKA not just vacant office space) from Broadway to Snow King along the King, Cache, Glenwood and Millward corridors, which would allow for more supporting businesses and activities to develop around the Center for the Arts and Brew Pub/Fitzgerald's. •Need for complete sidewalks the full length of above streets to make said corridors pedestrian friendly to encourage flow between these denser vibrant enclaves/nodes •Interest in creating a family friendly pedestrian mall on or around the Town Square for locals and visitors alike, such as an open space with playground or appropriate activity (successful example = new Teton Village Commons where the playground/water fountain combo allows kids to play while parents eat on the deck at Osteria. For many of my friends with kids, this is a favorite summer activity. Something like this would be totally possible on/near the Town Square.) •A need to clean up and create a welcoming sense of arrival at main entry points to Jackson, whether its landscape architecture affected by the Town or basic requirements of maintenance for frontage property owners Thanks so much for the opportunity.
5/5/2011	Parks, Carla Interested Public	I am extremely concerned that you safeguard the environment-the reason people come and the reason people want to come back. We owe the people of this valley, the visitors, the future people, the future visitors to protect and preserve the environment, the aura of the town itself. You MUST place a moratorium on "box" stores and chain stores. The small businesses in this valley need the support of the local people and the visitors. Big chain stores dilute the integrity of the town, bring down wages, put other businesses out of business. This is true for all major corporations. One of the things that is especially important is to maintain the spirit of independence for those creating businesses here and now and in the future. Please do not allow yourself to be lured into betraying the people of this valley by BIG MONEY interests. You must also place LIMITS on the amount of development allowed if we are to preserve our environment. Please NEVER change the town square or the small businesses around the square. PLEASE do not allow huge hotels, motels, corporate store to change the small town atmosphere. We have a saying, "Please don't 'Vail-ify' our valley."

Date	Name	Comment
1/7/2010	Fulton, Greg Interested Public	To the Honorable Mayor and Town Council, City of Jackson, Wy, Thank you for the opportunity to voice my views regarding the future of the Jackson Hole Town Square. As the owner of Astoria Fine Art Gallery located at 35 E. Deloney Ave. (on the Town Square) I am against any proposal to close Deloney Avenue or any Town Square streets to create a pedestrian only area. I am shocked and concerned that such an idea would even be considered without first contacting and interviewing the business owners that would be the most effected my such a measure. I believe this is a bad idea for the Town Square. I believe my business would be adversely effected by this proposal. It is important for my customers to have ample parking in the street; and especially during the winter months my business relies on people being able to park in front of the gallery and having easy access to my entrance. As you may know we are in the process of expansion. We are adding employees and attempting to grow even in a tough economic climate. Any experiment (and it would be an experiment) that could hurt traffic patterns at my establishment would be contrary to your mission statement: It is the mission of the Town of Jackson Municipal Organization to provide municipal services that enhance the quality of life for our residents and guests and to help support the local economy. Changing traffic patterns, perhaps adversely, would be a terrible blow to businesses who may be struggling. I believe the proposal would hurt, not support, the local economy and would be a decision that could lead to more closings and empty buildings. It is too risky. So far Jackson has survived the recession well. Other large art markets have seen 10-15% of their galleries close. Jackson has not. Please do not take any action that may change that scenario. Please do not close Deloney Avenue to the vehicles that our customers use to visit the town square and the adjacent businesses. To use the old adage: If its not broken do not fix it. Please trust that if I thought my business or my neighbors' businesses would stand to benefit in the slightest way I would support any measure. I see no benefit and stand firmly against any future consideration towards changing a very good and historically high-performing economic center downtown. Sincerely, Greg Fulton A very concerned local business owner and resident
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that building height should be limited to two-stories as recommended in the plan.
6/17/2009	, STAG	Group discussed design standards versus guidelines trying to get to predictability, but understanding differences in style.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group discussed the feasibility of lodging due to the two story limit, but didn't want to preclude lodging necessarily.
6/17/2009	, STAG	Parking should be provided as a public common amenity to give pedestrian orientation to the district.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that workforce housing was not appropriate in the Town Square Overlay. Language should be revised to reflect this sentiment.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	-Agree that building heights should not exceed 2 stories.
5/15/2009	Rohrstaff, Kate Interested Public	Honestly I don't think it matters. 2 or 3 stories? What is the difference really???

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Hoke, Bland, Jr. Interested Public	I believe that Town Square should be restricted to two stories and that regulatory relief should be granted for redevelopment/upgrade of propertiesin the Town square overlay. Particularly relief from housing requirements needs to be done. Two stories in the Town square do not lend themselves to affordable housing.
5/14/2009	Ferguson, Jean and Dick Interested Public	We are very concerned about the new Comprehensive Plan, which we feel is seriously flawed. It needs complete revision. 1. Its growth rates are excessive and omit the costs of and solutions to expanded schools, utilities, fire and police protection , streets, and highways, etc, etc. We need a plan for slow growth by implementing caps, restrictions and other possibilities. 2. It includes no plans to preserve the unique character of Wilson and Jackson while promoting massive growth and massive urban style. Just limiting growth around the Square does not preserve the character the citizens desire. 3. Wildlife, the number 1 value to the people, was totally devalued by this plan. Wildlife corridors, winter range, prime habitat, wetlands, and scenery decisions from the 1994 plan were omitted and current science based data is needed to protect wildlife. 4. Questions to be answered: Why won't the planners release the data with which they are supposedly making decisions. Isn't it public information? Who is pushing our employees in the planning department to propose such an extreme pro-growth plan? Or are the planners just totally out of touch with Jackson. 5. What possible "human needs" could drive 9 million square feet more of commercial growth? Growth has been shown to cost more than it generates; it is a vicious cycle. Affordable housing should not be an excuse for growth. 6. The 2 story limit around the Square is a very good idea. Besides allowing views of scenery, it will help the sun keep the winter ice on the streets to a minimum. In fact it is a good idea for all of Jackson and Wilson. 7. Greed locally and nationally has hurt so many people and continues to displace values in its rush for money. To purposely degrade the wildlife and the western character & hospitality of Jackson Hole for financial self-interest by developers, realtors and other groups surprises us. Some of them understand that preserving the Hole's uniqueness will make them more money in the long run and their life living here more enjoyable. 8. The planners seem to think limits on growth in one area must be provided somewhere else. It doesn't. Unlimited growth is not inevitable. It should be obvious to the electeds that the people want limited slow growth. And the electeds should instruct the planners to provide such a plan.
5/12/2009	McGee, Robin Interested Public	This area must be bike and pedestrian friendly. It would be so beneficial to encourage a small grocery store to be located in the area so that town residents have easy access to everyday needs. I am a big fan of closing the town square to traffic, much like the centers of Boulder and Burlington.
4/20/2009	Friend, William D. Interested Public	I applaud the goals for the Town Square. But the tricky part will be implementation; we'll need tough standards that are mule strong, horse high and not subject to compromise. Witness the new building now being completed on the north end of Centre Street - a tall, red brick and glass monstrosity that blends in with the Town Square area about as well as a buffalo turd in a punchbowl. Our elected officials will need to learn to say no to developers if exacting standards for the Town Square are not fulfilled. They should practice in front of a mirror: "no, hell no, and by God we mean it".And let us forever strike from our lexicon the phrase "parking meters".

DISTRICT 2: TOWN COMMERCIAL CORE

Town Commercial Core Comment (4/13/09 - 10/13/11)

Date	Name	Comment
10/4/2011	Flosbach, Amanda Interested Public	A note of thanks for inviting the community to participate in your feedback sessions last week. I attended late Thursday evening and was part of a group led by Mike, and I enjoyed not only the opportunity to share my vision for Jackson, but also the well
2/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	Recommendation 174 limiting land area expansions of Resorts applying to County Resorts (Teton Village, Golf & Tennis, Snake River Sporting Club, and Grand Targhee) should also apply to Snow King – the only Planned Resort in Town
6/17/2009	, STAG	Group was supportive of general pedestrian connection vision and specific use mix and bulk and scale proposed for this district.
6/17/2009	, STAG	Regarding the Forest Service Property, several members suggested that residential uses should be preferred over non-residential. They felt this was a good location to locate workforce housing.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group felt strongly about the inclusion of the relevance of Flat Creek in this district by enhancing the creek corridor as a community benefit.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group supported a three story max but had concerns about street wall, overall building height, sky plaining, and overall bulk and scale in this district. The group recommended including language about the maximum building size.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group was supportive of all proposed expansions to the lodging overlay.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The majority of the group agreed with to expanding the lodging overlay to include the south side of Pearl from Cache to Willow.
5/25/2009	Marsh, Susan Interested Public	This area has much potential as a scenic and welcoming gateway. Enhancing the pedestrain environment should be a high priority; the recent sidewalk to the visitor center is a great improvement although traffic noise and volume remain an unavoidable impact
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Do not discourage single use and single story buildings. The market will decide what is needed for this district.-Three story buildings are not appropriate as a gateway treatment.-Future development of the USFS site should favor residential use over co
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	-Proposed density for this district is over 2x what is currently built. It will change the character of the area and is not appropriate.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	The Lodging Overlay should not be expanded to the other side of Broadway along Flat Creek. A wall of hotels on both sides of Broadway is very undesirable. -Buildings should be limited to 2 stories.
5/13/2009	Smith, Barbara Interested Public	I have lived in East Jackson for nearly 37 years. Already when I walk past the recently built tall buildings I can't see the familiar landscape and they are built right to the side walk. I feel like I'm walking down a city street anywhere. I don't reco
5/11/2009	Schwartz, Bill & Cheryl Interested Public	As I have discussed with Jeff, my wife (Cheryl) and I own 10 and 20 East Simpson (Lots 1 and 2 of Block 7 of the Cache 2nd Addition). Our property is directly across the street from the Center for the Art's theatre.It appears from the map that only Lot 1

DISTRICT 3: TOWN RESIDENTIAL CORE

Town Residential Core Comment (4/13/09 - 10/13/11)

Date	Name	Comment
10/4/2011	Flosbach, Amanda Interested Public	A note of thanks for inviting the community to participate in your feedback sessions last week. I attended late Thursday evening and was part of a group led by Mike, and I enjoyed not only the opportunity to share my vision for Jackson, but also the well-organized format and engaged facilitators - it was both effective and fun. I wanted to follow up by putting the thoughts I shared in writing and sending it to you. Here are my two cents, focused primarily on the Town Square business character district: •Preference for development up, not out - the land has already been "broken" so since it's very unlikely anyone is going to "undevelop" it and restore it to its natural state, let's do something interesting and ALIVE with it. •Desire to encourage complete neighborhoods whenever possible (walk to services, grocery, restaurant, activities w/in .5 mile radius) •Recommendation to expand zoning restrictions to encourage greater vibrancy in select neighborhoods of higher density: Allow for all types of mixed use to include Restaurant and other vibrant, people-filled businesses that serve visitors and locals (AKA not just vacant office space) from Broadway to Snow King along the King, Cache, Glenwood and Millward corridors, which would allow for more supporting businesses and activities to develop around the Center for the Arts and Brew Pub/Fitzgerald's. •Need for complete sidewalks the full length of above streets to make said corridors pedestrian friendly to encourage flow between these denser vibrant enclaves/nodes •Interest in creating a family friendly pedestrian mall on or around the Town Square for locals and visitors alike, such as an open space with playground or appropriate activity (successful example = new Teton Village Commons where the playground/water fountain combo allows kids to play while parents eat on the deck at Osteria. For many of my friends with kids, this is a favorite summer activity. Something like this would be totally possible on/near the Town Square.) •A need to clean up and create a welcoming sense of arrival at main entry points to Jackson, whether its landscape architecture affected by the Town or basic requirements of maintenance for frontage property owners Thanks so much for the opportunity.
9/23/2011	Wallace, Jim Interested Public	Willow Street, from Snow King to Gill, is a Commerical through-fare, although in non-compliance:Vehicle traffic ranges 2000-4000 autos p/day, not including trucks & buses. The effects of such high activity preclude residential or AR zoning.There are only four owner occupied residencies on Willow; the remainder being primarily heavy commerical, mostly large Town & County bldgs. Commerical zoning of all lots which border Willow St. on the East & West, will preclude the requirements to re-route or restrict traffic; protect adjoining property occupants; add attractivness & function; create a welcoming & friendly village style district & concretely illustrate our [Town] vision. I have lived & worked @ 450 Willow for 30 yrs., and know this district intimately. Our property @ purchase was zoned MR4. It was the Bruun connector & prior Town planning that designated Willow St. use as Commercial.

Date	Name	Comment
3/8/2011	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	Rich Bloom, speaking for South Park neighbors. You already have my comments and I'll do my best to follow up tonight's brief comments with more complete thoughts. Last night, when I could not sleep again, reviewing yesterday's session—and I've never been to Alcoholics Anonymous—but I thought of a serenity prayer: Grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change, the courage to change the things I can, and wisdom to know the difference. I seem okay in the courage department. I'm working every day on the wisdom portion. Serenity over the last four years, though, has been very hard to find. And I think that's true for you also. And ultimately that's because we all care deeply about this community and this special place. I want to address those things perhaps I can inform you on. Change, though, is done on a personal level, and I would not be so grandiose to think I can change your minds or your world views. Address the pattern of growth, smart-growth goals. I know you will do this. Define the end state of the community's growth, the total amount of growth. This perhaps you are unwilling to do or simply do not believe it needs to be addressed. I understand that. Do address the types of growth, especially the balance of residential and commercial, about large second-home housing units, homes and condos, versus housing more likely to be accessed by the local workforce, landowner ownership. Address the cost of growth. Growth regardless of its location and how that would be paid for. The primary topic, though, I open the room is addressing the end state of growth and what you can do to rearrange some of the growth that's already in the pipeline. But I don't want to approach that from a world view that perhaps you may accept or at least be open to. And that is the community clearly does not want new growth area, regardless of where they are, and sprawl. That's what we're concerned about. I don't think any of you want both new growth areas and sprawl if you can avoid it. You also probably don't want new growth areas at the expense of reinvestment, revitalization and infill in places like East Jackson and North Broadway. I think you should give some consideration of that competition. Smart growth is best when it's focused on substantive growth, especially when you're starting fresh, when you can move it around or start fresh with a piece of land. That is when it ties with entitlements we already have. The concern the community has, and we've learned in this, is we're already going to roughly doubling of housing units and commercial. And even with smart-growth principles of pride that can be to those, also implications of an eventual doubling is daunting to our transportation systems, our public lands of community character and quality of life. It scares the bejesus out of us. It is a slippery, dangerous slope to merely try to grow oneself out of growth of these problems, whether they are jobs, workforce housing, tax revenue. Be careful and be modest, especially on any new growth that is not substantive. You also need to talk about the cost of growth. Michael Kinsley of the Rocky Mountain Institute spoke eloquently through a parable on the cost of growth issues. Consider the story of a recent unemployed builder, daunted by down size, he buys a truck and a load of vegetables to sell beside the highway. After a terrific day, he sold out. Back home, he gushes to his wife about his success. How much did you earn? Eighteen hundred bucks, he crows. How much did you pay for the veggies? Two thousand. Hmmm, there seems to be a problem. Grimily, he says, yeah, I need a bigger truck. [Laughter] So, in summary, first please address the cost of growth, starting with something tangible like a 15-year capital improvement plan. That should keep you pretty busy for the next five months. Second, please talk about redirecting and reshaping existing growth. We do not want both new growth centers and sprawl. Third, talk about how to achieve permanent open space. Don't take the easy route and simply down zone large rural areas. Permanent open space is much more preferable than temporary zoning. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
7/1/2009	Jaubert, Jessica Interested Public	As a young professional resident here in Jackson for 4 years, I am asking that you keep housing/affordable housing as the most important aspect of the Teton County Comprehensive Plan. That especially includes development in the South Park area as well as East Jackson. The South Park area is a great example of land that is vacant and could be used for housing residents that would like to stay and be a part of the community. Instead they are forced to move out of Jackson, primarily because of housing costs and availability. South Park and East Jackson areas help expand our need for housing while keeping the "heart" of Jackson: Town Square, South Cache, Snow King available for businesses and tourism. I think it is important to keep the "Heart" of Jackson in its historical character since this is one of its greatest charms that draws both residents and tourists alike to Jackson. South Park and East Jackson are much less visited by tourists, so these areas seem like a natural destination for our expanded housing to be located. I know that many residents from Cottonwood, Melody Ranch, and Rafter J subdivisions are the main voices in this community regarding this plan, and have made no secret about how much they do not want to see the South Park continue to grow. I find this incredibly hypocritical being that all of their subdivisions were created for the continuing need for housings years ago. It seems that there is an attitude in this valley that as long as I have a house, why should I care about my fellow citizens in this community who want to stay, but can either not afford housing or have none available to them. Residents of these above referenced subdivisions mention traffic, wildlife, air pollution, and increase in crime as the reasons to keep the amount of units that are essential to Jackson out of the South Park area. As mentioned in the Teton County Comprehensive Plan, "A workforce that commutes adds traffic to Teton Pass, Snake River Canyon, and Hoback Canyon, which reduces safety for both humans and wildlife. Moreover, the impacts of development are displaced to adjacent valleys; and the additional vehicle miles traveled increase carbon emissions, reduce air quality, and require new transportation infrastructure." I believe this contradicts their whole argument for wildlife, traffic, and air pollution. Air pollution will be increased because of workers driving two hours round trip everyday to neighboring towns where they live instead of fifteen to thirty minutes if they lived in the valley. To be honest, I do not think the residents of these subdivisions are concerned about wildlife so much as their current mountain views from their home becoming semi-blocked from development and the price of their home decreasing because of housing supply increasing. These residents have lost the meaning of community and are only looking out for themselves, however if they continue to block housing development, Jackson and they will suffer in the end because Alpine, Victor, & Driggs will continue to get financial revenue and taxes that should be in Jackson. Who will help continue paying the costs of buildings such as the Center for the Arts and the Teton County Recreation Center when all the young professionals and families are living in neighboring cities and giving their sales taxes to those cities? We need young professionals and young families to stay here in Jackson where their tax dollars can help continue these great civic structures that our town has worked hard to establish and maintain. We need young adults who care about their community, who want to spend money at the Farmer's Market in the Summer, participate in Old Bill's Fun Run in the Fall to raise money for our non profits, stand in the cold and cheer at the Pedigree Dog Sled Race, and participate with their families in the Spring Easter Egg Hunt at the Town Square. What will happen to these cherished events once all of our young professionals and families are living thirty to sixty minutes away from Jackson? Are we going to go the Driggs Farmer's Market? The Alpine Dog Sled Race? When we talk about "Saving Historic Jackson Hole", aren't these community events part of what we should be saving? Also, what will happen to all the shops, restaurants, and bars in Jackson once the young adults and young professionals are living elsewhere? I know these businesses rely on tourism heavily, but they also rely on our own community members just as much. I wanted to make my feelings known as a young professional, mother, wife, and community member of this town. If you do not do something to provide housing for young professionals, seasonal workers, and families now, I think it will be a complete detriment to this town and its character very near in the future. Please do all you can to increase housing and make this comprehensive plan a success. Thank you for all your hard work and everything you do for Jackson and the members of this community.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Exchange the fairgrounds property (District 19) in town for property in S. Park (District 12) in an area separated from residential development and with its own egress/ingress from hwy 89. Move the Fairgrounds, Rodeo, and START to this property in District 12, with the intent of building workforce housing in District 19 that will mitigate for the employees generated by already approved non-residential development in Town.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group recommended including a stronger statement about the importance of the hospital campus and accommodating future expansion of their facilities and supporting uses in the area. In addition Community Facilities due to the location of the hospital should be moved up the Theme prioritization due to health, safety, and general welfare concerns of the community.
6/17/2009	, STAG	Some of the group felt that wildlife permeability needed more emphasis in this district. Others stated that the wildlife access was strategically designed to discourage wildlife permeability in residential neighborhoods and to direct wildlife to around the built environment (i.e. Elk Refuge fencing).
6/17/2009	, STAG	A straw poll was taken on whether the rodeo grounds and public works facility should be moved out of town to make room for a public park and medium to high density residential. The majority of the group supported the relocation of these facilities.

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group generally agreed that the lodging overlay should not be removed on East Broadway.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group suggested inserting a statement about redevelopment of the Public Works Facility if should be relocated in the future. The future land use should be designated as residential.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group supported classification of the neighborhood north of Rodeo Grounds as Single Family Mixed.
5/29/2009	Wilmot, Jason Interested Public	I own a home at 45 Stormy Circle in East Jackson. I write to comment specifically on the comprehensive plan components relevant to our neighborhood. Here is some background: My property is adjacent to a lot that is in turn adjacent to East Broadway. In the last year, I have educated myself on details regarding the zoning of the property adjacent to ours to the north (between us and East Broadway). This adjacent property (550 East Broadway at the intersection of Stormy Circle and East Broadway) was recently sold. As part of this sale, it was originally offered up under the premise that the entire parcel was zoned Office Professional. This premise of zoning was not congruent with my understanding of the zoning of this parcel. Upon further investigation and communication with the Jackson Planning and Building Department, it was revealed that the map available on the Teton County website was not accurate, and in fact, the south half of 550 East Broadway is still zoned Neighborhood Conservation-Single Family (NC-SF). The sale of this property was completed under new terms given this zoning fact. This zoning status has been verified, in writing, from the Planning and Building Department. This fact has been a large, temporary, relief to me and my family, as we are VERY concerned about the quality of our home and neighborhood if the south half of 550 East Broadway would be rezoned into Office Professional. With this background in mind: I have reviewed the draft Comprehensive Plan for District 15: East Jackson, and see that the south portion of this parcel, 550 East Broadway, is intended to be zoned as "Mixed-Use Office Orientation". I fear that this zoning change is premised upon the ownership boundaries of the parcels, rather than being congruent with a zoning delineation that is in line with your stated priority for East Jackson. If the zoning is changed on the south half of this parcel, this block of new zoning would be a peninsular intrusion into the single-family mixed-type zoning. The draft Comprehensive Plan states, “Redevelopment should generally be neutral and maintain and preserve existing character.” The existing character of our neighborhood will be directly compromised if the south half of the parcel at 550 East Broadway is rezoned to allow Office development. We already have significant parking congestion and busy traffic on our street. I am concerned about my children’s safety and the quality of the neighborhood if even more congestion and traffic is allowed under a new zoning configuration. I am very anxious over the following potential scenario. 1) The south half of 550 East Broadway becomes rezoned to become Mixed-Use Office Orientation. 2) The current owner of 550 East Broadway also owns the lot immediately adjacent lot to the west. I presume this owner will want to consolidate these parcels to achieve the minimum square foot lot size to qualify for a Planned Mixed-Use Development Bonus. (Even though the draft plan states that the ‘town strongly discourages consolidation of multiple lots to create longer home sites not consistent with community character’. I recommend this principle also be applied to consolidation of lots for office professional development, especially in areas that should be single family homes). Depending upon how the Planned Mixed-Use Development Tool is applied to “Mixed-Use office Orientation”, it is possible that the landscape surface ration for the combined lot would be reduced to only 5%. Also, and I admit I don’t quite understand how the PMD would be applied to the new Mixed-Use Office Orientation, it is possible that a height bonus would be granted to a developer. What this would result in is effectively an urban character, very little landscaping, higher volumes of street traffic, congestion, a multi-story mixed-use building overshadowing my home and blocking any sort of view, and a loss of what East Jackson is all about. This scenario, to me, is directly counter to maintaining the quality of our neighborhood. These multiple and domino-effect changes would effectively be the opposite of your goal of “maintaining and preserving existing character”. This scenario is not neutral, and the draft plan states that redevelopment should be neutral. Therefore, my strong request, recommendation, and comment is that you NOT rezone the south half of 550 East Broadway, but instead keep it the same zoning intended to maintain the character of an area intended for single family homes. Changing the zoning to Mixed-Use Office Orientation is a disservice to our neighborhood and, to me, would not be consistent with sound neighborhood stewardship.
5/25/2009	Marsh, Susan Interested Public	The theme and plan for this area makes sense. In order to achieve the goals stated, there needs to be some limit on rentals and the number of people per rental unit (already in the zoning but apparently not consistently enforced) and some teeth in the plan that would prevent more of the larger, out-of-scale structures that are popping up. East Hansen has become a speedway; perhaps removable (for snowplowing) speed bumps would help. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
5/25/2009	Marsh, Susan Interested Public	As a resident of this area, I have seen much change in the past 20+ years. What is planned for this area makes sense as presented, but zoning waivers granted in the past have reduced the ability of the area to meet the hoped-for character. Increased rentals and through-streets have created much more traffic that has not been mitigated. Speed bumps would be helpful. I would suggest the following to be included in the plan: 'Office overlay' should refer to allowing a homeowner to have a low-impact business in the existing building, such as those across Willow St from the county admin bldg -- not to purchase several lots, raze the houses, and construct a larger, more impactive business. Willow Street, as the primary access road, needs sidewalks on both sides all the way through to Snow King Ave. This has been on the plate for years but never completed. Sensitivity to partly-buried Cache Creek should be explained. In my mind this would include allowing Cache Creek to emerge into the llight, where it would serve as a central focus and linear park for the area, though I am sure that's not quite what is envisioned due to cost. Finally, street lights. They are not consistent or where needed for pedestrians at night. Also, none are shaded, so the lights shine in people's houses, not onto the street/walk below. This would be an easy fix and should apply to all town streetlights to reduce unwanted light 'pollution' as well as to work better for their intended purpose. Thank you.Another item: as town builds out there is more need for some kind of noise abatement. We live close enough to the county admin building that the fans etc. on top make enough noise to prevent sleep in the summer when it would be nice to be able to have a window open. State of the art mechanical works and noise screening (as was done at the Senior Center) would be very helpful in reducing the ambient noise.
5/18/2009	Crowley, James Interested Public	Tyler,Thank you for your time last week to discuss the potential impact of the proposed District 20, Future Land Use Map, on the Business Conservation (B.C.) zone. As a housekeeping matter, I would first of all suggest that the language in the paragraph describing the uses in the Multi-family classification which overlays the B.C. zone include a reference to Offices, since they are an existing and allowed use in the B.C. zone (albeit with some restrictions). Additionally, based on our conversation it seems that some qualifying language like that included in the District 24, Future Land Use Map, would be appropriate. I would propose something along the lines of: In all cases, it will remain important to balance the impacts of any proposed new higher-density residential uses with the existing single-family and office uses in the area. Planning within the district will need to be cooperatively addressed by current and future property owners to ensure a desirable solution for all parties. In the interest of brevity I have left out an exhaustive recitation of the reasoning behind this proposal because we have already discussed it at length. Let it suffice to say that this addition to the District 20 language will serve as a placemark to allow us to address the unique challenges and opportunities that the B.C. zone presents, and is consistent with Themes 3, 4, and 5 of the proposed Comprehensive Plan.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Building height in this district should be limited to 2 stories.-This sub-area an almost double in density from what is currently built compared to what is currently allowed. It is already the densest sub-area in town. The proposed hi potential density is over 2.5x waht is currently built. This would have negative impacts on the character of this neighborhood and the entire Town. There is significant unused density potential. Do not add anymore until it is all built out.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Density bonuses for Single Family Mixed is in conflict with statement that East Jackson is a Town Stable District
5/15/2009	Rohrstaff, Kate Interested Public	The Rodeo Grounds are one of the key componets to our "wild west" roots. That is one thing that I don't think should change.
5/15/2009	Wilmot, Kate Interested Public	I would like to comment on changes to the comp plan that effect a particular section of East Jackson - Broadway between No Name and Stormy Circle. I am a home owner that shares a boundary line with a large piece of property that has a zoning boundary in the middle of the parcel. The 92' south of Broadway is zoned OP and the 108' of property directly south of this is zoned NC-SF as stated in the 1994 comp plan. This is consitent with the sounthern extent of OP zoning along Broadway. In the new comp plan, it appears that this entire piece of property has been rezoned into a catergory that would allow a significant amount of Commercial development. The size of the parcel also allows it to be considered for a PMUD. This change is absolutely not taking into account the character of the neighborhood, but rather favoring the owner of this property by changing the potential development opportunites based on property ownership. This is not acceptable. The property directly west and north of me also shares a boundary with this particular property but it is not being considered for the same zoning change? Again, this shows that zoning changes are being made based on ownership - this is not how the Town of Jackson should be setting priorities.My strong suggestion is to keep the zoning boundary between OP and Single Family residential in the same location as was set in the 1994 comp plan.I look forward to hearing back from you with regard to how you have justified the proposed zoning change for this parcel.Thanks

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Allowing two stories fronting the street but three stories to provide incentives for workforce housing is not predictable. Limit all buildings to 2 stories. -Proposed hi potential for development density is almost 2x what is currently allowed and is almost 3x what is currently built. This will not just change the character of this neighborhood; it will change the character of the entire Town. There is significant unused density potential. Do not add anymore until it is all built out.
5/14/2009	, Interested Public	The Rodeo Grounds: The current zoning and planned furute zoning all fit the existing neigborhoob. However, the actual Rodeo Arena should not be moved or relocated. This property serves the town very well, as a venue for a multitude of events. It's location within the town makes it unique and brings helps to keep our downtown vibrant. Additionally, the Rodeo ground serves as significant open space, if rezone to muli-housing, this open space will be significantly dimished.
5/14/2009	French, Peter Interested Public	I am a property owner in both district 15 and 19. I support your plans throughout those districts.As you finalize the plan and begin to work on the LDR's I would encourage you to allow lot splits/PUD's on single parcels in the appropiately dense areas. The current 3 parcel minimum discourages redevelopment to denser uses.The 6,000+ square foot lot certainly can support 2 or more very attractive units which would be more affordable for sale products. It would be more fair to the small property owners who are the majority of owners in those areas.Thank you for your consideration of this comment
5/14/2009	Lasley, Louise Interested Public	There has been talk over the years of moving the rodeo grounds south of town. If we are in fact wanting to address town as heart and transportation issues, we should keep the facility where it is. The location actually helps maintain the character of town that we endorse...the wild west.
5/14/2009	Springer, Kim Interested Public	I'd like to comment on the new Draft of the 2009 Comprehensive Plan. It has been a long time (almost one year) since we saw the first draft and there are far too many substantive changes to expect the public to have such a tiny window to comment. This is far too important a Plan to rush through. Please extend the comment period. My greatest concerns are listed below: The Community has placed the protection of wildlife and open space as our highest priority yet this plan does not protect Jackson Hole's irreplaceable wildlife and scenery. There are no tools in place to measure the impacts of the huge potential developments. We need planning tools to ensure that protecting wildlife is the highest priority. What happened to protecting our “Community Character?" As anyone involved in the 1994 plan knows, the community character was paramount in the Plan yet it has been omitted from this Draft. Please include verbiage from the 1994 plan regarding the protection of our rural character. The "Single Family Mixed-Type" classification is too vague. I'm told the need for the new plan is to provide "accountability, predictability, and measurability." The Single Family Mixed Type would allow single family, duplexes, tri-plexs, four-plexs and "convenience retail." What is predictable about a neighborhood with this classification? Sounds like anything goes in a neighborhood With this designation. In east Jackson the 1994 plan would allow an additional 140 new dwellings and the new draft will allow 270 new places including "convenience retail." With a total of less that 1000 existing dwellings in East Jackson now, this is an increase of over 25%, yet the plan calls east Jackson "Town Stable." What does stable mean? It is clearly misleading. The new Draft could more than double the residential and commercial development in the Valley. This would only exacerbate the need for workforce housing. The infrastructure costs are lacking in this Plan. Nodes will drive commercial growth and increase urban sprawl. Zoning should remain as is on the entire West Bank. Animals will not realistically adhere to our zoning boundaries; we are witnessing this with many species such as the bland and grizzly bears. Whose plan is this? I'm told this plan is a synthesis of all the public's input but I have yet to talk to anyone in favor of this plan or find evidence of its support. Realtors, general contractors, students, business owners, etc. are in opposition to the Plan. There are clearly some who will benefit financially from this kind of growth but not many of us. I ask you to slow down, read all the fine print and please listen to the people who care so passionately about this wonderful Valley.

Date	Name	Comment
5/13/2009	Smith, Barbara Interested Public	I have lived in East Jackson for nearly 37 years. Already when I walk past the recently built tall buildings I can't see the familiar landscape and they are built right to the side walk. I feel like I'm walking down a city street anywhere. I don't recognize where I am. I agree that density belongs in already developed areas. Lets do it consciously and not build to capacities just because we can. Thank you for the enormous amount of time and energy that has been put forth by the elected stewards of our community thus far. I support redirection of the comprehensive plan regarding these points:1) Town has 4,251,000 square feet (sf) of existing commercial floor area. The Draft forecasts an increase of 3,678,000 to 5,420,000 sf, depending upon incentives. Up to 3,466,000 sf of this growth will occur within the Downtown and Snow King districts. These two districts alone will employ 8,665 new workers (using a very conservative 2.5 jobs/1000sf). Total employment growth for Town would be 13,550. This represents a level of urbanization for our town that could destroy it's character and quality of life for those already living here.a) Where will these workers be housed? How many deed restricted or rental units will be needed and what is the funding plan? What policies link the creation of new jobs to housing supply? Under the Draft, there are only a few Town districts where increased residential density is planned. Do these districts have the capacity to house 13,550 workers and their families? b) Is this Plan affordable? What increases in taxes and fees are planned to fund the required schools, justice center, roads, bus system, parking structures, etc.? Schools are roughly $25 million each, how many are needed to support the growth allowed under this Plan? The financial burden of higher taxes will fall hardest on the very people our affordable housing programs are designed to help. Is this Plan sustainable? 2) Downtown Jackson = growing resort district. The Lodging Overlay is to be expanded west to Flat Creek. Important community retail services (ex. Staples, Hoback Sports, Ace Hardware, Bubba's) could be replaced by hotels. Why doesn't the Draft seek to restore a sense of Community in this district? Rather than more hotels, let's zone for more workforce housing and amenities which will attract residents.2. East Jackson, "District 15"The East Jackson portion of the Draft hints at the possibility of important policy shifts. EJ is designated as a "stable" district where development is "neutral and preserves existing character." Development is expected to be sensitive to wildlife permeability, especially in areas bordering open space. While these are encouraging words, there is one change which must become codified in the LDRs if these words are to affect what happens on the ground: ***** PLEASE Restrict affordable housing density bonuses under the Planned Unit Development tool (PUD) to lots already zoned for higher density (AR/NC-2). We must ensure that this restriction becomes part of our land use regulations, significantly improving land use predictability while providing proper EJ locations for workforce housing.
5/12/2009	McGee, Robin Interested Public	I agree with town as heart and don't mind the rodeo grounds being in town but the grounds need a serious facelift. This area, along with the public works area and START bus parking are a true eyesore. I loved the addition of trees on SK Ave. but much more needs to be done to make this a useable and visually appealing space.
5/12/2009	McGee, Robin Interested Public	If more development is to occur in this area, it must be sustainable with the traffic and public transportation. More open space and parks must be created.
5/8/2009	Remlinger, Brian Interested Public	If the Rodeo Grounds is built as single family, the Town will need to find a new location for snow storage in Town. I would completely eliminate the language stating conversion to single family . Please consult the Town on the logistics and cost of hauling snow to a less central location.

Date	Name	Comment
5/6/2009	Farrell, Nadia and Bob Interested Public	We have reviewed the April 3, 2009 Draft Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan. Our main interest and concern with the draft plan are focused on District 19: Rodeo Grounds. Concern 1: Inaccurate description of the area shown as Single Family Mixed-Type. In the Draft Plan this area is described as follows: "The area classified as Single Family Mixed-Type currently consists of single family homes with accessory residential units and multifamily residential structures located at the periphery. The land use pattern in this area will continue to be dominated by single family residences (with and without accessory units) with some multi-family projects at the edge of the area." This description implies that all residences include accessory residential units. In fact only a small percentage of homes in the proposed Single Family Mixed-Type area have accessory residential units. We believe there are less than six accessory residential units and of those only one is a stand-alone building (a partially converted detached garage). The reference to the multifamily residential structures would be correct and more informative by stating that a few multifamily residential structures are located at one corner of the area. As currently written, this description creates a false image of the make-up and character of this neighborhood. This false image seems to provide the basis for the proposed classification of this area as Single Family Mixed-Type. An area consisting of two residential units on each lot and with Multifamily units on the edges of the area could logically be classified as Multifamily with little or no change to the area. This is not the make-up of the proposed Single Family Mixed-Type area in District 19: Rodeo Grounds. Following is a suggested rewrite of the description of this area. "The area classified as Single Family Low Mixed Type currently consists primarily of single family homes, a few of which have with accessory residential units. and There are a limited number of multifamily residential structures located at one corner of the area the periphery. The land use pattern in this area will continue to be dominated by single family residences (some with and without previously developed accessory units) with a some multi-family projects at one corner the edge of the area." Concern 2: The classification of the Single Family area as Single Family Mixed-Type rather than Single Family Low. We agree that the Multi-Family classification for a portion of this District is appropriate considering its current uses, the District's status as a Town Targeted Growth District and the priority to Manage Growth Responsibly in this District. However, it does not seem appropriate to classify the Single Family area as Single Family Mixed-Type instead of Single Family Low. This neighborhood is primarily single family residences without accessory residential units (See Concern 1 above) and under the 1994 plan was identified as Neighborhood Conservation - Single Family. This neighborhood has been a stable and positive addition to the Town of Jackson for over 40 years. If all or most of the homes had accessory residential units, the properties were falling into disrepair or the neighborhood was in need of redevelopment we would be in favor of a classification of Single Family Mixed-Type. Perhaps in 10 or 15 years during a five year Plan review a finding for the need for redevelopment might occur. At that time an amendment to the Plan could classify the area as Single Family Mixed-Type. However, at the present time, our neighborhood is strong, viable, stable and at least equivalent in size, quality, viability and stability to neighborhoods classified as Single Family Low in other Town Targeted Growth Districts - for example, the proposed Single Family Low residential area at Scott Lane and Snow King Avenue in District 17: The "Y". That neighborhood, like ours, is relatively small (~37 lots vs. ~47 lots) and is adjacent to areas classified as Multifamily. Based on the above facts, we believe the Single Family area in District 19: Rodeo Grounds could and should be classified as Single Family Low. By doing so, the plan would preserve a viable, stable neighborhood while providing for additional managed growth in the larger Multifamily portion of the District. We appreciate your consideration of our comments and look forward to the finalization of the Plan and the development of Zoning and Land Development Regulations needed to implement the Plan.
4/14/2009	Cedarholm, Todd Interested Public	I beleieve that you should include the area north of Kelly Ave, south of Simpson Ave, east of Glenwood and west of Millward in the multi-use district. That neighborhood (my neighborhood) has always been sandwiched between commercial and public/commercial areas, most of the visitors and parked cars belong to people at the Brew Pub or the Center for the Arts. It is not a quiet place. Since we are surrounded by commercial it would make sense to allow light commercial such as office and not restrict it to residential. Also, the lots on the south side of Hansen are only 110' long making re-development difficult under the current development regs. Any redevelopment would require some accomadation to the smaller lot size to avoid the variance mess.

Date	Name	Comment
4/14/2009	Hoff, JoAnn Interested Public	I think the east end of Aspen drive should not be included in the multi-family zoning. The east end of Aspen drive should be included in the 'Southern Hillside' district as that is what it is most compatible with. As homeowner and resident of Aspen drive I can state that this street cannot possible handle any more traffic and growth. Most of the east end of Aspen is condominium or townhome development which is unlikely to change. There are several parcels in the middle (between Cache and Millward) that could be developed under this zoning. I urge you to consider maintaining the NC-2 or something similar in this area rather than multi-family. All of Aspen drive is currently zoned NC-2 and should stay that way. This would be an ideal place for affordable single-family housing. Please consider maintaining the same zoning as the rest of Aspen drive. Thank you.

DISTRICT 4: MID TOWN

Mid-Town Comment (4/13/09 - 10/13/11)

Date	Name	Comment
12/17/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	The residential component of development in the area general know as the "Y" should emphasize workforce housing.
12/17/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Maintain a mix of use (res/non-res) on a lot by lot basis in the area generally known as the "Y"
8/31/2009	Healey, Bill Interested Public	Commissioners----as a resident of the South Park region ---Dairy subdivision---I strongly believe that Theme I needs to be amended to recognize & reaffirm the wildlife,connectivity,scenic & ag. Values in the greater South Park Region-----I further find particularly disturbing the proposed connector road intersection at South Park Loop & Boyles Hill rd.---while I recognize this road was approved many years ago the affected area/ neighborhoods have changed / grown so much that the connector road & the amount of traffic---16,000 cars per day?---would effectively change a rural atmosphere to a urban one----the Real problem is the “Y”---where are the in depth traffic studies & designs to rectify the real issue??----

Date	Name	Comment
8/20/2009	Aurelio, Linda Interested Public	APPENDIX H Travel Demand Modeling Uses WYDOT travel model . Assign motor vehicle trip to roads in the network using the Shortest Path Possible. This method does not take into account wildlife, school zones, and neighborhood density,quality of life. Looking at Future Scenarios: #1 No land use or roadway network changes. Not acceptable. We already have failing intersections, the first being the Y intersection. Clearly, we need to address our main intersections for cost effective, green methods of resolution, ie round abouts. #2 Existing network with Indian Trials Road connection. This proposal seeks the shortest path possible approach, and does not account for neighborhood density, majority (6) of schools in area, or wildlife migration/habitat. This proposal violates community values and places a great risk to the above established circumstances. This also represents the greatest impact on existing area of all the scenarios presented. We are appreciative of the current Micro study being conducted by consultants FHU, to study these issues on a much closer look. We are anxious to see the results. At the very least, this study should show origin-destination surveys, traffic counts, and intersection turning movement counts. Only then can we get a glimpse of the impacts this cut thru would have on the area. Future projection of population numbers must be considered as well ,with Comp Plan build out included for South Park region/node. This section also admits that “improvement to the Y intersections to facilitate motor vehicle, transit, bike, and pedestrian travel may still be warranted after the Indian Trails Road connection” THEREFORE, we should be addressing the Y intersection as a FIRST PRIORITY, then reassess traffic patterns as necessary. Y redesign could easily accommodate traffic demand without new road construction thru existing neighborhoods/wildlife corridors. #3 Existing network with Spring Gulch Road improvements: Could reduce 20% of traffic on Broadway , results in 6% more traffic at Y. Again, let’s take the 20% reduction on Broadway, and redesign the Y so that a 6% increase there would be deemed insignificant ! No new road construction, limited neighborhood density in this area, no schools. Must be combined with Y redesign, can not evaluate individually. #4Existing network with North Bridge crossing: Shortest Path Possible approach again. No regard for wildlife community values. Redesign at the 22/390 intersection would relieve congestion. Possibilities are another round about. With combined improvements at the Y intersection, Spring Gulch Road, and the 390/22 intersection, we would see significant traffic flow and quality of life benefits for everyone. Let us examine the problems at our current “failing” traffic intersections and roadways and address these issues. We are ignoring the obvious solutions. I have a lot of information on round abouts for discussion and how we could make this a 2 community effort in a “Gateway design.”

Date	Name	Comment
7/26/2009	Aurelio, Linda Interested Public	As the Comp Plan begins the challenge of a joint review/ rewrite process, my concerns over Theme six Transportation issues remain in the forefront. The redesign of the "Y intersection" as the primary concern for future traffic planning for Jackson is imperative. Please take a look at the article attachment below on the benefits that a round about design would offer our community. This "gateway" approach could save millions of dollars in unnecessary new road build out and provide a safer, greener solution to many of our traffic backups. This concept could be continued at both the 22/390 Moose -Wilson Road and the Spring Gulch light to allow greater vehicle throughput and reduce traffic accidents overall on Highway 22. My colleagues and I have had conversations directly with WyDot District Engineers in Rock Springs, as well as Governor Fruedenthal regarding the Y round about concept. All are favorable to the idea, and are looking for support and cooperation from our town elects to put this back on the priority list of road projects. As you consider Theme six alternatives for transportation improvements, Highway 22 upgrades, and funding sources, a priority placement of the redesign at the Y could prove to be the most prudent improvement we could make for the community. I believe the town would rally behind this process, and I have ideas how to make this a "community effort" project. We need to bring the town back together more than ever before, and this could be the catalyst.
6/17/2009	Callahan, Mary Lynn Interested Public	I'm Mary Lynn Callahan. I'm a Town resident and also a business owner in Town, and you've already received my e-mail comments and comments at the last County meeting last week, but there's two other things I wanted to state, and one being in Town these wildlife corridors, like, for instance, Karns Meadow, which I live right next to, that it really needs to be left as it is. A lot of animals use that corridor, and I'm hoping that they need that area to move across the Valley instead of just north and south in this Valley. And then the last thing I want to do is just encourage this Planning Commission to support the County's Planning Commission in their motion that they made last week, because I agree with it and would hope that you would support them. Thank you.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The consensus of group was to modify the language in the Plan to be more positive by encouraging two to three story mixed use buildings rather than discouraging single story, single use buildings..
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group felt document was weak on details of "Y" intersection redesign especially the multi-modal issue and suggested pedestrian overpasses.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group felt that Single Family Mixed north of Broadway should be changed to Single Family Low.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group felt strongly that wildlife movement from East Gros Ventre Butte to Karns Meadow needs to be addressed immediately in this district through overpass, or funneling to a wildlife crossing, or other method.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group discussed the impact of multi-family land use classification on wildlife in Karns Meadow, but no consensus was reached.

Date	Name	Comment
6/2/2009	Tillson, Becky Interested Public	While it is great that you acknowledge “this area is a primary migration corridor for mule deer and other animals traveling from the Saddle Butte southern hillsides to Karns Meadow" and that "specific roadway and site design features will need to be incorporated into future highway improvements to address wildlife concerns and crossings,” there are some things missing from the district description. First, Flat Creek must be identified as what it is - a hugely valuable asset to the community in terms of ecosystem health, downstream conditions, and connectivity for both aquatic and terrestrial species. Second, setbacks from the river MUST be established and respected. Third, animals continue on from Saddle Butte to Karns Meadow to the southern part of Snow King and beyond. They do not always stop in the meadow, so road improvements need to extend on both sides of Karns Meadow. Lastly, the highway improvements should be REQUIRED with any new developments/housing projects to go into the area, not only when the roads are improved on whatever time scale they are on. This needs to be addressed AS SOON AS the connectivity is threatened/limited.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Transportation Theme should include a Roundabout at the Y to reduce congestion. A density increase is not appropriate unless congestion problems are solved. -Disagree that the Y is an appropriate location for significant increase in workforce housing. As a gateway it should transition to town.- The proposed hi potential density is twice what is currently built. This is not appropriate for an intersection that already has significant traffic problems.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Since 30% of all deer killed in Teton County are killed on this stretch of Broadway, it is obvious we need to address this problem. Although wildlife is not a high priority for this district, a safe wildlife crossing should be a high priority. If development in this area is not permeable to wildlife, it needs to provide safe travel corridors. These corridors need to be an integral part of any development patterns. Surrounding Karns Meadows with high density development will severely reduce its value to wildlife. The goal should be to identify a solution for a wildlife crossing before any development is approved. If we wait until after development is approved, it will be too late. -This area is a critical link for wildlife between the North side of Snow King and the South facing buttes on West Broadway. -The proposed hi potential density is over 2x what is currently allowed. This proposed density is higher than the current density in any sub-area in Town.
5/14/2009	Lasley, Louise Interested Public	I do not believe that this area should contain high density development. Use of the park area would be damaging if the west end of the area had large numbers of houses/families, dogs. The area should be reserved for needs that will not negatively impact the current status of the meadow as the last large remaining wildlife friendly part of town and a means of crossing town for wildlife. The site of the current RV park would work for multifamily housing, the remaining area identified for that use should be more of a buffer or be for uses that do not bring large numbers of people into that area.
5/12/2009	McGee, Robin Interested Public	I am thankful for the open space in this part of town and encourage planners to not develop too much around the meadow. Having open space in the densely populated areas of town is critcal for a healthy community.
5/12/2009	McGee, Robin Interested Public	Please be sure that any "enhancements" to the Y keep pedestrian and biker safety as top priorities. Navigating these areas as a walker or biker is exceedingly dangerous.
5/1/2009	Ambler, Emily Interested Public	The Y is a congested area. We do not think there should be any high density construction approved, similar to what was recently discussed. In general the Comp Plan should assert that if an area is upgraded another area should be downgraded in regard to building/density. Without corresponding protection for scenic and wildlife habitat we will all too quickly lose what we value most in the area.We could end up with both sprawl in the county and congestion in town.

DISTRICT 5: WEST JACKSON

West Jackson Comment (4/13/09 - 10/13/11)

Date	Name	Comment
6/1/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Any chance you can bring some of your cohorts, I splurged on halfway decent coffee beans. I might even bypass the day old coffee cake and buy fresh. I'd like to show you the different affordables and what works and doesn't work here. Also, how the one way in and one way out for Cottonwood phase one could pose serious problems if High School Road is the main traffic corridor for West Jackson. These are a few of the issues that will become big problems if there is too much flexibility and LDRs trump neighborhood character policies in the comp plan. Many here think that in order to be fair-minded, the size of homes in town and county need to be reigned in to stem the tide of service workers needed to maintain them. Jonathan Schechter (Compass Symposium back on May 19th) believes that there will be even more emphasis on the uber rich because other states are going to become less inviting by raising taxes, making it more inviting here in the hole. Nothing wrong with that, but after the smart growth presentation at The Wort last week, the speaker reminded me, you have to have a carrot and stick approach towards the McMansion builders. I can't help but feel that they are getting carrot cake and we are getting the big stick. Well, I better get outside and finish planting my veggies, I make my own carrot cake:) Looking forward to our chat! Kathy
2/15/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I would like to bring the public back into this most important public document. I support Kristy Bruner's op ed piece in the JHN&G on Feb 9th "Land-Use plan A Flop Without A FLUP". We need to be proud of our unique valley and take seriously, the responsibility that goes along with being the first gateway community to our national parks and being live in caretakers of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. Please remember going forward that a desired vision for the new comprehensive plan is one that doesnâ€™t impart negative impacts on established family neighborhoods in order to satisfy development rights of large property owners. More development equals more traffic which leads to more roads and therefore degradation of established neighborhoods. The proposed Tribal Trails connectorâ€™s negative effects on the schools adjacent to and near High School Road and the Cottonwood Park neighborhood, in part, to mitigate dense growth in Northern South Park, is one example of satisfying the right of a large property owner to the detriment of a large group of small property owners. Sincerely, Kathy Tompkins Cottonwood Park

Date	Name	Comment
2/7/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I know you said it was unnecessary to prepare a formal response but as a small homeowner with concerns that official stakeholders might not have,I thought it was important to jot some things down. I think the questions on allowed growth keep popping up so I responded to them also. Could you send my comments on to Bruce and incorporate them into your records. I appreciated being invited to the introduction meeting with Bruce Meighen, but I forgot to submit my comments to him. I have a tough time organizing my thoughts on a normal day so I chose to organize them on paper:) 1.What are the three objectives you would like to accomplish from the Comprehensive Plan update? A."No Net Negative Environmental Impacts; Ideally, this means everyone working together to ensure that wildlife, plants, water, air, soil and the processes that connect them will be better off or at least no worse tomorrow than they are today." (http://www.banff.ca/locals-residents/environment/No_Net_Negative_Environmental_Impact.htm) B. A healthy, energy sustainable, diverse economic mountain community and national park gateway that is not dependent on growth, non renewable energy, and boom and bust industries. C.An enforceable checks and balances system to support objectives A and B. 2.Given that new development will occur in the Town and County based on existing zoning, what are some key opportunities we can achieve with new growth? There are no opportunities we can achieve with new growth unless we resolve the contradictions in the new comp plan draft and create a verifiable predictability that does not deposit phantom densities in selected family neighborhoods that may not benefit from the open space these transfers claim to create. If these issues are left open to interpretation, the only people that will see opportunity and rewards are developers, while established family neighborhoods bear the negative impacts of unchecked dense growth. 3. What must happen for this development to occur in the right way? Verifiable predictability that includes a well researched (not inflated) build out number and permanent open space once created. 4.What is the desired character or vision you would like the Plan to achieve? A.Pride and responsibility that goes along with being the first gateway community to our national parks and live in caretakers of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. B.A desired vision is one that doesn't impart negative impacts on established family neighborhoods in order to satisfy development rights of large property owners. More development equals more traffic which leads to more roads and therefore degradation of established neighborhoods. The proposed Tribal Trails connector's negative effects on the schools adjacent to and near High School Road and the Cottonwood Park neighborhood, in part, to mitigate dense growth in Northern South Park, is one example of satisfying the right of a large property owner to the detriment of a large group of small property owners. 5.Provide several realistic tools and recommendations that would help preserve the character or vision you desire? A.A fully funded, enforceable, ongoing checks and balances system that would make themes one and two a success. B.Public and Private support for programs that encourage sustainable energy programs like JHESP, Slow Food, and Vertical Greenhouse… sharing and gathering helpful info from other mountain communities to further our goals. C.Switch from being dependent on boom and bust economies which include industries like non renewable energy and second homeowner construction (that increases the need for more servicing), to more innovative and sustainable industries like retrofitting existing housing with Net Zero Energy Community ("A net zero-energy community (ZEC) is one that has greatly reduced energy needs through efficiency gains such that the balance of energy for vehicles, thermal, and electrical energy within the community is met by renewable energy."(National Renewable Energy Laboratory)) and Passive House (http://www.passivehouse.us/passiveHouse/PassiveHouseInfo.html) inspired techniques, green career training for our local youth in order to give them an option to stay and contribute to the community in a positive way, regional grown and transported food and goods (Wyoming, Idaho and Utah) and made in Jackson Hole products marketed throughout our intermountain region. 6.A successful Plan is one that : A.Realizes and supports new and healthier ways to sustain and preserve our fragile ecosystem. B.Does not sacrifice the needs of established family neighborhoods that want to foster a safe, healthy place to live and share with wildlife. C.That is simple to understand, and not contradictory.

Date	Name	Comment
6/10/2010	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Yes, Kathy Hopkins, Cottonwood Park. First of all, my husband came home with the newspaper, threw it down on the floor and ran in the other room—a new life for nodes. He really liked that title and totally agreed with what the Conservation Alliance is saying, and I don't want to revisit anything that has been already voted on. It just hurts the process. It humiliates everybody that's been spending so many months coming here and really, really putting in some good work. And the other thing I would like to say is Ben Reid's comments on chapter eight. I loved the one paragraph. There is a direct and conspicuous correlation between prosperity on the one hand and both carbon emissions and climate change on the other hand. And there are, of course, no differences at all between carbon emissions produced by a coal plant in China and those generated by the construction of large luxurious homes here that are far from services. It follows that we are challenged precisely because, as our community, we are so wealthy to recognize and manage our disproportionately very high contributions on ?? carbon emissions and of course global warming. And that leads me to the comments on the review about ARUs, Auxiliary Residential Units, and the opinion page last week about ?? consequences. You know, I read things like that, and I know they mean well, but I hate to be reminded of the hand that feeds us, you know. It's getting very old and it's very shortsighted. There are two editorials I really do like written by Kristen Rivers and Butch Kirschner about using local labor for local jobs. It's so important to hire locally so we don't get in, you know, when we do have a recession, we do have jobs for people here. And I'm embarrassed to say that, you know, with that Rocky Mountain Bank going up and how big it is and yet they have laborers from Utah building it, as Kristen states in her opinion, in her letter. I'm embarrassed that that's my bank. I was happy to go to that little building there and get my mortgage. They were very helpful. I don't see how they can be more helpful in a little building…or even more helpful in a big building. I was totally happy with that little square footage thing they had, almost a little bit bigger than my house. And I wasn't going to submit another comment, except I wanted to…I did write an editorial that I did not submit, like Sue did with her response, so I'd like to submit it today, answering all the comments about the ARUs from a lot of real estate agents and architects and everything. And I know everybody needs jobs, architects need jobs, and real estate agents need places to sell to keep their companies going. But, again, it's shortsighted solutions that have long-term problems attached to them. So, I'll just read this letter that I wrote. It took me a long time to write this, so I didn't rewrite it for the meeting. It says, I'm writing in response to the guest shop last week, as guesthouses have unintended consequences. They often make some valid points about the proposed elimination of Auxiliary Residential Units and making it right so it is fair to year-round Valley residents who want to provide for their families and live on their land when they get old and somebody can take care of them. You know, I think that should be a discussion, but I don't think it should be a reason to go back to that vote. Unfortunately, the proposed elimination was probably needed to focus on a real and meaningful dialog to create and enforce real solutions for potential growth problems of ARUs. We need this conversation. We also need to create a sustainable economy to prevent boom/bust cycles that hurt our local service employers and employees. It is true that jobs are created by second homeowners. But what was not mentioned is what happens to the service people like carpenters, electricians, housekeepers and gardeners when the second homeowner industry goes into a bust cycle. And these same people see their jobs disappear that pay for mortgage, for rent and put food on the table for their families. I support the need like bumper stickers that the author resents. It is not an admonishment of second homeowners but more of a push for changing the way we all think about living in our natural environment. We need to choose human needs before human wants. And I know I say this a lot but I'm just going to keep repeating it—human needs before human wants. Let's take care of human needs first with a healthy environment at the top of the list. I believe the environment is the hand that feeds us all, including second homeowners. Then we have to see if our wants are sustainable and leave them behind if they're not. The United States leads all other nations when it comes to excesses in the building size of residential homes and what goes into them. The housing industry is the biggest user of oil. Unfortunately, we took a wrong turn and went down the road of everything bigger is better, and that journey led to our addiction to oil and ultimately to the tragedy in the Gulf of Mexico. Look at all the fishermen, oyster men, store owners, resort owners, restaurant owners, their employees and families who rely on the Gulf for their livelihood. Now they're relying on BP. That could be here, you know, I mean, in different circumstances. People in need, the museums and the arts are already recipients of second homeowners' charity and we benefit greatly from them. More importantly, however, we need to help Jackson Hole small business owners, their employees and their families in a permanent way. I agree with the author about needing a solid enforceable limited growth management plan, but that also includes a sustainable economy that is not constantly subjected to the high price of housing in a boom cycle and the harsh reality of a bust cycle. Therefore, we cannot rely on the second homeowner in these recurring recessions. They may have to cutback on services here to maintain their lifestyle and their primary home. The socioeconomic environmental damage, the downside of trickle-down economics, ?? is not good for Jackson Hole. Thank you very much.
2/18/2010	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hi, Kathy Tompkins, Cottonwood Park. Accountability, predictability, and measurability are all important ingredients in a successful Comprehensive Plan. In particular, build-out numbers and a cost-of-growth statement incorporated for theme two will define what can and cannot be done when it comes to rewriting LDRs. You can stop unwanted growth and development that can't pay for itself. Along with results and conflicting statements and better defining theme- two policies that were mentioned in the public comment, a lot of the public comment on theme two, we can also avoid long, drawn-out and costly confrontations with landowners and the public <<inaudible>>.

Date	Name	Comment
2/16/2010	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Comments On Theme Two Rewrite I would like to comment on the theme 2 rewrite of the comp plan. Armond Acri said it best in SHJH's in all his comments on the theme redline version. I support his comments on tightening up the policies and defining better things like what kind of light industrial and convenience commercial will be allowed in neighborhoods. I worry about interpretations being wide and varied that could negatively affect neighborhoods in and around Cottonwood Park and interfere with the school zone on High School Road. We can't be all things to all people and still be a viable family neighborhood. With outside pressures coming from the Tribal Trails proposal and the development wishes from across High School Road you should be thinking a few steps ahead to prevent over doing it in West Jackson. Please continue to keep listening to what the public has been saying all along. We want accountability and predictability to make this plan work for the community. I would also like to include the below letter I wrote about including a cost of growth statement in the plan. Keep up the good work. Accountability and Predictability As the joint planning commissions review Theme 2 "Growth Management" of the Teton county, Town of Jackson Comprehensive plan over the next few weeks, the most important ingredient that seems to be missing from the plan to date is the cost of growth to our community. Adding this to the formula will help the plan succeed in making sure future growth won't be subsidized by the taxpayer. This in turn will help prevent unwanted growth and development that can not pay for itself. In my family budget we make sure that if we can't pay for it, well, we can't have it right now. It has helped us avoid getting in over our heads when something new looks too good to resist. We make do with taking good care of what we do have and putting our money where it counts, into our family's future. I think the nation is in the mess it's in right now because a lot of people's questionable needs wound up being wants they couldn't afford. If we treat the community of Jackson Hole as our family and the environment we live in, our home, then I think you'll easily agree that a cost of growth statement is needed in the rewrite of the Comprehensive Plan to create accountability and help predict what will be costly to the community or a great benefit to the community and future generations. Thank You, Kathy Tompkins Cottonwood Park Neighbors
12/18/2009	Hudnall, Marion Interested Public	While I realize this project is enormous it seems every update I get is one step forward and at least three steps back. It has become so convoluted and incomprehensible that the general public is giving up on trying to understand it. It almost seems like that has been the goal all along. Play the public, act like we're listening to their valid concerns, and then drag it on infinitum until they are totally discouraged and disgusted. THEN we'll go ahead and do what we planned to in the first place. I have written before asking if you are even listening to the public. That would still be my first question. But it all goes back to my original question at a Cottonwood meeting. "Why do we think they will listen to us?" I don't see it happening. It looks like money and greed are winning your hearts and pocketbooks rather than wildlife, safe schools and neighborhoods, and the voice of the public. I have to assume that your legacy is going to be the administration that allowed "development" to ruin this natural valley paradise.

Date	Name	Comment
11/18/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hi, Kathy Tompkins, Cottonwood Park. I'd like to take this opportunity to fully support the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance's position and recommendations to theme one of the Teton County Comprehensive Plan redraft. Everybody at the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance works very hard to make Jackson Hole the very best it can be, and they have my the respect, and by the looks of all the comments on the Plan's site, they have the respect and trust of a lot of other Valley residents. I hope that you still take into consideration a funding source that can help us achieve permanent open space. It is a worthy goal that the community already agrees with and wants. It starts in the Comprehensive Plan as a goal and then defines it later. We need to be creative in preserving open spaces and protecting wildlife, so this is not the time for mediocrity and overcompromising. On the subject of property rights, I hope that all residential property rights will be respected in the new Comp Plan. I keep repeating this and hoping that people do take it serious that about the general public and the small property owner taking/footing a lot of the bill for unchecked growth, construction and services. Most small residential property owners here don't enjoy the luxury of many of the tax write-offs and ??. In West Jackson another concern that negatively affects the small property owner and their rights is the suggestion of extending the industrial sector from Gregory Lane to behind the high school. This will just lead to more open spaces in the next Comp Plan rewrite. Another opened Pandora's box. I think we should stop at the Sewage…I think we should stop at the Sewage Transfer Station and go no farther. Hopefully, some day the Transfer Station will be gone and be replaced with something that will fit in with the school campus area along High School Road. I mean no disrespect to large landowners and their efforts to do what is right for their families' future while also being good stewards of the land. We should take every effort and opportunity to work with the ranchers and large landowners, i.e., for a funding source, to achieve a goal that will enhance everybody's life in Jackson Hole while protecting our surroundings. But along the way let's not forget the hundreds of hard-working small property owners who most times get lost in the shuffle and end up paying for the mistakes of overdevelopment through higher taxes, less services, higher crime rates, overcrowded roads, kids that slip through the education cracks, and degrading neighborhoods. Thanks a lot.
11/12/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hello, Kathy Tompkins, Cottonwood. Just a few things. Just concerns and a couple of comments or recommendations. One is I like the idea of establishing a dedicated funding source to acquire permanent open space for wildlife habitat protection, scenic vistas preservation and agricultural lands. And the other things that Kristy and Rich alluded to was that, you know, predictability, cost of growth, the burden it puts in these receiving areas to the people next door, specifically, you know, like Cottonwood Park and West Jackson. And also please correct the Staff estimate of the number of units created by the PRD. It was too low. It ignores SRA and other projects that use the PRD to justify their density. Saving Historic Jackson Hole stated Staff ignored the SRA project at Teton Village. This controversial project did not use the PRD for its 1517 acres but used the amount of development potential allowed buy the PRD on greater than 35 acres to justify 339 market units versus 331 that are outside the PRD. This was an increase of 296 units <<inaudible>> 43 units. This is almost twice the reported number of ??. This is just one example. Technically, these units were not created by the PRD mechanism, but the PRD was used for the justification. And I sent that out to my neighbors and friends in Cottonwood Park. So, people do read this stuff. And it's really important to go over it. Clarification, and this is, you know, I'm still learning this stuff. If we could have clarification that is needed on the creation of conservation easements though the PDRs [sic], can the development rights that were supposedly extinguished actually be transferred to somewhere else? So, I'm still learning, and if you guys could answer that for me, that'd be great. And I represent a group of families in Cottonwood Park and the common thread that runs through our families—retired couples and young couples just starting out—is that we matter, too. We would like to protect our future in Jackson Hole just as much as the ranching families in this Valley. The best way to do that is to sit down and discuss our needs and concerns to make this Comprehensive Plan work for everybody, not just a few families, only to give the burden to hundreds of small landowners who just happen to be next to a so-called desirable area for dense development in northern South Park. It is a misconception to believe that High School Road can handle any more dense development without seriously impacting the lives of so many working families that live off of High School Road. When the vote failed for the reduced PDR [sic] of three for 35, you are basically ensuring the further failure of High School Road and the neighborhoods around it. That means we are back to 370+ units—I think that's right—that could be built along High School Road with the nine per 35 PDR [sic]. When you combine that with the proposed Indian Trails Connector jumping onto High School Road, the die is cast to save degraded neighborhoods and unsafe roads for children walking towards schools in that area. This would make a mockery of preserving neighborhood character and the transportation ?? for West Jackson in the Comprehensive Plan. That is why it is so important to take into consideration the recommendations, corrections and concerns I made at the start of my comments. I also think you missed a great opportunity when you turned down the chance to have a workshop with the ranching families and on the PDRs [sic] to gather info and come up with possible alternative and creative solutions that would resolve their concerns. This Comprehensive Plan should be all about research, science and connecting people with solutions to the people with concerns. And we have a lot of concerns. Okay. Thanks.
10/22/2009	, Interested Public	Please vote down nodes for west Jackson and Cottonwood Park. In fact, doing away with nodes in South Park or anywhere, so that a fair zoning map can be developed Jackson and county folks. Thank you all for your hard work during this difficult and anxious time for most of us.

Date	Name	Comment
10/19/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I would like to respond to a comment made at last week's Teton County's Comprehensive Plan rewrite meeting, during the public comment segment. A gentleman said that the Northern South Park area around the high school should be a receiving area for development because the area is already "messed up" or ruined. Please don't treat the residents of the neighborhoods around the high school as if we don't matter. I hope that the planning commissioners and the elected officials respect the small home owner's future in West Jackson as much as they respect the large landowners, concerning their property rights and the money they may gain or lose on their land investment. West Jackson also has a lot to gain or lose in the rewrite of the comprehensive plan, not only in our home values but the very existence of viable and safe family neighborhoods. There is a simple formula that we can aspire to for the location of any needed housing. If housing is needed, it should be placed where the jobs are generated. Affordable homes and rentals should be placed near or where service people are needed for the upkeep of high end homes, high end developments and resorts in town, Teton Village, The Aspens and the Wilson area. There should be a shared responsibility by everyone who generates the need for service people. If we dump dense new bedroom communities in Northern South Park, people will still rely on their cars to get to and from work in town, Teton Village, Wilson, and The Aspens. We do not need more traffic on the already overburdened High School Road, which will be even more dangerous if the Tribal Trails connector road goes through. It will threaten the safety of all our children in and around the schools here. It defeats the purpose of smart and managed growth. We need to keep commercial and unneeded residential development to a minimum in all areas, protect wildlife, open spaces and preserve our family neighborhoods. Most of all, everybody should share in these responsibilities, not just the small homeowner who works very hard to call Jackson their home. Please be considerate of the neighborhoods in West Jackson. We matter, pay taxes and vote too!
10/4/2009	Hudnall, Marion Interested Public	It amazes me that the powers that be feel they can bulldoze public opinion with no repercussions. One meeting I hear about is all positive and you are actually listening to the public. The next meeting you reverse your vote and go with what the planning commission set forth. Why would this happen?? Why would you allow density to be higher with incentives for that?? The only answers I can come up with are not pretty and lead me to think that the public, let alone wildlife and the environment, are not the consideration. The vote is only influenced by what the moneyed people want and it follows that somehow you as elected or employed officials will also benefit. I sincerely hope I am not right and that the public and the environment and their well-being will finally be the major consideration. We, the "common" citizens are confused and bewildered by the process. It seems to me that's the way you want us. Drag it out as long as we can and they'll give up so we can do what we planned to do all along. Not a pretty picture, is it?

Date	Name	Comment
8/21/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	First I would like to say thank you for the time and effort you are putting in to change the comprehensive draft plan to represent the input from the concerned residents of Teton County. Cottonwood Park greatly appreciates what you are doing. I would like to put in writing what I tried to say at the meeting last night. It was a long day and my brain was definitely somewhere else. I read Rich's letter below the other night and liked the changes that were made. Where Rich and I differ is the map he presented and where he represents a new development in the NW corner of South Park. This area should only be developed when infill is complete in town and other developed areas of course. We respect the present base unit development number (around 200 with out any density bonuses which should be done away with, as described in the county planning commissioners recommendations along with doing away with all nodes. The difference is; Residents of Cottonwood park would like to see open space along High School Road set back further to the southern border of the High School property and continue to South Park Loop Road. This area can serve as a wildlife corridor and improve the connectivity of the area. Bringing the fences down will allow the wildlife to pass through Cottonwood Park to South Park with out any of the detours they have to make presently. This should hopefully reduce the nuisance calls that Cottonwood 1 (Corner Creek Lane) makes to game and fish officials about the wildlife that gets backed up in their neighborhood. Yes we do have have wildlife (no bears yet Forrest). Coyote, moose, deer (an eight and a four pointer were feeding on my broccoli stumps in the winter), osprey, etc. We do hear the elk at night in the fall bugling from across the fields to the West. The antelope mate and feed in the fall right across the road in the NW corner of South Park where future homes are planned. The other purpose this open space can serve is as a park for West Jackson and all the schools along High School Road. You have probably heard me mention this before but it is worth mentioning again. Even Kelly Lockhart liked the idea when he came over one morning for coffee and a walk through Range View Park and the immediate area to show him what works and doesn't work here. He loved Range View Park and the way it leads right to High School Road. He said he would like to continue it across the road. Of course we respectively disagreed on the amount of development. I liked his base number development rights without any density bonuses and he liked, well, way too much. The schools could use it for the xcountry running instead of running on the streets and winter cross country ski track loops that can double as a running track in the green months with exercise stations. Outdoor learning facilities for the schools like solar panels that can operate the rest rooms, lights etc. xeriscape areas and native species areas, playgrounds and maybe even a farmers market on the weekend. A parallel road that connects 89 and SPLR on the other side of the park can alleviate the traffic on HSR while using the back entrance to the high school for bus loading and unloading. I would like to see High School Road narrowed using woonerfs; European style traffic calming, no curbs. Instead pavers that delineate the bike and pedestrian paths on both sides of HSR. Covered bus stations like the ones in town. Removable posts that separate vehicular traffic from pedestrians. The posts then can be removed in the winter time for a clean sweep with the plows that don't have to worry about curbs and plowing separate paths. Wildlife friendly snow fence can be put up in the park along HSR to prevent build up of snow drifts on the North side against the long wooden fence that was just replaced because of the weight of the snow on them. They don't last very long there. High School Road should be a campus road that will encourage the use of biking, xcountry skiing and walking and keeping Mom and Dad's car at home because it will be a lot safer for kids who don't have bussing being so close to the schools. I know a lot of the above is too detailed for the comp plan but if you set it up in the plan as a goal, this could happen. Don't get hung up on funding. Like Rich said "there are some deep pockets here that would like to help keep South Park open space for wildlife" which in turn helps our economy and quality of life in 2 the valley. I also respect the landowners' right to build what is allowed them, but you also have to take

Date	Name	Comment
		into consideration the negative impacts on wildlife and landowners across the road in Cottonwood Park that the larger landowners' actions will have. Give me a call and I will gladly show you around. It's a great area. We want to work with you to make it better for wildlife and people who already live here. Kathy Tompkins 734 6211
7/20/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I would like to know what definition the Teton County Draft Comprehensive Plan used to define human needs. It states at the beginning of the plan in the Community Vision chapter that “Ecosystem preservation does not preclude growth and development necessary to meet our community’s human needs.” The following quote is from a workbook on Landscapes, Wildlife and People; “The needs of people are more complex than the needs of animals, simply because people have something that animals lack: wants. Wants and needs are often used interchangeably to describe the essential things that people require in life. Dictionary definitions of the two words even use one to describe the other. Yet human wants can go far beyond human needs in both benefits and impacts. The driving consumer impulse of wanting something--- a new car, a vacation, a lifestyle--- causes people to overlook the basic needs of humans and animals alike. In our quest to satisfy our wants, we might leave our needs, or those of others, unmet. It is important to distinguish between human needs and wants as you explore the ways that community growth and development have an impact on the basic needs of living things.” I believe that human needs as defined in the draft comprehensive plan go far beyond needs and morphs into the category of human wants without regard for wildlife protection and preserving open spaces. True human needs for Jackson Hole’s success as a healthy gateway community are woven into ecosystem preservation. You can’t have a socioeconomic successful Jackson Hole without putting wildlife and open spaces first throughout the county. We have to protect the needs of wildlife and humans to have a balanced, healthy, economically viable place to live for everybody, not just for some people in some parts of the County. There needs to be an annual cap on growth and development to stop the sprawl into South Park and other areas that the present draft comprehensive plan would allow. We need to go back to the build out numbers of the 1994 regulations without any up zoning or bonus density tools. The list of recommendations put forth by the county planning commission is a good start towards realizing the true needs of our unique community. Although as you know I do not agree with moving the rodeo, fairgrounds and Start Bus facilities to northern South Park. That would only lead to ‘wanting’ more commercial there and continue the sprawl southward. “Sometimes we forget that all living things share the same environment and basic needs.”(Project Wild). In order to grow and develop responsibly in Jackson Hole, you need to prove we need it, not just want it! Kathy Tompkins Cottonwood Park

Date	Name	Comment
7/8/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Forrest, Thanks for your reply to my letter about the new recommendations. Sorry for not getting back to you sooner. I had to put on my tour guide hat for friends and relatives who were visiting over the Fourth. I had talked to Tony who was recommending just the fairgrounds be moved to South Park but he stated he did not want them close to High School Road for reasons I mentioned in my letter to all of you. Somehow it turned into the whole enchilada and near High School Road. It is a great idea to keep the work force housing in town near destinations of employment. I understand the planning commission's frustration about making it happen without exporting the problems to South Park. My fear is that if it all comes down to South Park what's to prevent the NW South Park node from still being overdeveloped in the future. Things promised today can easily be changed with a vote to permit it after the public facilities are moved. Commercial is one of my concerns around the High School and and the easement would be a great idea. I actually do like Kelly's idea of a higher education campus connected to the high school sometime in the future. He suggested a dormitory that could double as employee housing during the summer. I don't know about that but maybe for summer forest service employees, or summer seminars could be introduced to utilize it. I can also see a small Mom and Pop old fashioned coffee shop bakery, deli (owners living upstairs) servicing the campus. Where I disagree with Kelly is that he wants to put light industrial there too. My fear is that we would never see the higher education campus and the light industrial would take over. I talked to Kelly and Jeff Daugherty about High School Road being turned into a true academic campus road, creating a park the width of the High School and extending over to South Park Loop Road along High School Road. We have 6 schools there already. Let's foster the concept to really take advantage of the area. The park could have a cross country ski track in the winter and double as a running track with exercise stations along it. There could be outdoor learning facilities for the school children covering environmental and conservation concerns (future green jobs). Science tech stations for learning about solar energy and other alternative energy sources that can double to actually support the park, like lighting and bathrooms. I went to a rest station North of Monument Valley where it doubled as a learning station for Solar that ran the complex. Very cool! The park would then act as an East West wildlife corridor. The barbed wire fencing would be down and then the wildlife would have an easier time migrating through neighborhoods. High School Road then can be treated as a pedestrian and bike friendly road instead of the car and truck being the dominate transportation vehicle. If you google 'woonerf' (traffic calming measures) it will show you what the Europeans have been doing for years with their small towns and roads. It would be nice if homes are built that they would be offered to school teachers and employees that keep the area schools running. Now that would make the transportation chapter in the comp plan work! (I would still like to see infill in town first to take advantage of infrastructure already there.) The small neighborhood could be on the South side of the park I just suggested. Keep it to the 200 (preferably less) units that are allowed under current zoning. There would be an East West collector Road (from South Park Loop Road to Route 89) to alleviate traffic on High School road. That would be located on the southside of any new residential development. Those are some alternative suggestions that I think would improve High School Road for the surrounding neighborhoods and valley school children. My neighbor Carolyn (she's an architect and Mom) and I want to get together and draw something up that would include what I tried to explain. Maybe I can say it better with a map. Tony Wall suggested that we do it and if we ever get the time in the next couple of weeks we will. Thanks for letting me ramble on. I want the Hole to be nice for my son who will hopefully live in our house if things work out and we're not taxed out of it! Sincerely, Kathy Tompkins Cottonwood Park 734 6211 From: forrestmccarthy@hotmail.com To: wozkins@hotmail.com Subject: FW: Public facilities in South Park Date: Thu, 2 Jul 2009 08:28:23 -0600 Kathy, Thank for sharing your thoughts. I have mixed feeling about the idea of moving the fair grounds to South Park. It is an interesting idea worthy of consideration. However, until we consider all the consequences it is hard to form an opinion. Certainly the impact to the existing neighborhood needs be serous consideration. In your comments one of your main concerns was commercial being developed to the South. What if a permanent green belt (conservation easement) was including in the plan that would prevent that from happening? Forrest G McCarthy PO Box 21 Teton Village, WY 83025 307/733/3742 From: iadams@tetonwyo.org Date: Thu, 2 Jul 2009 08:14:43 -0600 Subject: FW: Public facilities in South Park From: Kathy Tompkins [mailto:wozkins@hotmail.com] Sent: Wednesday, July 01, 2009 10:25 AM To: Irina Adams; County Commissioners Subject: Public facilities in South Park Dear County Planning Commisioners, Thanks for all the work you and your colleagues did on the recommendations and taking our comments about the plan into consideration. I am worried however about moving the Start facilities, rodeo grounds and fairgrounds near High School Road. I think it will only trade one group of problems for another. I don't think that West Jackson should be dealt that kind of either or scenario and be made to look like we don't want to sacrifice anything. We have already with 6 schools, the public school transit system, heavy industrial, a sewage transfer station, a supermarket that services the whole valley and roads that are school children and pedestrian unsafe. How will South Park deal with the added traffic, light, noise, air pollution and industrial runoff from the new facilities that would include oil, gas, antifreeze etc. How will the traffic in the summertime be mitigated and not just put up with? Will the town's plowed snow be transported to South Park also on to the new fairgrounds only to melt off into Flat Creek down here instead of in town? We can't just move the problems around. We have

Date	Name	Comment
		to solve the environmental and neighborhood unfriendly problems these needed facilities continually generate. Will LEEDS type regs be applied to these new facilities such as nonpolluting and quiet engines for the new start busses before the complex is moved. Will there be park and ride to the rodeo and fairgrounds from within town? Will town find somewhere else to dump their snow or use it in the summertime by implementing a gray water cistern system? How do we deal with the garbage that is produced from these public facilities, especially the fairgrounds and rodeo? Can we somehow tie into the composting facility located at the county dump site to accept compostable beer cups, plates, etc. and reduce the amount of garbage being thrown out? How close will the rodeo and fairgrounds be to the High School in relationship to the beer that will be sold; will it be too close to school grounds? Will there be sound and light mitigating measures like heavy landscaping with large Cottonwoods and low shrubs? The most important question is if South Park gets all these public facilities what's to prevent South Park from attracting more commercial in back of the High School and still pack the homes into the NW corner of South Park Loop Rd and High School Road if your other recommendations of reduced build out and dumping density bonus tools aren't included in the final comp plan. It seems that history will repeat itself on High School Road. Haven't we learned a lesson with all the problems that condensing all the schools on HSR generated? Kelly accepted my invite for coffee and a walk around Cottonwood to show him what works and what doesn't work in Cottonwood Park. We met one morning a couple of weeks ago. He loved Range View Park and would like to continue something like it across High School Road. Do we now lose the open space incentive idea along HSR? I respect Kelly's family's right to make money off of South Park but at what price to their neighbors in Cottonwood Park and the surrounding neighborhoods? The transfer of these facilities to South Park I believe will embolden the South Park owners to continue with more commercial behind the high school. This only galvanizes Kelly's belief that this is what the community wants there (The 2008 community survey doesn't support that belief). Although, at the end of our conversation he did say that he personally doesn't want to see commercial by the high school. He would rather see a community college campus. I think that statement was just a feel good statement. Will the numbers in The NW corner of South Park be brought back down to the original 200 allowed under present zoning without the bonus density tools? Or will that be negotiated from a higher rate. Kelly seems to think that between 600 and 800 residential units in the NW corner is fine. I animatedly but respectfully disagreed with him. These are Cottonwood Park concerns as well as my own. I have to admit I can't speak for the rest of Cottonwood when it comes to the transfer of the public facilities to South Park. But I can guess the initial response will be no. Personally, I don't want them in South Park. Although I am trying to keep an open mind about it. We would like to work with everybody to create a plan that is beneficial to everyone, but we are not willing to be dumped on again and then forgotten about to deal with the consequences. It would be nice if the hardworking people of West Jackson could escape to a quiet home in the evening and not have to deal with the tourists they deal with during the day. Thanks again for all the hard work you are doing to make this plan resemble what the community is speaking up about. Sincerely, Kathy Tompkins Cottonwood Park 734 6211

Date	Name	Comment
6/26/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Dear County Planning Commisioners, Thanks for all the work you did on the recommendations and taking our comments about the plan into consideration. I am worried however about moving the Start facilities, rodeo grounds and fairgrounds near High School Road. I think it will only trade one group of problems for another. I don't think that West Jackson should be dealt that kind of either or scenario and be made to look like we don't want to sacrifice anything. We have already with 6 schools, the public school transit system, heavy industrial, a sewage transfer station, a supermarket that services the whole valley and roads that are unsafe for school children and pedestrians. How will South Park deal with the added traffic, light, noise, air pollution and industrial runoff from the new facilities that would include oil, gas, antifreeze etc. How will the traffic in the summertime be mitigated and not just put up with? Will the town's plowed snow be transported to South Park also on to the new fairgrounds only to melt off into Flat Creek down here instead of in town? We can't just move the problems around. We have to solve the environmental and neighborhood unfriendly problems these needed facilities continually generate. Will LEEDS type regs be applied to these new facilities such as nonpolluting and quiet engines for the new start busses before the complex is moved. Will there be park and ride to the rodeo and fairgrounds from within town? Will town find somewhere else to dump their snow or use it in the summertime by implementing a gray water cistern system? How do we deal with the garbage that is produced from these public facilities, especially the fairgrounds and rodeo? Can we somehow tie into the composting facility located at the county dump site to accept compostable beer cups, plates, etc. and reduce the amount of garbage being thrown out? How close will the rodeo and fairgrounds be to the High School in relationship to the beer that will be sold; will it be too close to school grounds? Will there be sound and light mitigating measures like heavy landscaping with large Cottonwoods and low shrubs? The most important question is if South Park gets all these public facilities what's to prevent South Park from attracting more commercial in back of the High School and still pack the homes into the NW corner of South Park Loop Rd and High School Road if your other recommendations of reduced build out and dumping the density bonus tools aren't included in the final comp plan. It seems that history will repeat itself on High School Road. Haven't we learned a lesson with all the problems that condensing all the schools on HSR generated? Kelly accepted my invite for coffee and a walk around Cottonwood to show him what works and what doesn't work in Cottonwood Park. We met one morning a couple of weeks ago. He loved Range View Park and would like to continue something like it across High School Road. Do we now lose the open space incentive idea along HSR? I respect Kelly's family's right to make money off of South Park but at what price to their neighbors in Cottonwood Park and the surrounding neighborhoods? The transfer of these facilities to South Park I believe will embolden the South Park owners to continue with more commercial behind the high school. This only galvanizes Kelly's belief that this is what the community wants there (The 2008 community survey doesn't support that belief). Although, at the end of our conversation he did say that he personally doesn't want to see commercial by the high school. He would rather see a community college campus. Will the numbers in The NW corner of South Park be brought back down to the original 200 residential units allowed under present zoning without the bonus density tools? Or will that be negotiated from a higher rate. Kelly seems to think that between 600 and 800 residential units in the NW corner is fine. I animatedly but respectfully disagreed with him. These are Cottonwood Park concerns as well as my own. I have to admit I can't speak for the rest of Cottonwood when it comes to the transfer of the public facilities to South Park. But I can guess the initial response will be no. Personally, I don't want them in South Park. Although I am trying to keep an open mind about it. We would like to work with everybody to create a plan that is beneficial to everyone, but we are not willing to be dumped on again and then forgotten about to deal with the consequences. It would be nice if the hardworking people of West Jackson could escape to a quiet home in the evening and not have to deal with the tourists they deal with during the day. Thanks again for all the hard work you are doing to make this plan resemble what the community is speaking up about.

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2009	Halpin, Pete Interested Public	Thank you. My name is Pete Halpen, and my wife and I and adult children have property at 565 Trails End in Indian Trails and we also have property in Teton County. So, we have both property in the Town and in the County. And I believe my comments are reasonably connected to the themes. So, it's a hard act to follow, the specificity, of the previous speaker, but I did speak at the previous County meeting, and I appreciated the opportunity to do so at that time. I am opposed to the Tribal Trails Connector. So this is a completely single-issue discussion, and I spoke against it at the previous meeting last week. Just a little bit of background, again speaking from my knowledge of the Connector and its antecedents, there was a time when it was a great idea to have bypasses around towns, and a lot of towns in America have them, and the State planned for that. There was a bypass planned, which would run up the Gulch, and over time, of course, that's morphed. And there was a time also when, theoretically, and on the County Plan there could be up to 1250 units of housing between the two hills north of Wells Hill, up to the Wilson Road and through the Indian Springs development. Of course, that evaporated, but the Connector stayed on the Plan. And I didn't like the Connector back then and I still don't like it. And obviously being in my front yard or back yard, I like it less than most. In terms of…if I could just go through a couple points, and then I'll follow up later with a letter or more appropriate means of communication, but in terms of the alternatives, which is really what this is about, since the Connector has been in the Staff documents, it's been identified as a solution to Y-intersection traffic. I think that's a very relative thing. I think that one of the beauties of the County in preserving the nature of the community and habitat and for planning purposes have been the fact we've been able to channel traffic as much as we have into as few arterials as we do. And putting a parallel, high-speed—it's all relative again, high speed to us and certainly in our neighborhood through that area—is going to be, of course, permanently disruptive. And just to go through a laundry list of some of those damages, which I think would be quite severe to the neighborhood, obviously disruption to the neighborhood and wildlife, safety hazards, permanent noise, speeding traffic, reduction of property values and also damaging valuable view corridor that homes in Indian Trails have westward across the current Tribal Trails Road. And I certainly recommend to you that there are any number of standard conventional engineering solutions to the Y- intersection, and that the kind of money that would be contemplated being spent on the Connector could easily be appropriated in a different direction, including going to the State and getting that kind of support. And I might also add that the additional cost on road modification includes a major change in the Indian Springs access that was contemplated in the original zoning for Indian Springs. But if you talk to people...and I was in a meeting maybe a year or so ago...I heard some language, oh, it's going to cost a couple hundred thousand dollars to move that road. I would argue that the actual cost of moving that access over to connect down in what are wetlands may be more than the entire cost of improving the Y- intersection. That's before you spend money on the Connector. So these are very real things to the neighborhood and to people in Indian Springs on both sides of the creek. It's pretty obvious that the Connector is going to cut across major open space, which connects the mountains, and anyone who lives in that area sees the wildlife moving through there all the time. And of course there's significant current agriculture use there, traditional agricultural use, that would be disrupted. So, in terms of looking at the impacts, I would argue that the Connector should be removed and that instead you should appropriate the money and other planning resources toward the Y-intersection improvements, and I think that'd be a good investment. And it's much more consistent with the overall long-term values of the County and the Town to do that. Thank you.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group recommended that the Tribal Trails Connector be included in a more comprehensive traffic system study of all of West Jackson (Hwy 22, the "Y", High School Rd. South Park Loop). General discussion occurred regarding the local vs. collector character of Tribal Trails and the original intent of the road.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that the Tribal Trail connector should not increase traffic congestion on High School Road. The group also discussed the appropriateness of traffic calming to reduce traffic impacts on local residents.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group felt that a better definition of "local convenience commercial" was needed in light of possible Tribal Trails construction and desire not to attract trips to this area.

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	Halpin, Pete Interested Public	Good evening. My name's Pete Halpin and I have property both in the Town of Jackson, as does my wife and two adult children who are residents, and property in the County. And I'm here to speak solely on behalf of my own family in opposition to the tribal trails connector. And I do intend to submit other written opposition to this connector along with either by myself or with others who share my convictions about this connector. Let me just say I have two principal things to say in regards to the connector, one which I have to say with a little bit of a grain of salt, which is that I applaud the concentration of traffic in the major arterials in Jackson Hole. And I think that one of the principal factors that enabled us to control environmental impacts and lead to a higher quality of life is that we have so few roads. So, my basic thrust is let's throw the money at the WY intersection and not run a second major arterial down the center of Jackson Hole, because that is exactly what it's going to become. Let me say that I'm in my 46th year in Jackson and in the Valley and if you want sprawl, build a connector because that's exactly what it's going to lead to. And I'm not going to spend the rest of my short time I have allotted this evening to speak to all those more technical reasons why I think this is a bad idea, but it's certainly going to be a nightmare for our neighborhood. And I might say a lot of people on both Indian Trails and Indian Springs actually believe that this connector is never going to happen. And as somebody who's spent a lifetime in transportation planning, I can tell you that it could happen. And I think it's a bad idea. And let me just say a little bit about the history as I recollect. This bypass, this connector started as a ill-fated Town of Jackson bypass. And a long time ago that was a great idea. Because planners thought that if you had a small growing town, you needed a bypass. And you can find those bypasses in many small towns around America. And fortunately we didn't choose to have a bypass. And when Indian Springs was developed, I remember one of the principal factors that were involved—it's not the only factor—some people in the County who were looking ahead for this very kind of meeting to happen, many decades in the future. It's been many years since then. But the reason why was because, well, the state of Wyoming wants it. And I remember that because I was in the state of Wyoming. It's on the plan; you've got to have it because in the state of Wyoming in Cheyenne it's hard to get those things off the plans. That's a fact; that's a fact. So, I leave you with some of those thoughts. How does a bad idea get embedded in a Plan?
6/3/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I am writing to invite you to come to Cottonwood and go for a walk around the neighborhood to let you see what works and doesn't work here to keep our great little neighborhood viable. We are not opposed to extending our neighborhood South Of High School Road into South Park when the time comes. We welcome a new neighborhood when needed to compliment what's already here. We just ask that you have an open mind to our concerns about the proposed over development in the NW corner of South Park and the negative effects it will have on our diverse neighborhoods here in West Jackson. Our main concerns are the failure of High School Road being the only collector between Rte 89 and South Park Loop Road. There are no assurances in the comp plan to promise a parallel collector in South Park to alleviate the traffic on High School Road before this development occurs and the Tribal Trails Connector Road goes in. The second is the lack of open space and parks in the NW corner of South Park. If you do the numbers there is no room for these ammenities in NW South Park. The plan states that West Jackson infrastucture such as parks, roads and schools can serve the proposed 1500 units in the 400 acres in the NW corner. There are about 1500 all toll, homes from Cottonwood down to the tail end of of South Park. Can you imagine that many jammed into the small amount of land and the pressures that these units will put on the schools, parks and roads here in West Jackson. Give me a call and come on over for a cup of coffee and a walk around a great diverse neighborhood and help us think of ways to keep it going and make it better with out abandoning it for newer pastures accross the road.
5/15/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	For South Park, the following 2009 Plan adjustments are in order: -Wildlife and Natural Resources should be first priority for the South Park district-Clearly articulate the entire district as containing important wildlife, connectivity, and scenic values, using language similar to that in the current (1994) comp plan.-Delete language that states South Park will be built out from 'North to South starting at High School Road.'-Exhaust in-fill in town before considering any expansion into new County nodes, including NW South Park.-Drastically reduce the proposed NW South Park 400-acre, 1,500-unit housing node, both in footprint and number of units, consistent with a less-growth plan.-Clearly state that any density incentives used for the reduced NW South Park node will be derived from permanent open space protection within the district only, not from Alta or Buffalo Valley.-At least 50% of any density incentive in any County node or targeted Town growth area to be derived from permanent open space incentives (not solely from workforce housing), still leaving 50% available to incentivize additional deed-restricted workforce housing.-The reduced NW South Park node to have a pull-back from both High School (for a park) and South Park Loop Roads, to respect the educational nature of HS Road and the scenic value of South Park Loop.-The design of any development in the reduced NW South Park node to allow wildlife movement permeability.-The placement of an East-West connector road in South Park should precede any new development in the Northwest corner of South Park and placed close enough behind the high school to alleviate traffic on High School Rd.-The design of the reduced Northwest corner of South Park should not be connected directly to High School Road but to the new East-West connector road. -No annexation of the new reduced Northwest corner of South Park until it is designed and approved under County LDR criteria. No annexation as a whole, to then fall into Town design standards.-The Tribal Trails connector between South Park Loop Road and HWY 22 not even considered until all solutions for improving the "Y' intersection are exhausted, and assurances made that no new traffic would be diverted onto High School Road.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hopefully if and when South Park does develop, that somehow preservation of the single family neighborhood is seriously enforced. What bothers me is the fact that 'growth' (theme #1) and work force housing (theme # 4) are higher priorities in West Jackson then (theme #7) "maintaining the existing residential neighborhoods as attractive places to live for our local workforce" which is last in the draft FLUP for West Jackson. West Jackson is already built out except for a few small lots and I don't think you can squeeze anymore workers in West Jackson except over stuffing single family home rentals with 5, 6 and 7 unrelated people. It's a catch 22 for working people here in West Jackson who keep this valley going for the large homeowners on the outskirts. They get the protection for wildlife and scenic vistas and we get the overcrowded neighborhoods and streets for trying to do the right thing for the valley. That's some trade off. What really upsets a lot of people here in Cottonwood Park is that the planners couldn't even set up a presentation here for the draft plan. I was told it was a scheduling oversight because of Spring break. I would think that since we are on the frontline of major up zoning and traffic impacts that a meeting here would have been obvious. Theme # 5 'community facilities' states that we should "continue the district's role as home for most of the school district and parks and recreation facilities". With no promise of open space in NW South Park like a set back for a park (the depth of the high school property) on High School Road to South Park Loop Rd, West Jackson's neighborhood parks and open space will be overburdened. The plan does mention a 1/8 of a mile setback along South Park Loop Road across from Three Creek to preserve the scenic vistas of that area. That's another slap in the face to the hardworking people of West Jackson. What are we going to do when we want to walk down the South Park Loop path to see the vistas, use our periscopes to see over the ugly berms that will be on both sides of the road like a gigantic half pipe? Again it's scenic vistas for those who can afford it. We do have great parks here in Cottonwood Park but they will be maxed out especially since the Blair Apartments and the new affordable neighborhoods like Ellingwood have only the bare minimum of open space. Parking is already an issue here when families come from outside the neighborhood to use the Range View and Cottonwood Parks. How much more traffic can the "failed" High School Road take, especially if the Tribal Trails connector is built and the major up zoning of South Park occurs. Theme 3 'transportation' states that there needs to be a "balance of needs between the existing neighborhoods of District 12 and the entire community". Where's the balance when all you are doing is tipping the scale of traffic jams from the "y" to High School Road. The comp plan needs to promise that the East West collector road in Northern South Park has to be in place before any new development in South Park takes place and before the Tribal Trails connector is started. Any new neighborhood in South Park should empty on to the new East West collector and not High School Road. The scale of the NW build out should be drastically reduced also. The new draft plan is asking West Jackson to bear a lot of the burden for this plan. Maybe that is why the 'Balanced Community' Theme is dead last for West Jackson. You need to come to West Jackson and walk with us to find out what works and doesn't work here if you are going to use our West Jackson as a role model for "responsible growth". Christine Walker from The Housing Authority walked around the neighborhood with us to see and hear our concerns; perhaps officials and planners could take a field trip. I will supply the coffee and doughnuts. We have some great neighborhoods here in West Jackson and we deserve a lot better then what the present draft plan has to offer us which is basically zip right now.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Gillete, Claudia Interested Public	Neighbors in the Cottonwood Park Subdivisions are concerned with some of the language written to describe our district and our neighborhoods. We find it surprising that of the seven individual themes identified through the process, four of them for district 13 have been defined almost identically. Although we feel strongly that "supporting the existing neighborhood" should be a priority, more weight should be placed on how each theme relates back to its original ideal, principles and how those work within the districts. The use of Neighborhood as singular in the themes of this district is not really what is going on and does not represent this district or others effectively. Each district is made up of varying neighborhoods of sizes, types and uses. The clustering, feathering and linking of neighborhoods makes them relate to each other and causes a district to be unified. We love our neighborhood and how it, with the other neighborhoods in our district, make them a great place to live. The individual designs, community services and circulation create a diverse yet whole district. The high density does leave something to be desired. Less density in our neighborhoods is important; please listen to the concerns and needs of many (older) citizen's, some of whom were born and raised in this valley, (scenic, wildlife, open space/migrant corridors; less crime, infrastructure needs, on and on!) When reading the written text pUblished in the draft plan we have the following comments: 1) Responsible Growth: We hope that the comp plan is using our districts neighborhoods as role models for future developments since we are almost built out. And since we are almost built out, responsible growth should not be District 13's first priority. The only future growth that may take place in our district is School growth which when designed needs to look further into its impact on the existing neighborhoods of our district. The huge Growth proposed in the neighboring District 12 in the NW corner of South Park is unnecessary and detrimental to district 13. The impact on the schools, roads, parks, scenic and natural resources of district 12 is immeasurable. This proposed growth should be scaled back tremendously. Utilizing open, available lots within the town makes more sense. 2} Town as Heart: Continuing to "support" the mixed-use neighborhood is top priority for District 13. The proposed growth of neighboring districts as well as the school district and the impact of the possible Tribal Connector will all affect pro & con, our district's character and attraction for the working families that we are designed for. Proposing more density in the NW corner of district 12 before infilling the town proper does not support this theme. Twisting the theme to state "develop adjacent to" causes more infrastructures to be built instead of using the city roads and utilities already installed. 3) Transportation: Balancing the needs of the community and constructing the Tribal connector detract from our district. Protection of these impacts needs to be first and foremost. In addition, the traffic impact of the High School as well as 5 other schools that are currently serviced through our district and the proposed growth in the NW corner of South Park need to be equally listed. Prior to any new development, the existing problems have to be addressed. The school district needs to be engaged further to reduce the impact students are having on the neighborhood. The missed opportunity of reducing single car use and increase alternate modes of transportation needs further consideration & forethought. Also the lack of small parking areas where county residents can access the amenities and bus stops provided in this district cause damage to personal property. 4) Workforce Housing: District 13 is mainly work force housing already. We are mostly built out and therefore this theme is the least priority. However adding the proposed 1500 units of Work Force housing to the neighboring district 12 creates a concentration of this demographic in one area in the county. Designing pockets of work force housing in other locations in the county is more desirable and creates a more diverse community over all. Any density bonuses should only be granted if, in fact, the work force housing developed by the bonus benefits directly from it. 5) Community Facilities: Future growth of the schools in this area will impact the district as it relates to traffic congestion, parking locations, impervious parking lots, and light pollution in the evenings and on weekends. Teton County Schools need to be looked at as a developer and held to the same standards of protecting existing neighborhoods as part of their future growth. In addition first responders of Fire & EMT should be considered as needing to have a home somewhere in our district especially when considering any future housing to be located in the NW corner of South Park. And finally new developments need to be required to create new parks within their neighborhoods and not tax the existing one found in District 13's. The proposed work on the high school ~stadium" is a bit much in dollars and ~improvements". 6) Wildlife Natural Resources: More and more wildlife is being directed into district 13 due to the growth and fencing/berming along South Park Loop Road which also detracts from our scenic vistas. The potential loss of a scenic corridor to the south due to future development and the blocking of the scenic view to the west is a great deterrent to all who live and travel through this district. Again the people who live and work here should be taken care of before future residents. District 13 should not have to sacrifice (~allowable trade offs for District 13" are the words from the planners) scenic views and wildlife to accommodate future workforce to the South. 7) Balanced Community & Economy: To maintain the existing residential neighborhoods as attractive places to live we should not and need not allow convenience commercial into the proposed housing directly to the south of us in the NW corner of South Park. The Smith's plaza is physically close enough, for both District 13 as well as the NW corner of South Park and it does not make sense economically to compete with a national chain for fuel and groceries.

Date	Name	Comment
5/13/2009	Wemple, Robert Interested Public	Development in the NW corner of South Park should be mitigated so it has no impact on High School Road. I strongly feel there should be a buffer between development and HS road. Growth should be limited as much as possible. I generally agree with comments that were developed by Kathy Tompkins and Rich Bloom., see below.Cottonwood Park District 13Neighbors in the Cottonwood Park Subdivisions are concerned with some of the language written to describe our district and our neighborhoods. We find it surprising that of the seven individual themes identified through the process, four of them for district 13 have been defined almost identically. Although we feel strongly that "supporting the existing neighborhood" should be a priority, more weight should be placed on how each theme relates back to its original Ideal, principals and how those work with in the districts.The use of Neighborhood as singular in the themes of this district is not really what is going on and does not represent this district or others effectively. Each district is made up of varying neighborhoods of sizes, types and uses. The clustering, feathering and linking of neighborhoods makes them relate to each other and cause a district to be unified.We love our neighborhood and how it with the other neighborhoods in our district makes a great place to live. The individual designs, community services and circulation create a diverse yet whole district.When reading the written text published in the draft plan we have the following comments:1) Responsible Growth: We hope that the comp plan is using our districts neighborhoods as roll models for future developments since we are almost built out. And since we are almost built out, responsible growth should not be District 13's first priority. The only future growth that may take place in our district is School growth which when designed needs to look further into its impact on the existing neighborhoods of our district. The huge Growth proposed in the neighboring District 12 in the NW corner of South Park is unnecessary and detrimental to district 13. The impact on the schools, roads, parks, scenic and natural resources of district 12 is immeasurable. This proposed growth should be scaled back tremendously. Utilizing open available lots with in the town makes more sense.2) Town as Heart: Continuing to "support" the mixed-use neighborhood is top priority for District 13. The proposed growth of neighboring districts as well as the school district and the impact of the possible Tribal Connector will all affect pro & con, our districts character and attraction for the working families that we are designed for. Proposing more density in the NW corner of district 12 before infilling the town proper does not support this theme. Twisting the theme to state "develop adjacent to" causes more infrastructures to be built instead of using the city roads and utilities already installed.3) Transportation: Balancing the needs of the community and constructing the Tribal connector detract from our district. Protection of these impacts need to be fist and foremost. In addition, the traffic impact of the High School as well as 5 other school that are currently serviced through our district and the proposed growth in the NW corner of South Park need to be equally listed. Prior to any new development, the existing problems need to be addressed. The school district needs to be engaged further to reduce the impact students are having on the neighborhood. The missed opportunity of reducing single car use and increase alternate modes of transportation is a big mistake. Also the lack of small parking areas where county residents can access the amenities and bus stops provided in this district cause damage to personal property.4) Workforce Housing: District 13 is mainly work force housing already. We are mostly built out and therefore this theme is the least priority. However adding the proposed 1500 units of Work Force housing to the neighboring district 12 creates a concentration of this demographic in one area in the county. Designing pockets of work force housing in other locations in the county is more desirable and creates a more diverse community over all. Any density bonuses should only be granted if in fact the work force housing developed by the bonus benefits directly from it. 5) Community Facilities: Future growth of the schools in this area will impact the district as it relates to traffic congestion, parking locations, impervious parking lots, and light pollution in the evenings and on weekends. Teton County Schools need to be looked at as a developer and held to the same standards of protecting existing neighborhoods as part of their future growth. In addition first responders of Fire & EMT should be considered as needing to have a home some where in our district especially when considering any future housing to be located in the NW corner of South Park. And finally new developments need to be required to create new parks within their neighborhoods and not tax the existing one found in District 13's.6) Wildlife Natural Resources: More and more wild life is being directed into district 13 due to the growth and irrelevant berming along South Park Loop Road which also detracts from our scenic vistas. The potential loss of a scenic corridor to the south due to future development and the blocking of the scenic view to the west is a great determent to all who live and travel through this district. Again the people who live and work here should be taken care of before future residents. District 13 should not have to sacrifice ("allowable trade offs for District 13,Äù are the words from the planners) scenic views and wildlife to accommodate future workforce to the South.7) Balanced Community & Economy: To maintain the existing residential neighborhoods as attractive places to live we can not allow convenience commercial into the proposed housing directly to the south of us in the NW corner of South Park. The Smiths plaza is physically close enough and for both District 13 as well as the NW corner of South Park and it does not make sense economically to compete with a national chain for fuel and groceries.

Date	Name	Comment
5/12/2009	Barney, Bodean Interested Public	I have the following concerns about the South Park Development:1.) 1/8 of a mile (660 ft.) set-backs from South Park Loop Rd. is inadequate. There should be set-backs of at least 1/4 mile from both this road and the High School Road. The only ditch that conveys water from the Leek Ditch over to the Dairy Subdivision (where there are water rights, appears to be the one along the South side of High School Road). Further, why do we care more about keeping this "gateway" (East of Flat Creek)open from development, while congesting the NW side of Flat Creek. Seems that we are giving preference to tourists visiting Jackson Hole at the expense of the folks that live and work here. Why not actually maintain open spaces and "scenic vistas" rather than giving that impression to passing travelers, who would find something very different if they drove just a mile to the West.2.) What about infrastructure? Will connector roads (East/ West) and other roads be in place before they determine how many units will be packed in to this area. What about open space? Rangeview seems to be very well planned and laid out, almost too well, as we get a lot of traffic from folks visiting Rangeview Park from all over town (but especially Blair Place and Ellingwood). As I understand it, the open space in Rangeview was detremined by the # of residents (when you add all of the additional use and potentially even more from the other side of High School Road, this makes me feel like I live in the center of a housing project). I'm concerned that there will be a toilet bowl effect, with Rangeview Park at the center (especially when the Tribal Trails conncetor goes through). Thank you for your time and consideration.
5/10/2009	Yeomans, Jessica Interested Public	According to the results from the community survey, it does not appear that the connection road from hwy 89 is a desired thing. If fact, it seems like the road is completely unwanted.
5/6/2009	Sundgren, Shelley Interested Public	I have concerns regarding the proposed Tribal Road connection. Minimal effort should be put into planning that connection until AFTER all possible improvements have been made to the Y and the traffic has shown that it is required. Do NOT plan (or build) the Tribal Road connection until the traffic actually exists that requires it. Do NOT build it based on estimated (modeled, hypothetical) traffic.The construction of the Tribal Road connection would have negative impacts on the local communities along the currently dead end road, wildlife, and on the residents of Blair and Cottonwood Park. It would increase traffic on local roads - a decrease in the quality of life of the residents. It would increase traffic on High School Road, Middle School Road, as well as South Park Road - a big safety issue with all the students who walk to school.

Date	Name	Comment
4/29/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I just think that unless you solve the problems we have right now and use the laws we have on the books to reign in the renting of single family homes to 4, 5 and 6 people by landlords in supposedly single family neighborhoods, this trend will just spread South to any new neighborhood and history then repeats itself. People are going to find a way to cram as many into a house to save on rent. All at the expense of the live in owners who are trying to make ends meet and make their home a home not just a frat house. There is no regard for the speed limit and safety of the children playing. These single family homes are suppose to have no more then 3 unrelated people in them. I just went around the corner of my place to a house and asked them to get the cars off the lawn (what was left of it!)clean up the trash and the empty beer bottles. At that time I think they had 5 kids living in the house. They had a bar set up at the end of the garage and fire wood and skis here and there. Not pleasant to look at. Plan all you want but it will be for nothing if you can't preserve the single family neighborhood. It is indeed an admirable proposal to try to persuade people to use alternate modes of transportation such as biking, taking the bus, car pooling and last but not least your feet. The Teton County, Town of Jackson Comprehension Draft Plan is trying to do just that, with an overall reduction of single occupied vehicles (SOV's). The plans' success relies on the good graces and athletic capabilities of our future residents that would live in the proposed new South Park town hub. A reality check is needed when we grow bigger instead of better. Before I get to the realty check I just want to say I love the proposed programs about home mail delivery, encouraging and or requiring students to take the bus, walk or bike (don't forget skateboarding) to school and employee carpooling incentives. We should back them 100%. Although I think we should forget about encouraging students not to drive to school. Bribing works best with teenagers. Now, fantasy verses reality. Do you really think people in the future South Park town hub, living that far away from their jobs and services in Teton Village, Wilson and town are going to give up their car to take the bus, walk or bike? The only South Park residents that will possibly walk or take the bus are the employees at the South Park convenience stores selling four dollar a gallon not so fresh milk, overpriced beer and cigarettes. Now suppose they do hop on their bikes or walk to the stores or work. Don't you think they'll have trouble getting through those unplowed pathways in the winter? I know several people including a lot of kids that have that problem right now. There is also that highly visible but nobody wants to do anything about it problem of overcrowded non family occupied rental homes with five and six cars in the driveways, on the lawns and on the streets (snow plow drivers love the last one). I don't think that a new South Park town hub is going to solve it. The rent is not going to be any cheaper and if tenants can save a lot of money and landlords look the other way; South Park is going to end up having the same problems other single family neighborhoods are having right now. That brings me to the calculations on the build out number of up to 1500 units for South Park over the next 10 to 15 years. I know, I'm not supposed to worry, it's just a number. Instead of 3,000 more cars coming out of South Park it will probably be more like 4000 cars when the above rental trend spreads there. I keep hearing the plan is just guidelines. Well, let's guide it a little more. Why don't we just take a breather, listen to the majority of the constituents who want "limited" managed growth and scale this plan back. What's the rush? The economy is not heading anywhere fast, anytime soon. In the mean time we can work on solving the problems we have by building more affordable Category 1, 2 and 3 homes in town, closer to work and services so our future residents don't wear out so many shoes and bicycle tires. Clear the most used pathways in the winter or groom them all and break out the cross country skis! Give single families back their neighborhoods by creating on work site employee housing like seasonal hostels with a few more creature comforts for the singles that just need someplace to sleep, store their skis, bikes and kayaks. Nothing fancy they're up all night and day anyway either working or playing. That's why they came to Jackson Hole. Improve the bus system we have by doing two way loops so you don't have to go all the way around town to get to Smith's from Cottonwood! I like sightseeing but we should leave that for the tourists.

DISTRICT 6: TOWN PERIPHERY

Town Periphery Comment (4/13/09 - 10/13/11)

Date	Name	Comment
2/15/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I would like to bring the public back into this most important public document. I support Kristy Bruner's op ed piece in the JHN&G on Feb 9th "Land-Use plan A Flop Without A FLUP". We need to be proud of our unique valley and take seriously, the responsibility that goes along with being the first gateway community to our national parks and being live in caretakers of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. Please remember going forward that a desired vision for the new comprehensive plan is one that doesnâ€™t impart negative impacts on established family neighborhoods in order to satisfy development rights of large property owners. More development equals more traffic which leads to more roads and therefore degradation of established neighborhoods. The proposed Tribal Trails connectorâ€™s negative effects on the schools adjacent to and near High School Road and the Cottonwood Park neighborhood, in part, to mitigate dense growth in Northern South Park, is one example of satisfying the right of a large property owner to the detriment of a large group of small property owners. Sincerely, Kathy Tompkins Cottonwood Park

Date	Name	Comment
2/7/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I know you said it was unnecessary to prepare a formal response but as a small homeowner with concerns that official stakeholders might not have,I thought it was important to jot some things down. I think the questions on allowed growth keep popping up so I responded to them also. Could you send my comments on to Bruce and incorporate them into your records. I appreciated being invited to the introduction meeting with Bruce Meighen, but I forgot to submit my comments to him. I have a tough time organizing my thoughts on a normal day so I chose to organize them on paper:) 1.What are the three objectives you would like to accomplish from the Comprehensive Plan update? A."No Net Negative Environmental Impacts; Ideally, this means everyone working together to ensure that wildlife, plants, water, air, soil and the processes that connect them will be better off or at least no worse tomorrow than they are today." (http://www.banff.ca/locals-residents/environment/No_Net_Negative_Environmental_Impact.htm) B. A healthy, energy sustainable, diverse economic mountain community and national park gateway that is not dependent on growth, non renewable energy, and boom and bust industries. C.An enforceable checks and balances system to support objectives A and B. 2.Given that new development will occur in the Town and County based on existing zoning, what are some key opportunities we can achieve with new growth? There are no opportunities we can achieve with new growth unless we resolve the contradictions in the new comp plan draft and create a verifiable predictability that does not deposit phantom densities in selected family neighborhoods that may not benefit from the open space these transfers claim to create. If these issues are left open to interpretation, the only people that will see opportunity and rewards are developers, while established family neighborhoods bear the negative impacts of unchecked dense growth. 3. What must happen for this development to occur in the right way? Verifiable predictability that includes a well researched (not inflated) build out number and permanent open space once created. 4.What is the desired character or vision you would like the Plan to achieve? A.Pride and responsibility that goes along with being the first gateway community to our national parks and live in caretakers of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. B.A desired vision is one that doesn't impart negative impacts on established family neighborhoods in order to satisfy development rights of large property owners. More development equals more traffic which leads to more roads and therefore degradation of established neighborhoods. The proposed Tribal Trails connector's negative effects on the schools adjacent to and near High School Road and the Cottonwood Park neighborhood, in part, to mitigate dense growth in Northern South Park, is one example of satisfying the right of a large property owner to the detriment of a large group of small property owners. 5.Provide several realistic tools and recommendations that would help preserve the character or vision you desire? A.A fully funded, enforceable, ongoing checks and balances system that would make themes one and two a success. B.Public and Private support for programs that encourage sustainable energy programs like JHESP, Slow Food, and Vertical Greenhouse… sharing and gathering helpful info from other mountain communities to further our goals. C.Switch from being dependent on boom and bust economies which include industries like non renewable energy and second homeowner construction (that increases the need for more servicing), to more innovative and sustainable industries like retrofitting existing housing with Net Zero Energy Community ("A net zero-energy community (ZEC) is one that has greatly reduced energy needs through efficiency gains such that the balance of energy for vehicles, thermal, and electrical energy within the community is met by renewable energy."(National Renewable Energy Laboratory)) and Passive House (http://www.passivehouse.us/passiveHouse/PassiveHouseInfo.html) inspired techniques, green career training for our local youth in order to give them an option to stay and contribute to the community in a positive way, regional grown and transported food and goods (Wyoming, Idaho and Utah) and made in Jackson Hole products marketed throughout our intermountain region. 6.A successful Plan is one that : A.Realizes and supports new and healthier ways to sustain and preserve our fragile ecosystem. B.Does not sacrifice the needs of established family neighborhoods that want to foster a safe, healthy place to live and share with wildlife. C.That is simple to understand, and not contradictory.

Date	Name	Comment
11/12/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hello, Kathy Tompkins, Cottonwood. Just a few things. Just concerns and a couple of comments or recommendations. One is I like the idea of establishing a dedicated funding source to acquire permanent open space for wildlife habitat protection, scenic vistas preservation and agricultural lands. And the other things that Kristy and Rich alluded to was that, you know, predictability, cost of growth, the burden it puts in these receiving areas to the people next door, specifically, you know, like Cottonwood Park and West Jackson. And also please correct the Staff estimate of the number of units created by the PRD. It was too low. It ignores SRA and other projects that use the PRD to justify their density. Saving Historic Jackson Hole stated Staff ignored the SRA project at Teton Village. This controversial project did not use the PRD for its 1517 acres but used the amount of development potential allowed buy the PRD on greater than 35 acres to justify 339 market units versus 331 that are outside the PRD. This was an increase of 296 units <<inaudible>> 43 units. This is almost twice the reported number of ??. This is just one example. Technically, these units were not created by the PRD mechanism, but the PRD was used for the justification. And I sent that out to my neighbors and friends in Cottonwood Park. So, people do read this stuff. And it's really important to go over it. Clarification, and this is, you know, I'm still learning this stuff. If we could have clarification that is needed on the creation of conservation easements though the PDRs [sic], can the development rights that were supposedly extinguished actually be transferred to somewhere else? So, I'm still learning, and if you guys could answer that for me, that'd be great. And I represent a group of families in Cottonwood Park and the common thread that runs through our families—retired couples and young couples just starting out—is that we matter, too. We would like to protect our future in Jackson Hole just as much as the ranching families in this Valley. The best way to do that is to sit down and discuss our needs and concerns to make this Comprehensive Plan work for everybody, not just a few families, only to give the burden to hundreds of small landowners who just happen to be next to a so-called desirable area for dense development in northern South Park. It is a misconception to believe that High School Road can handle any more dense development without seriously impacting the lives of so many working families that live off of High School Road. When the vote failed for the reduced PDR [sic] of three for 35, you are basically ensuring the further failure of High School Road and the neighborhoods around it. That means we are back to 370+ units—I think that's right—that could be built along High School Road with the nine per 35 PDR [sic]. When you combine that with the proposed Indian Trails Connector jumping onto High School Road, the die is cast to save degraded neighborhoods and unsafe roads for children walking towards schools in that area. This would make a mockery of preserving neighborhood character and the transportation ?? for West Jackson in the Comprehensive Plan. That is why it is so important to take into consideration the recommendations, corrections and concerns I made at the start of my comments. I also think you missed a great opportunity when you turned down the chance to have a workshop with the ranching families and on the PDRs [sic] to gather info and come up with possible alternative and creative solutions that would resolve their concerns. This Comprehensive Plan should be all about research, science and connecting people with solutions to the people with concerns. And we have a lot of concerns. Okay. Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
10/19/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I would like to respond to a comment made at last week's Teton County's Comprehensive Plan rewrite meeting, during the public comment segment. A gentleman said that the Northern South Park area around the high school should be a receiving area for development because the area is already "messed up" or ruined. Please don't treat the residents of the neighborhoods around the high school as if we don't matter. I hope that the planning commissioners and the elected officials respect the small home owner's future in West Jackson as much as they respect the large landowners, concerning their property rights and the money they may gain or lose on their land investment. West Jackson also has a lot to gain or lose in the rewrite of the comprehensive plan, not only in our home values but the very existence of viable and safe family neighborhoods. There is a simple formula that we can aspire to for the location of any needed housing. If housing is needed, it should be placed where the jobs are generated. Affordable homes and rentals should be placed near or where service people are needed for the upkeep of high end homes, high end developments and resorts in town, Teton Village, The Aspens and the Wilson area. There should be a shared responsibility by everyone who generates the need for service people. If we dump dense new bedroom communities in Northern South Park, people will still rely on their cars to get to and from work in town, Teton Village, Wilson, and The Aspens. We do not need more traffic on the already overburdened High School Road, which will be even more dangerous if the Tribal Trails connector road goes through. It will threaten the safety of all our children in and around the schools here. It defeats the purpose of smart and managed growth. We need to keep commercial and unneeded residential development to a minimum in all areas, protect wildlife, open spaces and preserve our family neighborhoods. Most of all, everybody should share in these responsibilities, not just the small homeowner who works very hard to call Jackson their home. Please be considerate of the neighborhoods in West Jackson. We matter, pay taxes and vote too!
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group recommended that the Tribal Trails Connector be included in a more comprehensive traffic system study of all of West Jackson (Hwy 22, the "Y", High School Rd. South Park Loop). General discussion occurred regarding the local vs. collector character of Tribal Trails and the original intent of the road.

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2009	Halpin, Pete Interested Public	Thank you. My name is Pete Halpen, and my wife and I and adult children have property at 565 Trails End in Indian Trails and we also have property in Teton County. So, we have both property in the Town and in the County. And I believe my comments are reasonably connected to the themes. So, it's a hard act to follow, the specificity, of the previous speaker, but I did speak at the previous County meeting, and I appreciated the opportunity to do so at that time. I am opposed to the Tribal Trails Connector. So this is a completely single-issue discussion, and I spoke against it at the previous meeting last week. Just a little bit of background, again speaking from my knowledge of the Connector and its antecedents, there was a time when it was a great idea to have bypasses around towns, and a lot of towns in America have them, and the State planned for that. There was a bypass planned, which would run up the Gulch, and over time, of course, that's morphed. And there was a time also when, theoretically, and on the County Plan there could be up to 1250 units of housing between the two hills north of Wells Hill, up to the Wilson Road and through the Indian Springs development. Of course, that evaporated, but the Connector stayed on the Plan. And I didn't like the Connector back then and I still don't like it. And obviously being in my front yard or back yard, I like it less than most. In terms of…if I could just go through a couple points, and then I'll follow up later with a letter or more appropriate means of communication, but in terms of the alternatives, which is really what this is about, since the Connector has been in the Staff documents, it's been identified as a solution to Y-intersection traffic. I think that's a very relative thing. I think that one of the beauties of the County in preserving the nature of the community and habitat and for planning purposes have been the fact we've been able to channel traffic as much as we have into as few arterials as we do. And putting a parallel, high-speed—it's all relative again, high speed to us and certainly in our neighborhood through that area—is going to be, of course, permanently disruptive. And just to go through a laundry list of some of those damages, which I think would be quite severe to the neighborhood, obviously disruption to the neighborhood and wildlife, safety hazards, permanent noise, speeding traffic, reduction of property values and also damaging valuable view corridor that homes in Indian Trails have westward across the current Tribal Trails Road. And I certainly recommend to you that there are any number of standard conventional engineering solutions to the Y- intersection, and that the kind of money that would be contemplated being spent on the Connector could easily be appropriated in a different direction, including going to the State and getting that kind of support. And I might also add that the additional cost on road modification includes a major change in the Indian Springs access that was contemplated in the original zoning for Indian Springs. But if you talk to people...and I was in a meeting maybe a year or so ago...I heard some language, oh, it's going to cost a couple hundred thousand dollars to move that road. I would argue that the actual cost of moving that access over to connect down in what are wetlands may be more than the entire cost of improving the Y- intersection. That's before you spend money on the Connector. So these are very real things to the neighborhood and to people in Indian Springs on both sides of the creek. It's pretty obvious that the Connector is going to cut across major open space, which connects the mountains, and anyone who lives in that area sees the wildlife moving through there all the time. And of course there's significant current agriculture use there, traditional agricultural use, that would be disrupted. So, in terms of looking at the impacts, I would argue that the Connector should be removed and that instead you should appropriate the money and other planning resources toward the Y-intersection improvements, and I think that'd be a good investment. And it's much more consistent with the overall long-term values of the County and the Town to do that. Thank you.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that the Tribal Trail connector should not increase traffic congestion on High School Road. The group also discussed the appropriateness of traffic calming to reduce traffic impacts on local residents.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group recommended including a definition of Complete Streets that would consider sidewalks, traffic calming, reduce neighborhood speed limits and other applicable multi-modal encouragements.
6/17/2009	, STAG	Another recommendation was that the Wildlife Theme should move up in the priority order since the district provides connectivity from Karns Meadow.

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	Halpin, Pete Interested Public	Good evening. My name's Pete Halpin and I have property both in the Town of Jackson, as does my wife and two adult children who are residents, and property in the County. And I'm here to speak solely on behalf of my own family in opposition to the tribal trails connector. And I do intend to submit other written opposition to this connector along with either by myself or with others who share my convictions about this connector. Let me just say I have two principal things to say in regards to the connector, one which I have to say with a little bit of a grain of salt, which is that I applaud the concentration of traffic in the major arterials in Jackson Hole. And I think that one of the principal factors that enabled us to control environmental impacts and lead to a higher quality of life is that we have so few roads. So, my basic thrust is let's throw the money at the WY intersection and not run a second major arterial down the center of Jackson Hole, because that is exactly what it's going to become. Let me say that I'm in my 46th year in Jackson and in the Valley and if you want sprawl, build a connector because that's exactly what it's going to lead to. And I'm not going to spend the rest of my short time I have allotted this evening to speak to all those more technical reasons why I think this is a bad idea, but it's certainly going to be a nightmare for our neighborhood. And I might say a lot of people on both Indian Trails and Indian Springs actually believe that this connector is never going to happen. And as somebody who's spent a lifetime in transportation planning, I can tell you that it could happen. And I think it's a bad idea. And let me just say a little bit about the history as I recollect. This bypass, this connector started as a ill-fated Town of Jackson bypass. And a long time ago that was a great idea. Because planners thought that if you had a small growing town, you needed a bypass. And you can find those bypasses in many small towns around America. And fortunately we didn't choose to have a bypass. And when Indian Springs was developed, I remember one of the principal factors that were involved—it's not the only factor—some people in the County who were looking ahead for this very kind of meeting to happen, many decades in the future. It's been many years since then. But the reason why was because, well, the state of Wyoming wants it. And I remember that because I was in the state of Wyoming. It's on the plan; you've got to have it because in the state of Wyoming in Cheyenne it's hard to get those things off the plans. That's a fact; that's a fact. So, I leave you with some of those thoughts. How does a bad idea get embedded in a Plan?
6/3/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I am writing to invite you to come to Cottonwood and go for a walk around the neighborhood to let you see what works and doesn't work here to keep our great little neighborhood viable. We are not opposed to extending our neighborhood South Of High School Road into South Park when the time comes. We welcome a new neighborhood when needed to compliment what's already here. We just ask that you have an open mind to our concerns about the proposed over development in the NW corner of South Park and the negative effects it will have on our diverse neighborhoods here in West Jackson. Our main concerns are the failure of High School Road being the only collector between Rte 89 and South Park Loop Road. There are no assurances in the comp plan to promise a parallel collector in South Park to alleviate the traffic on High School Road before this development occurs and the Tribal Trails Connector Road goes in. The second is the lack of open space and parks in the NW corner of South Park. If you do the numbers there is no room for these ammenities in NW South Park. The plan states that West Jackson infrastucture such as parks, roads and schools can serve the proposed 1500 units in the 400 acres in the NW corner. There are about 1500 all toll, homes from Cottonwood down to the tail end of of South Park. Can you imagine that many jammed into the small amount of land and the pressures that these units will put on the schools, parks and roads here in West Jackson. Give me a call and come on over for a cup of coffee and a walk around a great diverse neighborhood and help us think of ways to keep it going and make it better with out abandoning it for newer pastures accross the road.
5/15/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	For South Park, the following 2009 Plan adjustments are in order: -Wildlife and Natural Resources should be first priority for the South Park district-Clearly articulate the entire district as containing important wildlife, connectivity, and scenic values, using language similar to that in the current (1994) comp plan.-Delete language that states South Park will be built out from 'North to South starting at High School Road.'-Exhaust in-fill in town before considering any expansion into new County nodes, including NW South Park.-Drastically reduce the proposed NW South Park 400-acre, 1,500-unit housing node, both in footprint and number of units, consistent with a less-growth plan.-Clearly state that any density incentives used for the reduced NW South Park node will be derived from permanent open space protection within the district only, not from Alta or Buffalo Valley.-At least 50% of any density incentive in any County node or targeted Town growth area to be derived from permanent open space incentives (not solely from workforce housing), still leaving 50% available to incentivize additional deed-restricted workforce housing.-The reduced NW South Park node to have a pull-back from both High School (for a park) and South Park Loop Roads, to respect the educational nature of HS Road and the scenic value of South Park Loop.-The design of any development in the reduced NW South Park node to allow wildlife movement permeability.-The placement of an East-West connector road in South Park should precede any new development in the Northwest corner of South Park and placed close enough behind the high school to alleviate traffic on High School Rd.-The design of the reduced Northwest corner of South Park should not be connected directly to High School Road but to the new East-West connector road. -No annexation of the new reduced Northwest corner of South Park until it is designed and approved under County LDR criteria. No annexation as a whole, to then fall into Town design standards.-The Tribal Trails connector between South Park Loop Road and HWY 22 not even considered until all solutions for improving the "Y' intersection are exhausted, and assurances made that no new traffic would be diverted onto High School Road.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hopefully if and when South Park does develop, that somehow preservation of the single family neighborhood is seriously enforced. What bothers me is the fact that 'growth' (theme #1) and work force housing (theme # 4) are higher priorities in West Jackson then (theme #7) "maintaining the existing residential neighborhoods as attractive places to live for our local workforce" which is last in the draft FLUP for West Jackson. West Jackson is already built out except for a few small lots and I don't think you can squeeze anymore workers in West Jackson except over stuffing single family home rentals with 5, 6 and 7 unrelated people. It's a catch 22 for working people here in West Jackson who keep this valley going for the large homeowners on the outskirts. They get the protection for wildlife and scenic vistas and we get the overcrowded neighborhoods and streets for trying to do the right thing for the valley. That's some trade off. What really upsets a lot of people here in Cottonwood Park is that the planners couldn't even set up a presentation here for the draft plan. I was told it was a scheduling oversight because of Spring break. I would think that since we are on the frontline of major up zoning and traffic impacts that a meeting here would have been obvious. Theme # 5 'community facilities' states that we should "continue the district's role as home for most of the school district and parks and recreation facilities". With no promise of open space in NW South Park like a set back for a park (the depth of the high school property) on High School Road to South Park Loop Rd, West Jackson's neighborhood parks and open space will be overburdened. The plan does mention a 1/8 of a mile setback along South Park Loop Road across from Three Creek to preserve the scenic vistas of that area. That's another slap in the face to the hardworking people of West Jackson. What are we going to do when we want to walk down the South Park Loop path to see the vistas, use our periscopes to see over the ugly berms that will be on both sides of the road like a gigantic half pipe? Again it's scenic vistas for those who can afford it. We do have great parks here in Cottonwood Park but they will be maxed out especially since the Blair Apartments and the new affordable neighborhoods like Ellingwood have only the bare minimum of open space. Parking is already an issue here when families come from outside the neighborhood to use the Range View and Cottonwood Parks. How much more traffic can the "failed" High School Road take, especially if the Tribal Trails connector is built and the major up zoning of South Park occurs. Theme 3 'transportation' states that there needs to be a "balance of needs between the existing neighborhoods of District 12 and the entire community". Where's the balance when all you are doing is tipping the scale of traffic jams from the "y" to High School Road. The comp plan needs to promise that the East West collector road in Northern South Park has to be in place before any new development in South Park takes place and before the Tribal Trails connector is started. Any new neighborhood in South Park should empty on to the new East West collector and not High School Road. The scale of the NW build out should be drastically reduced also. The new draft plan is asking West Jackson to bear a lot of the burden for this plan. Maybe that is why the 'Balanced Community' Theme is dead last for West Jackson. You need to come to West Jackson and walk with us to find out what works and doesn't work here if you are going to use our West Jackson as a role model for "responsible growth". Christine Walker from The Housing Authority walked around the neighborhood with us to see and hear our concerns; perhaps officials and planners could take a field trip. I will supply the coffee and doughnuts. We have some great neighborhoods here in West Jackson and we deserve a lot better then what the present draft plan has to offer us which is basically zip right now.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	density bonuses for single Family Mixed is in conflict with statement that the Southern Hillside district is A Town Stable district.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Gillete, Claudia Interested Public	Neighbors in the Cottonwood Park Subdivisions are concerned with some of the language written to describe our district and our neighborhoods. We find it surprising that of the seven individual themes identified through the process, four of them for district 13 have been defined almost identically. Although we feel strongly that "supporting the existing neighborhood" should be a priority, more weight should be placed on how each theme relates back to its original ideal, principles and how those work within the districts. The use of Neighborhood as singular in the themes of this district is not really what is going on and does not represent this district or others effectively. Each district is made up of varying neighborhoods of sizes, types and uses. The clustering, feathering and linking of neighborhoods makes them relate to each other and causes a district to be unified. We love our neighborhood and how it, with the other neighborhoods in our district, make them a great place to live. The individual designs, community services and circulation create a diverse yet whole district. The high density does leave something to be desired. Less density in our neighborhoods is important; please listen to the concerns and needs of many (older) citizen's, some of whom were born and raised in this valley, (scenic, wildlife, open space/migrant corridors; less crime, infrastructure needs, on and on!) When reading the written text pUblished in the draft plan we have the following comments: 1) Responsible Growth: We hope that the comp plan is using our districts neighborhoods as role models for future developments since we are almost built out. And since we are almost built out, responsible growth should not be District 13's first priority. The only future growth that may take place in our district is School growth which when designed needs to look further into its impact on the existing neighborhoods of our district. The huge Growth proposed in the neighboring District 12 in the NW corner of South Park is unnecessary and detrimental to district 13. The impact on the schools, roads, parks, scenic and natural resources of district 12 is immeasurable. This proposed growth should be scaled back tremendously. Utilizing open, available lots within the town makes more sense. 2} Town as Heart: Continuing to "support" the mixed-use neighborhood is top priority for District 13. The proposed growth of neighboring districts as well as the school district and the impact of the possible Tribal Connector will all affect pro & con, our district's character and attraction for the working families that we are designed for. Proposing more density in the NW corner of district 12 before infilling the town proper does not support this theme. Twisting the theme to state "develop adjacent to" causes more infrastructures to be built instead of using the city roads and utilities already installed. 3) Transportation: Balancing the needs of the community and constructing the Tribal connector detract from our district. Protection of these impacts needs to be first and foremost. In addition, the traffic impact of the High School as well as 5 other schools that are currently serviced through our district and the proposed growth in the NW corner of South Park need to be equally listed. Prior to any new development, the existing problems have to be addressed. The school district needs to be engaged further to reduce the impact students are having on the neighborhood. The missed opportunity of reducing single car use and increase alternate modes of transportation needs further consideration & forethought. Also the lack of small parking areas where county residents can access the amenities and bus stops provided in this district cause damage to personal property. 4) Workforce Housing: District 13 is mainly work force housing already. We are mostly built out and therefore this theme is the least priority. However adding the proposed 1500 units of Work Force housing to the neighboring district 12 creates a concentration of this demographic in one area in the county. Designing pockets of work force housing in other locations in the county is more desirable and creates a more diverse community over all. Any density bonuses should only be granted if, in fact, the work force housing developed by the bonus benefits directly from it. 5) Community Facilities: Future growth of the schools in this area will impact the district as it relates to traffic congestion, parking locations, impervious parking lots, and light pollution in the evenings and on weekends. Teton County Schools need to be looked at as a developer and held to the same standards of protecting existing neighborhoods as part of their future growth. In addition first responders of Fire & EMT should be considered as needing to have a home somewhere in our district especially when considering any future housing to be located in the NW corner of South Park. And finally new developments need to be required to create new parks within their neighborhoods and not tax the existing one found in District 13's. The proposed work on the high school ~stadium" is a bit much in dollars and ~improvements". 6) Wildlife Natural Resources: More and more wildlife is being directed into district 13 due to the growth and fencing/berming along South Park Loop Road which also detracts from our scenic vistas. The potential loss of a scenic corridor to the south due to future development and the blocking of the scenic view to the west is a great deterrent to all who live and travel through this district. Again the people who live and work here should be taken care of before future residents. District 13 should not have to sacrifice (~allowable trade offs for District 13" are the words from the planners) scenic views and wildlife to accommodate future workforce to the South. 7) Balanced Community & Economy: To maintain the existing residential neighborhoods as attractive places to live we should not and need not allow convenience commercial into the proposed housing directly to the south of us in the NW corner of South Park. The Smith's plaza is physically close enough, for both District 13 as well as the NW corner of South Park and it does not make sense economically to compete with a national chain for fuel and groceries.

Date	Name	Comment
5/13/2009	Wemple, Robert Interested Public	Development in the NW corner of South Park should be mitigated so it has no impact on High School Road. I strongly feel there should be a buffer between development and HS road. Growth should be limited as much as possible. I generally agree with comments that were developed by Kathy Tompkins and Rich Bloom., see below.Cottonwood Park District 13Neighbors in the Cottonwood Park Subdivisions are concerned with some of the language written to describe our district and our neighborhoods. We find it surprising that of the seven individual themes identified through the process, four of them for district 13 have been defined almost identically. Although we feel strongly that "supporting the existing neighborhood" should be a priority, more weight should be placed on how each theme relates back to its original Ideal, principals and how those work with in the districts.The use of Neighborhood as singular in the themes of this district is not really what is going on and does not represent this district or others effectively. Each district is made up of varying neighborhoods of sizes, types and uses. The clustering, feathering and linking of neighborhoods makes them relate to each other and cause a district to be unified.We love our neighborhood and how it with the other neighborhoods in our district makes a great place to live. The individual designs, community services and circulation create a diverse yet whole district.When reading the written text published in the draft plan we have the following comments:1) Responsible Growth: We hope that the comp plan is using our districts neighborhoods as roll models for future developments since we are almost built out. And since we are almost built out, responsible growth should not be District 13's first priority. The only future growth that may take place in our district is School growth which when designed needs to look further into its impact on the existing neighborhoods of our district. The huge Growth proposed in the neighboring District 12 in the NW corner of South Park is unnecessary and detrimental to district 13. The impact on the schools, roads, parks, scenic and natural resources of district 12 is immeasurable. This proposed growth should be scaled back tremendously. Utilizing open available lots with in the town makes more sense.2) Town as Heart: Continuing to "support" the mixed-use neighborhood is top priority for District 13. The proposed growth of neighboring districts as well as the school district and the impact of the possible Tribal Connector will all affect pro & con, our districts character and attraction for the working families that we are designed for. Proposing more density in the NW corner of district 12 before infilling the town proper does not support this theme. Twisting the theme to state "develop adjacent to" causes more infrastructures to be built instead of using the city roads and utilities already installed.3) Transportation: Balancing the needs of the community and constructing the Tribal connector detract from our district. Protection of these impacts need to be fist and foremost. In addition, the traffic impact of the High School as well as 5 other school that are currently serviced through our district and the proposed growth in the NW corner of South Park need to be equally listed. Prior to any new development, the existing problems need to be addressed. The school district needs to be engaged further to reduce the impact students are having on the neighborhood. The missed opportunity of reducing single car use and increase alternate modes of transportation is a big mistake. Also the lack of small parking areas where county residents can access the amenities and bus stops provided in this district cause damage to personal property.4) Workforce Housing: District 13 is mainly work force housing already. We are mostly built out and therefore this theme is the least priority. However adding the proposed 1500 units of Work Force housing to the neighboring district 12 creates a concentration of this demographic in one area in the county. Designing pockets of work force housing in other locations in the county is more desirable and creates a more diverse community over all. Any density bonuses should only be granted if in fact the work force housing developed by the bonus benefits directly from it. 5) Community Facilities: Future growth of the schools in this area will impact the district as it relates to traffic congestion, parking locations, impervious parking lots, and light pollution in the evenings and on weekends. Teton County Schools need to be looked at as a developer and held to the same standards of protecting existing neighborhoods as part of their future growth. In addition first responders of Fire & EMT should be considered as needing to have a home some where in our district especially when considering any future housing to be located in the NW corner of South Park. And finally new developments need to be required to create new parks within their neighborhoods and not tax the existing one found in District 13's.6) Wildlife Natural Resources: More and more wild life is being directed into district 13 due to the growth and irrelevant berming along South Park Loop Road which also detracts from our scenic vistas. The potential loss of a scenic corridor to the south due to future development and the blocking of the scenic view to the west is a great determent to all who live and travel through this district. Again the people who live and work here should be taken care of before future residents. District 13 should not have to sacrifice ("allowable trade offs for District 13,Äù are the words from the planners) scenic views and wildlife to accommodate future workforce to the South.7) Balanced Community & Economy: To maintain the existing residential neighborhoods as attractive places to live we can not allow convenience commercial into the proposed housing directly to the south of us in the NW corner of South Park. The Smiths plaza is physically close enough and for both District 13 as well as the NW corner of South Park and it does not make sense economically to compete with a national chain for fuel and groceries.

Date	Name	Comment
5/12/2009	Barney, Bodean Interested Public	I have the following concerns about the South Park Development:1.) 1/8 of a mile (660 ft.) set-backs from South Park Loop Rd. is inadequate. There should be set-backs of at least 1/4 mile from both this road and the High School Road. The only ditch that conveys water from the Leek Ditch over to the Dairy Subdivision (where there are water rights, appears to be the one along the South side of High School Road). Further, why do we care more about keeping this "gateway" (East of Flat Creek)open from development, while congesting the NW side of Flat Creek. Seems that we are giving preference to tourists visiting Jackson Hole at the expense of the folks that live and work here. Why not actually maintain open spaces and "scenic vistas" rather than giving that impression to passing travelers, who would find something very different if they drove just a mile to the West.2.) What about infrastructure? Will connector roads (East/ West) and other roads be in place before they determine how many units will be packed in to this area. What about open space? Rangeview seems to be very well planned and laid out, almost too well, as we get a lot of traffic from folks visiting Rangeview Park from all over town (but especially Blair Place and Ellingwood). As I understand it, the open space in Rangeview was detremined by the # of residents (when you add all of the additional use and potentially even more from the other side of High School Road, this makes me feel like I live in the center of a housing project). I'm concerned that there will be a toilet bowl effect, with Rangeview Park at the center (especially when the Tribal Trails conncetor goes through). Thank you for your time and consideration.

DISTRICT 7: SOUTH HIGHWAY 89

South Highway 89 Comment (4/13/09 - 10/13/11)

Date	Name	Comment
3/24/2011	Ross, Ty Interested Public	The current PC Certified Plan indicates that the Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) will be appended to the plan upon completion of the Themes and Policies. I find this approach completely disheartening, as the FLUP is the primary component of interest to most concerned citizens. I believe the final Comp Plan should be reviewed and approved just as the name implies, in a "Comprehensive" format, rather than the piecemeal approach currently being undertaken. The ramifications of the verbiage within the Themes and Policies cannot be fully evaluated without concurrently reviewing the FLUP. Regarding Themes and Policies, the reviewing body must contemplate the current economic climate and outlook when considering outdated information collected at the outset under brighter conditions. Attracting growth and improving the economy likely garner much more weight now than when this colossal process was first begun FOUR years ago. At this point in time, growth in any respect should be welcomed, but definitely cannot be discouraged or stifled as was outlined in past plans. Just because some properties within the County are not located within or adjacent to designated development nodes does not mean they should be completely discarded when considering future development. The decision makers of the Comp plan should be reminded that only 3% of the entire land mass comprising Teton County is privately held, developable land. It is unnerving that the officials responsible for approval of the plan, which has taken four years to date and will likely require an additional year or two to finally complete (I have heard as many as three additional years), will dictate property uses throughout the entire valley for the next 15 – 20 years. Under the present economic conditions and atmosphere of uncertainty, fluidity in any particular eventual land use from that dictated in the plan should be achievable by some means. If this cannot be provided for, specific nodal development designations should be revisited and include major portions of the Hog Island area. The County is constantly opining the affordable housing problem but refuses to allow or zone for development that could and would alleviate the issue. The concerns of maintaining wide open spaces, acceptable view corridors for tourists, and unlimited migration paths for wildlife of all species far outweigh the pesky dilemma of maintaining a viable, LOCAL work force. The decision makers of the comp plan, and perhaps the public in general, need to be made aware (or reminded?) of the reality that currently exists. Only a smattering of local law enforcement, emergency responders, healthcare providers, teachers, etc are able to reside in the valley. The majority of the active workforce commutes from one of the many satellite communities that actually provide (and actively encourage) affordable housing. Access to this valley from those satellite communities is dependent on two narrow canyon byways and a mountain pass that is regularly closed for maintenance. A minor event such as heavy snowfall (not to mention a much more devastating one such as a major earthquake) could conceivably isolate the entire valley, leaving the area bereft of critical services, potentially during the greatest time of need. The comp plan should be more focused on affordable housing and providing the tools throughout the valley (not in just three or four nodes) to accomplish and actively promote development thereof. I am uncertain how closely the eventual, appended FLUP will resemble the original version depicted in the April 2009 Draft, but would like to offer the following comments regarding District 7 (Hog Island/Game Creek) as portrayed in the April 2009 version: 1. I and other members of my family own significant portions of property in this District. The FLUP that is ultimately adopted will essentially determine the value and worth of our property, and dictate what (if anything) will be allowed to occur on the property. I do not believe that the April 09 Draft proposed use schedule accurately reflects existing conditions or reasonable future land use expectations, especially along portions of the Highway 89 corridor. Many areas slated for Single Family Dispersed classification (which is 100% Residential) is either sandwiched by or directly adjacent to Light Industry property. The configuration of lots and existing uses (which in many cases are not residential at all) indicate that much more property in the area should be classified under Light Industry, or some other use allowing home businesses by right and businesses of all types through a CUP process. Mandating these properties to be 100% residential while they are surrounded by industrial uses of all varieties is indisputably asinine. 2. The Teton County Gravel Study (which also has drug on the last several years) identified the Ross Plateau as a viable gravel extraction location. However, the designation in the April 09 FLUP indicates strictly agricultural use. This is completely contradictory considering the Evans pit and yard are proposed as Light Industry. The decision makers must consider the gravel study during their deliberations, even if the study remains technically incomplete. The status of this study is ambiguous, but my understanding is that final release of the study is being upheld due to ongoing litigation with another landowner mentioned in the study 3. It should be noted that Ross Plateau is one of the rarest properties in the valley, offering expansive development potential while unseen from any public byway. This property could prove to be an invaluable resource to the entire community as; 1) an alternative gravel source 2) an affordable housing location 3) any other positive development contribution ALLOWED OR PRESCRIBED IN THE COMP PLAN, FLUP, AND FINAL LDRs. 4. As implied in 1 above, a new zoning designation needs to be created to accommodate existing configuration and uses in the Hog Island area. A very large percentage of existing residential properties contain either grandfathered, nonconforming uses or businesses allowed through the CUP process. This area epitomizes the actual working class of Teton County. This being the case, the ultimate zoning for most of Hog Island should allow for both residential growth and growth of businesses of all types, including heavy equipment contractors. Under current rules and regulations, the only zone

Date	Name	Comment
		allowing these types of businesses is BP, and even under that zone, a CUP is still required. What is so scary about heavy equipment contractors, especially if their existence is regulated through a CUP? Thanks for considering these comments during your deliberations. Many County residents share these or similar opinions. Unfortunately, most of those that do are busy making a living and are not afforded the valuable time necessary to consistently voice their opinions, as so many other valley residents and organizations are.
3/16/2011	Ross, Dianna Interested Public	I ALSO WOULD LIKE TO ASK THAT THE ROSS PLATEAU BE ZONED FOR THE GRAVEL PIT THAT WE INTEND TO PURSUE.
3/14/2011	Potzernitz, Lisa Interested Public	I am in support of zoning changes for the South Hwy 89/191 area. Because there are a large number of home operated business' along Hwy 89 (that include masonry, construction, electrical, landscape, etc), it only makes sense to change the zoning to allow for this type of use. It will also enable landowners that might have vacant land the possibility of marketing their properties to a larger pool of potential buyers. It is my understanding that there is a huge need for areas to stockpile during construction projects with little to no locations available in Teton County. I fail to see the sense in trucking this material out of county or state when there are viable options available yet unattainable due to a zoning issue. This only increases the cost for the owners and builders and takes money out of Teton County. Due to the lack of options available to landowners currently, changing the use could open avenues previously declined thru the planning process. These changes could include a sit down with county planners to ensure that intended uses are both beneficial to the landowner as well as Teton County. Thank You.
3/10/2011	Ross, Dianna Interested Public	I WOULD LIKE TO LEAVE A COMMENT ABOUT THE FUTURE ZONING FOR OUR PROPERTY SOUTH OF JACKSON. THE PROPERTY LIES BETWEEN COWBOY WAY AND KDC LANE. WE HAVE HAD NUMEROUS OFFERS TO SELL THIS PROPERTY TO CONSTRUCTION RELATED BUSINESSES. WE HAVE TRIED TO GET THIS ZONE CLARIFIED SO THAT THESE BUSINESSES COULD LEGALLY OPERATE THERE. SO FAR NO LUCK, ALTHOUGH THERE ARE 35+ BUSINESSES IN THE IMMEDIATE AREA SURROUNDING THESE PARCELS. MOST ALL OF THESE BUSINESSES ARE OPERATING OUTSIDE THE LEGAL ZONING IN PLACE NOW. THERE SEEMS TO BE A GREAT NEED IN THIS AREA FOR MORE INDUSTRIAL USES. IF THESE ISSUES ARE NOT ADDRESSED, IT WOULD SEEM THAT THESE BUSINESSES WOULD NECESSARILY BE PUT OUT OF BUSINESS IN THE JACKSON HOLE VALLEY AND WOULD BE FORCED TO RELOCATE OUTSIDE OF THE VALLEY, THEREBY INCREASING ROAD AND FUEL USAGE. THIS DOESN'T SEEM TO BE THE BEST ANSWER. I APPRECIATE YOU LOOKING AT THIS PROBLEM.
3/10/2011	Ross, Dianna Interested Public	THE AREA BETWEEN COWBOY AND KDC LANE, 9 MILES SOUTH OF JACKSON, NEEDS AN UPDATED ZONE TO ALLOW CONTRACTOR YARDS AND SIMILAR BUSINESSES TO OPERATE. AT THIS TIME THERE ARE 35+ BUSINESSES OPERATING WITHIN A 1 MILE RADIUS OF THIS PROPERTY, MOST ILLEGAALLY ACCORDING TO CURRENT ZONING, THIS PROPERTY COULD BE USED TO IT'S HIGHEST AND BEST USE IF ZONED FOR INDUSTRIAL USE. THIS ZONE WOULD BE FOR CONSTRUCTION RELATED BUSINESSES, NOT BOX/OFFICES AS SEEN IN VALLEY VIEW.

Date	Name	Comment
3/9/2011	Ross, Dianna Interested Public	WE OWN 13+ LOTS ON HWY 89 BETWEEN WY DOT AND KDC LANE. WE HAVE HAD THIS PROPERTY FOR SALE FOR SEVERAL YEARS AND THE ONLY OFFERS HAVE BEEN FROM BUSINESSES SUCH AS TRASH COMPANIES, CONSTRUCTION COMPANIES, LANDSCAPING, ETC. IN THIS AREA ALONE THERE ARE 35+ DIFFERENT BUSINESSES, MOST OPERATING OUTSIDE THE CURRENT LAND USE PLAN. MANY OF THEM ARE CONSTRUCTION BUSINESSES. WE WOULD LIKE TO PROVIDE A BUSINESS PARK OF SOME KIND FOR THESE BUSINESSES TO LOCATE LEGALLY. SO FAR WE HAVE NOT BEEN ABLE TO ACCOMPLISH THIS G0AL WITH THE PLANNING DIRECTOR AND WOULD LIKE SOME CLARIFICATION ON THE FUTURE LAND USE IN THIS AREA. IF WE CANNOT CREATE A LEGAL ZONE, THEN ALL OF THE ILLEGAL USES LOCATED THERE NOW WOULD BE TERMINATED AND THESE BUSINESSES WOULD HAVE TO FIND A PLACE OUTSIDE THE VALLEY TO RE-OPEN. WE FEEL THAT PROPERTY RIGHTS SHOULD ENTER INTO THE EQUATION SOMEWHERE WHEN TALKING ABOUT FUTURE LAND USES. WE FEEL THAT TETON COUNTY HAS DONE A TAKING ON OUR PROPERTY AS WE CANNOT SELL EVEN THOUGH NO ONE HAS OBJECTED TO OUR PLAN EXCEPT THE PLANNING DIRECTOR. WE HAVE HAD MANY CHANCES TO SELL THIS PROPERTY, WHICH HAS ALWAYS BEEN USED IN CONJUNCTION WITH OUR OWN CONSTRUCTION BUSINESS SINCE 1966, BUT CANNOT BECAUSE THE BUYER WILL NOT BE ALLOWED TO BUILD A CONTRACTOR YARD OR SHOP. THIS PROCESS HAS DRAGGED ON FOR SO LONG THAT MANY OF US ARE BEGINNING TO WONDER IF IT WILL EVER END AND WHEN IT DOES IF WE CAN LIVE WITH THE END PRODUCT. WE DON'T SEEM TO HAVE MUCH ABILITY FOR INPUT AND DIRECTING AN OUTCOME EVEN THOUGH OUR FAMILY IS ONE OF THE FOUNDING FAMILIES IN JACKSON. GUESS WE GET TO PAY NOW FOR NOT SLAMMING THE DOOR SHUT IN THE 1940'S. HERE'S HOPING THAT THIS PROCESS ENDS SOON.
11/12/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Identify Hog Island (highway frontage south of South Park Bridge) as a home business area for light industrial uses by right with sensitivity to the gateway treatment
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that maintaining residential density allowances are important in rural areas to allow for the dedication of conservation easements.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	"Encourage upgrades to this gateway district" is not clear. What upgrades are desired?
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	There is no Resort in this district. Why is there mention of "no additional resort"?

DISTRICT 8: RIVER BOTTOM

River Bottom Comment (4/13/09 - 10/13/11)

Date	Name	Comment
9/17/2009	Wolff, Susan Interested Public	Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the Teton County, Wyoming, Comprehensive Plan update. As stated in the Wyoming Local Sage-Grouse Working Group Charter "The purpose of Local Sage-Grouse Working Groups (LWGs) is to develop and facilitate implementation of local conservation plans for the benefit of sage-grouse, their habitats, and whenever feasible, other species that use sagebrush habitats. The plans will identify management practices and the financial and personnel means to accomplish these practices, within an explicit time frame, for the purpose of improving sage-grouse numbers and precluding the need for listing under the Endangered Species Act." Although our working group area is dominated by public lands and our group's plan (http://gf.state.wy.us/wildlife/wildlife_management/sagegrouse/index.asp) reflects that, Greater Sage-Grouse are directly affected by development and human impacts on private lands and public rights of way in Teton County. In addition, the Jackson Hole population constitutes one of the core sage-grouse populations in Wyoming as designated by the Wyoming Governor's Office. Recommendations: Sage-Grouse Species of Special Concern Based on the comments submitted by the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (June 26, 2009: Tim Fuchs, Regional Wildlife Supervisor and Rob Gipson, Regional Fisheries Supervisor) we request that Greater Sage-Grouse be considered as a species of special concern with subsequent consideration related to: the Natural Resources Overlay (NRO); Indicators and Monitoring of Ecosystem Health; Inclusion of Important Habitat Types, Buffer Areas between Nodes and adjacent NRO Designation; Build Out; Maintain Viable Populations; Dispersed Recreation; and Wildlife Vehicle Collisions. We expect that the Planning Departments and, eventually, the Environmental Commission will work with the Local Sage-Grouse Working Group and the Wyoming Game and Fish Department regarding impacts (initial and cumulative) of development on Greater Sage-Grouse. Development in Critical Habitat Specific development impacts of concern include, but are not necessarily limited to issues related to habitat connectivity and direct mortality. Greater Sage-Grouse are sagebrush obligates although recent research in Teton County has found birds using treed areas for winter shelter even as feeding occurs in the open sagebrush (B. Bedrosian, Craighead Beringia South, unpublished data). Winter habitat should be considered as limiting, and critical winter habitat on private land (e.g., East and West Gros Ventre Buttes) thus requires special consideration during development. Although dependent on sagebrush overall, Sage-Grouse have different seasonal habitat needs for breeding, nesting and brood rearing in addition to crucial winter habitat. Transportation Issues Transportation has significant impacts on habitat connectivity and direct mortality and additional development can be expected to have additional, cumulative impacts on Sage-Grouse. The airport and its surroundings are a critical area for the local Sage-Grouse population because they use the area year-round. Transportation issues include direct mortality (e.g., airplane strikes, vehicles driving to and from the airport and through the Park) and, potentially, disruption of other life-cycle phases (e.g., breeding, nesting and brood rearing). A significant number of Sage-Grouse mortalities resulting from vehicle collisions have occurred recently on HWY 191 and the Gros Ventre road and should be included in data regarding wildlife-vehicle collisions. At a minimum, speed reductions should be enacted on Highway 191 to benefit all wildlife. Development of the new pathway between the Town of Jackson and Grand Teton National Park adds an additional bisection of critical habitat (e.g., the National Elk Refuge and the pastures and cottonwood forests between Highway 191 and Spring Gulch Road) and potential negative impacts due to increased human presence on the landscape. Impacts will need to be monitored and mitigated (e.g., through seasonal and potentially other closures as identified in the Environmental Assessment). Conservation of Open Space Conservation of existing open space could be beneficial to Sage-Grouse on several fronts. Restoration of pasture and hayfields to native sagebrush vegetation could increase habitat connectivity and/or availability. Research ongoing in Grand Teton National Park will contribute to the development of best management practices for such restoration (J. Moeney, Grand Teton National Park, unpublished data). Removal of fencing and/or requirements for wildlife friendly fencing that includes consideration for birds could increase connectivity and reduce potential direct mortality from collision with fencing. Prohibition of man-made or altered water features that permit mosquito breeding will reduce potential direct mortality from West Nile Virus. Effects of Fire on Habitat Development can both increase the risk of fire (e.g., many fires are ignited by humans) and alter the patterns of fire (e.g., buildings in the wildland urban interface (WUI) force fire fighting to focus on saving property). Historically fire would have played an important role in maintaining functional sagebrush habitat over large areas. Currently, however, local sagebrush habitat has become fragmented by human use, and fire has removed areas that historically were important grouse winter range. Protecting key sage grouse habitat is now essential for the survival of the local population. Therefore, current fire management plans need to recognize that some high-value sagebrush areas may need to be aggressively protected from fire even if fire may have been beneficial in the past. That said, creation of defensible space could permanently remove sagebrush habitat, and such development

Date	Name	Comment
		actions must be required to be mitigated (e.g., restore meaningful habitat elsewhere). Summary Development in Teton County, Wyoming, can be expected to affect the local Greater Sage-Grouse population particularly in relation to habitat connectivity and direct mortality. However, development planning through specific consideration in both the Comprehensive Plan and subsequent Land Development Regulations can ensure that the negative effects on Sage-Grouse are minimized and the potential to improve and restore habitat is realized. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions now or in the future.
6/28/2009	Adams, Justin Interested Public	The sewer pipe north of Town is a vector for development that people do not want. State School Lands near Mormon Row can access this pipe. And there is a fair amount of private property along hwy 189 that can go for PRSDs with the sewer pipe because they can build near the highway, access the sewer pipe, and not have to build expensive access roads to their property.And the airport? Is this a deal to accomodate the airport, enabled by the Park?
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that maintaining residential density allowances are important in rural areas to allow for the dedication of conservation easements.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that maintaining residential density allowances are important in rural areas to allow for the dedication of conservation easements.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that local convenience commercial near Golf & Tennis within existing entitlements to reduce trips to town is appropriate.
5/25/2009	Marsh, Susan Interested Public	Wildlife habitat should be the primary concern in this area, as it is winter range for deer, elk, and moose. Working with WYDOT consider a 45-mph speed limit from Horse Creek bridge to where the 40 MPH begins near Hoback Jct. Recognize that the lower Hoback River and the Snake River south of Hoback Junction are now national Recreational Rivers with standards that apply to federal lands. Private land development in these areas should be compatible with the purposes for which the rivers were designated by Congress.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Matthews, Heather Interested Public	I am unable to make detailed comments on the Comp Plan on its website by the end of today, so I hope you will accept these summarized comments. I have lived in Teton County since 1997. I have worked at a dude ranch, in a restaurant, at a vet clinic, for an artist, for a plumbing and building contractor, and for two non-profits in that time. I am very lucky to be a homeowner, to enjoy recreating in this amazing valley, and to be a part of this community. I have come to love and respect what makes Jackson Hole so special- its wildlife, amazing views, clean streams and clean air, and the people. Jackson is so special is because of the balance between all of these things. The Comp Plan, as written right now, does not hold up this balance, and it does not protect those natural resources mentioned, or the community's character and values. This may be unintentional. I hope it is. But I have serious doubts because of a single phrase that I reread and reread in disbelief: "ecosystem preservation and protection does not preclude growth". "Human needs" is mentioned as being the priority. The community spoke its mind in surveys: we want to protect the wildlife and natural resources, manage growth, and provide affordable housing- in that order. I would say that means the ecosystem comes before growth. The Plan would allow an enormous amount of commercial development that would demand a number of employees that we don't have, and to get those employees we would need more affordable housing- I don't see the link in this plan. I also don't see the link of this need for employees to a projected population build-out to transportation needs for that amount of population growth or the affect that would all have on our natural resources. Why isn't a carrying capacity of the ecosystem determined and planned from? Why aren't there ways included in the plan to determine how development allowed by the plan would impact natural resources, housing needs, transportation, infrastructure, etc.? It seems that the Plan only allows for evaluation AFTER development has occurred. Why push the limits, which could cause irreversible damage, instead of erring on the side of caution? I don't see in the Plan how open space will be permanently protected if/when development rights are transferred into nodes. I also see a lack of wildlife protection within nodes- the Plan seems to think wildlife and natural resource values can be dismissed in nodes. The local economy gets attention in the Plan, but not like it did in the 1994 Plan. The 94 Plan recognized that our natural resources, recreational opportunities and our western, small town character are the basis for our local economy. This plan seems to say that our economy is based on growth and development. The 94 Plan showed vision for a sustainable future- for its residents and the ecosystem. I would like to add two specific comments on the Plan here: Hoback Junction- the lack of potable water in the area is not mentioned as a limiting factor in regards to additional housing and commercial development. Please include that. On page 25 you mention in ways to decrease the impact on public lands that we need dog parks. I have worked with PAWS on and off for 10 years, trying to get a dog park in Jackson. So far, we have had no or little support from the town or county, or potential neighbors, to do so. This makes me think there is very little chance of a dog park existing in the valley. And I do see dogs (which will increase in numbers along with an increasing population) as a huge impact on public lands, and on neighbors. Thank you for your consideration, and all of your time that has been dedicated to drafting this plan, to meetings and hearing, and to reading comments. I hope that we can get this plan right for the ecosystem, instead of for developers.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	SR Sporting Club should take workforce housing out of approved development. There should be no expansion of the Resort or its uses. Additional restricted workforce housing is not appropriate at Snake River Sporting Club.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Agree expansion of JHGT is not appropriate.
4/28/2009	Lewis, Rod Interested Public	Comments from conversation at Center for the Arts meeting-unhappy that the Hoback commercial area is now "chipmonk habitat"-got screwed in 1994 when hotel use was prohibited in Hoback commercial area-a Wild and Scenic designation for the Snake will prohibit anything from happening in Hoback-sick and tired of 40 years of the County screwing him-County cares more about wildlife than people-County cannot put a boat ramp on their newly acquired property on the Hoback River-he is going to develop the ugliest thing possible to spite the County-Larry Huhn got so sick of the County that he built 3 crappy houses on Hoback commercial property-can't do anything because of the 150 foot river setback
4/23/2009	Spitzer, Austin Interested Public	I am in agreement with the guidelines listed for district 4. This is an important wildlife area that requires high priority protection.The continuation of the bike path from Moose to the southern end of Grand Teton Park or to town would be deserving of consideration.Also worthy of consideration is the establishment of minimal flow standards for the main channel of the Gros Ventre river to prevent diversion from "drying up" the river each summer and thus damaging the fish population.
4/17/2009	, Interested Public	Do not enlarge the airport. Enforce stricter policy of noise abatement close to airport

Date	Name	Comment
4/15/2009	Friend, William D. Interested Public	Some of the area identified as MultiUse Visitor Orientation should perhaps instead be classified as MultiUse Local Orientation, since portions of this area consist of single family homes occupied year-round by local residents.

DISTRICT 9: COUNTY VALLEY

County Valley Comment (4/13/09 - 10/13/11)

Date	Name	Comment
9/17/2009	Wolff, Susan Interested Public	Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the Teton County, Wyoming, Comprehensive Plan update. As stated in the Wyoming Local Sage-Grouse Working Group Charter "The purpose of Local Sage-Grouse Working Groups (LWGs) is to develop and facilitate implementation of local conservation plans for the benefit of sage-grouse, their habitats, and whenever feasible, other species that use sagebrush habitats. The plans will identify management practices and the financial and personnel means to accomplish these practices, within an explicit time frame, for the purpose of improving sage-grouse numbers and precluding the need for listing under the Endangered Species Act." Although our working group area is dominated by public lands and our group's plan (http://gf.state.wy.us/wildlife/wildlife_management/sagegrouse/index.asp) reflects that, Greater Sage-Grouse are directly affected by development and human impacts on private lands and public rights of way in Teton County. In addition, the Jackson Hole population constitutes one of the core sage-grouse populations in Wyoming as designated by the Wyoming Governor's Office. Recommendations: Sage-Grouse Species of Special Concern Based on the comments submitted by the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (June 26, 2009: Tim Fuchs, Regional Wildlife Supervisor and Rob Gipson, Regional Fisheries Supervisor) we request that Greater Sage-Grouse be considered as a species of special concern with subsequent consideration related to: the Natural Resources Overlay (NRO); Indicators and Monitoring of Ecosystem Health; Inclusion of Important Habitat Types, Buffer Areas between Nodes and adjacent NRO Designation; Build Out; Maintain Viable Populations; Dispersed Recreation; and Wildlife Vehicle Collisions. We expect that the Planning Departments and, eventually, the Environmental Commission will work with the Local Sage-Grouse Working Group and the Wyoming Game and Fish Department regarding impacts (initial and cumulative) of development on Greater Sage-Grouse. Development in Critical Habitat Specific development impacts of concern include, but are not necessarily limited to issues related to habitat connectivity and direct mortality. Greater Sage-Grouse are sagebrush obligates although recent research in Teton County has found birds using treed areas for winter shelter even as feeding occurs in the open sagebrush (B. Bedrosian, Craighead Beringia South, unpublished data). Winter habitat should be considered as limiting, and critical winter habitat on private land (e.g., East and West Gros Ventre Buttes) thus requires special consideration during development. Although dependent on sagebrush overall, Sage-Grouse have different seasonal habitat needs for breeding, nesting and brood rearing in addition to crucial winter habitat. Transportation Issues Transportation has significant impacts on habitat connectivity and direct mortality and additional development can be expected to have additional, cumulative impacts on Sage-Grouse. The airport and its surroundings are a critical area for the local Sage-Grouse population because they use the area year-round. Transportation issues include direct mortality (e.g., airplane strikes, vehicles driving to and from the airport and through the Park) and, potentially, disruption of other life-cycle phases (e.g., breeding, nesting and brood rearing). A significant number of Sage-Grouse mortalities resulting from vehicle collisions have occurred recently on HWY 191 and the Gros Ventre road and should be included in data regarding wildlife-vehicle collisions. At a minimum, speed reductions should be enacted on Highway 191 to benefit all wildlife. Development of the new pathway between the Town of Jackson and Grand Teton National Park adds an additional bisection of critical habitat (e.g., the National Elk Refuge and the pastures and cottonwood forests between Highway 191 and Spring Gulch Road) and potential negative impacts due to increased human presence on the landscape. Impacts will need to be monitored and mitigated (e.g., through seasonal and potentially other closures as identified in the Environmental Assessment). Conservation of Open Space Conservation of existing open space could be beneficial to Sage-Grouse on several fronts. Restoration of pasture and hayfields to native sagebrush vegetation could increase habitat connectivity and/or availability. Research ongoing in Grand Teton National Park will contribute to the development of best management practices for such restoration (J. Moeney, Grand Teton National Park, unpublished data). Removal of fencing and/or requirements for wildlife friendly fencing that includes consideration for birds could increase connectivity and reduce potential direct mortality from collision with fencing. Prohibition of man-made or altered water features that permit mosquito breeding will reduce potential direct mortality from West Nile Virus. Effects of Fire on Habitat Development can both increase the risk of fire (e.g., many fires are ignited by humans) and alter the patterns of fire (e.g., buildings in the wildland urban interface (WUI) force fire fighting to focus on saving property). Historically fire would have played an important role in maintaining functional sagebrush habitat over large areas. Currently, however, local sagebrush habitat has become fragmented by human use, and fire has removed areas that historically were important grouse winter range. Protecting key sage grouse habitat is now essential for the survival of the local population. Therefore, current fire management plans need to recognize that some high-value sagebrush areas may need to be aggressively protected from fire even if fire may have been beneficial in the past. That said, creation of defensible space could permanently remove sagebrush habitat, and such development

Date	Name	Comment
		actions must be required to be mitigated (e.g., restore meaningful habitat elsewhere). Summary Development in Teton County, Wyoming, can be expected to affect the local Greater Sage-Grouse population particularly in relation to habitat connectivity and direct mortality. However, development planning through specific consideration in both the Comprehensive Plan and subsequent Land Development Regulations can ensure that the negative effects on Sage-Grouse are minimized and the potential to improve and restore habitat is realized. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions now or in the future.

Date	Name	Comment
8/21/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	First I would like to say thank you for the time and effort you are putting in to change the comprehensive draft plan to represent the input from the concerned residents of Teton County. Cottonwood Park greatly appreciates what you are doing. I would like to put in writing what I tried to say at the meeting last night. It was a long day and my brain was definitely somewhere else. I read Rich's letter below the other night and liked the changes that were made. Where Rich and I differ is the map he presented and where he represents a new development in the NW corner of South Park. This area should only be developed when infill is complete in town and other developed areas of course. We respect the present base unit development number (around 200 with out any density bonuses which should be done away with, as described in the county planning commissioners recommendations along with doing away with all nodes. The difference is; Residents of Cottonwood park would like to see open space along High School Road set back further to the southern border of the High School property and continue to South Park Loop Road. This area can serve as a wildlife corridor and improve the connectivity of the area. Bringing the fences down will allow the wildlife to pass through Cottonwood Park to South Park with out any of the detours they have to make presently. This should hopefully reduce the nuisance calls that Cottonwood 1 (Corner Creek Lane) makes to game and fish officials about the wildlife that gets backed up in their neighborhood. Yes we do have have wildlife (no bears yet Forrest). Coyote, moose, deer (an eight and a four pointer were feeding on my broccoli stumps in the winter), osprey, etc. We do hear the elk at night in the fall bugling from across the fields to the West. The antelope mate and feed in the fall right across the road in the NW corner of South Park where future homes are planned. The other purpose this open space can serve is as a park for West Jackson and all the schools along High School Road. You have probably heard me mention this before but it is worth mentioning again. Even Kelly Lockhart liked the idea when he came over one morning for coffee and a walk through Range View Park and the immediate area to show him what works and doesn't work here. He loved Range View Park and the way it leads right to High School Road. He said he would like to continue it across the road. Of course we respectively disagreed on the amount of development. I liked his base number development rights without any density bonuses and he liked, well, way too much. The schools could use it for the xcountry running instead of running on the streets and winter cross country ski track loops that can double as a running track in the green months with exercise stations. Outdoor learning facilities for the schools like solar panels that can operate the rest rooms, lights etc. xeriscape areas and native species areas, playgrounds and maybe even a farmers market on the weekend. A parallel road that connects 89 and SPLR on the other side of the park can alleviate the traffic on HSR while using the back entrance to the high school for bus loading and unloading. I would like to see High School Road narrowed using woonerfs; European style traffic calming, no curbs. Instead pavers that delineate the bike and pedestrian paths on both sides of HSR. Covered bus stations like the ones in town. Removable posts that separate vehicular traffic from pedestrians. The posts then can be removed in the winter time for a clean sweep with the plows that don't have to worry about curbs and plowing separate paths. Wildlife friendly snow fence can be put up in the park along HSR to prevent build up of snow drifts on the North side against the long wooden fence that was just replaced because of the weight of the snow on them. They don't last very long there. High School Road should be a campus road that will encourage the use of biking, xcountry skiing and walking and keeping Mom and Dad's car at home because it will be a lot safer for kids who don't have bussing being so close to the schools. I know a lot of the above is too detailed for the comp plan but if you set it up in the plan as a goal, this could happen. Don't get hung up on funding. Like Rich said "there are some deep pockets here that would like to help keep South Park open space for wildlife" which in turn helps our economy and quality of life in 2 the valley. I also respect the landowners' right to build what is allowed them, but you also have to take

Date	Name	Comment
		into consideration the negative impacts on wildlife and landowners across the road in Cottonwood Park that the larger landowners' actions will have. Give me a call and I will gladly show you around. It's a great area. We want to work with you to make it better for wildlife and people who already live here. Kathy Tompkins 734 6211
7/3/2009	Kaplan, Dale and Jay Interested Public	My husband and I have lived in Indian Springs Ranch for 10 years. Before there was a house built in either Indian Trails or Indian Springs, there was a master plan that showed PLAINLY and CLEARLY the road connection to Hwy 22. Anyone who built or bought homes in either community only needed to do their homework before buying; the plan for the road preceded their homes. Now some are screaming that they don't want the road...looking for reasons to stop it. To compound this, there is a major safety issue on 22. The Teton Science School traffic turning towards town and the increased traffic load along 22 are AN ACCIDENT WAITING TO HAPPEN. It wasn't too long ago that someone had to DIE to get a light installed at Spring Gulch. Please don't wait for this to happen at this intersection. EITHER put a light at the intersection of Hwy 22 and the Science School/ISR Entry, or build the master planned connector road.
6/28/2009	Adams, Justin Interested Public	The sewer pipe north of Town is a vector for development that people do not want. State School Lands near Mormon Row can access this pipe. And there is a fair amount of private property along hwy 189 that can go for PRSDs with the sewer pipe because they can build near the highway, access the sewer pipe, and not have to build expensive access roads to their property.And the airport? Is this a deal to accomodate the airport, enabled by the Park?
6/17/2009	, STAG	The consensus of the group was to make improvements to Highway 390 before allowing additional development in this corridor. Further, the group recommended that more specific traffic solutions should be identified in this district.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that local convenience commercial near Golf & Tennis within existing entitlements to reduce trips to town is appropriate.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that maintaining residential density allowances are important in rural areas to allow for the dedication of conservation easements.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that maintaining residential density allowances are important in rural areas to allow for the dedication of conservation easements.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group acknowledged that without more local convenience commercial near the Aspens to reduce trips to town, traffic increases on Hwy 390 will cause additional congestion.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that maintaining residential density allowances are important in rural areas to allow for the dedication of conservation easements.

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	Brooks, Clark Interested Public	Yeah…actually, my number is number two but because I never sat in the front of a classroom, I took number two, but unfortunately no one took number one either. My name is Clark Brooks. I live in the County on Thistle Road. I want to, as the meetings come up and since it's a major driver, is focus your attention on theme #4, which is the housing. And in there it's stated that we want to provide 65 percent of our employees in the County with housing. And I'm…since this is a major driver, I'm going to reach out and grab the third rail here. There are two issues that I'd like to bring up. One is philosophical. Like most people who have moved to the Valley, I spent a lifetime commuting, and I spent over 30 years commuting to various cities as did a lot of my friends in Chicago, New York and LA and San Francisco. And so the idea of there is some sort of inalienable right we have to subsidize housing that's approximate to your point of employment, really, I wonder why we have to do this. The second point I want to make is one that's economic. In this Valley today, you can hardly buy a footprint for a house for less than a half a million dollars. Let's say that you could buy one for two hundred thousand dollars—there is none available like that but let's assume you could—if you put a hundred…if you put a thousand-square-foot house on this, then at $200 a square foot, you're talking $200,000. So, that's talking, for affordable housing, that's talking…the reality is $400,000. If you need, under this Plan, let's say, pick a small number at the housing, employee housing, then you're talking four hundred million dollars. Now, in the paper I don't know if these numbers are right, but if you're talking 2000 employee housing, you're talking eight hundred million dollars. So, I think someone has to look at this and say is this 65 percent number realistic. And I would strongly suggest you ought to start looking at perhaps we provide employee housing on the other side of the Canyon, south of Town, or over the hill.
5/15/2009	Pollock, Gary Grand Teton National P	Mary asked me to send you some info regarding the airport EIS and our thoughts on the Comp Plan. Regarding the comp plan, I had asked Alex Norton several months ago to include some specific language regarding Moose - Wilson Road. Although I am not finished reviewing the current draft, I have not seen the language in the sections where it would make the most sense for it to be. We will be making the same request in our written comments that are due on May 15. The language I suggested is as follows: Transportation strategies will be sensitive to the needs of sulTOunding jurisdictions, induding Grand Teton National Park. In light of the sensitivity of the Moose - Wilson Road to increases in traffic volume, the Town and County will coordinate with the National Park service to ensure that in addressing transportation issues on Wyoming 390, additional transportation-related impacts are not created within the national park.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Huff, Mercedes Interested Public	I am sorry to say that I have waited until now to write this letter, but I have been listening, reading and reviewing in hopes of understanding. However, I feel very strongly that what has been proposed will be very detrimental to Teton County. I'm sure it has been a thankless task to compile all of the information from all of the surveys and meetings, and I appreciate that your team has attempted to do this. But it isn't clear to me how you came up with the suggestions that you did, because I know that I heard very different voices at all of the meetings that I attended – and from people that I spoke with, particularly in Wilson and the Westbank , before this draft came out. Teton County continues to be a special place because of all the hard work that has gone into keeping it that way. I can attest to that first hand, from my 37 years of living In the valley. If this concept of nodes and intense growth is allowed to go forward, we will no longer have the environment that sets us apart. I thought the whole point of the Comprehensive Plan was to avoid going down the same path that Aspen, Vail and Sun Valley did. We are supposed to have learned from their mistakes. I think a question that was asked loud and clear, was "Why do we have to continue with the growth pattern from the 1994 Plan?" I think what we saw in the 1994 plan has begun to be built, and it is no longer just words on paper – it has taken on a dimension, and not one that people want to see built out to its maximum – let alone made larger. I understand that there are basic rights for the landowners, and removing that density would be considered a "taking". But think of all of the landowners who have worked within that Plan and been able to preserve large acreage, and still been able to build what they want on their property. Sending all of the development to these "nodes" is so structured and unnatural! It's hideous to think about! Who will want to come here to see a series of dense, built-out communities? Who will want to live in these dense, built-out communities? I think we should continue to let the large landowners develop their properties according to their rights – not forcing them to transfer or sell their development rights to these nodes. We don't need the commercial and residential growth that has been proposed. Adding so much commercial just creates more work force, which means more services, more schools, more contractors to build the schools – and it's an endless cycle for more growth. Who says we need all of these people to live here? Who says that everyone is entitled to live here? I came here as a 22 year-old, and I took all sorts of jobs to make ends meet. I didn't look to the community to provide affordable housing for me and I didn't feel entitled to stay here. I don't feel that my 20 and 22 year-old daughters are entitled to have affordable housing provided for them. It wasn't easy to make ends meet back in 1972, and it's not easy now – but I think it's all relative. I have always believed that there should be affordable housing – but nothing like the amount which you have proposed. I especially don't think the affordable units need to be owned; I feel that as a community we would be much better off to offer more rentals. There are hundreds of people who want to come to work and play in this valley for a few years, without the commitment of ownership. Seasonal employees don't necessarily want ownership. We have gotten way ahead of ourselves on these numbers. You say that 65% of the work force should be housed in Teton County. I'm sure you have some calculation of how many are currently housed. Have you counted me in that number? I can tell you that I consider myself a fulltime worker, and a lot of people I know are in my position – but I don't think you've considered us as "work force", which may skew your numbers. In addition, there is quite a bit of inventory in today's market that should be considered affordable – and interest rates are affordable. Let's not add hundreds of units in these nodes, We don't have the people to fill all of those units – so let's not encourage the growth that would be necessary to build and fill them! There are so many topics that I would like to address in this plan, but this one letter can't contain it all. I would like to say "ditto" to the insert from the Conservation Alliance, and from a letter written to you by Ernest Labelle, as well as many other Wilson/Westbank residents who are opposed to this enormous density and change of character that you have proposed. I realize how important it is for each of us to continue to go to meetings, talk to each other and talk to all of you – and I'll continue to do that. Thank you for listening!
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	-When do we need to expand sewer? This should be in Theme 7.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Agree expansion of JHGT is not appropriate.

Date	Name	Comment
5/14/2009	Springer, Kim Interested Public	I'd like to comment on the new Draft of the 2009 Comprehensive Plan. It has been a long time (almost one year) since we saw the first draft and there are far too many substantive changes to expect the public to have such a tiny window to comment. This is far too important a Plan to rush through. Please extend the comment period. My greatest concerns are listed below: The Community has placed the protection of wildlife and open space as our highest priority yet this plan does not protect Jackson Hole's irreplaceable wildlife and scenery. There are no tools in place to measure the impacts of the huge potential developments. We need planning tools to ensure that protecting wildlife is the highest priority. What happened to protecting our “Community Character?" As anyone involved in the 1994 plan knows, the community character was paramount in the Plan yet it has been omitted from this Draft. Please include verbiage from the 1994 plan regarding the protection of our rural character. The "Single Family Mixed-Type" classification is too vague. I'm told the need for the new plan is to provide "accountability, predictability, and measurability." The Single Family Mixed Type would allow single family, duplexes, tri-plexs, four-plexs and "convenience retail." What is predictable about a neighborhood with this classification? Sounds like anything goes in a neighborhood With this designation. In east Jackson the 1994 plan would allow an additional 140 new dwellings and the new draft will allow 270 new places including "convenience retail." With a total of less that 1000 existing dwellings in East Jackson now, this is an increase of over 25%, yet the plan calls east Jackson "Town Stable." What does stable mean? It is clearly misleading. The new Draft could more than double the residential and commercial development in the Valley. This would only exacerbate the need for workforce housing. The infrastructure costs are lacking in this Plan. Nodes will drive commercial growth and increase urban sprawl. Zoning should remain as is on the entire West Bank. Animals will not realistically adhere to our zoning boundaries; we are witnessing this with many species such as the bland and grizzly bears. Whose plan is this? I'm told this plan is a synthesis of all the public's input but I have yet to talk to anyone in favor of this plan or find evidence of its support. Realtors, general contractors, students, business owners, etc. are in opposition to the Plan. There are clearly some who will benefit financially from this kind of growth but not many of us. I ask you to slow down, read all the fine print and please listen to the people who care so passionately about this wonderful Valley.
4/23/2009	Spitzer, Austin Interested Public	I am in agreement with the guidelines listed for district 4. This is an important wildlife area that requires high priority protection.The continuation of the bike path from Moose to the southern end of Grand Teton Park or to town would be deserving of consideration.Also worthy of consideration is the establishment of minimal flow standards for the main channel of the Gros Ventre river to prevent diversion from "drying up" the river each summer and thus damaging the fish population.
4/17/2009	McElroy, Glenn Interested Public	The Plan states redesign of Hwy 22 and working to bury the power lines to enhance the scenic beauty. I am in favor of both but I strongly support moving the power lines to below ground. The route proceeding northward on Hwy 22 toward the Tetons provide spectacular views of the mountains and are downright breathtaking as evidenced by the many motorists that pull onto the hwy shoulder, leave their cars, and take photographs. Often motorists will walk to the fence east of the hwy to obtain a view free of the power poles. Often too, motorists will turn onto Pratt Road to obtain a vantage point. Commercial photographers are occasionally seen taking photos of the Tetons from Pratt Road. It would really be nice if a turnout(s) could be included in the redesign of Hwy 22, if only in apron size, to provide a stationary view of the mountains and valley.
4/17/2009	, Interested Public	Do not enlarge the airport. Enforce stricter policy of noise abatement close to airport
4/15/2009	Friend, William D. Interested Public	Some of the area identified as MultiUse Visitor Orientation should perhaps instead be classified as MultiUse Local Orientation, since portions of this area consist of single family homes occupied year-round by local residents.

DISTRICT 10: SOUTH PARK

South Park Comment (4/13/09 - 10/13/11)

Date	Name	Comment
10/7/2011	Lee, Mira Interested Public	Support commercial development for communities south of town e.g. Melody and Rafter J. Retail, services etc.
5/31/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hi everyone, Thought I would point out one of a few concerns I have over some policies in the latest draft. I did submit this for comment to the JHN&G. I have been getting more defensive because it does comes down to Northern South Park in the end. I just don't want it to become a field day. It needs to be fair for people who are already struggling and don't have the time or energy anymore to deal with the future of Northern South Park. Kathy I have been reading through the latest draft of the Teton County Comprehensive Plan and would like the elected to clarify and strengthen a policy so it doesn't open the door to creative interpretations by future planners, developers and town and county elected. In section three, titled "Responsible Growth Management" under Policy 3.1.d: "Cluster nonresidential development in existing locations", it states; "existing county nonresidential uses outside of complete neighborhoods will be encouraged to redevelop in a manner that is more consistent with rural character. The possible exception to this would be the location of additional light industry opportunities that respect wildlife, natural and scenic resources and neighborhood character goals." I understand this is directed toward places like Hog Island where homes and light industry coexist and there is a need to support home businesses. But, I worry that this policy will also lead the way for more light industry along High School Road and around the high school. The comp plan's joint planning commission voted down expanding light industry in and around the schools because of all the congestion and environmental problems it would cause on High School Road and Flat Creek. By Including this statement in the latest draft, "The possible exception to this would be the location of additional light industry opportunities that respect wildlife, natural and scenic resources and neighborhood character goals" the comp plan will give opportunists the opening they need to expand light industry to Northern South Park and degrade the existing neighborhoods and schools in and around High School Road. Whose version of respecting neighborhood goals will be followed? When do neighborhoods have meaningful input on neighborhood goals or is it left up to each individual project of which I thought we were trying to avoid through a well defined comprehensive plan rewrite? We need to error on the side of "no expansion" of light industrial along High School Road and around Jackson Hole High School to ensure that we do preserve and enhance existing neighborhoods through park like open space, and traffic calmed complete streets. This is one of a few ambiguous policies, under the guise of flexibility, in the latest comprehensive plan draft that need to be clarified to prevent Northern South Park from becoming the cure all for Teton County's growth problems.

Date	Name	Comment
5/27/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Below is an updated letter that I submitted to JHN&G for an editorial a couple of weeks. I added a suggestion that you may or may not of heard before from other concerned residents. It could help our goal for a more sustainable economy and environment in Teton County. I believe the latest draft of the comprehensive plan backs away from the commitments of the joint planning commissioner's draft and still has ambiguities to be resolved. I liked the common sense overlay map that was discussed at the "Smart Growth" presentation in the Wort, last night. The example map was for Mizzoula, Montana and helped with practical info that included for example, how far a neighborhood is from a fire house, etc. I think PlanJH.org is going to post the meeting highlights. We need this practical overlay map before we delve into the final FLUP. It might of saved us four years of many comprehensive plan draft revisions. I was a little disapointed that the presentaion didn't touch on housing size and energy conservation in downsizing. It dealt mostly with moving the impacts of supersized homes to town. Have a great Memorial Day weekend! Kathy Dear Elected, I understand that everybody has to make sacrifices when it comes to preserving open space by stripping density from rural areas and shifting density to town and Northern South Park. But shifting “the burdens” of service worker housing needed to maintain large homes in or bordering sensitive areas in the valley, to Northern South Park, will only serve to increase traffic problems and negatively impact wildlife in all areas. We have not seriously considered the 4,000 square foot, supersized gorilla in the room that can still be built in and bordering sensitive areas that Transfer Development Rights don’t capture. “A 2005 article in the Journal of Industrial Ecology showed that a very well-insulated 3,000-square-foot house consumes more energy than a poorly insulated 1,500-square-footer. Building a 25 percent smaller house saves more trees than are saved by using advanced wood-efficient construction techniques. The average U.S. house in the 1970s had 1,500 square feet; by 2006, the typical house was heating and air conditioning almost 2,500 square feet, despite having fewer people living in it. The average home today has three times as much living space per person as in the 1950s.” Many McMansions on the West bank exceed these averages and require many laborers to maintain them. What we need is a combination of a permanent funding source to buy and extinguish development rights and TDRs that do not negatively impact existing neighborhoods in the receiving areas. TDRs also need to be closely monitored and transparent, so as not to allow phantom density transfers from unbuildable rural areas to receiving areas. We also need a long overdue realty check in the form of new responsibilities for want to be Mc Mansion owners. When planning for a more sustainable economy and environment in Teton County, prevention is far cheaper and less complicated than trying to play catch up by containing the negative impacts of McMansions in Northern South Park or other areas of town. The maximum size allowed for Mc Mansions needs to be drastically reduced. One example is to only allow a 2500 square foot house to be built on 35 acres. If the landowner wants to supersize, he or she needs to extinguish development rights on another 35 acres, to add, let’s say, another 1000 sq ft. to the house size. Along with TDRs, this combination will give you a three for one triple win strategy by increasing permanent open space, decreasing the amount of wasted materials and energy needed to build and maintain the McMansions and decreasing the amount of McMansion service workers that would need housing and services in town and any future “greenfield” development in Northern South Park. Transfers of service worker housing to Northern South Park without in place, numbers monitoring, checks and balances, will lead to sprawl southward. It also tempts developers and landowners to push for more light industrial around the schools, over priced convenience stores, low quality, lot line to lot line high density housing, for service workers sacrificing open space for families and schools. The proposed Tribal Trails connector will add to the traffic problems. The increased traffic impacts will pressure existing neighborhood families to increase car use because our roads will be unsafe for children to walk or bike to school. If change does come to Northern South Park, include open space that starts at the West side of the high school and ends at South Park Loop Road. A new, smaller, low carbon foot print neighborhood can be concentrated along the Southern border of the open space or around the high school. The open space can double as a wildlife corridor and learning park for the schools teaching conservation that could include xeriscape practices, solar and wind power generation, native habitat learning center, etc. Include a x-country track for skiers in the winter and runners in summer. Have local produce fairs in the park on summer weekends to help promote locally grown food and the (hopefully future) downtown Vertical Harvest Greenhouse Project. We would love to be able to walk or bike across High School Road to take advantage of these possibilities. Any new neighborhood should have its infrastructure like roads and sewers in place before home building starts. This will keep construction traffic off of High School Road. The infrastructure needed should be paid for by the proposed new development. Gravel pits in Northern South Park should be discouraged. The blowing dust and noise from a gravel pit at the entrance to Jackson, close to neighborhoods and schools is unacceptable. There must be a parallel road South of High School Road (connecting Route 89 and South Park Loop Road) that can drop off and pick up students behind Jackson High School to alleviate traffic on High School Road. The new road must also take the majority of traffic from the proposed Tribal Trails connector if it unfortunately becomes a reality.

Date	Name	Comment
		High School Road should be declared a campus corridor and the school children walking and biking to and from the schools should get top priority. It needs safe, weather protected START bus stops and narrow car lanes with trees, paths and other traffic calming methods to promote a shared campus corridor that slows traffic in favor of pedestrians and bicycle riders. There should be no light industrial added around the schools except for where it already exists on Gregory Lane. There should be no heavy commercial traffic allowed between High School Road at Gregory Lane and South Park Loop Road. Working class family neighborhoods bordering Northern South Park are committed to help cure our growth problems so we can preserve wildlife and open spaces in ALL of Teton County. But we will not suffer the burdens of an urbanized dumping ground shifted from anywhere in the valley, while others continue to build their labor intensive, energy inefficient McMansions. Strong medicine is needed for everyone, especially for those infected with the environmental and economic debilitating disease called Affluenza. (Epidemic of overconsumption)
5/6/2011	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	Planning Staff and Bruce – as you meet next week on the composition of the character maps – plus the associated public process - I wanted to touch on one focused concern: Clearly whether through enhancing the existing PRD tool, new approaches via some form of TDRs or other to be determined mechanisms – there should be both a focus in mapping of density “receiving areas” – as well as “sending areas”. In South Park in particular the initial FLUPs had a very large and non-congruent mapping that was bounded by High School road and South Park Loop road. My concern is that for this area – and similarly for other receiving zones such as Town, Teton Village, Aspens and Wilson – you not paint the entire area with a broad brush which did occur in much of the language and values ranking (e.g. wildlife) in the old FLUPs – especially for my region. In addition, by the plan now committing to work within the overall entailments – more or less – any idea of holding back of any rural areas as potential sending zones in order to have future growth 50 years from now after we have doubled the built environment - is basically off the table. I bring this up as an unspoken assumption was that some of South Park was not to be prioritized for conservation so “as not to tie the hands of future generations” – this is now old thinking that has gone away via the public process to date. So - I expect a large portion of South Park’s rurally zoned areas to be sending areas – especially given the large land owners of Robert Gill and Kelly Lockhart that control both the logical receiving area near Cottonwood Park as well as considerable sending areas themselves – including non-contiguous parcels they control in the Snake River bottomlands near Shooting Iron. If we really want to see transfer of development rights happen - we need to accept this ownership reality and the existence of the PRD tool which certainly can be enhanced – but at least is already in the LDRs. So please consider how to address an area like the current middle/northern South Park FLUP map – either re-divide the maps to address this (brining much of these lands over to the Three Creeks/Indian Springs Ranch map). Alternately consider in an area like the old “middle” South Park FLUP map – that you then will need to indentify stable areas (Rafter J, Melody Ranch, South Park Ranches etc.) – plus areas that should most definitely be consider sending areas e.g. east of Flat Creek to HWY 89, central and southern South Park (Lockhart, Gill, Lucas and Seherr-Thoss) – then a focused character district description of NW South Park as a receiving zone. I just want to make sure the character district mapping for this area not only describes a “density receiving area” – but also represents that it has defined “stable areas” - and other significant “sending areas” (east of Flat creek and in the middle and southern portions) which are not only now zoned rural but the majority are also mapped within the SRO - plus this area is also specifically called out in the 1994 Comp Plan for scenic/agricultural/wildlife protection. The old FLUPs in multiple ways disavowed these embedded qualities (plus known habitat connectivity values) and I want to make sure the new character district maps reaffirm these values along with defining the character of the one portion that is to be a density receiving area. You will have this same issue to varying degrees in the remainder of the receiving zones of Town, Aspens, Wilson and Teton Village – unless you break those zones out separately from the old FLUPs that contained them. Good luck – I would love to give feedback on your chosen approach – and perhaps pull together a small interested group together again – before you simply present a plan to the public in June.

Date	Name	Comment
4/29/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Comp Plan Update - Substantially Responding to Recent Community Concerns [Dates for release of the final draft Plan should have been stated as May 20 instead of April 20 in my update. Sorry for the confusion. - Rich] AS ALWAYS – FEEL FREE TO FORWARD Comprehensive Plan Update I wanted to thank the scores of you that have commented the last several weeks – and the close to 50 citizens who attended the public comment session Wednesday afternoon/evening. The Plan has continued to respond to overwhelming resident feedback and concerns. Although it does not have firm growth caps – the new changes (and clarifications) are a significant and positive response to community concerns. Caveat - given the workshop format and various directions to staff for rewriting – we will not see exactly what was captured via changes until the final draft Plan is released to the public on April 20. After over 30 citizens verbally conveyed their concerns to the joint electeds the previous evening - the electeds yesterday morning did address all recent major issues to varying degrees. I would summarize that the Plan will now include language that does the following in some manner: Directions Issued for Comp Plan Rewrite •The Plan will mention a "desired community size" that is no more than twice what is on the ground today. Given the imbedded entitlements that basically match this number – they have acknowledged by "referencing" this statement in the managing growth theme and/or introduction – that this is the context the community expects the Plan to work within to achieve various community's goals. •There will not be a hard cap either as a total or for any specific density receiving area (northwest South Park, Wilson, Aspens, Teton Village and Town). I would say they are establishing a "soft cap" approach instead based on sensitivity to each density receiving area's unique limits and existing character. •"Character Districts" for all areas of the valley (replacing the future land use maps – FLUPs) will each have buildout ranges – along with descriptive and illustrative explanations of their future design. •Staff is to create a new "Appendix I", which documents the outcomes of the Character District discussion and shows ranges of what may be possible in each district (and in total) and then compare that to the 1994 entitlements. •The addition of a progressive restrictive adaptive growth management process to measure (and respond) as we grow. As outlined in Wednesday's News and Guide newspaper article, this will measure at set growth trigger points, whether we are matching our goals we want to achieve on: oThe mix of development: especially commercial versus residential – and workforce housing units versus second home development. OThe pattern of development: achieving permanent open space in important rural areas (this should include currently unprotected portions of South Park) and seeing development transferred (and/or purchased) via tools that are to be determined - either into various County "nodes" and/or Town itself. •There will be a statement that "measuring cumulative impacts of development on wildlife and natural resources is an important goal for the plan" – "but that the tools to achieve this are still being developed". •Elected officials are to "affirm" the Plan Themes and Policies in June and this summer move into Character District discussions - then adopt the entire document as ONE package. •Elected officials are committed to completing the entire Plan in December 2011 – and staff is to set a schedule to achieve this. Thanks to the Electeds and Staff This has been a long and difficult process – collectively the electeds HAVE responded to a large degree to recent community concerns. Aside from a few unfortunate comments from a small handful of electeds yesterday - that they were responding only to a "vocal minority while a silent majority was not being heard from"…. – in general they respected the concerns and the will of their constituents. Go to the online audio recordings to follow the nuisances of the entire conversation from yesterday morning. You can also listen in on the passionate and thoughtful public comment delivered to the

Date	Name	Comment
		electeds the previous evening. Next Steps Generally you will not see any alerts and/or updates from me for awhile - certainly not until the final draft Plan is released. Unless there are significant issues with the final April 20 draft – be prepared this summer/fall to weigh in on what you want the specific neighborhood you live or work in to look like via the to be determined process in the "Character District" public input process. April 20 – Final draft of Plan's Themes and Policies released – the public and the electeds will then be able to review if all direction/concerns have been addressed sufficiently. June 7 – 5-9PM - Draft Plan Presentation and Review Workshop - includes public comment session. Location – TBD June 29 – 5-9PM – Themes and Policy Plan "Adoption" Public Hearing - includes public comment session. Location – TBD Mid-Summer into Fall – Individual neighborhood Character District map workshops. December 2011 – Final Plan Adoption (including character district maps) and Implementation 2012 and Ongoing – Modifications to Town and County Land Development Regulations (LDRs) to address Plan goals. Supplemental Information •Web link to the Comprehensive plan - http://www.jacksontetonplan.com/ •This includes audio recordings of all sessions, staff reports and meeting presentation materials. Your South Park Neighbor - Rich Bloom, cell weekdays 690-5273 P.S. If you are getting this through forwarding and would like to receive direct emails – just let me know. Our email list is now over 410 neighbor (and County) households strong.

Date	Name	Comment
4/28/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I would like to thank all the people, public and private that worked so hard on the Teton County comprehensive plan to date. After a few years the public has been worn thin by the process as you can tell from the decreasing attendance numbers in our most important final phase of the plan approval. We owe it to the public to implement policies and themes that have been overwhelmingly favored by the public. We want to provide stewardship of wildlife habitat and other environmentally sensitive areas through science back monitoring and permanently preserved open space. Build out should be clearly identified and provide guidance in policy creation. We all live with limits or boundaries. The Comp Plan is intended to put limits on the amount of growth. People surveyed said, to limit growth in the valley was most important. We would like to see an estimate for how much growth is allowed before the Plan is approved. That includes Non-residential square footage and dwelling units. Let's get the bad news up front instead of pawning it off on our children to deal with later when it's too late. Up zoning in perimeter areas is not smart growth. Only allow development in Northern South Park that leaves a small environment damaging footprint. Any development should be preceded by infrastructure including roads, pathways, open space, etc. to reflect and enhance a safe and inviting academic corridor. Up zoning in places like Northern South Park will cause damaging negative impacts to the established neighborhoods and school zones on and around High School Road. It is foolish to think that up zoning won't lead to never ending sprawl. We don't need convenience stores. Again, we do need family safe and bike friendly roads, paths, parks and open spaces to enhance our existing neighborhoods and school zones. Over 70% of the people surveyed said that they would be willing to pay higher taxes to conserve open space and natural areas. Do not rely on any one tool like transfer development rights. The community also needs to weigh in on TDRs and PDRs through community workshops. Performance based tools should be well defined. We can't rely on vague terms such as "it will provide community benefit". When I hear that term and it is not followed up with any actual benefit to the community other than higher tax revenue, then vaguely defined performance based tools serve no purpose except to fuel our addiction of relying on growth to solve our growth problems. TDRs if used must be well defined to prevent transfers that only benefit the money changers. People in proposed receiving areas should be given priority as to what and how much can be added to their neighborhoods to prevent negative impacts. Small property owners in neighborhoods are equally important and valuable to the community as the few large property owners whose property rights seem to get more attention and respect in this process. The Character District Maps are an essential bridge between the Comp Plan and the Land Development Regulations. The Comp Plan should not be approved until the Character District Maps are completed and included in the overall plan. The public needs input into all aspects of the character maps process and how they are incorporated. Character district maps are essential to a complete and enforceable comprehensive plan. The proposal for a growth management plan is a big step in the right direction. We need to monitor commercial growth, not just dwelling units. The trigger for reevaluation should be lower than the proposed 7% to give ourselves more time and tools to do deal with any growth problems that rear its sprawling head. I also have a problem with the 50/50 split. It needs to be lowered in the county to give us an earlier warning signal to take actions to rectify the failure. Predictability is important to the community because we cannot plan for the future if we do not know what we are going to allow to be built. This means we can't shy away from the numbers, indicators, science and actions needed. Don't be vague. Take out the loop holes and confusing doubletalk that people with narrow profit minded agendas can take advantage of. We need to be bold and thorough in order to pioneer a comprehensive plan that succeeds where the 1994 plan failed. If we fail again, there won't be a next time. Post comment meeting remarks...I heard from a couple of people at the public comment portion of JIM 8 that we should be prepared to get pushback from the neighborhoods when the character maps (flup - future land use plan) are dealt with and that the officials need to push through. They sounded sincere in their wants but what are the neighborhoods affected suppose to do, roll over? Don't we have a right to want the best for our neighborhoods? We can work together to create a great comp plan but we also can't ignore the small property owners in the affected neighborhoods, who most of the time bears the most of the cost of what others decide is best for us.

Date	Name	Comment
2/28/2011	LaJeunesse, Debbie Interested Public	To Everyone working on Workforce housing issues in the new comp plan, I'd first like to commend everyone for all the hard work you been doing. Next, I'd like to say how important wildlife issues are to most in our community and that I agree with many of those sentiments. However, I also think that a lot of the folks that already have their little piece of heaven have lost sight of keeping our valley, economy and human residents happy as well, and they are not thinking clearly about where we need to house people, now and in the future. As I look at the Teton County GIS, and those areas already protected by conservation easements (thereby precluding most further development), it leaves very little land available for housing our residents. The most logical place for housing is all the areas between High School Road, west to South Park Loop Road and south to South Park Loop Road. As you know, there are already several dense subdivisions in this section of the valley (South Park Ranches, Melody Ranch and Rafter J). If these areas are allowed to be developed, in the same density and keeping open spaces for animals to migrate, it is the ideal space for housing. It irritates me that NIMBY folks have been able to shut down proposed subdivisions in these areas, when it is a perfect logical place for people to be. I hope that you will zone, plan and regulate this section of the valley to allow greater density. It makes sense for animals, traffic, and in so many other ways. Thanks, Debbie LaJeunesse, 2225 E. Porcupine Road, Jackson, WY 83001 307-739-1461 P.S. I'd perfer if this letter were not printed in the newspaper.

Date	Name	Comment
2/7/2011	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I know you said it was unnecessary to prepare a formal response but as a small homeowner with concerns that official stakeholders might not have,I thought it was important to jot some things down. I think the questions on allowed growth keep popping up so I responded to them also. Could you send my comments on to Bruce and incorporate them into your records. I appreciated being invited to the introduction meeting with Bruce Meighen, but I forgot to submit my comments to him. I have a tough time organizing my thoughts on a normal day so I chose to organize them on paper:) 1.What are the three objectives you would like to accomplish from the Comprehensive Plan update? A."No Net Negative Environmental Impacts; Ideally, this means everyone working together to ensure that wildlife, plants, water, air, soil and the processes that connect them will be better off or at least no worse tomorrow than they are today." (http://www.banff.ca/locals-residents/environment/No_Net_Negative_Environmental_Impact.htm) B. A healthy, energy sustainable, diverse economic mountain community and national park gateway that is not dependent on growth, non renewable energy, and boom and bust industries. C.An enforceable checks and balances system to support objectives A and B. 2.Given that new development will occur in the Town and County based on existing zoning, what are some key opportunities we can achieve with new growth? There are no opportunities we can achieve with new growth unless we resolve the contradictions in the new comp plan draft and create a verifiable predictability that does not deposit phantom densities in selected family neighborhoods that may not benefit from the open space these transfers claim to create. If these issues are left open to interpretation, the only people that will see opportunity and rewards are developers, while established family neighborhoods bear the negative impacts of unchecked dense growth. 3. What must happen for this development to occur in the right way? Verifiable predictability that includes a well researched (not inflated) build out number and permanent open space once created. 4.What is the desired character or vision you would like the Plan to achieve? A.Pride and responsibility that goes along with being the first gateway community to our national parks and live in caretakers of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. B.A desired vision is one that doesn't impart negative impacts on established family neighborhoods in order to satisfy development rights of large property owners. More development equals more traffic which leads to more roads and therefore degradation of established neighborhoods. The proposed Tribal Trails connector's negative effects on the schools adjacent to and near High School Road and the Cottonwood Park neighborhood, in part, to mitigate dense growth in Northern South Park, is one example of satisfying the right of a large property owner to the detriment of a large group of small property owners. 5.Provide several realistic tools and recommendations that would help preserve the character or vision you desire? A.A fully funded, enforceable, ongoing checks and balances system that would make themes one and two a success. B.Public and Private support for programs that encourage sustainable energy programs like JHESP, Slow Food, and Vertical Greenhouse… sharing and gathering helpful info from other mountain communities to further our goals. C.Switch from being dependent on boom and bust economies which include industries like non renewable energy and second homeowner construction (that increases the need for more servicing), to more innovative and sustainable industries like retrofitting existing housing with Net Zero Energy Community ("A net zero-energy community (ZEC) is one that has greatly reduced energy needs through efficiency gains such that the balance of energy for vehicles, thermal, and electrical energy within the community is met by renewable energy."(National Renewable Energy Laboratory)) and Passive House (http://www.passivehouse.us/passiveHouse/PassiveHouseInfo.html) inspired techniques, green career training for our local youth in order to give them an option to stay and contribute to the community in a positive way, regional grown and transported food and goods (Wyoming, Idaho and Utah) and made in Jackson Hole products marketed throughout our intermountain region. 6.A successful Plan is one that : A.Realizes and supports new and healthier ways to sustain and preserve our fragile ecosystem. B.Does not sacrifice the needs of established family neighborhoods that want to foster a safe, healthy place to live and share with wildlife. C.That is simple to understand, and not contradictory.

Date	Name	Comment
2/2/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Public Comment & Participation • Understand folks have already weighed in - we want that comment listened to - not just heard. Do not expect a weary public to offer up much more. The plan should reflect the will of the residents. • Staff versions have not done that to date. • The joint PCs approved Theme 1 & 2 mostly has. I am worried that the improvements in Theme 1 & 2 - and to some degree elsewhere - will be unwound. That is very concerning to the public that has engaged to this point. • Trust is lacking. Community Priorities • Wildlife, natural resources and open space should be the top priority in all parts of the County. Growth • Growth is the elephant in the room. It is not just about where it goes - but how much occurs in total. • The existing (1994) plan states our community's vision is to 'promote economic sustenance that does not depend on population growth.' (p 5) • Growth will occur. Current entitlements are huge - close to doubling of both residential units and job creating commercial space. The plan should work with rearranging that potential to achieve community goals - not pile on "additive growth". • The plan should clearly achieve community goals within, or less then, our reasonable assumed development potential - minus discretionary tools (PUO, PMUO, PR, and PUO-AH). We have termed this as a "least growth" approach to achieving community goals. Pattern of Growth • Impacts of growth are significant off-site through public land use, transportation and other impacts. Improving patterns of growth - only modestly reduces cumulative and off-site impacts. That is why the community is so concerned. The plan should recognize this. • The rub is the community does not want both sprawl and new city centers. The community wants a potential build-out that matches, or is less than, currently where we are reasonably headed. The first plan drafts dramatically over estimated the rural PRO and other tools - then transferred a bunch of "phantom density" to multiple "nodes". • County planning chair Paul Dunker summarized it well in his final comments: "What Staffwound up with, however, was a hypothetical buildout number that included every rural landowner using the PRD to its maximum potential, as well as every landowner with the right to construct an ARUdoing so, and then transferring all ofthis hypothetical development potential into the various nodes designated in the April 2009 draft. " Cost of Growth • All development - commercial and residential - should pay for the full incremental impact it engenders - whether sewer, roads, water, parks or workforce housing. Predictability • Plan and zone for what we want - to avoid getting what we don't want. • No more discretionary floating density tools. Encourage performance based, prescriptive approaches to zoning rather than less predictable tools. • Either Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) maps must be included - or the plan itself will need significant more clarifying language. Achievement of Permanent Open Space • Permanent achievement of open space should be a priority over temporary zoning. • The rural open space clustering tool (PRO) is performance tool based but needs work. Right now - especially the non-contiguous PRO - is the only transfer of development tool we have. South Park - especially within South Park Loop Road (as greater South Park values have been mostly affirmed) • Clearly articulate the entire district as containing important wildlife, connectivity, and scenic values, using language similar to that in the current (1994) comp plan.

Date	Name	Comment
		• Wildlife and Natural Resources should be first priority for the South Park district. • South Park not become a dumping ground for additive growth that no one wants - or needs. • Thoughtful transfer of development of rights could be accommodated - if permanent open space is also achieved
7/1/2010	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Good evening, Rich Bloom, and tonight I am speaking on behalf of some of the South Park neighbor groups that I ?? in the last few weeks. You're going to hear a theme repeated…thank you for all your work by the way and thank you especially to Tony Wall and Barbara Allen for resonating some of my concerns that I have on theme four. I do appreciate that. Likewise, you know, I held back from engaging South Park neighbors until the FLUP maps came back, because that's really where the rubber meets the road. Now I'm wondering whether that was the wrong move. Because I don't think it was your intent. I was at the meeting when you decided to separate the FLUPs and the policies and themes, and then decided to wait and see if the electives would simply change the themes and policies before you put your time and effort, volunteers as you are, in the FLUPs. I do not believe that any of the Planning Commissioners that voted for that intended to have the themes and policies by themselves replace the current Comprehensive Plan. I certainly didn't think that was the deal we made. I know well the current Comp Plan. I've read it through multiple times and I know pretty well this Plan before you and where it is right now cannot replace our current Comprehensive Plan. Until we add the FLUPs or use a substitute for those to have the detail, lesser, we won't have the predictability. And again for those of you that are new to the Planning Commission when some of those decisions were made, it was very clear it was done so you wouldn't have to repeat work by having the electives state a change of course. So, with that, and I guess for integrity of the process, I would hope that you would amend this Resolution to honor bullet number two the Staff put out there, requesting the Joint Planning Commissions be asked that the Future Land-Use Plan or their substitute following approval of the themes and policies by the electives, and that the elected officials wait to adopt the themes and policies as a formal portion of the Plan having it replaced. Or we will be in a quagmire. What will happen is they will be adopted in with no specificity. All of sudden applications will come forward and we'll be in a worse situation than letting the current Comp Plan sit until we get this fully done. Thank you. I know you guys are tired and would like to get this done, but I think this is the proper way to do it, and it's what the community and what I expected. Thank you.
6/17/2010	Thomas, Shirley Interested Public	Hello. My name is Shirley Thomas and I live in Teton County, Melody Ranch. And I just had an idea as I read over the sustainability energy conservation theme. One of the things that came to mind is that maybe we can incentivize people in decreasing the amount of their trash by basing the rate on weight. And I don't know if this is even feasible. You know, I have a bag of trash this big every night, a little tiny bag, because I compost and I do all kinds of things to reduce my weight. So, if everyone knew what I know and could do that, maybe an incentive, as far as what our waste removal would be, our garbage prices, even if it's based on possibly containers, size of containers, or whatever, or a weight on a truck when they lift the bins. I don't know whether that's even feasible, but it's just something to think about to reduce our waste in general. That's it. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
5/27/2010	Paolucci-Rice, Francesc Interested Public	May 27, 2010 Teton County Planning Commission: Paul Dunker, Mark Newcomb, Forrest McCarthy, Tony Wall, Peter Stewart via e-mail to: planningcom@tetonwyo.org Town Planning Commission: Barbara Allen, Paul Nash, Dana Buchwald, Michael Pruett, Ben Read, Jamie Walter via e-mail to: Jeff Noffsinger, Contact Planner: jnoffsinger@ci.jackson.wy.us Board of County Commissioners: Hank Phibbs, Ben Ellis, Andy Schwartz, Leland Christensen, Paul Vogelheim via e-mail to Sandy Birdyshaw, Office Manager: sbirdyshaw@tetonwyo.org Jackson Mayor and Town Council Mark Barron, Mark Obringer, Bob Lenz, Melissa Turley, Greg Miles via e-mail to: Asst. Administrator, Roxanne DeVries Robinson: rrobinson@ci.jackson.wy.us County Planning Director, Jeff Daugherty : jdaugherty@tetonwyo.org Town Planning Director, Tyler Sinclair : tsinclair@ci.jackson.wy.us Regarding: Jackson / Teton County Comprehensive Plan Revision Elimination of Guest Houses / ARUs Dear Commission and Board Members, We are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposal to eliminate guest houses/accessory residential units (which, for simplicity I will refer to below as ARUs) from allowed development in Teton County. We believe ARUs, now each limited to a maximum floor area of 1000 square feet, are important for many permanent residents and second homeowners. We own property in an area generally referred to as South Park Ranches, a development of 2.5 acre tracts, in which there are currently a significant umber of ARUs. (We do not have ARU on our property.) The majority of ARUs in South Park Ranches, as I believe is the case in most areas our community where permanent residents predominate, are utilized as: private living spaces for out-of-town family and friends who come for extended visits; quarters for aging parents; transition or permanent housing for children who could not otherwise afford to live in the valley; housing for caregivers in households with seriously ill family members; and/or living quarters for nannies for single parent households, or for families where both parents have demanding work schedules. For second homeowners, a core segment of our tourist based economy, ARUs serve as an important source of caretaker employee housing, as well as a valued amenity allowing large families and groups of friends to comfortably visit the valley at the same time. The current land development regulations (LDRs), adopted in 1994, did not originally allow the rental of guest houses. However, it is our understanding that one of the factors (along with a concern for creating more options for employee housing) resulting in the Page 2 of 2 May 27, 2010 Letter Re: Jackson / Teton County Comprehensive Plan Revision Elimination of Guest Houses / ARUs LDR amendment that transformed guest houses into ARUs (permitted for rental) was the difficulty of enforcing the non-rental status of guest houses. Removing ARUs or guest houses with non-rental status from allowed uses under the Land Development Regulations would not preclude the development of attached and detached recreation rooms or sleeping areas, which would easily and likely often be converted effectively into guest quarters again resulting in many enforcement and regulation compliance issues. We understand the concern over the growth potential of Teton County, but the goal of providing for smart growth should not be achieved in a manner that creates unnecessary hardships on important segments of the community. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Francesca Paolucci- Rice Richard A. Rice

Date	Name	Comment
4/1/2010	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	Good evening, Rich Bloom, speaking tonight on behalf of South Park neighbors. Theme six, you already have my written comments and I don't really have anything to add, but what I did want to do is just backtrack. You know, in August of 2007 defining the issues and concepts, the Plan's role and this was from the Comp Plan. We're three years into this process. Update and evaluate democratic changes. Evaluate consequences of overall growth—fiscal, environmental, social, infrastructure, transportation and public services. Key issues to be addressed. Model what the County might look like at build-out and consider the implications for infrastructure needs, quality of life and the environment. Transportation needs. Determine whether traffic and construction needs for the future in order to obtain our vision for the Valley. Determine under what conditions the traffic could affect the growth of the community. Fiscal and economic. Evaluate whether the Town can afford the public commitments in the Comprehensive Plan and that revenue is greater or at least equal to the cost of services. And I guess how did we do? You know, I wish I could say this was an April Fool's joke, but we basically failed on all those, except for some modest modeling of a few connections in North Bridge and Spring Gulch. Why is that important? Because then I think we would have seen the economic and the traffic impacts of our decisions instead of that now coming at the end. So, I guess with theme six, the only thing to add to my comments are two. One is, I think Paul Duncker stated it best—we might as well stay at the 50,000-foot level because we don't have any data. We don't have any information to make those decisions about widening and connections and local connectors and bypasses. And second would be Friends of Pathways. Tim Young is here tonight. You have his written comments. You have his verbal comments. It's been our whole argument about why this became a rewrite versus an update. We left behind all the good stuff in the existing transportation chapter. So, I hope you find a way to add that in. As far as the process, and that's why I'm really here tonight, why I stepped back into this meeting. You know, in the last three years, this is a three-year plus process. In that time the economy has gone from growth to collapse to partial rebirth. We've elected a new President. We've debated health care. We actually passed it. You know, we've entered a new decade. As far as, you know, the public is drained and they've checked out. An elective has died in office in that time—God rest Bill. Another elective has become pregnant and given birth at this time. We're in a new election cycle of half of our electives up for election. The Planning Commissioners finally review their new year tonight versus a year ago. Some have changed jobs. Others have gotten pregnant and had children, started new careers. No wonder the public is left behind and then left out. So general suggestions in the remaining process. Do not radically change course, e.g., the nodes and compact centers. The public will only be confirmed of things that are said to me on a weekly or monthly basis at this point, which is this is just like a large development process—it drags on and on and on until the public gives up, doesn't attend, and at the very last moment a change in course. The public isn't there to yell. And it's done. Please don't do that. I know that's not your intent. And it's not your intent to drag this out for a year since this review and three years since the start. Keep the new ideas out when you go back to visit the themes. Focus on whether Staff has gotten your joint votes correct in the new text. Then reconcile the inconsistencies between any themes. Those are two tasks that I think is big enough before you. That's important. Specific suggestions as far as following the Staff Report. Again, public stay tuned on themes one and two and the introduction. And I think we heard them loud and clear. I think the other themes follow from that. So, please don't go back and start changing the prioritization of wildlife and open space, capping development at no more than currently title, removing all nodes except for Town, because those tie into all those other things that were in some of my comments. Release of the remaining themes. With that release of the redline theme copies, the public is going to need four weeks to review that if you're willing to make changes in course. And concurrent with that will be the vision and introduction chapters. Please release all those together so they will see three, four, five, six, seven and eight, plus the introduction and vision. And I understand that could be rewritten to the point it won't be the final final, but let's see those all as a whole if we want to have any hope of trying to get the public to see how we've done. Oral public comment because there's some questions here to remain of no more than 45 minutes at the start of each meeting. Please don't change that routine if you want to invite the public to speak. Vision and introduction again, release it. FLUP maps, these need to be addressed before you pass this on to the electives. The FLUP is about the only thing we ultimately care about at the first-step level as we tie it into the bigger picture, because that's our backyards. As far as how you review those, I would go with the preliminary review by the Town and the County separately and then come back together with the joint finalization. That way you honor the joint process, but you have a little more efficiency of those three choices. Thank you for your time. Let's get this done. Let's get to the FLUP maps and get it to the electives so we can see what they do with it before we get the new member. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
3/24/2010	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	08Theme610-03-24Bloom.pdf Rich Bloom – March 23, 2010 Comprehensive Plan Theme 6 Comments Support for the Friends of Pathways modification on the statement of ideal - especially the last sentence. • "Town of Jackson and Teton County residents and visitors will be able to safely, efficiently, and economically move into, within, and out of the county by a variety of transportation choices that comprise an interconnected, multi-modal system based on conservation of energy, enhancement of public health, and fuels that are clean and renewable. The transportation system will allow for viable populations of all native species, the preservation of natural scenic vistas, and the safe, unimpeded movement of wildlife." Incompleteness in WYDOT Based Model: • Citizens and electeds need the best available information to make sound policy decisions. • As the consultant Carlos Hernandez stated in today's presentation – the modeling done as part of the comp plan "is not the best available tool to determine roadway design." • In particular as consultant Rob Bernstein stated today "you need to determine the improvements to support your proposed growth. This was not done. You need a full traffic analysis based on the full comprehensive plan proposal; you need to indentify the list of improvements to meet the plan's growth objective - including new roadway links, intersection and interchange improvements and additional capacity – e.g. widening of existing roadways." • Rob concluded with "This would have provided the information on your growth choices in how they will affect roadway costs, impacts and their desirability." • Simply we did not get the feedback on what the draft plan meant as far as build-out, effective population and the required transportation improvements to know what our decisions would actually engender. If we had - I think we would have had a much more meaningful discussion on possible growth reduction strategies as we worked through this plan review. Circular Thinking: • Identifying your total growth goal. I believe you will hear that again tonight from the consultants as a start point for what you then must model and plan for. The joint planning commissions have already decided on a slightly different approach. • Absent that then - do the modeling as proposed by the transportation consultants once the draft is accepted but before it becomes law. Otherwise we still will not know the implications of our decisions. Then be willing to revisit our decisions once the public understands the implications of the revised plan. • You will hear there is no silver bullet for transportation solutions – both total growth and pattern of growth are inseparable issues. As Michael Kinsley – growth expert from the Rocky Mountain Institute said when he visited: "Smart growth that is additive growth – can not be called smart!" Revisiting nodal development without discussing how you will achieve the shift in development patters (e.g. TDRs) will not move the plan forward – only backwards. • You need to deal with the build-out and/or cap of growth if you want to reduce the ultimate impacts growth makes on transportation systems. Mitigating impacts only through pattern of development and multi-model approaches is incomplete. We have discussed this at length. • Compact centers (nodes) will likely be revisited as you move into this theme. O Listen to the consultants carefully and do not over estimate the achievable mitigation of compact centers. O Patterns of behavior will still be important. Folks housed in Wilson working in Town or those housed near Cottonwood Park working at the village will only modestly reduce transportation demands. Likewise folks living near Cottonwood Park recreating at the Village, skiing the pass or visiting Grand Teton Park will also not reduce

Date	Name	Comment
		transportation demands. The only sure way to reduce impacts – is to address and reduce the total build-out. Rich Bloom – March 23, 2010 • As I said months ago on why citizens were so reluctant about the nodal concept – why does it seem there are no acceptable receiving areas (Wilson, Aspens, South Park, Teton Village)? O The nodes were additive growth as proposed in the draft plan. O The nodes were much too aggressive in footprint and in total housing numbers. O The nodal approach did not appear to accomplish certain community priorities such as achieving the permanent protection of open space. O The locations were selected in the FLUP maps without first updating the natural and scenic overlay maps (NRO and SRO). • The community may be willing to support the concept of nodes if it is considered WITHIN the following constraints: o Absolutely can not be 'gamed' to achieve additive growth. O That nodes be used to address substitutive growth only – not adding, but rather shifting growth patterns. • Do not revisit nodal development in Theme 6 unless you go back and also resolve the issues on growth caps, on how to incentivize permanent open space if the County PRD tool was removed, a workable Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program, the converting of some commercial to residential zoning, or down zoning significant areas if you intend to upzone any compact centers (nodes). • As I have said before - the Planned Residential Development (PRD) tool does NOT depend on the node concept to work. So nodes as proposed in the plan are not connected to the PRD tool. • In closing relative to greater South Park: o We will already be achieving transportation and other goals without indentifying a new 'expansion area' to Town. It already exists. O Next week the PRD tool will come out of moratorium. On Robert Gill's property as one example – there are 35 acres zoned as Suburban across from Cottonwood Park. At 4 DUA (four dwelling units per acre) this equates to 140 housing units, 25% of which must be Category 1-3 affordable. O In additional Mr. Gill has approximately 1,000 additional acres zoned rural. With the current unmodified PRD tool – 85% of this acreage can be permanently preserved as open space while locating some 257 additional housing units (maximizing the 9/35 clustering incentive) in the most logical location on his two parcels – in northern South Park. Again 25% of these units would be required by law to be category 1-3 affordable workforce housing. O The neighbors are also open to financially assisting Mr. Gill via a land trust to achieve any personal desires he may have to protect the ranch if this is simply too much development. O So why would the community want the proposed 1,500 unit node (more then the entirety of greater South Park to date including Cottonwood Park, Rafter J, Melody Ranch, 3 Creek Ranch, South Park Ranches, Shooting Iron, Indian Springs Ranch, Flat Creek Fishing Club etc.) identified in South Park where zoning could then be selectively changed? O A significant 'node' already de-facto exists via the LDR's and zoning maps that also achieves other community values such protecting open space and wildlife habitat. O South Park WILL push back if needed housing to support growth and jobs on the west bank or north of town are dumped unnecessarily into South Park!

Date	Name	Comment
		O South Park has it own significant documented wildlife, scenic and agricultural values that we intend to achieve protection of as development occurs. That has always been our regional pattern of development. O Please let South Park work with its large land owners, and within the existing zoning and LDR's, to achieve regional open space AND workforce housing – while at the same time achieve smarter patterns of development that better meet the transportation objectives you will be discussing in this theme. We already have the tools in place without the cancerous 1,500 unit South Park NODE returning. Thank you for all the hours you continue to spend on this process – it is appreciated! - Rich Bloom
12/17/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hi, Kathy Tompkins, Cottonwood Park. Again, thank you very much, Larry, on behalf of all of us. I just wanted to make a comment or express concern about the recommendation to expand the Gregory Lane light industrial area next to the schools by transferring the sports fields across the road behind the high school because ??. I just worry that as busy as High School Road is, if we really do need any more light industrial off that road and, you know, complicating matters while the old school is there. And then plus the fact that a lot of other people's wishes on the wish list compounding the problem as far as maybe you should put some industrial behind the school also. I know I was just at a meeting the other day as far as the…I know it wasn't stated as a recommendation, but it does put more of the South Park at the top of the list as far as a place to have a gravel extraction pit. And I'm just worried about all these things coming to light that you're going to create some kind of industrial area that will just choke off Cottonwood altogether. And then in combination with the Indian Trails ??, or whatever you want to call it, so, basically I would think trucks would use that a lot, and then cutting through, you know, Cottonwood and any new development to the south on the northwest part of the Porter Estate. I just think in the future if this all comes to light, you know, all becomes reality, if somehow a gravel pit is proposed and passed because it's at the top of the list, you know, from the guidelines on the gravel pit study, and we get more industrial into Gregory Lane ??. I mean, I would love to see the road improved there. I think that needs it anyway. But I'm just worried about Cottonwood Park, the other neighborhoods and schools, because it means so much, especially Cottonwood Park being on the corner there, that we're just going to be cut off from the rest of the Town as a community and really just separated because of all this industrial that's on everybody's wish list for putting things and squeezing more things in there, so we don't have to put it anywhere else. I know there's a lot of problems as far as trying to find places, but I just think that's the wrong place in light of all these other plans and wishes that everybody wants. I just think again that comes into human wants where it really hard presses the human needs of Cottonwood Park and schools in that area. Thank you very much for listening to me. Have a merry Christmas and a happy new year.
12/3/2009	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	Rich Bloom, and thank you again for all your comments and <<inaudible>>. Just a few comments about theme three. Today I'll make comments about process and I'm sure there will be a discussion on that tonight. And I want to keep these back up to the 50,000-foot level we'd always love to go to, and it has to do with Michael Kinsey from the Rocky Mountain Institute and those discussions. I've been reading some of his papers and all and the idea of smart growth. And I had a conversation with Michael about smart growth works when it's substituted growth, when you're trying to move growth around. But when it falls in the realm of additive growth, when you already have huge potential growth within a community that you can't unwind, then it's not smart growth anymore. And I think we found how problematic that was and I think we had wonderful discussions there. I wish more of the Town Council and the County Commissions were here about transferrable development rights, about the Planned Residential Development tool, the PRD tool, about the discussions between permanent open space and temporary zoning and just how you move those units around. So, as you move into theme three, Town as heart, I think you're going to be looking at some stuff to get at growth within Town, which areas should be maybe have different types of uses or lower intensity, moving those to other more logical locations. But I think there's always a tendency to everything becoming more and more additive because it's so painful to downzone. It's almost as bad of a term as node I guess. And I think that's where nodes and the County came to a rub was great idea but how do we move that around without it being additive. So, that's going to come up within theme three. So, as you have discussions about adding and changing density, make sure it is substitutive growth within Town or from County to Town that is achieving those goals because I think we already know just how much growth we already have, commercial and residential, on our plates to deal with that we can't unwind. And I think that's going to become clearer when the Numbers Group presents. We've been able to quantify some of those numbers and they're pretty scary. They're actually very scary. Then the only other thing would be…really, that's kind of it. I guess as we have these discussions, just go back to that whole idea that Michael Kinsey was talking about that we're not just trying to do ??, that we're not trying to just add things. Why are we doing these things? Are we trying to achieve more vitality or property tax to achieve housing, and make sure we're achieving those goals and we're not just doing ?? versus achieving a goal whatever that goal happens to be. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
11/14/2009	May, Faith Interested Public	Please NO NODES and Open Space and wildlife must be a priority.
11/12/2009	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	Yeah, Rich Bloom, and tonight I am speaking on behalf of South Park neighbors. And Ms. daCosta is right, 45 minutes is still in play because both groups <<inaudible>>. But in a given week, I ?? e-mail ??, or bump into 20, 25 neighbors from this County. In fact last night at 9 p.m. I got a call from ?? via Skype wanting some fact-checking before they submitted their comments their ?? in the Valley. So, ??, so anyway having talked to them again in the last few weeks, I guess I'm frustrated—sorry about that—but it has to do with the Staff's questions and the outlines that you've been working from. They are modified and agreed upon by Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Pruett, as I understand it, but I think you have to recognize some of us here our communication happens with a large segment of the population and the issues that we put forth are not our own but rather their representation of what you've been hearing for a year and a half. So when those do come up and are not on the outline and they get bypassed, I think there's something that could be improved in the process. I guess tonight, again, I was wondering whether I should come, as I imagine many of you have better things to do with our time. You know, I'm missing the entire season of Grey's Anatomy because I don't have TiVo. And I did want to go see Jennifer Lowe <<inaudible>>. But I think when the public does come here, they want to participate. When we're bringing things forward from a wide ?? in the community, we want to make sure it's on the topic at some point in the discussion. So, I hope you'll consider that. And with that in mind, please discuss—it's on your outline—the mix of growth in a bit more detail. You've touched on it. Job creating, commercial growth is considered hand in hand with residential and large homes versus small homes. We touched on local convenience and a few other things, but I think there more detail in the chapter that ??. The cost of growth, again, growth regardless of location or type residential or commercial should pay its full share of direct impacts on workforce housing and constructing social systems. I think you need to go back a little bit on the total amount of growth in the end state because you had some confusing votes. And I think you're very clear what the public at large wants. And if you want, you can include some of these discussions in your community character <<inaudible>>. As far as last week, I think you missed completely Paul Hansen's request. That was a request, whether or not the electeds--?? is here tonight—they do listen to you from time to time. And they take your recommendations to heart. They did that with the environmental group. What was meant there was to try to get it out of your hands and get it to the County Commissioners, frankly. And really the only vote that matters I think are the County Planning Commission's. So, I hope you'll consider passing on or doing a joint vote that you have them start working on that. Jeff Daugherty and I had a brief conversation—you can always correct me—but I asked him what was done a few months ago when they extended the moratorium for six months, which runs out March 31st. And they directed Staff to work on two things as far as text amendments. And those text amendments had to do with the PUDAH and with growth caps, but no direction to Staff to do anything with the PRD tool. So, Staff is not working or reviewing the PRD tool as per a directive of the County Commissioners. It's very unclear if the County Commissioners intend to merely down zone rural areas. I'm unclear on that from what I've been told with the two for 35. I don't see a lot of large landowners in here, but I would be worried. So, please declare a vote tonight to recommend that the County Commissioners that they convene a workshop on the moratorium PRD tool that's going to run out March 31st, that includes all stakeholders, especially the rural landowners, the Land Trust, the conservation groups and the public. So, however you want to do that by process but I think it's critical. And again, Jeff can clarify if I got anything wrong here.
11/12/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	important point and adds to misunderstanding. Perhaps a memo summarizing all errors (these things happen) certainly before this passes on to the electeds. Of course the draft sent along will have the corrections already made I assume? Also it would help if this one memo had the corrections all on one or two pages – in one location – and that be posted to the web site now. Meanwhile with the N&G's help – they can make the correction also next week in the paper. There is a big difference – Proposed NW South Park node (of course the joint PCs have now recommended dropping all nodes – keeping current zoning along with PRD option on Rural) = 8% actual zoned Suburban (92% Rural) versus reported/published 100% zoned Suburban and 210 actual potential units versus 370 reported/published potential units – all via current zoning along with the PRD option on the Rural acreage using the maximum multiplier of 9/35. Remember also the community would also be getting 85% permanent open space on all Rural acreage (92% of the identified node) if the PRD tool is used – and the 4 units per acre on the 35 acres zoned Suburban. Meanwhile 25% of any actualized units would be category 1-3 affordable per the LDRs. The devil is always in the detail.

Date	Name	Comment
10/22/2009	Swope, Linda Interested Public	South Park is NOT the density solution. Our unique character, wildlife and rural entrance into Jackson Hole is treasured. Please help us preserve it!

Date	Name	Comment
10/22/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	I ask that the County nodal development concept be dropped including the 1,500 homes targeted for northern South Park. • Due to last week's votes that recognized the near impossibility of transferring density from rural areas to receiving areas via the TDR tool – then the primary reason for nodes has been removed. • As to the NW South Park node. • Again I will refer you to Bill Schwartz's letter of 9/17/09 representing Robert Gill. • Not only are there significant connectivity and South Park to HWY 89 connector road impediments pointed out in the letter - the Gill family also highlighted their ranching and conservation interests. Please re-read their submitted letter and review the attached maps. • The accompanying maps clearly showed that both the Gill and Lockhart families have their own separate non-contiguous parcels each totaling approximately 700 acres. • Either or both families can move forward, at any time, and ask for an exemption from the present moratorium to cluster development near to the High School via the PRD tool and permanently protect 85% of their non-contiguous and separate family parcels. In addition any housing units created with this tool will still have to meet the 25% Category 1-3 affordable housing requirements. So both open space and housing benefits are achieved. The community would support them with such an application. I would support them even under the 9/35 option. • Do not replace nodes with simple upzoning and downzoning as the only areas with significant possibility are the rural zone and you have already recommended the reduction of the PRD 9/35 multiplier – do not remove any remaining incentive for the creation of permanent open space protection. • As the Land Trust and Brad Mead testified - 90% of the time the PRD tool has been used - it has resulted in no additional housing units – but rather was a private conversation between the land owner, the land trust, their appraiser and the IRS. • The non-contiguous PRD tool needs to remain intact except for a reduction of the upper multiplier of 9/35. • Nodes should NOT be used - and are NOT needed - to achieve workforce housing objectives. • We currently are comfortably above our goal of housing 65% of our workforce and that is improving each month with the recession generated opportunities for more affordable homes and abundant affordable rentals. Just look in the newspaper on the available inventory of affordable housing, increasingly affordable rentals, condos, townhomes as well as single family homes. • Workforce housing is best achieved going forward by "keeping up" as new development occurs. • With 'keeping up' – this is the way to address workforce housing without needing any density incentives. Again then the nodes are not needed. In Theme 2 address the Cost of Growth • Growth, regardless of location or type (residential or commercial), should pay its full share of direct impacts on workforce housing, infrastructure and social systems. • In Theme 4 revise the housing mitigation rates especially on the commercial calculation (both Town and County) that now only is calculated on the seasonal bump in employment – so is wholly under mitigating the commercial workforce housing impacts. • In Theme 4 identify a permanent funding source to correct any past under mitigation issues. Increasing build out and density is an onerous tax in of itself. The community does not need – and does not want - solutions that increase build out and unnecessarily put our other higher community values of wildlife, open space and small town character at risk.

Date	Name	Comment
		• In Theme 2 address the Mix of Growth - that job creating commercial growth is considered hand-in-hand with residential development. • Recommend reducing and/or converting some of the proposed commercial square footage into residential instead. • Revisit the role and effect that ARU's may have. • As to the concern that very large homes in the County also contribute to under mitigated job creation – then consider reducing the upper limit of allowable square footage from 10,000 to 8,000 square feet also in Theme 2. In summary: • Remove all County nodes, including South Park. Let's move forward. • Retain a significant portion of the PRD tool – do not simply downzone the rural county further and upzone certain locations. This would be the worst approach as permanent open space protection (versus temporary zoning) will not be achieved. • Address the costs of growth in Theme 2 – that all future development, regardless of location or type (residential or commercial), should pay its full share of direct impacts on workforce housing, infrastructure and social systems. • Make sure in Theme 2 and in Theme 4 we address commercial mitigation rates. • Address the mix of future growth – discuss and address the balance between job producing commercial and residential. Address the balance between resident housing verses large second homes or possibly problematic ARUs. • Make sure you allow the numbers task force to identify the EFFECTIVE population of current and potential housing units, commercial AND lodging units. Let the task force complete the work on the job creation effects of commercial and also large second homes. o Then address what is not in balance rather then simply going to additive growth via considering density incentive tools applied to possible nodes.
10/21/2009	Parker, Jon Interested Public	Please drop the "node" concept. South Park does not need a high concentration of new homes. It is an important scenic and wildlife area. We need to set an overall growth target rather than looking at each development separately. We should also reevaluate density bonuses.
10/21/2009	Smith, Emily Interested Public	I recommend that the county nodal development concept be dropped including the 1,500 homes targeted for the northern South Park area. Say NO to all county nodes. We do not need nodes to achieve workforce housing objectives. I recommend constraining growth equal to or less than allowed under the current plan minus all discretionary density tools. Nodes are damaging to current neighborhoods.
10/21/2009	Mckay, Rick Interested Public	please, drop the designation of south park for growth specifically and drop the concept of nodes in general. thanks r.m.

Date	Name	Comment
10/15/2009	Sibson, Barry Interested Public	My name is Barry ??, and I hope I'm not too far behind the curve, but I've been gone for a month on grandparent duty. So, I will pick up maybe too far behind. But first, I'd like to thank you all for redirecting this process and getting us back more in line with what I think is a reasonable outlook for the community. I do not, however, with respect to the '94 Plan, I would ask you to look at the amount of commercial that would be permitted within that '94 Plan. In my view, that still is too high. I've been told by planners that it would be something <<inaudible>> square feet of additional commercial space. If one were to use a factor of one employee per 400 square feet, which is actually pretty high if we're moving more toward office space as seems to be occurring, which would be in the 150 to 200 square feet per employee. But using the 400 to be generous, it would say that we…if we built another 1200 or, I mean, two square feet of commercial, we would have approximately 3000 more employees in this County that might, considering double up between employees, that might mean 2000 new homes just for employees. If you put a ratio of three to three and a half people per dwelling unit, that would put us to about 6000 to 7000 more people in the County, just employees. That's almost a doubling of the population of the Town of Jackson at this point in time. So, in my judgment the commercial allowance under the '94 Plan really needs to be reconsidered. With respect to South Park, which is a special interest of mine, the community has spent a lot of its money, the Land Trust has spent a lot of its time to protect the view corridor along Highway 22. It's very appropriate. It seems to me that Highway 89 is just as, if not more, important as an entry to Jackson Hole than Highway 22. So, the view corridor along 89 I think is of utmost importance. And, therefore, I don't think that the growth in employee housing or any other type of housing should be figured all to be in South Park. I think first of all I have no idea what Robert Gill's views are with respect to his future. When I heard that he wants to continue ranching, I would be most happy. But in my judgment the placement of the High School where it is on the south side of High School Road has, excuse me, but already ruined the northern end of South Park. So, it seems to me that development as deep as the high school property is to the south on either side of the High School would not be a tremendous detriment. And if you talk about nodes, that is the South Park node there already. With respect to the balance of the unplatted land in South Park, which is if that great geographic computer system we have is accurate with this, and I know how to use the area calculations, there remains about 1500 acres that is unplatted. In my mind, that area would be a good area to use bonus densities for open space. I think it would be important to keep open space along 89. I think it would be important to keep open space along South Park Loop. And making some calculations, it seems to me that if we were to allow six to one in the remaining areas, with 70 or 80 percent open space, and if there were more density allowed in the depth of the high school property, that the owners, if they wished to develop, could gain what under current procedures they would be allowed, which is nine to one, and therefore they would not have a loss of economic value. So, there are the two points that I would like. I think South Park, I think it's got to develop in some respect but the amount and how I think is the key question. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
10/15/2009	Ankeny, Barbara Interested Public	My name is Barbara ??. <<inaudible>> It is a reminder of the letter that was sent to you approximately a month ago from a lawyer of the northwest corner, a landowner in South Park. And I was hoping that you would take a look at that again and really study it and see what it has to say. It's important. I don't like to speak in public and I'm glad that Franz said a lot of what I was already going to say, so you can just say that Barbara ??. That will save us some time. But I'd like to be more specific of what I want to say. And that is the node that you call the northwest corner of South Park. I know a lot about it. I've lived on High School Road since 1991, and I say on because I live at the corner of High School Road and Ranch View Drive. And I've seen what development in all of South Park have done to this road, in particular High School Road. In 1999 or 2000, the Town decided that we needed a ?? in order to deal with the situation that was happening at High School Road. Jim ??, who <<inaudible>> steering committee for the annexation of South Park attended. I was one of those eight members. At that time Jim ?? of ?? Associates had deemed that High School Road had already met its match, so to speak. But yet South Park development has increased and will increase, obviously, with the node at the northwest corner of South Park. High School Road can't take anymore development. We already know that the Travel Trails Road is going to be the buffer. Eventually, it will happen regardless if anything gets developed in this northwest corner. The traffic on Travel Trails Road will eventually find its way to High School Road. Will eventually find its way, unfortunately, to someone walking on that road can be hit. I, unfortunately, have had the opportunity to repair my fence, which borders High School Road, a number of times because of traffic, traffic sliding off the road and hitting my fence and going through it, and I can only be happy to say that my daughter was not building a snowman on the other side of that fence, or my neighbor's boys. It could have gone through their fence. And this is going to happen again. The ?? are going to increase when the northwest corner of South Park is eventually developed. I know everybody says, but that's the most common-sense place to put development. And just because it's a horizontal surface, doesn't mean that you need to put everything you can on it. Please, when you talk about the northwest corner of South Park, please consider what it's going to do to High School Road. You have multiple owners in South Park. Some want to develop; others do not. You have a connectivity issue with this. There's a strong possibility that you're going to be having high density in the northwest corner of South Park and there's not going to be any way to develop an east/west connector or connector road meeting Highway 89 to South Park Road. Then what? We'd like to see this all in writing before you say how many people and how many units you can put in this corner. Let's not think about how many people. Let's not even think about how many houses. Let's think about how many vehicles this development will entail. All I can say is at this point South Park cannot handle any more development. It's not the way it's set up now. It's not the way that the owners want to do with their…the letter states that one of the owners wants to continue ranching. Unfortunately, this owner is in the middle of South Park. But that's where all the people want to put high density and the development. All I can say is, please, think about High School Road and the students that are on it and the people that live on it. You're going to be affecting all of their lives by what you decide about that corner. Thank you.
10/15/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Good evening everybody. My name is Kathy Tompkins. I live at Cottonwood Park. And again I'd like to express my gratitude for all the hard work you guys are doing and keep up the good work. We need to revisit the idea of using South Park as a node. We need to say no to nodes altogether and provide homes in the already-developed areas that produce the need for housing which would be in Town and the Village. Using South Park as a receiving area for phantom density from Alta, Buffalo and other outlying areas is unfair to the residents of West Jackson and especially around High School Road. We get nothing in return except more growth and traffic problems. This does not solve the traffic problems; it only makes them worse. Any new residents from the dense node north of South Park on High School Road will still need to travel to get to their jobs in Town and at the Village. This will only exacerbate the problems on High School Road and at the Y intersection. Housing should be placed where the jobs are generated. We cannot create more and better communities and open up South Park to developers. We need to address the growth problem driven by commercial and unneeded residential development and resist loopholes such as density bonus tools. Keep the present development rights base number or even lower them. And South Park must be taken out of the development ?? or the human-wants frenzy will never end. We need to take care of the residents we have, not the unforeseen transient residents created by commercial and unneeded residential development. Please let us be heard and respected. To say we have it wrong is wrong. There will be no chance of saving South Park and ultimately the Valley if you don't take big and sweeping action now. Baby steps won't do. This is not about neighborhood against neighborhood. It is about wildlife and open spaces competing with uncapped and excessive growth. We need to think human needs versus human wants and not naively or smartly lump the two together on meeting human needs. Human wants has no room for wildlife and open spaces. Human needs includes protection of all wildlife, open spaces and family neighborhoods, not just a selected and lucky few. This in turn creates a model scenic and healthy gateway community that we can all be proud of far into our children's and their children's future. Thanks.

Date	Name	Comment
10/15/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Rich Bloom. Thanks again for all your comments. The idea of nodes again are really just tied to the pattern of growth issue and about the transfer of development rights and about unit-to-unit transfers. Yet, the danger of nodes and why I think at this point in this conversation we should just say no to all county nodes period. If you feel the TDR is not going to work, then the only thing that will occur is the simple up zoning of an area and some temporary down zoning in other areas. If you were to do that in the northwest corner, then you're going to disincentivize the ?? potential of the 1800 units in Town by having a new subdivision across the street. We certainly don't need nodes other than for the TDR. If you decide the TDR does not work, the nodal concept falls away. You have an operative as PRDs, which is to achieve a lot of the transfers that we want. As far as workforce housing, we're at 70 percent of the workforce living here right now ??. We have mitigation rates that have been put into place leaving residential at 25 percent. If we would only address the commercial mitigation rates as we go forward with development paying its own way for both infrastructure and workforce housing, we'll be fine. With a little bit of money when we come to that statute in the theme to fund some of the retirement issues will go into solving those problems plus the creativity in Town. South Park, if you read the letter that Bill Schwartz delivered on behalf of Robert Gill, the node that was identified now lies three quarters on Robert Gill's land. He seems to tell Ralph he has a very different interest. He wants to ??. Perhaps it will work in the County but more importantly to keep it open space and agriculture. That's being listened to by those well-to-do neighbors around there and the Land Trust as far as potential. He points out in the letter again <<inaudible>> an east/west connector is very problematic. Then you may not be able to consider that. Simply, do not go to these nodes where they're simple up zones not tied to the TDR, or it will be additive growth, absolutely. Last is the Task Force numbers, the Task Force, you address that tonight, Staff was asked to come up with numbers on the existing baseline housing and commercial and where that would take us in population job creation. A memo was sent out two days ago to invite everybody from the existing Task Force to participate but excluded the Alliance and invited Tim O'Donoghue from the ??. I'm fine with having Tim on that, but I don't know…I don't have a clue why the Alliance was excluded from the Task Force to generate those numbers. Those two, Paul Hansen, who would probably delegate Kristy Bruner, should be invited back on the Task Force, along with Hal Hutchinson, Armond Acri, Mike Whitcomb, and Scott Pearson, who were invited on this new one. So, I hope that's an oversight. I've asked Alex directly about why the Alliance was dropped, as they…me as a citizen in the Valley tend to believe whatever the Alliance produces, it has a higher level of credibility than sometimes what the Staff delivers, so I'd like to see them involved. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
10/15/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	WE NEED TO RESIST THE IDEA OF USING SOUTH PARK AS A NODE. WE NEED TO SAY NO TO NODES ALL TOGETHER AND PROVIDE HOMES IN THE ALREADY DEVELOPED AREAS THAT PRODUCE THE NEED FOR HOUSING WHICH WOULD BE IN TOWN AND THE VILLAGE. USING SOUTH PARK AS A RECEIVING AREA FOR PHANTOM DENSITY FROM ALTA, BUFFALO AND OTHER OUTLYING AREAS IS UNFAIR TO THE RESIDENTS OF WEST JACKSON AND ESPECIALLY AROUND HIGH SCHOOL ROAD. WE GET NOTHING IN RETURN EXCEPT MORE GROWTH AND TRAFFIC PROBLEMS. THIS DOES NOT SOLVE THE TRAFFIC PROBLEMS! IT WILL ONLY MAKE THEM WORSE! ANY NEW RESIDENTS FROM A DENSE NODE IN NORTHERN SOUTH PARK ON HIGH SCHOOL ROAD WILL STILL NEED TO TRAVEL TO GET TO THEIR JOBS IN TOWN AND THE VILLAGE. THIS WILL ONLY EXACERBATE THE PROBLEMS ON HIGH SCHOOL ROAD AND AT THE Y INTERSECTION. HOUSING SHOULD BE PLACED WHERE THE JOBS ARE GENERATED! WE CAN NOT CREATE MORE BEDROOM COMMUNITIES AND OPEN UP SOUTH PARK TO DEVELOPERS. WE NEED TO ADDRESS THE GROWTH PROBLEM DRIVEN BY COMMERCIAL AND UNNEEDED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND RESIST LOOP HOLE INFESTED DENSITY BONUS TOOLS. KEEP THE PRESENT DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS BASE NUMBER OR EVEN LOWER THEM AND SOUTH PARK MUST BE TAKEN OUT OF THE DEVELOPMENT SHELL GAME OR THE HUMAN WANTS FRENZY WILL NEVER END! WE NEED TO TAKE CARE OF THE RESIDENTS WE HAVE; NOT THE UNFORESEEN TRANSIENT RESIDENTS CREATED BY COMMERCIAL AND UNNEEDED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT. PLEASE LET US BE HEARD AND RESPECTED. TO SAY WE HAVE IT WRONG IS PUTTING YOUR HEAD IN THE SAND. THERE WILL BE NO CHANCE OF SAVING SOUTH PARK AND ULTIMATELY THE VALLEY IF YOU DON'T TAKE BIG AND SWEEPING ACTION NOW. BABY STEPS WON’T DO. THIS IS NOT ABOUT NEIGHBORHOOD AGAINST NEIGHBORHOOD. IT IS ABOUT WILDLIFE AND OPEN SPACES COMPETING WITH UNCAPPED AND EXCESSIVE GROWTH. WE NEED TO THINK HUMAN NEEDS VS. HUMAN WANTS AND NOT NAIVELY LUMP THE TWO TOGETHER UNDER HUMAN NEEDS. HUMAN WANTS HAS NO ROOM FOR WILDLIFE AND OPEN SPACES. HUMAN NEEDS INCLUDES PROTECTION OF ALL WILDLIFE, OPEN SPACES AND FAMILY NEIGHBORHOODS NOT JUST FOR A SELECTED AND LUCKY FEW. THIS IN TURN CREATES A MODEL SCENIC AND HEALTHY GATEWAY COMMUNITY THAT WE ALL CAN BE PROUD OF, FAR INTO OUR CHILDREN'S AND THEIR CHILDREN'S FUTURE!
9/25/2009	Smith, Margaret E. Cree Interested Public	Please amend Theme 1 in the plan to recognize and reaffirm the wildlife, connectivity, scenic and agricultural values in the greater South Park region. Every day I see sand hill cranes, eagles, ospreys, hawks and many other birds that are living in this corridor. Also there are lots of elk, foxes, cows, horses, occasional moose and pronghorn antelope. There are beautiful vistas, and it would be a crime to turn this scenic area into a congested housing project. High density is what we would like to avoid. Please think of all the schools that are already here and the traffic we currently have.

Date	Name	Comment
9/17/2009	Schwartz, William P. Interested Public	The Porter Trust ranch properties have been the subject of a great deal of public discussion over the years and they continue to be a large part of the ongoing debate over the shape and scope of future development in Teton County. As revisions to the comprehensive plan move forward, it is important that public officials and others involved in the planning effort understand recent changes concerning the Porter Trust and the ownership of the Porter Trust ranch lands. As the attorney for Robert Gill, I am writing on his behalf to inform you of those changes. Robert Bruce Porter established the Porter Trust in 1960 for the initial benefit of his daughters, Jeannine Porter Gill and Roberta Porter, and upon their death, for the benefit of his grandchildren. Under the terms established by Mr. Porter, upon the death of his children, all remaining trust assets were to be distributed equally to his grandchildren. Jeannine Porter Gill and Roberta Porter are now both deceased, leaving Robert Gill and his sister, Elizabeth Lockhart as the only surviving grandchildren of Mr. Porter and the sole beneficiaries of the Porter Trust. As directed by the terms of the Porter Trust, Robert Gill and Elizabeth Lockhart have been engaged for sometime in the process of dividing the trust assets in equal shares between them. Those assets include the Porter Trust's interests in the "upper" and "lower" ranch properties located in the South Park area. Although the ranch properties have not yet been completely transferred, the division of the ranch properties has been determined and the transfer documents are in the process of being prepared. I expect that the transfer process will be largely complete within the next month. I am enclosing for your reference two maps which depict the pending division of the "upper" and "lower" ranch properties. As can be seen in the maps, the western side of the "upper" ranch and the southern portion of the "lower" ranch will be conveyed to Robert Gill or his designees; the eastern side of the "upper" ranch and the northern part of the "lower" ranch will be conveyed to Elizabeth Lockhart or her designees. The pending conveyance of ownership of the Porter Trust ranch lands to two separate families represents a changed reality that should be taken into account as the planning process moves forward. Among other things, the separate ownership could have important implications on planning for interconnectivity between the ranch parcels, other parcels and public roadways, as well as the future location of density, open space, and public facilities. For his part, Robert Gill presently intends to continue the family ranching business on the property distributed to him for as long as he can, recognizing the challenges created by the division of the ranch lands as well as surrounding development. He is mindful that the planning process will no doubt result in decisions that will impact the uses he and his family can make of their ranch properties. Nevertheless, he does not feel he has the expertise to represent the interests of his family in the planning process without assistance. For that reason, Robert has asked Jim Verdone and me to monitor and advise him in the planning process. You should feel free to contact either of us as questions arise regarding the properties to be distributed him. In closing, at this time of transition for the Porter Trust, it only seems right to recognize its remarkable stewardship of the South Park ranches. The Jackson Hole Hereford Ranch has operated continuously on the land for approximately 70 years. While surrounding lands have undergone significant development, the Porter Trust ranches have remained open and largely unchanged for generations. But for the longstanding dedication to ranching and agriculture of Bruce Porter and his descendants, the public would have considerably fewer planning options to debate going forward. Robert Gill is pleased that he will be able to continue the ranching legacy and traditions of the Jackson Hole Hereford Ranch on his property. At the same time, he recognizes the public significance of his family's property and is willing to work with the community to address the needs of working families and other individuals who make Jackson Hole such a remarkable place.

Date	Name	Comment
9/10/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	Recommendation #54 – Strongly support - "Throughout Theme 1 do not limit wildlife protection policies to implementation only in the Natural Resource Overlay" Recommendation #71 – "Leave Policy 1.1.c as is" (Conserve large, contiguous, and open spaces) • Recommend improving Policy 1.1.c: at a minimum to add "connectivity between NRO areas" so it recognizes your recommendation #54. Specifically suggest rewriting/adding: o "Additional efforts are critically important to preserve open space that either lie within or provide connectivity between portions of the Natural Resource Overlay." • STAG recommended: "The group agreed that connectivity of open space is important. Further explanation of what open space means and the importance of connectivity should be incorporated into this theme." Recommendation #93 – Strongly support – thank you for putting South Park back in this policy: "The County will support efforts of landowners and land trusts to permanently conserve intact parcels of land throughout the County." • Suggest also encouraging other permanent open space protection, regardless of size, initiated by landowners and/or land trusts. • Teton Science Schools specific example of 3.5 acre Cody Creek. Tonight's discussion: Conclusion of Theme 1: Recommendation - Making Open Space it's Own Principle – • STAG recommended: "The group thought more emphasis should be placed on obtaining conservation easements to protect natural resources and open space by inserting it as its own principle." • STAG further recommended: "The group agreed that connectivity of open space is important. Further explanation of what open space means and the importance of connectivity should be incorporated into this theme." • Have staff add a principal that consolidates open space policies in 1.1, 1.5 and 1.6 o The 1994 Plan focuses on the protection of open spaces for three primary functions: scenic preservation, agriculture and wildlife habitat protection o Expand with language from 1994 Comp Plan language related to Open Space. Recommendation - Adding an Open Space Funding Goal – • May 14, 2009 - The Jackson Hole Land Trust recommended: "Creation of a permanent funding mechanism, such as proposed for affordable housing and transportation (both important but neither at the top of the list of goals for either the Plan or the community for the purchase of conservation easements…" • Add a policy under this new Open Space Principle (or in 1.1, 1.5 or 1.6) similar to other language from this draft used in the transportation and housing themes: o Policy: establish a permanent funding source for open space acquisition. o Strategy: Dedicate a seventh cent sales tax, additional mil property tax, or other funding source to the acquisition of permanent open space. • Taxing ourselves first for the acquisition of Open Space will leverage the enormous philanthropic potential that exists in this valley. o Personally TSS fundraising experience – "always start the big asks with the bake sale" • In the end - any and all funding strategies will take a public vote by the electorate to implement. Let the public decide to tax themselves to achieve

Date	Name	Comment
		broad community goals.
9/8/2009	Prayzich, Elise Interested Public	Thank you so much for changing the wording in 1.6(a) to read ... “support efforts of landowners and land trusts to permanently conserve large intact parcels of land throughout Teton County.” We are impressed with your willingness to incorporate this information, received during public comment, into the revised Comp Plan! We look fwd to when the document is completed and sent to our Mayor and Council and the County Commissioners for final adoption, that they will follow the joint planning commission’s recommendation and not unwind this statement affirming South Park’s value - and value of all large, open parcels. Again, thank you for your tireless work to get the planning document for the Town and County right - instead of quickly done!!
9/6/2009	Jerger, Karen Interested Public	"Dear Commissioners: I attended the Comp. Plan meeting on 9/3, and want you to know that I appreciated your attention to public comment, and the discussion that followed. I was pleased with your decision to leave out specific area references when acknowledging the importance of open space, scenic vistas, agricultural activity, and wildlife habitat and travel corridors. This was a better solution than the initial proposal to re-insert South Park into the text. Thanks again for all of the thought and work that you are putting into this important effort. Sincerely, Karen Jerger"
9/3/2009	Jerger, Karen Interested Public	I am looking forward to attending your meeting tonight, but do not plan to speak unless I feel that something is being left out of the conversation about South Park. My main concern is that the proposed plan disregards the important scenic, agricultural, and wildlife attributes of the South Park Area. These qualities are recognized in the previous (current) plan, and should not be ignored in the new plan. I have lived in the Rafter J subdivision for 21 years. There have been alot of changes in the areas south of us over that time. I do not see that the current plan has deterred thoughtfully planned growth. But without formally recognizing the importance of open space and connectivity for wildlife, developers/planners have little incentive to consider the significant impacts of their proposals. We need to continue to publicly state in our Comp. Plan that South Park has qualities that are to be (at the very least) carefully considered and creatively addressed. Thank you for your consideration. Please do the right thing by maintaining the descriptions and protections already provided in the 1994 Plan.
9/3/2009	Heileson, Marv and Juli Interested Public	We sincerely hope the two commissions will respond to the views expressed by the public and amend the Plan to preserve the scenic, wilflife and historical/agricultural values of South Park. The current Plan recognizes the importance of South Park to the overall environment of Jackson Hole, and no compelling reasons have been estalished why this should change -- in fact just the opposite. The visitors and residents of the valley, and certainly the wildlife dependent on it, recognize that the Park, the town and all the surrounding neighborhoods are part of a unified ecosystem and scenic landscape. Please modify Theme 1 and Policy 1.6 accordingly. Present and future generations will be eternally grateful to you.
9/3/2009	Harger, Don Interested Public	In your discussions on our new Comprehensive Plan, please keep in mind what makes our area so special: wildlife, open space and the uncrowded feeling of a small, connected community! Most communities with these values lose them within a generation because of growth pressures and an absence of sound long-range planning. As you are well aware, our resources are not inexhaustable and can disappear in the relative blink of an eye.Breckenridge, Aspen and Vale are excellent examples of what can happen to our special valley. Elk Ridge, North Carolina no longer has elk and the last sighting of a grizzly bear in the Los Angeles area was in 1903.

Date	Name	Comment
9/3/2009	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	Previous straw votes: Recommendation #54 – We strongly support - "Throughout Theme 1 do not limit wildlife protection policies to implementation only in the Natural Resource Overlay" Recommendation #71 – "Leave Policy 1.1.c as is" (Conserve large, contiguous, and open spaces) • We recommend improving Policy 1.1.c: at a minimum to add "connectivity between NRO areas" so it recognizes your recommendation #54. Specifically we suggest rewriting/adding: o "Additional efforts are critically important to preserve open space that either lie within or provide connectivity between portions of the Natural Resource Overlay." • Further we suggest the following changes to Policy 1.1c (Conserve large, contiguous, and connected open spaces) to recognize you recommendation # 54. o "Large and contiguous open spaces of habitat are the most valuable to wildlife because they protect connectivity between crucial areas, enable migration and reduce human conflict. Private efforts have been successful in permanently preserving such some of these strategic lands. Continued public, private and cooperative efforts are critical to conserving open space, particularly with the Natural Resource Overlay. Continued public, private and cooperative open space acquisition efforts for the purposes of wildlife protection, scenic vistas preservation and agriculture, should be encouraged. Additional efforts are critically important to preserve open space that either lie within or provide connectivity between portions of the Natural Resource Overlay." Tonight's discussion: Open Space Conservation Strategies, South Park: • This plan must encourage the continued acquisition of permanent conservation of large, contiguous open spaces in order to uphold the community's top priorities of both wildlife and open space. Open space conservation, for the purposes of wildlife protection, scenic vistas preservation and agriculture, should be encouraged and not be limited to the narrowly defined NRO. The 1994 Plan focused on the protection of open spaces for three primary functions: scenic preservation, agriculture and wildlife habitat protection. • Expand with language from 1994 Comp Plan language related to Open Space. Policy 1.6.a: Conserve agricultural lands and agriculture throughout Teton County: "The County will support efforts of landowners and land trusts to permanently conserve large intact parcels of land and to continue farming in South Park, Alta, Buffalo Valley, the Gros Ventre area, Spring Gulch, and south Fall Creek Road." • Add South Park to this list. o South Park is first on the list in the section of our current legally binding 1994 Comp Plan. The new language inadvertently strips South Park of such protection, implying that the entirety of the South Park district does not deserve conservation and directly unwinding the protection in our existing plan. Whether a node is or is not included on one very small portion of the South Park region – as in the 1994 plan, the greater South Park area should be prioritized for conservation. • Expand in this section Principle 1.6 (Conserve remaining agricultural resources), under Principle 1.5 (Maintain the scenic resources of the area), and under Principle 1.1 – (Maintain healthy populations of all native species) by utilizing some form of the 1994 Plan expanded language which focuses on the protection of open spaces for three primary functions: wildlife protection, scenic vistas preservation and agriculture. o Recommended using some form of the following language from our current 1994 plan within Principles 1.1, 1.5 and 1.6: "These are lands on which ranching should continue, wildlife habitat preserved, and the visual qualities of scenic vistas protected. These areas should be kept free of development to the maximum extent possible to help preserve rural character, critical wildlife habitat and important image-setting scenic vistas and river corridors, and to encourage the continuation of ranching and other types of traditional agriculture as a vital part of the

Date	Name	Comment
		community's character. The County should encourage the preservation of the rural character, critical wildlife habitat and important image-setting scenic vistas and corridors, and encourage the continuation of ranching and other types of traditional agriculture as a vital part of the community character. Where possible, the County should be flexible with its development regulations as an encouragement to landowners to permanently protect these wildlife, scenic and agricultural areas. In addition, where nonregulatory options are available, these should be encouraged."
9/3/2009	Creel, Margaret Interested Public	Margaret Creel. I live in Rafter J, and some of you in the room know me and some don't. I've been very outspoken over the years about development in South Park. And I have no problem in stating that South Park has tremendous wildlife value. It has for years and continues to have tremendous value. One of my hopes is that the Game & Fish at some point will change their paradigm in giving some sort of importance value to small mammals that include rodents. Because the agricultural meadows in South Park as well as a large portion of Teton County is just ripe with small rodents that are the base of what so many of the animals eat. Elk, you know, they're certainly at a different place on the food chain, but at any rate, I just want to…I don't want anyone to ever forget how much value small rodents do have in agricultural meadows to ?? and bears and wolves and raptors and eagles and weasels. Every member of the weasel family, which includes everything from skunks to badgers to martens to river otters and so on and so forth. So, of course, I would like you to put South Park back into the Plan where you removed it. Something else has been really curious to me and, having just read the letter from the Game & Fish that have a lot of tremendous and valuable information, is that I haven't heard anyone address the chronic waste disease that's on our doorstep in Teton County. And one of the places it would profoundly affect is South Park, a well-known elk refuge. No one has talked at all about what is going to happen when those thousands of elk come down with this disease and start wandering aimlessly through the developments in South Park and elsewhere in Jackson Hole. And I think this is an issue that everyone involved in planning and involvement in this Plan have to address because it is on our doorstep. The first documented case of chronic waste disease in elk and moose was documented in this past year I think in Teton County or one other county. It is coming. For one thing, I was trying to do a little bit of work reading some of the work that you all have done in terms of changing maybe some of the…I don't have that either, do I…something that I'd like to be changed because I took tremendous issue with usage of sustainable development from ?? report from, where was it, the 1980s? Where are we right now, 2009? I thought that was incredibly outdated and, I'm glad, it seems like you removed that. Am I correct? And so kudos for that because I was going to fire off a letter to say, come on, you know, we're in the 21st century. So, sorry, I was disjointed but thank you again.
9/3/2009	Simms, Barbara Interested Public	I would like to offer a comment I'm not sure I've heard mentioned in the many discussions about South Park: the "view corridor" approaching the Valley from the south, just after the little rise north of the South Park bridge, is beautiful. The remaining open land and hayfields with horses and grazing cattle provide a sense of continuity with the Valley's ranching history and a quietly stunning welcome to the Valley. I believe we need to value that open, spacious view corridor and all that it represents.

Date	Name	Comment
9/3/2009	Hiddleson, Marv Interested Public	Yeah, my name is Marv Hiddleson. I live in South Park. Actually, I'm a neighbor of Rich's. I want to just comment on my overall impression of the presentation. It all premised on the fact that, as I think Laurie said, landowners who wish to protect the land. And God bless 'em. I mean, my family, my grandfather was born in Freedom in '88, '89, I mean, where I went to law school. I was a Future Farmer of America. But I'm a member of ??. And so what my concern is, as I listen to this…I also have a Planning Commission background in our cities and the like, so I'm attuned to this and I did a lot of land-use work in California and I've had developers in the plan, so I think I understand what's going on. And so you have to anticipate people like most of my former clients who don't wish to protect the land. And so I'm just saying we're in a dilemma, and God bless anybody who wants to protect the land and who would grant conservation easements, although I'm not really aware of a lot of conservation easements that they've granted in South Park. And I really wonder why. We've have all these tools, there's been a lot of great work done to get conservation easements, but somebody needs to ?? in South Park. And what's concerning me as I see this whole process is, you know, transfer, density rights or non-contiguous PRDs, well, you have to put the density somewhere. And what is making me nervous is that South Park is not, at least up to a lot of the point in the Comprehensive Plan the discussion in the works, viewed as really worth being protected. And so it's sort of a dumping ground for density is how I read it. And that can't be because we've heard so much about how valuable the South Park area is to the greater Jackson environment. It's ??. You drive in the from the gateway coming from the south, it's just as important as the gateway coming from the north. The gateway coming in on Highway 22. I can understand there's a lot of conservation easements that have landed in that area. And that's why it looks so beautiful. So, we've got to work out tools to preserve this. And just to really be smart. If we do continue to use non-contiguous PRDs, the key is, as I think Rich said, where you put the density. <<inaudible>>. Also, you know, we had this Teton Meadows battle. I mean, that would have been a beautiful area to have had somebody grant a conservation easement, but nobody did. So, you have these bonus density tools and it's a two-edged sword. The good guys can utilize them to help their families and realize on their land, but the bad guys can do a Teton Meadows. And so how do you prevent that? How do you have the tool sort of just produce for people who want to protect their land and not people who basically want to destroy the land? And then I also want to just finish by saying, you know, there are no guarantees at all in life. And Brad was saying how there's no assurance through zoning that there can be protection. Well, actually, there's no assurance you can even do it through conservation easements. Hell, there have been condemnation of conservation easements in the past. So, I mean, nothing is for sure. But I wouldn't get overly carried away. I think we can do a real good job with zoning. And I hope we can work out some scheme where the ranchers and those who wish to protect the land can utilize these things. But I surely am worried that if we don't have some type of control, people who do not wish to protect the land can wreck havoc on the land. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
9/3/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hi, I'm Kathy Hopkins of Cottonwood Park. I think what I have to say here all ties into theme one, even though it might touch on a little bit of growth management. Let me say again how much we appreciate your time and effort you're putting in to achieve a workable Comprehensive Plan that benefits wildlife and defines human needs. I am a small property owner in Cottonwood Park. I can vacuum my whole house from one outlet. I don't need a slew of house cleaners, landscapers, managers, personal assistants. I do all the above. I take pride in taking care of my small home ensuring what I grow in my garden. There are two things I do need help with, though—property taxes and property rights. My property taxes have gone up over a thousand dollars in the last year. With all the new services needed in the future because of the large increases in residential and commercial development rights in the new draft Plan, I'm afraid I will be taxed right out of the Valley when my husband and I retire. I am also concerned that the only property rights that will be respected will be that of the large landowners. Even though our homes are modest, Cottonwood Park stands together as a community, and as property owners we have rights too. By protecting wildlife and open space in all of South Park we will be protecting the reasons why we work so hard to stay in this Valley. We are not ??. South Park must be put back at the top of the list when it comes to protecting wildlife and open spaces. This will then guide and help us properly plan how much and what kind of development will happen in the northwest corner of South Park after ?? has been completed. We need to keep the base development rights that exist now without density bonuses until we can figure out a fair way to do this. Both protection of wildlife and open spaces and managing growth by limiting growth are needed for South Park. They are inseparable. One without the other would result in ?? of any new Plan. On the subject of managing growth, and I know this is going to be down the road a little bit, but I think this just will tie in. All too often the small homeowner is left to fend for him or herself to protect their property and its value. We are shuffled between Town officials, police and our homeowners associations when we alert them that our neighborhoods are deteriorating from overcrowded homes that are being used as boarding houses and employee dormitories. We need to attend this problem or we will find our most precious commodity, working families, being exported to areas outside the Valley. The Town of Jackson will then be known for its boarding houses and the problems they bring with them. This does not mean building thousands of new homes. This will only lead to abandoning the old neighborhoods and support what we don't want—growing our way out of our growth problems. We need to manage what we have by working together. That means Town government, employers, homeowners associations, and especially land and rental management agencies. The burden to protect the neighborhood falls on the shoulders of the small property owner who lives in his or her home while absent landlords and rental management companies profit from encouraging overcrowded single-family rentals by looking the other way. Employers need to help out more by housing their employees on or near their job site. We should be mindful of the unintended consequences that unchecked growth resulting in overcrowded rentals has on the single-family neighborhood however you define a family, whether they're straight or gay couples, married couples, with or without children, or the traditionally defined family. However we achieve it, we cannot afford to have a laissez-faire attitude toward the small property owner. If you want to preserve community character and make a revised Comprehensive Plan work, it starts with protecting wildlife and open spaces and managing growth by limiting growth and last, but most important, stabilizing and protecting our family neighborhoods. Without them we are just another spot on the map.
9/3/2009	, Interested Public	I'm Denise ?? from East Jackson. And I want to first thank these two bodies for their mammoth undertaking here in revising this Comp Plan. It's going to be long and time consuming and we appreciate your efforts. I also appreciate your efforts of realizing that you need to include wildlife and open space in every portion of this Comp Plan, not just in one place. So I thank you. I would like to also support putting South Park back into the 1.6.A. That's an area that certainly needs protection. And I would urge you to also keep in mind that focus on wildlife, connectivity and agriculture values as well. That's all. Thank you very much.

Date	Name	Comment
9/3/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I am Kathy Tompkins of Cottonwood Park. Let me say again how much we appreciate the time and effort you are putting in to achieve a workable comprehensive plan that benefits wildlife and defined human needs. I am a small property owner in Cottonwood Park. I can vacuum my whole house from one outlet. I don't need a slew of house cleaners, landscapers, nannies or personal assistants. I do all the above. I take pride in taking care of my small home and sharing what I grow in my garden. There are two things I do need help with though; property taxes and property rights. My property taxes have gone up over a thousand dollars in the last year. With all the new services needed in the future because of the large increases in residential and commercial development in the new draft comprehensive plan, I am afraid I will be taxed right out of the valley when my husband and I retire. I am also concerned that only the property rights of the large landowners are going to be respected in the new comprehensive plan. Even though our homes are modest, cottonwood Park stands together as a community and as property owners we have rights too. By protecting wildlife and open space in all of South Park we will be protecting the reasons why we work so hard to stay in this valley. We are not " no growthers"! South Park must be put back at the top of the list when it comes to protecting wildlife and open spaces. This will then guide and help us properly plan how much and what kind of development will happen in the NW corner of South Park after infill in town has been completed. We need to keep the base development rights that exist now without density bonuses. Both protection of Wildlife and open spaces and managing growth by limiting growth are needed for South Park. They are inseparable. One without the other will result in failure of any new plan. On the subject of managing growth, all too often the small homeowner is left to fend for him or herself to protect their property and its value. We are shuffled between town officials, police and our home owners associations when we alert them that our neighborhoods are deteriorating from overcrowded homes that are being used as boarding houses and employee dormitories. We need to attend to this problem or we will find our most precious commodity, working families, being exported to areas outside the valley. The town of Jackson will be then known for its boarding houses and the problems they bring with them. This does not mean building thousands of new homes. This will only lead to abandoning the older neighborhoods and supports what we don't want; growing our way out of our growth problems. We need to manage what we have by working together. That means town government, employers, homeowners associations, and especially landlords and rental management agencies. The burden to protect a neighborhood falls on the shoulders of the small property owner who lives in his or her home; while absent landlords and rental management companies profit from encouraging over crowded single family rentals by looking the other way. Employers need to help more by housing their employees on or near their job site. We should be mindful of the unintended consequences that unchecked growth resulting in over crowded rentals has on the single family neighborhood however you define a family; whether they are straight or gay couples, unmarried couples with or without children or the traditionally defined family. However we achieve it we cannot afford to have a laissez faire, not my problem attitude toward the small property owner. If you want to preserve community character and make a revised comprehensive plan work, it starts with protecting wildlife and open spaces, managing growth by limiting growth and last but most important, stabilizing and protecting our family neighborhoods. Without them we are just another spot on the map.
9/2/2009	Salter, Andy Interested Public	The broad South Park area contains critically important wildlife areas and migration routes. Its scenic vistas are precious and must not be lost. Theme 1 must recognize and affirm the scenic, wildlife, connectivity and agricultural values of the greater South Park area. These values were recognized in the prior version of the Comp Plan and must be affirmed once again in whatever version the County and Town Planning Commissions develop.
9/2/2009	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	Thank you for volunteering your time and for all the work you are doing to insure that the Comprehensive Plan Update is a transparent, public process reflecting community priorities. Below is my input for tomorrow's themes. Please maintain the commitment made in the current plan to conserve the scenic rural beauty and wildlife of South Park. Removal of this theme is arbitrary and unacceptable. Transferring development rights from rural areas (e.g. Buffalo Valley, Alta) where growth is not likely to occur to areas where growth is most likely to occur (South Park) does not conserve agricultural land. To the contrary, it makes development of such lands more likely. The community has expressed in several polls and in numerous public comments, it prefers slow, smart growth, that it does not want increased build-out. There are sufficient development rights to grow for many years. Up- zoning South Park would serve no community purpose. It would make a few individuals wealthy (or wealthier) and that's about it. The cost of the proposed scale of growth in terms of infrastructure and run-down of our natural capital are high. Imagine the mess an enormous, 500-home development like TMR would be now had it been allowed to move forward. Growing slowly makes sense from an economic as well as an environmental perspective, especially for economies like ours that are heavily dependent on natural capital.

Date	Name	Comment
9/2/2009	Greger, Art Interested Public	Just a follow up asking you to consider the enormous input of public opinion asking for the protection of South Parks scenic and wildlife value as the plan moves forward.Please also consider the costs of growth as it impacts the quality of life for all residents.The public has asked for low growth and protection of South Park...please listen.
9/1/2009	Omlor, Kristen Interested Public	We find it very disheartening that the new comprehensive plan places low priority on the wildlife and scenic values of the South Park area. We have lived in Jackson Hole for 13 years and in Melody Ranch for 4 of those years. In those 4 years, we have seen and heard a variety of wildlife. We have had moose, elk and fox in our backyard. We have eagles, osprey, hawks, cranes and numerous other small birds fly around our house. We have heard the coyotes and frogs/toads. We have incredible views of the Tetons, Glory Bowl and Munger Mtn. We love driving by the open space whether on the highway or South Park Loop Road. Being affordable home owners, we understand the need for affordable units and are very grateful that we are able to live in this beautiful place. However, we are very aware that the wildlife and the scenery are reasons we love living here.
8/31/2009	Parker, Jon Interested Public	Please leave us some open space and wildlife corridors in South Park. The people have consistently said this is what they want.
8/31/2009	Prayzich, Elise Interested Public	Thank you for your difficult and hard work on revising the comprehensive plan to more closely represent the feelings of the community in their desire to protect wildlife and open space. Crowding anywhere in this Valley will result in degradation of the land, water, habitat for wildlife, and our quality of life. Most especially, I trust you will see the wisdom of reaffirming the wildlife, connectivity, scenic and agricultural values in the greater South Park region. South Park needs to be needs to be returned to Policy 1.6a!!
8/31/2009	Healey, Bill Interested Public	Commissioners----as a resident of the South Park region ---Dairy subdivision---I strongly believe that Theme I needs to be amended to recognize & reaffirm the wildlife,connectivity,scenic & ag. Values in the greater South Park Region-----I further find particularly disturbing the proposed connector road intersection at South Park Loop & Boyles Hill rd.---while I recognize this road was approved many years ago the affected area/ neighborhoods have changed / grown so much that the connector road & the amount of traffic---16,000 cars per day?---would effectively change a rural atmosphere to a urban one----the Real problem is the "Y"---where are the in depth traffic studies & designs to rectify the real issue??----
8/31/2009	Thomas, Shirley & Dan Interested Public	As concerned citizens we would like you to take into consideration the value of the South Park area. It remains a wildlife corridor. We have moose, fox, coyote & elk even in our back yards during the migration & the Winter months. It has wonderful scenic value & serves as agricultural land for several farms. Please do not lessen this value for our future generations.
8/20/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Kathy Tompkins, Poplar Wood Park. About the connectivity analysis Biota has been…is when you take down those fences, when it comes time to take down those fences, which I would like to see at the South Park at the north end across from Cottonwood, and then automatically you have greater connectivity through ranging park area, or through that ranging park itself, right across the road instead of the wildlife not knowing which way to go and everything. And the map that Rich gave you for South Park, I agree with most of it, but I would say even extend, widen, that setback on the northern part of South Park along High School Road, the width of the high school, and make that a beautiful transition area for wildlife from the surrounding areas. And double as a park, which would serve the community and the wildlife also at the same time. Bring down those fences and minimalize the development there as much as possible. And I think that the medium that you have here in the analysis that is at right now in the northern part of South Park, I can guarantee you that would go even better if we could get rid of those fences and widen that area as much as possible. So, that's it.

Date	Name	Comment
8/19/2009	Langenberg, Karen Interested Public	For anyone who cares about this valley's wildlife and scenic treasures, a recent report from the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance is well worth reading. "The Greater South Park Region: A Summary of Wildlife and Scenic Resources" assembles 30 years' worth of information on the southern end of the valley. It is an amazing and rich portrayal, pulled from existing records and accounts from multiple sources. What I walk away with is the following: greater South Park is as consequential to wildlife and scenery as any other part of the valley, and as deserving of conservation. Because of how interdependent each element of the ecosystem is, degradation in this one place could not be isolated and would inevitably have impacts elsewhere. Picture this: It is winter. You are a moose. You are hungry, thirsty, and need to get to your next resting place. You may have a calf with you. You have to travel between crucial winter range in the Cache Creek or Game Creek drainage and along the Snake River. As you move through the South Park area, you take refuge among tree stands, adjacent hillsides, and in the open meadows of ranch land. You must forage and find water as you thread your way, attempting to avoid humans and their domestic animals and get across or around their fences and buildings. You would be better off if you could avoid crossing roads, but this is impossible. You should especially avoid 'hotspot' areas, such as Highway 22 between Spring Gulch and Skyline (the road with the highest rate of wildlife-vehicle collisions in Wyoming), and Highway 89 from High School Road south to Melody Ranch. Maybe you're not a moose. You might be a big-horned sheep, mountain lion, river otter, bald eagle, great horned owl, trumpeter swan, cutthroat trout, chorus frog, or any of the over 80 mammal, bird, fish, reptile, and amphibian species catalogued as residents or users of the South Park ecosystem. You confront your own survival issues every day. OK, you are not any of these creatures. But you are a first-time visitor to the valley or you live in the area. You are driving up from Hoback, the road just widening from two lanes to four, WYDOT's wildlife crossing / kill zone sign flashing. At 55 mph, it might be hard to stop for that unfortunately-timed elk or moose crossing - wish there were a tunnel or overpass for our mutual protection. The valley opens up, to iconical foreground, mid-range, and far views that are familiar and loved, or heart-strummingly new. If instead you were coming in from the pass and Wilson, you'd have a similar 'gateway' experience, with all the same elements - wildlife traffic and rural viewscape included. The Conservation Alliance documents what we already know if we have been observant, and makes vivid what a first-time visitor might experience. No longer can we just toss away South Park as inconsequential to wildlife and scenic resources valley-wide. We should make planning decisions based on the best available information, including what is in this report. The low prioritization of South Park's wildlife and scenic values in the current Comprehensive Plan draft is not supported by the evidence. Significant language from the 1994 Plan, recognizing and prioritizing these values, should be restored as the present draft goes through planning review. Further development in the northwest corner of South Park should also be reduced in footprint and scale. As development occurs, significant portions of adjacent lands should be protected permanently, giving attention to continuity with other protected areas. Finally, the potential Tribal Trails connector should be evaluated with full recognition of the habitat types and wildlife movement that exist in the area, and the disturbance and fragmenting impact that such a road would have.

Date	Name	Comment
8/18/2009	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	I have a few comments for this Thursday's joint Comp Plan review of Theme 1 that are focused on the South Park region. I can attest that the now 400 members of my network have complete and universal agreement on the following suggested changes: • Policy 1.1c is a critical policy in this plan and is very relevant to the South Park region. This plan must encourage the continued acquisition of permanent conservation of large, contiguous open spaces in order to uphold the community's top priorities of both wildlife and open space. Open space conservation, for the purposes of wildlife protection, scenic vistas preservation and agriculture, should be encouraged and not be limited to the narrowly defined NRO. The 1994 Plan focused on the protection of open spaces for three primary functions: scenic preservation, agriculture and wildlife habitat protection. o We suggest the following changes to Policy 1.1c "Conserve large, contiguous, and connected open spaces" "Large and contiguous … Private efforts have been successful in permanently preserving such some of these strategic lands. Continued public, private and cooperative efforts are critical to conserving open space, particularly with the Natural Resource Overlay. Continued public, private and cooperative open space acquisition efforts, for the purposes of wildlife protection, scenic vistas preservation and agriculture, should be encouraged. Additional efforts are critically important to preserve open space that either lie within or provide connectivity between portions of the Natural Resource Overlay. Of equal importance are the continued efforts to protect important gateway image setting vistas as well as community character setting agricultural lands." • Policy 1.1 g: "Permeability of development for wildlife: In all areas, except those designated for mixed use or more intense development in the Town of Jackson or County nodes, development will be designed to accommodate wildlife movement." o See changes above: We believe, to achieve Draft Plan Principle 1.1 (maintain viable populations of all native species), the design of development in ALL nodes identified for growth must allow for wildlife movement permeability. Likewise perhaps this policy should be removed in its entirety as wildlife movement issues also apply to town. Staff has publically acknowledged this language was an oversight and that especially the County nodes (if in fact they remain in the plan) be designed for wildlife permeability. • Policy 1.6a: "Conserve agricultural lands and agriculture throughout Teton County: The County will support efforts of landowners and land trusts to permanently conserve large intact parcels of land and to continue farming in South Park, Alta, Buffalo Valley, the Gros Ventre area, Spring Gulch, and south Fall Creek Road." o South Park is first on the list in the section of our current legally binding 1994 Comp Plan. The new language inadvertently strips South Park of such protection, implying that the entirety of the South Park district does not deserve conservation and directly unwinding the protection in our existing plan. Whether a node is or is not included on one very small portion of the South Park region – as in the 1994 plan, the greater South Park area should be prioritized for conservation. o Below is the specific language from our current Comp Plan (with emphasize added) - from Chapter 1, Community Vision, Third Printing, October, 2002: 2 "In Teton County, the major issues tend to be broader and were of necessity mapped at a much smaller scale. The County Issues Map primarily depicts three areas of concern. The first is "open space." These are lands on which ranching should continue, wildlife habitat preserved, and the visual qualities of scenic vistas protected. Examples include the hay meadows of South Park, the Spring Gulch scenic area, ranchlands along the Teton Village road, Buffalo Valley and the western most entrance to Teton County from Alta. These lands also include the Snake, Hoback, Gros Ventre and Buffalo Fork river corridors and those hillsides and butte sides which are crucial winter range for ungulates. These areas should be kept free of development to the maximum extent possible to help

Date	Name	Comment
		preserve rural character, critical wildlife habitat and important image-setting scenic vistas and river corridors, and to encourage the continuation of ranching and other types of traditional agriculture as a vital part of the community's character. The County should encourage the preservation of the rural character, critical wildlife habitat and important image-setting scenic vistas and corridors, and encourage the continuation of ranching and other types of traditional agriculture as a vital part of the community character. Where possible, the County should be flexible with its development regulations as an encouragement to landowners to permanently protect these wildlife, scenic and agricultural areas. In addition, where nonregulatory options are available, these should be encouraged. For example, a land trust's resource analysis in preparation for a conservation easement, may be sufficient to replace the County's site analysis.” Respectfully, Rich Bloom – South Park Neighbors P.S. Please note the attachment which contains a proposed land use map by myself for our South Park region which helps to put the rural zoned land in context of it’s relationship to the NRO, SRO, federal and state lands, and protected open space easements. Also attached is a two page summary plus species list of the JH Conservation Alliance’s very detailed The Greater South Park Region: A Summary of Wildlife and Scenic Resources delivered to you via hard copy June 23.The Greater South Park Region: A Summary of Wildlife and Scenic Resources A Report by the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance Release Date: June 23, 2009 Report Summary Introduction/Purpose: Balancing competing objectives – preservation and development – is a monumental task. South Park is a microcosmic representation of this struggle in Jackson and Teton County, between preserving and protecting wildlife, scenic vistas and habitat, and providing for our community’s housing needs. In response to a draft Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan, released 04/13/09, that slates South Park for massive development potential with little data or analysis to justify it, the Conservation Alliance, with the support of several neighbor groups, collected existing data to document and bring forward the wildlife and scenic values in the region. South Park is defined in this report as the area between the National Forest Boundary near highway 89 to the Snake River, and between the southern end of South Park Loop Road and Highway 22, and includes District 12: South Park and portions of District 5: Eastbank, as defined in the draft plan. A majority of South Park should be prioritized for wildlife and natural and scenic resources protection even as one portion (the northwest corner) is called out as a node. This report focuses on South Park because it is slated for the most potential residential development of any district in the draft plan, and because the draft plan places very low priority on the protection of wildlife and scenic values in the area, which represents a significant departure from our community’s existing 1994 Plan. The draft plan also proposes up to 1,500 units in northern South Park, and includes unclear language about the extent to which the remainder of District 12 should be slated “as an extension of the town development pattern.” By allowing for dense development in the northwest corner, and without prioritizing the preservation of wildlife, scenic and natural resources in the remainder of District 12, the draft plan leaves an open door for similar levels of density throughout the district in the future. Due to the drastically proposed changes in land use in the South Park (from rural to town-level densities in certain areas), it is critical to take into account the area’s documented and understudied wildlife and scenic resources before the community considers a plan that stands to eliminate those resources and values. Key Findings: Baseline inventories, environmental assessments, wildlife-vehicle collision data and citizen and

Date	Name	Comment
		expert observations all indicate a significant wildlife presence in the greater South Park area. Elk, mule deer and moose, raptors, songbirds and migratory birds, along with a variety of waterfowl, amphibians and reptiles utilize the region to both live in and move through. Cumulatively, the habitats provided in and around South Park contribute to the overall ecological health of the larger Snake River ecosystem, and establishing protected connectors both north to south and east to west are crucial in ensuring successful wildlife utilization of the area. (Attached is a list of species that were documented in the area; citizen observations would add to the list significantly.) According to Jackson Hole Wildlife Foundation data, roads in the study area present some of the highest fatality rates for large ungulates in Teton County. While there is not much data regarding ungulate use of private lands not protected by easements, there is documented evidence of ungulate movement across the roads and through the study area. Specifically, both the Highway 22 area proposed for the Tribal Trails connector road, and Highway 89 near the junction with Game Creek have been considered appropriate areas to construct wildlife overpasses, due to the high ungulate use and road-related mortalities in those areas. Wyoming Game and Fish Department has also designated the area flanking Highway 22 from Town to Wilson as crucial range for a variety of wildlife species and as an enhancement area for future rehabilitation work. The true gateway from the south to both Town and the resort facilities, South Park has long been epitomized by its scenic hayfields and long-range vistas of the mountains. It is one of the most widely noticed and clearest materializations of our rural character. Maintaining these scenic viewsheds is an important community objective and should be noted and prioritized in the Plan. Recommendations: There are several formidable data gaps in the wildlife studies for the area, particularly on private lands; for example, there is no consistent, long-term ecological monitoring program, no vegetation map, and no comprehensive analysis of the health of the County's wildlife populations and habitats. Aside from the wildlife-vehicle collision data, there is very little data on ungulate movement throughout the County. The Natural Resources Overlay needs to be updated and must include a broader set of indicator species. It is important to acknowledge, for example, that a map depiction of an "absence of use" by wildlife does not necessarily indicate that the area lacks importance. Filling these gaps and others with the most up to date data is an important first step; we must base our development decisions on the best available information. While some residential development is appropriate in the northwest corner of District 12, the new draft should not recommend significant intensification of development in the greater South Park region (or any district) given the community's goals to limit overall growth and protect wildlife. And, as development occurs, significant portions of adjacent lands, within South Park, should be permanently protected to balance development and conservation goals in the area. In addition, significant language from the 1994 Plan should be reinstated in the new draft to call out for recognizing the importance of this region for wildlife, scenic and agricultural values. Teton County, and the surrounding ecosystem, should be looked at comprehensively, with an eye toward the cumulative impacts of growth and development on the ability of wildlife to both utilize and move through the region. While one development might not hinder the movement of an entire mule deer herd, for example, taken together and compounded, many of the proposed and existing developments most certainly will. Likewise, preserving a large portion of the habitats in the greater South Park area will increase the utility of the surrounding areas as well. This report intends to initiate discussion on the direction of future growth to be sure that it is guided by the best available information. The Conservation Alliance has consistently asserted that planning in the greater South Park region should not be carried out in a vacuum, isolated from the bigger picture planning issues in Jackson Hole and lacking in important data and research. As the community determines how, where, and in what amount Jackson and Teton County will grow for the next decade, it is important to take into account the cumulative impacts of that growth; the

Date	Name	Comment
		amount of development targeted for South Park and the surrounding areas stands to have significant localized and community-wide effects.
7/17/2009	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	I have a few comments to summit for next week's joint Comp Plan review: Teton County Planning Commission Recommendations I attended the long meeting where the County planning commission discussed and modified a long list that they had intended to give to the planning staff as formal recommendations so that the draft of our comprehensive plan would be much more in-line with public comment before your joint commissions started your review. These 35 recommendations, although not all-inclusive and with one recommendation I can not agree with (moving the START, Fair and Rodeo Grounds to South Park) – did capture the majority of public comments and concerns to date and I know my neighbors felt they had finally been heard for the first time. The issue for me is you are still starting with a document that is so seriously flawed it was due to be sent back to staff before you even started your work. Given last week's unsettling events and questionable ethics – that vote was shockingly reversed. I commend the County planning commissioners' efforts, despite reversal, to recognize our citizens' concerns that this draft was not ready to be reviewed. Now as I attempt to move forward (after what I firmly believe first should be a convened joint electeds meeting – see next point below) – I am sure those of you familiar with Roberts Rules of Order may believe those recommendations have also not moved forward due to the vote last Thursday evening. If there is any question on whether the vote last Thursday was only about whether to remand the draft to staff – or not - versus the validity of a very long public process to arrive at the 35 recommendations – then please start your meeting with the County planning commission reaffirming - with a vote - that these 35 recommendations (each approved on a majority basis) are still formally a start point from which they should continue the process. Need for a Joint Electeds Public Hearing Given what the public has learned Wednesday in the News and Guide newspaper, and what has been witnessed to in differing levels and in multiple ways by many of us over the past year-and-a-half, I believe holding the scheduled July 23 joint meeting is ill-advised. The meeting should be postponed until a full public hearing by the joint electeds can be held, addressing the complete breakdown in the process and involving Town Council, County Commissioners, and both Planning Commissions. The hearing should address three key questions: 1. Why has a preferred plan been issued (and reissued), when it is so out of sync with consistent and documented community input? 2. Why has a promised 'update' to the 1994 Comp Plan (sound and legally binding, although lacking in some detail) become a full 'rewrite' that diverts massively from much of the community-supported intent of the existing plan? 3. What occurred / has been occurring among the County Planning Director and any others, to influence the outcome of the draft and/or process outside of the public forums? Introduction and Vision Statement Given recent events, my concern about proceeding until the process issues I have already outlined are addressed - not simply 'swept under the rug' - and the short time frame since last Thursday's vote - I regrettably do not have additional specific recommendations that I had intended to submit for the Introduction and Vision Statement sections beyond my comments that are already part of the public record. As a citizen though I was invited to review the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance's updated comments you have received today (July 17) and I fully support the detail you will find in them. In closing it is important to say that I and the public appreciate the hard work you perform as volunteer appointees. Do not misconstrue out intent when I or anyone from the public challenges positions, process, and/or decisions or when we continually show up and engage in the public process. It is unfortunate I have found myself needing to raise my 'voice' simply to be heard. Going forward - I trust that you will still listen to the valid concerns that I and others have communicated – and will communicate - in our specific plan comments despite also having to challenge the process, decisions and some actions in the past. Simply - do not kill the messenger – at least not until you have heard and listened to the message. Respectfully, Rich Bloom

Date	Name	Comment
7/15/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hi Paul, Leland, Hank, Ben and Andy, I hope your summer is going well. I think I can confidently say that a lot of Cottonwood Park residents are very worried that what we have commented on so far; in the comprehensive plan survey that was poorly interpreted by planning staff (Jeff D. has admitted that to me at the July 9th joint commissioner's meeting) and the comp plan website itself will be lost in the shuffle of power plays that is going on right now over the plan process. Cottonwood Park residents want to know how many times do we have to comment before our concerns about the plan are acted upon. We liked the idea of sending the plan back to staff with directions to include public comment and the 35 recommendations by the county planning commission. We do not approve of the fairgrounds, rodeo and start bus depot being moved to South Park though. We are already dealing with the problems caused by six schools, a sewage transfer station, a grocery store that services the whole community and light and heavy industrial that surround us in West Jackson. Please don't choke our neighborhoods off any more. Even some people who say why not move the facilities are backing off after I emailed them Cottonwood Park's perspective. I think I emailed it to you also. I hope you read it. We are not nimbys. I get pummeled with that term all the time but it just makes my resolve even stronger because of what we have here already. I envision High School Road becoming an academic road and I think I have told you some of my ideas. I would like for you to hear about my walking tour with Kelly Lockhart through Range View Park where I live. We are the front lines for either an excellent symbiotic relationship with South Park or a disastrous erosion of great neighborhoods here in West Jackson due to the proposed over development of South Park. Please keep Tony and Forrest on the county planning commissioner's board. They seem to be the only ones that understand the frustration residents here are going through. What do we have to do to get our comments and the public survey acted upon. STAG and the way planners interpreted the plan do not represent us. How may times do we repeat ourselves that this is not the plan we wanted. If the wearing out of the public involvement is what the elected wanted to get this through as is with few changes; I can only say I hope that is not the strategy but many are believing that is the case. My phone number is 734 6211. Maybe we can get together so I can show what works and what doesn't work in Cottonwood Park. Please let me know what you think so I can believe that our concerns are your concerns. Sincerely, Kathy Tompkins Cottonwood Park, Jackson Wy.
7/9/2009	Swope, Linda Interested Public	As residents of Melody Ranch, we were not surprised by the results of the survey by the Conservation Alliance, confirming what we know to be true: that our neighborhood provides both habitat and migration corridors for a huge variety of wildlife. The writers of the Draft Comprehensive Plan, who put wildlife as the second lowest priority for South Park, must not have seen what we see: the great horned owls who nest each season in the adjacent cottonwood trees, the various waterfowl who visit the pond behind our house, the ducks who winter over there, the elk who migrate through, the moose who spends each winter here with a calf, feeding on our neighbor's willows, the coyotes, foxes and other small mammals, even the mountain lion who paid our neighbor a visit last winter. We own and operate a photography business that is largely dependent on visitors who have chosen Jackson Hole as a destination location. Time after time, they tell us that the wildlife and the scenery are the reasons for that choice. It's been well established that wildlife needs habitat beyond GTNP in order to maintain healthy populations. The Draft Plan, calling as it does for wall-to-wall high density in South Park, would drastically impact not only our neighborhood quality, but our business as well. We applaud the County Planning Commission for taking a stand for preservation of what we all cherish about Jackson Hole, and sending the Plan back to staff for a major overhaul. And we urge the Town Planning Commission to do the same. Thank you for your time, Linda Swope Linda Marquis Swope’s Mountain Photography

Date	Name	Comment
7/1/2009	Jaubert, Jessica Interested Public	As a young professional resident here in Jackson for 4 years, I am asking that you keep housing/affordable housing as the most important aspect of the Teton County Comprehensive Plan. That especially includes development in the South Park area as well as East Jackson. The South Park area is a great example of land that is vacant and could be used for housing residents that would like to stay and be a part of the community. Instead they are forced to move out of Jackson, primarily because of housing costs and availability. South Park and East Jackson areas help expand our need for housing while keeping the "heart" of Jackson: Town Square, South Cache, Snow King available for businesses and tourism. I think it is important to keep the "Heart" of Jackson in its historical character since this is one of its greatest charms that draws both residents and tourists alike to Jackson. South Park and East Jackson are much less visited by tourists, so these areas seem like a natural destination for our expanded housing to be located. I know that many residents from Cottonwood, Melody Ranch, and Rafter J subdivisions are the main voices in this community regarding this plan, and have made no secret about how much they do not want to see the South Park continue to grow. I find this incredibly hypocritical being that all of their subdivisions were created for the continuing need for housings years ago. It seems that there is an attitude in this valley that as long as I have a house, why should I care about my fellow citizens in this community who want to stay, but can either not afford housing or have none available to them. Residents of these above referenced subdivisions mention traffic, wildlife, air pollution, and increase in crime as the reasons to keep the amount of units that are essential to Jackson out of the South Park area. As mentioned in the Teton County Comprehensive Plan, "A workforce that commutes adds traffic to Teton Pass, Snake River Canyon, and Hoback Canyon, which reduces safety for both humans and wildlife. Moreover, the impacts of development are displaced to adjacent valleys; and the additional vehicle miles traveled increase carbon emissions, reduce air quality, and require new transportation infrastructure." I believe this contradicts their whole argument for wildlife, traffic, and air pollution. Air pollution will be increased because of workers driving two hours round trip everyday to neighboring towns where they live instead of fifteen to thirty minutes if they lived in the valley. To be honest, I do not think the residents of these subdivisions are concerned about wildlife so much as their current mountain views from their home becoming semi-blocked from development and the price of their home decreasing because of housing supply increasing. These residents have lost the meaning of community and are only looking out for themselves, however if they continue to block housing development, Jackson and they will suffer in the end because Alpine, Victor, & Driggs will continue to get financial revenue and taxes that should be in Jackson. Who will help continue paying the costs of buildings such as the Center for the Arts and the Teton County Recreation Center when all the young professionals and families are living in neighboring cities and giving their sales taxes to those cities? We need young professionals and young families to stay here in Jackson where their tax dollars can help continue these great civic structures that our town has worked hard to establish and maintain. We need young adults who care about their community, who want to spend money at the Farmer's Market in the Summer, participate in Old Bill's Fun Run in the Fall to raise money for our non profits, stand in the cold and cheer at the Pedigree Dog Sled Race, and participate with their families in the Spring Easter Egg Hunt at the Town Square. What will happen to these cherished events once all of our young professionals and families are living thirty to sixty minutes away from Jackson? Are we going to go the Driggs Farmer's Market? The Alpine Dog Sled Race? When we talk about "Saving Historic Jackson Hole", aren't these community events part of what we should be saving? Also, what will happen to all the shops, restaurants, and bars in Jackson once the young adults and young professionals are living elsewhere? I know these businesses rely on tourism heavily, but they also rely on our own community members just as much. I wanted to make my feelings known as a young professional, mother, wife, and community member of this town. If you do not do something to provide housing for young professionals, seasonal workers, and families now, I think it will be a complete detriment to this town and its character very near in the future. Please do all you can to increase housing and make this comprehensive plan a success. Thank you for all your hard work and everything you do for Jackson and the members of this community.

Date	Name	Comment
7/1/2009	Mahood, Ken Interested Public	As a Cottonwood park resident, I have an opinion about the comprehensive plan and its encouragement to increase density south of the high school road. If I look at the idea of increasing density in this area from a purely self-centered NIMBY attitude I do not like it, it will affect my way of life. However, honestly it is one of the more logical places for higher density development. It is close to the schools, it is on a public transportation route and it is right across the street from a very similar development…The Cottonwood subdivision. I would be a hypocrite if I were to say that the comprehensive plan should not allow the develop ranch land into a subdivision because I live in a neighborhood that did exactly that. There have been a number of emails circulating from residents of Cottonwood to you that are against this idea and the idea of a tribal trails connection, they want the number one priority to protect wildlife, and I am not one of them. I believe the number one killer of wildlife is automobiles, if we increase traffic from outside of this valley because there is no workforce housing in the valley close to town how is that protecting wildlife. Secondly, density has the smallest impact on our environment and will reduce carbon emissions because people will not have to drive as far to school, store or work, I know this because that is one of the reason I live in Cottonwood. I hope you do not abandon encouraging density to the south of high school road or the tribal trails connection, it is the most logical solution for future growth. As far as the comment of "exhausting all areas of town with higher density prior to allowing development south of high school road", this would only work in a socialist government structure, which I do not support. I do support one of notions of this vocal minority, a larger setback from high school road that could be a linear park is a great idea, also existing traffic issues need to be addressed prior to development.
6/29/2009	, County Planning Commi	Exchange the fairgrounds property (District 19) in town for property in S. Park (District 12) in an area separated from residential development and with its own egress/ingress from hwy 89. Move the Fairgrounds, Rodeo, and START to this property in District 12, with the intent of building workforce housing in District 19 that will mitigate for the employees generated by already approved non-residential development in Town.
6/29/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Thank you for for the alternative STAG meeting at the county chambers. I hope that town officials and the county commisioners now realize that what you have done to get the public's concerns about the comp plan up front again was the right way to go. I know you have a lot on your plate and can't please everybody. Do take into consideration the importance of how commercial developments should mitigate their impacts on the community 100% to prevent the type of growth the new comp plan is gearing up for if it is passed as is. The build out numbers need to be brought back to the original numbers that the current zoning laws allow. As we need more affordable housing and after infill in the Town of Jackson is complete then and only then should South Park and other nodes be looked at for future affordable homes. I think Gregory Griffth's comments got it right. We are so concerned about negatively impacting our neighbors outside of the valley that we overlook the negative impacts of exporting Teton Village, Snow King and other resort impacts (employee housing, traffic, services, etc) to South Park. If we let this happen the transporatation chapter of the new comp plan will be a joke. You can't expect future workers living in the South Park Node to bike and walk to their jobs in town and in the village. The resorts, other medium and large commercial projects need to house their employees where they work. Period! I know it sounds impossible but looking at all the money that is being poored into the village golf course and knowing that I won't be able to step foot onto it or even afford to, I would think that other future endeavors if they really want to build to take advantage of the scenery and wildlife Jackson Hole offers, they should be required to house all of their employees on site and help to mitigate other negative impacts their projects will generate. I commend the JHCA Report: The Greater South Park Region: A Summary of Wildlife and Scenic Resources (June 23, 2009). South Park needs the wildlife and open space preservation theme put back as the number one concern. The NW corner of South Park build out numbers in the new comp plan need to be brought back to the original numbers. We should complete the wildlife and habitat research so we can have a clear picture of what negative impacts future development in South Park will have on the valley's economy and wildlife. Our economy relies on the preservation of wildlife and open spaces. You can't have one with out the other! I would like to add to the [above] letter by recommending all density bonus tools be removed and get back to the base numbers. That would actually bring South Parks numbers down even more from 370 to less than 300 units allowed. If we already house 65% of our workforce let's not complicate the issue by subsidizing developers while we pay the ultimate price; losing the values that brought us to Jackson Hole to begin with.

Date	Name	Comment
6/28/2009	Heileson, Marv and Juli Interested Public	We would like to thank you again for your recommendation that the Plan be revised to reflect the wishes of the public. As residents of South Park, it is clear to us that the Plan as now written ignores the contribution of South Park to the character and grandeur of the Valley as a whole, in particular: South Park's status as the scenic southern gateway to Jackson; its provision of wildlife habitat and migration corridors; and its rural, agricultural aspect, which still defines the overall character of the area. It has certainly never been a "node" (defined by our edition of Webster's New World Dictionary as "a point of concentration; central point"). A particular threat to South Park is the potential for density transfers, a zoning manuever that allows developers to receive approval for density in one (presumably favored) location, and then transfer that density to another target location, piling even more density on the "less worthy" area. Another concern (extending beyond South Park) is the concept of density bonuses for affordable or "workforce" housing. Developers should be required to provide sufficient affordable housing to provide for the need generated by their own projects; otherwise, the affordable housing problem is never solved, but is just compounded infinitely into the future. Specifically, we respectfully request that the following be included in your directives to staff to incorporate into the Plan revisions: --Recognize the importance of South Park as a scenic gateway to Jackson, as wildlife corridor and habitat, and as a contributor to the still agricultural, rural character of the Valley. --Remove the designation of South Park as a node. --Retain the Natural Resource Overlay designation in South Park. --Retain the existing density of South Park, codified by the existing zoning of 1 unit per 35 acres. Restrict any increases in density to north of High School Road. --Expressly adopt a restriction to prohibit any density transfers from one project to another. --Eliminate the use of density bonuses for the provision of any housing categories. Thank you for your consideration.
6/28/2009	Goralski, Jim and Linda Interested Public	This is a short note to first of all thank the Planning Commissioners for their courageous decision to recommend that the current draft of the Comprehensive Plan be sent back to the Planners for MAJOR revisions. As we've previously commented at meetings and in letters, we strongly feel the current draft does not represent the input gathered from the community here in Jackson Hole nor does it represent the spirit of the Plan currently in place. The 'band-aid' approach of tweeking is not an acceptable resolution for this document in its current form. It requires a total overhaul. We think Commissioner McCarthy said it best when he said that....urban planning models suitable for cities such as Portland are not compatible with the needs of those living in rural WY. Second, we want to reiterate our comments that the community's desired preservation of wildlife and open space should be the priority of the Plan (THIS INCLUDES SOUTH PARK) and not excessive growth of commerical and residential development. The growth discussed in the draft exacerbates the problems we are currently struggling with and downgrades the quality of 'human needs' for residents currently living here. We wholeheartedly support the Alliance's motto of 'Grow slow, Grow smart'.
6/28/2009	Bain, Rhett Interested Public	WILDLIFE AND OPEN SPACES, VALUES THIS COMMUNITY HAS CHERISHED FOR DECADES, WILL BE REINSTATED AS THE COMMUNITY'S TOP PRIORITY AND BECOME THE ORGANIZING THEME OF THE ENTIRE PLAN Any new development in South Park should only occur after infill has been exhausted in the town of Jackson. The wording “Develop South Park North To South” should be eliminated from the Future Land Use Plan for South Park (District 12). Reduce the number of proposed future units from 1500 units in South Park back to the 370 units that are already allowed under present zoning. Any new development in South Park and the Tribal Trails connector Road should not be even be considered until a new road connecting Route 89 and South Park Loop Road in South Park is completed first to alleviate the traffic on High School Road. If any new development occurs in South Park there should be open space from the High School to South Park Loop Road between the new development and High School Road.
6/27/2009	Hudnall, Marion Interested Public	WILDLIFE AND OPEN SPACES, VALUES THIS COMMUNITY HAS CHERISHED FOR DECADES, WILL BE REINSTATED AS THE COMMUNITY'S TOP PRIORITY AND BECOME THE ORGANIZING THEME OF THE ENTIRE PLAN Any new development in South Park should only occur after infill has been exhausted in the town of Jackson. The wording “Develop South Park North To South” should be eliminated from the Future Land Use Plan for South Park (District 12). Reduce the number of proposed future units from 1500 units in South Park back to the 370 units that are already allowed under present zoning. Any new development in South Park and the Tribal Trails connector Road should not be even be considered until a new road connecting Route 89 and South Park Loop Road in South Park is completed first to alleviate the traffic on High School Road. If any new development occurs in South Park there should be open space from the High School to South Park Loop Road between the new development and High School Road. I hope a thank you is proper and adequate. I am glad elected officials are listening. BUT I am cynical enough to feel we are waiting for the other shoe to drop. I am afraid there will be some loophole that will allow this to go through just because of the vote to remand. I sincerely hope not and want everyone to listen to the public. Please make the plan much more detailed and SAVE the WILDLIFE HABITAT that is left.

Date	Name	Comment
6/26/2009	Harger, Cindy Interested Public	I write to you today, not in my capacity as an employee of a local nonprofit, but as a private citizen who has called Jackson Hole home for the majority of my life. I have worked to find a way to afford to remain in Jackson Hole because -- even though I have traveled a lot and tried living elsewhere -- I find this to be one of the most unique places in this entire country. No where have I found another place with a similar sense of neighborliness, proximity to nature and vibrancy of community that we share here. As a result, you will find me to be both a supporter of affordable housing AND wildlife and the environment. I firmly believe that the two are not incompatible. However, I believe that this comp plan process is heading down a dangerous road that takes us away from all of the reasons people say they like living here (a "tragedy of the commons," if you will). In doing so, there are components that could actually make the housing situation worse, and there are components that completely ignore the unique experience of being able to live in a community with wildlife. I am lucky to own a house in Rafter J, where I rent rooms to help pay my mortgage. When Rafter J was first built, I and others thought it seemed like a crazy design -- very suburban for rural Jackson… I mean, what was with all of those confusing winding streets and strange layout of housing? Today, a lifetime later of learning about planning issues and wildlife habitat, I see the design for some of the genius it included: corridors along the creek, wetlands and willow stands preserved, and open spaces between the clustered housing. As a result of that forward-thinking planning there and elsewhere in the valley, I frequently enjoy moose cow-calf pairs in my backyard in the winter, nesting ducks in the wetlands along the creek in the spring, the sound of coyote howls on summer evenings, and generous bird life in my trees and bushes. Last winter, I had a deer nest under my pine tree for a couple of snowy nights before it moved on. I cherish these moments, and whenever someone visits me from out of town and experiences this for themselves, they are awestruck and envious of life in Jackson Hole. That's why I was actually kind of flabbergasted when I read the draft Comp Plan and saw the extensive departure from the '94 plan regarding South Park, not to mention other areas, such as the plans for in-town development -- where I, as well as many others in this community also share a stake, even though we may have an address outside of town limits. For now, I will limit my comments to the South Park area. The new plan appears to call for a significant shift in what South Park would look and feel like by throwing mass amounts of development and traffic into South Park as a sacrificial zone… as opposed to working out problems holistically and in a way that would keep us from having the same problems -- and even creating new problems -- in the future. According to the new plan, here's what's in print and in store for South Park: …“the provision of housing and light industrial opportunities” and to “Develop South Park from north to south as an extension of the town development pattern to provide for community needs.” (New Comp Plan, Page 110.) I strongly urge you to please return to the '94 Comp Plan values for South Park, where this area was among those that “should be kept free of development to the maximum extent possible to help preserve the rural character, critical wildlife habitat and important image-setting scenic vistas and river corridors, and to encourage the continuation of ranching and other types of traditional agriculture as a vital part of the community’s character.” (Comp Plan, Chapter 1: Community Vision, Page 4; October, 2002.) The Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance's recently released study of wildlife and open space values in South Park lays out a well-documented framework to support a return to the community's prior vision for South Park. I also ask you to heed the 2 to 1 vote of the public not that long ago regarding the Porter Estate annexation. There was not then, nor is there now, the public support to put such high levels of density in the hayfields south of town limits as this new plan would support. As importantly, I believe we especially should not allow such high upzones of residential density when it is not balanced with the high amounts of commercial development proposed in this plan, particularly in town. Following simple rules of supply and demand, we will NEVER have enough residential development in the price ranges we need -- no matter how densely we grow -- if we don't balance commercial growth (which leads to more need for residential), and if we don't balance the types of housing. Just ask New York City, where housing costs are as sky high as their buildings. We can build skyscrapers like they do, and just like they do, not have any affordable housing unless we structure it in through affordable housing programs that serve our greatest community need. As Aspen, Vail and New York City have learned, free market solutions don't work very well in an area with unlimited demand and limited supply. I believe there is much support to return to the values of the '94 plan and to ensure that they are included in any revision. The '94 planning process incorporated significant amounts of public dialog. I personally attended many of those meetings, beginning with the Successful Communities process that Luther Propst came out here to conduct. And I watched the town and county share about $1 million in costs, if I remember correctly, to hire a world-renowned planning firm -- Lane Kendig and Associates -- to build a plan that, while it didn't completely please anybody or everybody, provided a balance and a framework to build on the diverse community interests that had come out of the extensive public process. Because of that, the '94 plan has had a reasonable amount of buy-in from the public over the years (though we all acknowledged there was room for adjustments). It's no wonder that there's so much community consternation over an entirely new plan that was developed in a significantly shorter amount of time, with seemingly little integration of public input. Instead of improving on the old plan and on well-established visions for the community [as the relatively teeny comp plan "update" budget was designed to do] a whole new document has been created without paying attention to the values this community embodies. What seems remarkably clear to me is that those same values that were expressed back in the '94 process have been reaffirmed multiple times over the last several years in community sentiment on major planning issues that have arisen (such as the Porter

Date	Name	Comment
		Estate annexation, Downtown Redevelopment District, Teton Village expansion and Teton Meadows, to name a few). Even though it feels like there are more and more new neighbors moving to this valley who would like to live here for its beauty but also want to bring the big city with them, I was greatly heartened to see the same historic community values come out in such strong force in both the scientific and non-scientific polling that was done just prior to rewriting the comp plan this go-around. Those values I am speaking of put preserving our one-of-a-kind wildlife ecosystem first, they preserve a rural, western character, and they balance residential and commercial growth in a way that it happens in a healthy fashion for this community, not in a way that inadvertently destroys the best things about this community. I know you all have an incredibly hard job. I thank you for putting your hearts and souls into it. Please keep those hearts and souls open to what you are hearing from this community. Thank you for your time and consideration of my thoughts.
6/26/2009	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	South Park's rural character, scenic beauty and natural resources are being shunned in the new draft of the comp. plan. Please help us. We can stand in the face of the planning staff and they all bob their heads. What we say either goes over their heads or is stored in a vacuum box never to be retrieved. We know that development in the northwest corner of South Park is appropriate. Our community agreed on that. The development of South Park starting north to south is way out of line. We need to preserve the wildlife and resources that we have. We have the Nat'l Elk refuge, for God's sake. Town density in the northwest corner is ridiculous. Please take time to read the data that is being presented. Know that the people of the valley think you have big shoulders and are counting on you.

Date	Name	Comment
6/26/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Dear County Planning Commisioners, Thanks for all the work you did on the recommendations and taking our comments about the plan into consideration. I am worried however about moving the Start facilities, rodeo grounds and fairgrounds near High School Road. I think it will only trade one group of problems for another. I don't think that West Jackson should be dealt that kind of either or scenario and be made to look like we don't want to sacrifice anything. We have already with 6 schools, the public school transit system, heavy industrial, a sewage transfer station, a supermarket that services the whole valley and roads that are unsafe for school children and pedestrians. How will South Park deal with the added traffic, light, noise, air pollution and industrial runoff from the new facilities that would include oil, gas, antifreeze etc. How will the traffic in the summertime be mitigated and not just put up with? Will the town's plowed snow be transported to South Park also on to the new fairgrounds only to melt off into Flat Creek down here instead of in town? We can't just move the problems around. We have to solve the environmental and neighborhood unfriendly problems these needed facilities continually generate. Will LEEDS type regs be applied to these new facilities such as nonpolluting and quiet engines for the new start busses before the complex is moved. Will there be park and ride to the rodeo and fairgrounds from within town? Will town find somewhere else to dump their snow or use it in the summertime by implementing a gray water cistern system? How do we deal with the garbage that is produced from these public facilities, especially the fairgrounds and rodeo? Can we somehow tie into the composting facility located at the county dump site to accept compostable beer cups, plates, etc. and reduce the amount of garbage being thrown out? How close will the rodeo and fairgrounds be to the High School in relationship to the beer that will be sold; will it be too close to school grounds? Will there be sound and light mitigating measures like heavy landscaping with large Cottonwoods and low shrubs? The most important question is if South Park gets all these public facilities what's to prevent South Park from attracting more commercial in back of the High School and still pack the homes into the NW corner of South Park Loop Rd and High School Road if your other recommendations of reduced build out and dumping the density bonus tools aren't included in the final comp plan. It seems that history will repeat itself on High School Road. Haven't we learned a lesson with all the problems that condensing all the schools on HSR generated? Kelly accepted my invite for coffee and a walk around Cottonwood to show him what works and what doesn't work in Cottonwood Park. We met one morning a couple of weeks ago. He loved Range View Park and would like to continue something like it across High School Road. Do we now lose the open space incentive idea along HSR? I respect Kelly's family's right to make money off of South Park but at what price to their neighbors in Cottonwood Park and the surrounding neighborhoods? The transfer of these facilities to South Park I believe will embolden the South Park owners to continue with more commercial behind the high school. This only galvanizes Kelly's belief that this is what the community wants there (The 2008 community survey doesn't support that belief). Although, at the end of our conversation he did say that he personally doesn't want to see commercial by the high school. He would rather see a community college campus. Will the numbers in The NW corner of South Park be brought back down to the original 200 residential units allowed under present zoning without the bonus density tools? Or will that be negotiated from a higher rate. Kelly seems to think that between 600 and 800 residential units in the NW corner is fine. I animatedly but respectfully disagreed with him. These are Cottonwood Park concerns as well as my own. I have to admit I can't speak for the rest of Cottonwood when it comes to the transfer of the public facilities to South Park. But I can guess the initial response will be no. Personally, I don't want them in South Park. Although I am trying to keep an open mind about it. We would like to work with everybody to create a plan that is beneficial to everyone, but we are not willing to be dumped on again and then forgotten about to deal with the consequences. It would be nice if the hardworking people of West Jackson could escape to a quiet home in the evening and not have to deal with the tourists they deal with during the day. Thanks again for all the hard work you are doing to make this plan resemble what the community is speaking up about.

Date	Name	Comment
6/26/2009	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	Teton County Planning Commission – even to me who tracks the process closely - the current situation is clear as mud. I can say from the volume of phone calls, conversations and emails to me this week that the public: -has lost trust in the comp plan process -does not feel the plan reflects their well communicated vision for the future of our County -believes that this time-out in the process, and the County planning commission's actions, were very welcomed and one of the few times they have felt truly "listened to" Also the public now expects that JOINTLY, in some manner, the two planning commissions will give staff further direction to revise the plan BEFORE the public continues to consider participating in the process further. Process changes are also very welcomed but should come after the revision. I assume that on Monday evening the County planning commission will develop a list of specific directions to staff – although I believe staff already is well aware of what needs to be changed in the plan anyway. I am unclear how Monday's meeting along with the July 6 JIM and July 9 joint planning commission meetings will all play out – I don't think anyone does. So representing a broad and consistently engaged neighborhood group of citizens – I would be remiss if I did not suggest a few points to consider for staff direction with a focus on the South Park region and the excellent and detailed June 23 analysis by the JH Alliance on "The greater South Park region: A Summary of Wildlife and Scenic Resources." Suggestions for the County planning commission to consider in their recommendation to staff for the revision with excerpts from the Alliance report: 1. "Because of the extent to which the new draft represents a rewrite, rather than an update of the 1994 Plan, the new draft has the potential to dramatically change future land use planning for the greater South Park region in particular. The new draft shifts away from the preservation of rural character, away from the importance of scenic preservation, and away from adequately recognizing wildlife resources in "interior districts," or nodes, in addition to outlying areas." a. Reinstate substantive language from our currently binding 1994 comp plan about the scenic, rural and wildlife values inherent in the South Park region. 2. "Specific to South Park, the Conservation Alliance questions the low prioritization of "wildlife and natural resources" in District 12: South Park, and in general is very concerned with the devaluation of scenic resources in the new draft. The study area, like much of the public and private land in this valley, provides critical migration routes and yearlong and seasonal habitat for a wide variety of native species. Based on the information available, the maximum density proposed in the new draft and a low prioritization of wildlife and scenic resources in South Park are inappropriate and should not be promoted. To rank what is the community's overall top priority so low on the list for South Park is to do a disservice to the area, its residents (both human and wildlife alike) and to the community as a whole." a.Either spit the South Park district 12 into two districts or perhaps better yet – redraw most of the district from ½ mile south of High School road (not ¾ mile as this was never polled for) to be included with the East Bank district 5. The prioritizing of themes and uses in district 5 better parallel the bulk of the South Park district 12. 3. "Overall, while some residential development is appropriate in the northwest corner of District 12, the new draft should not recommend significant intensification of development in the greater South Park region (or any district) given the community's goals to limit overall growth and protect wildlife. And, as development occurs, significant portions of adjacent lands, within South Park, should be permanently protected to balance development and conservation goals in the area." a. Reduce from ¾ to no more then ¼ to ½ mile (approximately 200 acres in the proposed node in the NW corner of the Porter Estate). Also reduce from 1,500 to no more then 400 the number of potential units which would be a doubling of current entitlements/zoning and use of the PRD tool (correct Appendix I to reflect entitled zoning including Suburban and PRD use is 210 units and not 370 units as stated for the initial 400 acre node as proposed – staff has acknowledged this error). b. Link any development in a now recommended smaller footprint and less intense remaining NW South Park node be tied not only to achieve workforce housing objectives but equally achieving permanent open space within district 12 and/or district 5. c. Recommend that this new reduced node, as well as any others still proposed in the plan - be withheld for consideration until all infill opportunities are exhausted. In summary the community has been crystal clear that they want a plan that presents the "least growth" approach to future land use planning significantly reducing both future residential and commercial development while respecting existing property rights. This is especially important given the plan has completely abandoned any analysis of its potential impacts on wildlife, transportation, workforce housing, schools, infrastructure and fiscal costs. Thank you for your continued leadership. Although I believe the plan should absolutely move forward as a joint process in some manner – no more public hearings should be held until planning staff has revised the document to better reflect the unified, clear and overwhelming public input to date. If this critical step does not take place – the public has made it clear to me that they will likely completely disengage from the process.

Date	Name	Comment
6/25/2009	Langenberg, Karen Interested Public	THANK YOU for wrestling the Comp Plan back some steps. It was a brave move and you know by now that you have a strong base of support for it. Having just read the Conservation Alliance piece assembling three decades' worth of information on wildlife and scenic values in South Park, I am writing to encourage (urge) your mindfulness of these findings in upcoming direction to Planning Staff. My takeaways: - No longer can we just toss away this part of the region as inconsequential to wildlife and scenic resources. - The impacts of any decisions we make are remarkably interdependent and cumulative. - Without habitat connectivity we won't have the animals. - The scenery establishes who we are. The report makes all these points vividly (some relevant excerpts are included at the bottom of this message). In your direction regarding Plan revisions, please consider including the following: 1. Restore important passages concerning South Park wildlife and scenic values (from the 1994 Plan). 2. Move most of District 12 (South Park) into District 5 (Eastbank), except for the NW corner and the light industry segments along Highway 89. 3. Reduce the footprint and scale of development in all identified nodes, including the NW corner of South Park. Many thanks for your leadership. Excerpts from the JHCA Report: The Greater South Park Region: A Summary of Wildlife and Scenic Resources (June 23, 2009) The region is consequential to the valley's wildlife. "Elk, mule deer and moose use the area for annual migrations, daily movements, and minimal foraging. Raptors use the open agricultural fields for foraging, and the cottonwood and aspen stands for resting. Songbirds and migratory birds use the region, particularly the wetlands and riparian areas, for feeding and resting. Waterfowl, amphibians and reptiles utilize the wetlands, rivers and riparian habitats….Some of the spring creeks also serve as spawning grounds for the Snake River Cutthroat Trout. Cumulatively, these habitats contribute to the overall ecological health of the larger Snake River ecosystem." (pp 7-8 of 49) The report makes vivid how interdependent and cumulative our decisions are. For example: - "the establishment of one easement or protected habitat accentuates the value of the surrounding easements or protected habitats....while the 3.5 acre Teton Science School easement adjacent to the Indian Springs Ranch easement may itself not contribute greatly to habitat connectivity, taken together with the surrounding acres of protected land, its individual value to both wildlife and the preservation of scenic vistas is exponentially increased." (p 8 of 49, last paragraph) - "the increased presence of roads [more roads, wider roads) necessarily increases the impacts of each [one] of the roads….roads have long been recognized as features that break up habitat connectivity for many wildlife species. According to Jackson Hole Wildlife Foundation data…most large mammals residing in Teton County must cross roads in order to access habitat and meet their daily, seasonal, and life needs. Roads in the study area [South Park and the area around the proposed Tribal Trails connector] represent some of the highest fatality rates for large ungulates in Teton County….[These areas] have been considered appropriate areas to construct wildlife overpasses." (p 8 of 49, 2nd & 4th paragraphs) Without habitat connectivity we won't have the animals. Both North-South and East-West Connectivity through the study area are needed, providing corridors "through which animals can pass or use to leave developed areas when they wander in. To allow access to the slopes or…to the river bottom, [a] corridor should be there." (p 9, 2nd & 3rd paragraphs) Scenery establishes who we are. "The true gateway from the south to both Town and resort facilities, South Park [is defined by] prominent valley viewscapes, connecting vistas of buttes to the more distant Teton mountain range….[likewise] the Tribal Trails area, as a gateway from the west, accentuates and further defines the rural and agricultural character of the Town and County." (p 9, last 2 paragraphs; top of p 10)

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Camenzind, Franz Conservation Alliance	Hi, I'm Franz Camenzind with Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance. I'm a property owner. I've lived here in Jackson since 1970. First of all, I'd like to say thank you for this opportunity tonight. I think this is a good restart on this process. From what I heard yesterday and what was explained tonight by Chairman Hamilton, I think we are in a position now to have some good input and hopefully good results out of this process. We thought from the beginning that this is going to be a correction of the '94 Plan, and quite a few months into it we thought that. And I think the community did. And all of a sudden we've come up with a brand new Plan. And we debated long and hard as an organization, and I'm not sure that we know exactly for sure what we're going to do, but right now, we're looking at sticking with this draft Plan, working off of it, making our comments off of this, primarily because we respect the time that everyone in this community and all of you and the Planning Staff have put into this current document. But we really debated about taking the '94 Plan and trying to correct it like we thought we were going to do. Now, having said that, if during these deliberations you all decide, or whoever decides that you would like to go back to the '94 Plan, because quite frankly, I think would be easier to correct than it would be to correct this one, we would certainly go along with that. Like I say, out of respect for invested time and resources into this one, we're going to try to work with it. And a very general overview, and some of you heard this already, but we're very concerned that some major elements here are missing. The '94 Plan had many, many pages talking about the character and the value of character in this community. And clearly I heard discussions that a character-based Plan is very difficult to instigate, you know, to manage. A character-based Plan can work if you define what the characters are. As an example, if you define a neighborhood in Jackson and say this is a single-family neighborhood, that's the character and that should be maintained. Then you all can write, the Planning Staff can write LDRs that will do that. So, just to say things that character doesn't work, I think is misleading. Character works if you become objective with it. Right now, this is so subject that character doesn't fit in and consequently it's not even mentioned very much in here. And we do believe that character is a large part of this community. I think all the surveys have shown that. The character is small town, rural. Again, this draft Plan seems to have abandoned that language completely. And I'm not sure the community has. And I would like to see this brought back into the discussion. And I think there is a lot in the '94 Plan that could be pulled out, inserted here and then corrected. Also lost in here is any discussion of SRO of our scenic valleys in this community. I would like to see more attention put back into the SRO. I don't know why it fell out. I don't know where that direction came from, or if it was an oversight. NRO is somewhat the same. It is talked about. It gets quite a few pages in here and I like a lot of what it says, but it doesn't weave through the rest of the Plan. It doesn't show up. It's not the first filter that a lot of these districts go through. It's not the first filter that these chapters go through. And we, our organization, is environmentally…it is a wildlife-driven organization. And we believe sincerely that those values are also the values that drive the economic engine in Teton County today and I think will be our best investment in the future. So I think that the NRO should not be relegated to just a tool, but it should be brought up, the value should be brought up into every chapter in this theme. Never just scrapped. And right now we feel they're gone. Analysis, there's just a whole ream of missing analyses, if you will. Numbers do count. We need to know where we are, or where we're planning to go. That's the only way we can start doing impact analysis—transportation, school, fire, you can go down the list, recycling, everything. We need to have some idea of where we're going to go with this. And then with those numbers we could start doing an economic analysis, an impact analysis. Those connections are missing in this Plan. For the average person that wants to read this and get a picture of the future, this picture is extremely blurry and extremely wide with very little definition to it. I could go on but I think we'd be better off proceeding with more of a dialog than just to have me sit here and go over things. Needless to say, we want this to be a Plan that works. We should also remember that this is a Plan that will be in existence for ten or fifteen years. That doesn't mean that it won't be changed again. It'll be a new generation. It will be a new time with people making that decision. But we will be responsible for what happens between now and ten, particularly development study ?? will not be taken away. Places that are protected will be protected for the future, either through conservation easements, which are right now talked about, but there's no nexus between keeping the open space and conservation easements. The nodes, virtually all wildlife values are missing in the nodes. The rural areas, they're fairly well represented. In the Town wildlife valleys are almost gone. They're put down four, five, six, and seven on the tier list of importance, and clearly wildlife does have importance. And, Planning Commission, I just handed out tonight a copy of our publication that came out today on an analysis of the reports from the last 30 years from South Park, because South Park is a focus area for development. And what we did is simply a literacy search. It's not trying to make a whole lot of long-term projections out of this. But clearly this literacy search is showing that these studies over the past 30 years, there's an immense wildlife, there's an immense environmental value in South Park. And to ignore that I think is to ignore the best data that we have, which is hopefully in front of you now, and I think the will of this community. So I would urge you to take a look at that, and what it does show is that there certainly are gaps and we would hope that these gaps would be filled through the charge of the Environment Commission that I think will be set up. And I hope that Environment Commission has clear direction, not only as to what to do but the timeline to get it done, to start doing some analysis in this community, and particularly South Park. And I'll just cut it off there.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hi, and thank you very much for doing this. I'm Kathy Tompkins; I'm from Cottonwood Park and, Forrest, I have to disagree with you about the wildlife. I think that you had mentioned something about that there might not be much value other than the small critters or something like that in Cottonwood. I live on Range View and Range View opens up on each end on the south side to High School Road on the north, west side over to South Park Loop Road, ?? Road, the ?? area. During the wintertime we always have deer and elk and fox, coyote come through that park. And, you know, nibble away at everything and usually when I see the animals, and especially in the evening, I see flashbulbs, flashes going off on all the houses cause all the kids are in the windows taking pictures of the animals and everything. And I have a question for you. Do you have a ??, Steve, from Cottonwood, as far as nuisance animals? Right, okay, because I heard you saying…thank you for clarifying that, yeah, cause over on Range View where we live on the Park, and it is open ended on both sides, we do get the wildlife in there. And talking with my neighbors and going around the circle there, we like it, we like them coming through. And if anyone's charging rent to this one moose, he's staying there quite awhile. But getting back to the permeability…leading up to the permeability with that and the development in South Park, I'm just hoping that I know there was like an easement along South Park Loop Road, you know, for wildlife for the view and everything like that. I would like to see that come around and some kind of park or something across the road, instead of pushing houses or whatever right up to the road and blocking off the wildlife permeability through-Range View Park, and then having them actually bottlenecked in there and then disbursing through the neighborhoods. That could be worse. And I'm just hoping that South Park and Cottonwood, and I say Cottonwood because Cottonwood is right next to South Park, you know, District 13 is a lot of neighborhoods, not just one neighborhood, but Cottonwood would be most affected by a new neighborhood on the south side. And we just feel as though we don't want to be gobbled up by this new neighborhood with the up zoning and take away from the community character that we love so much with all the different types of neighborhoods within this District 13—the affordables, the apartments, and the single-family homes. What we worry about is becoming a dead zone like the area around the new post office has become. That used to be in the old neighborhood, the border of Jackson, and then Cottonwood took over. My opinion is I see those houses around the post office and how disjointed they are now and how they're all rentals and not really single-family homes anymore. There might be a few in there. What we're afraid of is that spreading out to Cottonwood as these new neighborhoods in South Park are built. And then becoming rentals, you know, landlords would get more money because they could pile a lot more people into that one house, raise the rent up, and because they're sharing, you know, they'll agree to pay that rent. Those are the different kind of things that I think we need to…I know I'm going from wildlife permeability to the community character of Cottonwood, but I think it's all interconnected. And we just have to be careful that, you know, this up zoning in South Park, what will it do to the neighbors that are already there and how…I would like to see it brought back to the original number and I think it was 370 or 400 platted for South Park, the northwest corner. Does anybody know the number on that? Three seventy? Yeah, and then work from there and get all your studies in and get everything done, you know, before you start throwing numbers out there and before it's too late and then you see another neighborhood going down the drain, you know, just to make way for a new neighborhood. And again we like the animals in our Cottonwood Park. Right, and that goes back to actually to interviewing people like me and people who are there and live there and see, you know, talking to them about what they see. Range View Park is there; you have to deal with it and the animals do come in there. You just don't want to start building across the road without taking that into consideration and continuing that permeability across the road, you know, and things like that. And that's another thing with this Commission, you know, the Wildlife Commission is have them interview, you know, people from the neighborhoods there, cause they're the eyes on the ground there, you know, they know what goes through those areas. So that might be a good idea. So, that's all I have to say.

Date	Name	Comment
6/23/2009	, Conservation Alliance	To: Town of Jackson and Teton County Planning Commissions, Teton County Board of County Commissioners, Town of Jackson Town Council, Jackson and Teton County Planning Departments. Dear appointed commissioners, elected officials and planning team, On behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, thank you for your attention to the following report and for the opportunity to submit preliminary research on the wildlife and scenic values in the South Park area as part of the Comprehensive Plan update process. The Conservation Alliance believes that planning decisions for our county's dwindling undeveloped private lands should be based on the best available information, research and science. As we determine the growth patterns and the community's priorities in the different districts of Jackson and Teton County, it is important to base our decisions on the best available information. Additionally, when this information is outdated or incomplete, which is not uncommon, we believe planning should err on the side of caution, particularly given the community's top priority – to protect wildlife and promote stewardship of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. This report focuses on South Park because it is slated for the most potential residential development of any district in the draft Comprehensive Plan, released 04/13/09, and because the new draft plan places very low priority on the protection of wildlife and scenic values in the area. This low prioritization represents a significant departure from our community's existing 1994 Plan. Due to the drastically proposed changes in land use in the district, we believe it is first critical to take into account the area's documented and under-studied wildlife and scenic resources before the community considers a plan that stands to eliminate those resources and values. The enclosed report is simply a first step. It is a summary of readily accessible environmental reports, studies and documentation from the past 30 years that refer to the wildlife and scenic resources in South Park and along the proposed Tribal Trails connector road. While it demonstrates that much of the available data is old or incomplete, and that more complete data collection and comprehensive analysis is warranted, this summary also reveals that the area includes high wildlife and scenic values. Also, given the historical importance of the South Park area for scenic preservation, this study (which includes a review of the 1994 Plan) reveals how differently the new plan addresses scenic resources. This shift is a broad concern, but it is strongly demonstrated in the new draft plan's proposed South Park district. In general, this report intends to initiate discussion on the directions for future growth outlined in the draft plan and to what extent these proposed directions were guided by the best available information. Please see the enclosed report for more detailed information, and feel free to contact us with any questions. {referenced report, The Greater South Park Region: A Summary of Wildlife and Scenic Resources, available hard copy in the County Planning Department}

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2009	Woods, Becky Interested Public	I know it’s a lot of time, and you guys are going to be in the political hot seat. Ultimately, we all want what we feel is best for the community. There may be some disagreement in that, but I wanted to thank you for your time. I also wanted you, if you continue this meeting, which I think you're going to, to also allow public comment and a continuance. I think perhaps there’s a lot of people not from the County here because there was such uncertainty with what was happening in the process. So, I would ask you to please keep the opportunity for public comment on these particular themes and policies in the continuance, and not just discussion amongst yourselves because of that uncertainty. Okay, jumping right in, Policy 1.1(c), conserve large, contiguous and connected open spaces. It specifically states in the draft that that is necessary for habitat protection. It’s valuable for wildlife and connectivity between crucial areas. My problem with that, one of the largest open spaces is South Park. The way the draft is currently written, it’s basically develop it north to south with no preservation of open spaces. That defeats one of the main themes and priorities that our community values, which is both wildlife habitat and the scenic character of Jackson Hole. So, South Park as really…that language and visioning is not in line with that theme and policy. If you want to protect wildlife and conserve open spaces, the language of north/south development of South Park has got to be addressed, or you're going to defeat that purpose under Policy 1.1(c). So very important. Same thing under Policy 1.6(a), conserve agricultural lands and agriculture throughout Teton County. Again, that comes down to our scenic character, our Western historic character, and also allowing the opportunity for Land Trust to come in and permanently conserve large tracts of land. South Park is not mentioned. That is one of the largest tracts of land. You go into Alta, Buffalo Valley, and Gros Ventre area, Spring Gulch, and South Fall Park Road. It was one of the first areas mentioned in the vision of the 1994 Comp Plan. I don't know why it disappeared in this draft. It’s got to go back in, under Policy 1.6(a), again, for our scenic values, for our historic value of our community, and for wildlife. It’s a mystery to me as to why that just disappeared. It doesn’t seem to be in line with any of the surveys that have come out and what the community sees for its vision. Under Strategies, page 25, Strategy 1.1, it says, establish an environmental Commission, and they said it will be appointed by a volunteer committee of scientists. I urge the Planning Commissions to expand that to interested community leaders and neighborhood leaders, who have been working triple time on this, who have analyzed this line by line, who may have a different take on just someone with a strictly scientific background. I think that needs to be broader-based. It’s simply too important to our community. Same thing under Strategy 1.2 when it says, the mapping would be with the Wyoming Game & and Fish data. I think there’s also very valuable citizen data that has been collected from people who actually live in our various communities that needs to be addressed. So, I would expand that to beyond just Wyoming Game & Fish, but to use all available credible data to do the mapping of our wildlife, etcetera. And last, just kind of a general comment that really does fit in with these themes and policies, and it’s going to come up again and again. South Park is not a node. South Park is an area. It’s over 2500 acres and it’s the only node that has not been defined. If you're going to identify South Park as a node, that needs a hard edge, whatever it’s going to be, a quarter-mile pass, the South Park Road or whatever. It can’t be this amorphous South Park. Every other area has very specific boundaries identified with it. I don't know why South Park doesn’t have it. I really recommend that that be addressed by the Planning Commission so these other themes and policies have a ghost of a chance of becoming reality. Thanks for your time...I’m still Becky Woods, and this is directly related to the themes and policies, actually. One of the problems I'm really having when I go through this draft and see the different themes and policies, which takes precedent? What’s our overall community vision? It seems to me we’re parsing off the Valley and saying, well, this is the area that gets the housing and this is the area that gets the wildlife, and this is the area that gets to have a nice view. And that’s not how any of us feel who live here. We are all integrated, and we’re one. And what I have a real problem with these themes and policies is there’s no one integrating vision. And in think without one integrating vision, we stand the very real risk of destroying the Valley we love. I just have a problem with themes and policies. What I'm looking for in a Comprehensive Plan is a vision. I think we had it in 1994. I don’t think we have it in the draft of 2009.

Date	Name	Comment
6/17/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Good evening. My name is Kathy Tompkins. I'm from Cottonwood Park. I agree with Becky that South Park needs more definition and not to just throw it away, defining it as a node. It sounds like something you'd find in your armpit. And I just have some observations that I made the other day and today, and it has to do with Policy 1.1(b) and, first of all, I want to make sure...this is unclear to me. When it says here, local state and federal governments must work with local biologists to create and keep current a baseline inventory of habitat wildlife and climate. And I am relating this to South Park. There is no inventory right now, as I'm understanding it. So, before anything is done, there has to be some kind of impact study done to clarify what we have in South Park, which South Park's neighbors can pretty much tell you. And then the other thing that this, I think, relates to is the up-zoning of up to 1500 units in South Park along High School Road and down to...I don't know if you've been along South Park Loop Road down to the nursery. I think that's about three-quarters of a mile down. It used to be a half a mile; they kind of stuck that quarter mile in there...extra quarter mile. With the up-zoning with up to that many units and that much upkeep of that many units and the land that goes with these units, walking around my neighborhood and observing landscape companies coming around with their machines to spray lawns, to spray trees, to spread fertilizer, and especially these last few weeks with all the runoff we've had from the rain. And I was standing out there this morning with my cup of coffee and watching the water run down the street and empty into wherever else, and usually it's into those ditches and the wet areas in South Park so, you know, down along High School Road. We know pretty much where that goes, but do we know where the runoff from the up-zoning of 1500 units in the northwest corner crammed into that northwest corner, what will happen to Fall Creek and the wetland areas around there? When you have commercial fertilizing, pesticides, herbicide programs going on, private and public, and you know that private aren't always so good at reading directions, and a lot people do it on their own because they can't afford the companies to do it for them. So, I'm wondering if anybody is going to look into this and see where all this stuff is going to wind up. I have a pretty clear idea where it's going to wind up, and this is one of the many things that happens when you create a whole new neighborhood where there is no infrastructure, there's no studies done or anything like that. And just to remind you that from Cottonwood all the way down to the tip of South Park, there's about 1500 homes, give or take a hundred or so. And then to put 1500 units in that little northwest corner, that's a lot of concentration of chemicals and what we don't know that's going to wind up in the system. So, just a little food for thought.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group recommended a statement about connectivity of pathways and roadways to existing and future neighborhoods. Consensus was reached about highlighting future north-south and east-west thoroughfares in the north half of the district.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The consensus of the group was that this was an appropriate place for expansion of the town development pattern, but was no consensus was reached on how much development should occur. Some in the group felt that the increase in density should be similar to the Cottonwood Park area. Some members of the group believed that the whole district should be planned comprehensively. Some believed the district should be broken into a node district (north) and a rural district (south).
6/11/2009	Heileson, Marv Interested Public	My name is Marv Heileson and I live in the County in South Park. And my wife and I have written to the Commissions and to the other bodies here and I won't repeat that. But I just want to remark from the very outset of this, I've lived here for about four years. Born in Rexburg. Grandfather born in Freedom. Practiced law for 40 years in California. And represent developers. So, if I represent developers, I would like a lot of developers. I was a Planning Commissioner for seven years in a wonderful little city that drew the line and said we're going to be semi-rural, Lafayette, California. And you take real courage on the part of a body like yours to draw lines and say we're going to preserve what we have here. And low and behold all of the developers have now flocked to live in this little city, between Walnut Creek and Birchwood in that area in East Bay of San Francisco. So, really, you just really have to have a lot of courage sitting behind that desk to do the right thing. The thing that I think disturbed me most when I first got involved in seeing what was happening here is the euphemism being employed in this document by the Planning Staff. I'm not against planners. My wife has a master's in urban planning, and urban planner most of her life. But the big euphemism is node. Now, what the hell is a node? South Park is not a node. South Park is the same distance, one house per 35 acres, some development down there, a lot of wildlife, talk to the moose and ?? that live in my back yard during the winter. You know, you go wrong when you use terms like node as just an excuse for saying we're going to have high density in a given area. The same thing with managed growth. That seems to have gone to let's have growth. It's lost it's connotation, managing growth. I think we need to restrict growth along the lines a lot of the speakers have indicated today. And the last comment I really want to make before I run out of time is I've noticed a great difference between this year and last year in terms of employee needs. People are crying for employees, you know, two years ago and whatever and they couldn't get 'em and, you know, they had classified ads and <<inaudible>>. Now, when a lot of people, even in my neighborhood, have lost their jobs, put their houses on the market, it's radically different. So you've got to take that into account. I mean, we don't have the workforce it needs today, and then certainly if you can limit your commercial property development, we won't need that much in the future. But take that into account. Thank you very much.

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	Morris, Bob Interested Public	Bob Morris, Teton Village, and these are my opinions only. We should not be encouraging commercial growth, including lodging. And we should not be encouraging free-market homes. The clustering along High School Road should be accomplished not by up zoning but in accordance with the Plan of '94 so that the sum of 85 percent of all that land is dedicated to perpetual open space. And lastly I recommend that you call on one-minute speakers first
6/11/2009	Roush, Lou Anne Interested Public	As a resident of South Park I believe preservation of Wildlife and Natural Resources should be at the top of the list of priorities for our district not at the bottom. Also having students in the Middle and High School I am concerned about the amount of traffic already in this area. The increased amount of housing you propose next to the High School will only aggravate the problem and increase the potential for student related accidents.
6/11/2009	O'Brien, Kristine Interested Public	Due to a conflict, I will not be able to attend today's meeting.My comments follow. Please maintain the commitment made in the current plan to conserve the scenic rural beauty and wildlife of South Park. Removal of this theme is arbitrary and unacceptable. Transferring development rights from rural areas (e.g. Buffalo Valley, Alta) where growth is not likely to occur to areas where growth is most likely to occur (South Park) does not conserve agricultural land. To the contrary, it makes development of such lands more likely. The community has expressed in several polls and in numerous public comments, it prefers slow, smart growth, that it does not want increased build-out. There are sufficient development rights to grow for many years. Up- zoning South Park would serve no community purpose. It would make a few individuals wealthy (or wealthier) and that's about it. The cost of the proposed scale of growth in terms of infrastructure and run-down of our natural capital are high.
6/11/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	We the undersigned, residents ofWest Jackson, expect that the Comprehensive Plan will be revised to reOect the following: The wording "Develop South Park North To South" should be eliminated from the Future Land Use Plan for South Park (District 12). Reduce the number of proposed future units from 1500 units in South Park back to the 370 units that are already allowed under present zoning. Any new development in South Park should only occur after infill has been exhausted in the town of Jackson. Any new development in South Park and the Tribal Trails connector Road should not be even be considered until a new road connecting Route 89 and South Park Loop Road in South Park is completed first to alleviate the traffic on High School Road. If any new development occurs in South Park there should be open space from the High School to South Park Loop Road between the new development and High School Road. {signed by many, available in County Planning Department}

Date	Name	Comment
6/8/2009	Johnson, Joanna Interested Public	In January 2004 I wrote this letter to the Teton Co. Commissioners: As a native of Jackson Hole, I believe the Comprehensive Plan governing growth here has to be downsized. Many concerned citizens discussing growth at recent public meetings offered this conclusion: cut the amount of future growth allowed! Current information indicates the for-sale housing and rental units are pretty well in balance with available jobs. A referendum last December overturned a re-development plan for larger structures in downtown Jackson. Last year a referendum overturned a development plan for the J.H. Hereford Ranch. I believe the current structure of downtown should be maintained. I also believe every effort should be made to preserve the current use of J.H. Hereford ranchland. Only 3% of Teton County is privately owned, and of this, approximately two-thirds has already been developed (there may be as many as 2,500 lots platted, but not yet developed). The current population of Teton County is 18,000, so putting a cap on the population somewhere near 25,000, while implementing smaller and less development of the one third undeveloped land available would be responsible planning. Under the current plan the population could grow to (or exceed?!) 40,000. This valley cannot sustain that level without sacrificing our most valuable assets. Downsizing requires the courage and conviction to oppose unnecessary developments that waste valuable land, and/or adversely affect natural resources (such as water and wildlife). The impact overbuilding and overpopulation has on necessary services such as law enforcement, fire protection, health care, social services, schools, roads, water, sewer, etc. will be extreme! Jackson Hole is a most unique place. Our proximity to National Parks, National Forest, Wilderness areas, Federal Elk Refuge, State Refuges, and BLM land requires huge responsibility on our part to manage growth accordingly. This location is part of a large ecosystem that requires balance in order to survive. These natural resources are precious to residents, as well as to those who visit. We each have choices and bear responsibility for what happens here. We can’t change the past, but we can change the future by making wiser choices now. Sincerely, Joanna Johnson Now, in 2009, more excessive developments are proposed and again the majority of residents are saying no! Recently I spoke with the Planners and was told that 70% of private land in Teton Co. has been developed; 30% undeveloped. Planners quoted me the same figures five years ago, yet major developments have taken place in wildlife corridors and along major waterways. The population of Teton Co. is not truly known, as a census has not been taken for nine years. Necessary services such as law enforcement, fire protection, health care, social services, water, sewer, etc. are stressed. We will soon need more schools. The roads are at full capacity. We are losing wildlife (example: moose population is down 44%). Ranching is disappearing and natural resources are being compromised. Mismanagement of our part of the large ecosystem we share affects the balance of the whole. Teton Co. has gone from a ranching and tourist economy to an economy based on consumption which is driven by greed. Those who benefit monetarily are willing to sacrifice our most valuable assets. Consumption can only last as long as there is something to consume! Then what?? Will there be anything left to base a sustainable economy on? As a native resident I ask you again to please stop promoting the selling of Jackson Hole to the highest bidder and direct your efforts toward preserving what's left, while seeking alternatives for the economy.
6/4/2009	O'Brien, Paul F. Interested Public	It is unacceptable that the need to protect the scenic and wildlife attributes of this area, made clear in the existing plan, have been arbitrarily dropped from the rewrite. Past events, such as the TMR disaster, have made it clear the public wants protection of this area in the plan.
6/3/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I am writing to invite you to come to Cottonwood and go for a walk around the neighborhood to let you see what works and doesn't work here to keep our great little neighborhood viable. We are not opposed to extending our neighborhood South Of High School Road into South Park when the time comes. We welcome a new neighborhood when needed to compliment what's already here. We just ask that you have an open mind to our concerns about the proposed over development in the NW corner of South Park and the negative effects it will have on our diverse neighborhoods here in West Jackson. Our main concerns are the failure of High School Road being the only collector between Rte 89 and South Park Loop Road. There are no assurances in the comp plan to promise a parallel collector in South Park to alleviate the traffic on High School Road before this development occurs and the Tribal Trails Connector Road goes in. The second is the lack of open space and parks in the NW corner of South Park. If you do the numbers there is no room for these ammenities in NW South Park. The plan states that West Jackson infrastucture such as parks, roads and schools can serve the proposed 1500 units in the 400 acres in the NW corner. There are about 1500 all toll, homes from Cottonwood down to the tail end of of South Park. Can you imagine that many jammed into the small amount of land and the pressures that these units will put on the schools, parks and roads here in West Jackson. Give me a call and come on over for a cup of coffee and a walk around a great diverse neighborhood and help us think of ways to keep it going and make it better with out abandoning it for newer pastures accross the road.

Date	Name	Comment
6/1/2009	Viau, Carol Interested Public	I would like to comment on the part of the plan regarding the idea to continue "light industrial uses on the bench above Melody Ranch". Currently, those of us living below the bench are sleep deprived 3/4 of the year. Spring, summer and fall, Fish Creek Excavation starts up their equipment and operations early. The sound reverberates over the Melody Ranch neighborhood, due to it's location. The Steak Pub/south side pizza pub, has a history of music (and is continuing it) on the back deck until late, then we are kept awake by the loud revelers still hanging out back there. The noise distributes so well, that entire conversations can be heard from our bedroom window, which is open due to the summer heat. Two summers ago I became very familiar with the night shift at the sheriff's office due to all these late night antics. I would call them every night with noise complaints. The same sound problem emits from the apartments next to the Pub. For those of us that work odd hours (two to three jobs, 15 hour days, weekends) this is absolute torture. However, to continue living in my affordable home, this type of work schedule is necessary as services jobs are low paying. If you want to keep the working force here, you must consider this problem in future development of the Melody Ranch Bench. I strongly encourage you to consider "QUIET" type of industrial uses here.
5/28/2009	Sibson, Barry Interested Public	The allowable numbers of new housing units in nortwest South Park are double what they should be. The balance of the area in South Park should be limited to 1 unit per 3 acres, but in clusters, so that 50% open space can be required of any development. That open space should provide for a contiguous notrh/south corrider of open space.
5/17/2009	McIntyre, Julie Interested Public	Wildlife is our number one priority in TC, this includes South Park and other "nodes". South Park is an important rural area, it has fine scenic vistas and a slower pace. Next to the Snake, it is one of the most interesting areas for water fowl viewing and is critical for nesting. It is also our southern gate. I am very concerned about the odd, new, and vague language regarding protections in South Park. We do not want housing expansion, we seek to protect wildlife. Restore the language of the "94 Plan, eliminate the very strange wording that states South Park will be built out from 'north to south starting at High School Road.' Accidental?In-fill in town should be exhausted before considering expansion into outer areas. Do not use the NW South Park area as a dumping ground for problems generated by other areas of the county.Preserve the rural scenic nature of South Park Loop and High School Road. Any development in So. Park should allow wildlife permeability. No commercial development. No redlining.
5/17/2009	Jesse, Dennis Interested Public	Thank you for accepting my comments. I am a resident of Cottonwood Park Neighborhood.I came to Jackson from my home state of Colorado in 1977 with every intention of returning. I was on a summer climbing trip and had a job at a local summer camp. I ended up with a complete life here. I think the reason I stayed was people here had a sense of what was valuable, not in terms of dollars, but in quality of life. I hope that my suggestions are helpful. I know that I am part of Jackson's overall growth too. First of all, developing of land as an economy is flawed. Second, importing labor is a sign that business is flawed. Maintain an economy for the citizens. Jackson in the 1970's supported itself with a tourist based industry. Granted, there weren't huge profits but the community was very happy. Is there any chance we could return to just hosting visitors and showing off our beautiful county? The plan seems to be designed for expansion of town as if this type of growth is necessary for our survival. I think we're more unique. Specific to my concern: We work a huge amount of hours to come home and enjoy our nice, quiet neighborhood in Cottonwood Park. We are, for the third time, threatened with a super high density development right next door. This "node" has been kicked around the county and again landed on our doorstep. Nobody that I know wants the Porter Estate to be a city. I would welcome a mirrored image of Cottonwood Park in density (1/3 of proposed) and character to provide opportunity to our next generation of "in community" citizens on that land. Bear in mind that Cottonwood Park originally did not attract the buyer that would get a Sotheby's broker very excited but it did provide Jackson's current citizens a quality home. We have one of the most diverse neighborhoods in the County. We want to continue to maintain our "neighborhood character" as all of the other Town of Jackson subdivisions have claimed when a large development was proposed in their backyard. Please don't use the area for density trade, bonus, credit, whatever, for somebody's profit elsewhere. I suggest we take that off the table completely. Any trade for open space belongs in South Park. This property can be put on the market in a form attractive to the community, not to the outside opportunist. Also, it's not free enterprise if we pack it full of subsidized housing. Please adjust colors on the District 12 map to reflect the open space buffer zone along High School Road discussed with Cottonwood Park residents or schedule another meeting with the residents to confirm and clarify this proposed buffer zone. We would like to see this buffer zone be 1/4 of a mile (not 1 1/2 city blocks). If this buffer zone has been discarded please advise us. I think that an access corridor would be appropriate along Flat Creek, rather than allow it to be privately held. Maybe the District 12 map should suggest this, in color. Roads, in particular the "East-West connector", parks, water, sewer, should precede coloring of the map. Draw some lines and dimensions even if it's just preliminary, we'd get a better feel for what you are thinking. Wildlife, Scenery: Our moose and deer like the view of the Snake River Range as much as John Dodge moose enjoy the Teton view. Also note, and I'm sure you have, that quite a few old time citizens have moved to other areas e.g. Star Valley to have more space for horses, etc. and still work in Jackson. This is their choice and there is no reason to add more workers to replace them. They are still here, working.

Date	Name	Comment
5/17/2009	Smith, Margaret E. Cree Interested Public	Here it is, the 11th hour, and I find myself wishing there was more time for comment. I appreciate the amount of effort that has gone into producing a plan that has made an attempt to address the diverse and complex needs of this incredible community that I live in. Unfortunately, I feel that in a number of areas, the plan has fallen short of what this community wants. Forgive me for rambling as I go along but at this point, it is the only way I will get my comments to you. For starters, I am baffled as to how the update of the 1994 plan can call for such an increase in growth. Who is asking for more growth, and not just some growth, but a massive increase in it over the next 1-20 years? Doubling the number of housing units?, more than doubling the amount of commercial space? I feel that the projected numbers or housing units and commercial space needs to be dramatically reduced. In my mind, all of this growth creates a ripple affect through out the entire valley of Jackson Hole that moves away from the concepts of sustainability that are touted in this new draft. (Speaking of which- I don't know who wrote the following: "the concept of sustainability within the context of the community's vision delineates that ecosystem preservation does not preclude growth and development necessary to meet our community's human needs." but in my mind, this needs to be completely rewritten so that it makes sense to the lay person. Was someone trying to impress the masses with their mastery of the English language? Captain Bob was right when he said in so many words, "Keep it simple!" I find that loading up on density on the NW corner of the Porter Estate, especially at the density specified, will do nothing but create more problems as the infrastructure of that area, roads in particular, are not designed for that kind of density. I don't know numbers but having 4 schools in close proximity to a massive density increase seems seriously flawed to me. And what about the wildlife? The movements of wildlife in the South Park area is increasingly diminished as more and more development occurs. Continuing to put density into South Park does not bode well for the wildlife. They don't know boundaries. And what about when chronic wasting disease finally comes to Jackson Hole and works its way into the elk herds that winter on the feed grounds in South Park and elsewhere? Won't that too interfere with their movement patterns and their behavioral histories? I would hope that in addressing any future issues on development in South Park, that this issue be looked at and that recommendations are in place from the Game and Fish and other wildlife authorities. Now that I'm on South Park, let me continue. This new plan eliminates any language calling for permanent open space protection of portions of South Park, and for protection of scenic and wildlife values in the South Park region. Why is it that South Park was eliminated from this draft plan when it was first on the list in the 1994 plan's section "Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources"? Wildlife and natural resources should be the priority for South Park. Language that states that South Park will be built out from "north to south starting at High School Road" needs to be deleted. Any development that does happen in the NW corner of the Porter Estate should have at least 1/8 mile pull- back from both High School Road and South Park Loop Road. Good that Flat Creek will get protection but it can not be looked at independently. Animals move to and from Flat Creek. It is not enough to just protect it's corridor. There needs to be inclusion in the plan for movement corridors for wildlife. A study should be done on animals other than large game using the agricultural meadows throughout Teton County (this includes the majority of South Park). The paradigm needs to change where value is giving to species other than those that draw income from hunting permits. The small rodents of this valley and the animals that subsist on them need to be recognized for the importance the play in the biodiversity of Jackson Hole and the GYE. I would like to see this addressed in this plan. Density incentives for NW South Park should be taken from permanent open space protection in South Park, not from elsewhere. Why not move the Rodeo Grounds to the NW portion of the Porter Estate and use that area for town infill? My feeling is that town infill should happen before any other areas are targeted, especially Wilson and South Park. (The increase in density in Wilson, both in residential units and commercial seems completely misguided. Yes, there is commercial, yes, there is housing but it is still only a 15 minute drive from the heart of town. Do you really think that people will do more of their shopping in Wilson if you increase the commercial there? The Center for the Arts is in town, Snow King Ice Arena is in town, Jackson Hole Youth Soccer is in town, all High School athletics are in town- the list goes on. How many trips are made a day from any one place in Teton County to get kids to some activity? Parents then do what they need to do when they get their kids into town. Spreading out density across the valley and increasing commercial in these "nodes" is not going to solve a whole lot of problems. Am I rambling, or what? Density should be in town, first and foremost. There is does the least amount of damage to any other part of Jackson Hole, including its wildlife which if I remember correctly, was the #1 priority of this community. Oh yes, open space too. I can't remember growth being a priority. Somehow, it became one in this draft. I sincerely hope that everyone is listening carefully to the people of this community and that you will consider serious rewrites of this draft plan. It still needs some work before it is a document that we can be proud of. I hope that you will extend the deadline for comments. I felt that it was entirely too short.

Date	Name	Comment
5/16/2009	Langenberg, Karen Interested Public	As I digest all that has been said by the community and in April's Comp Plan draft… it occurs to me that for now, we should stick with the 1994 Plan, which in many ways got it (and still gets it) right. It's instructive to revisit the plan update objectives (in their entirety), which don't seem to imply much more (http://jacksontetonplan.com/plan/plan-update-objectives/): 'Plan Update Objectives The plan update will accomplish four main objectives:1. Reconfirm/refine the 20-year vision for the valley that is realistic and achievable 2. Bring directions and policies of the County and Town into alignment with each other and with those of other coordinating agencies 3. Coordinate decision-making 4. Provide a greater level of predictability to landowners, businesses, and residents.' It's water under the bridge that so much time and money have been spent on what amounts to a plan REWRITE, not just an update. It obviously matters much more what happens to real life here in Jackson Hole. Let's maintain the community vision as captured and reflected in 1994. Keep that ironclad. At most, stick with the commercial and residential growth numbers as envisioned in 1994. Now…with our 2009 sensibility, go to work on 1994's policies surgically (only): – Strengthen permanent protections for wildlife, open space, and community character (if new taxes are considered, designate these to help pay for such protections). – Think about reducing residential (and especially commercial) growth BELOW 1994 projected buildout, and CAPPING annual growth rates at 1-2% per year. – Incorporate specific policies that will increase workhouse housing in the mix (and place much greater emphasis on affordable rentals). Prioritize redevelopment, infill, mitigation, and exactions for this purpose. New ground-breaking should be the last option, and then only in or directly adjacent to Town (avoiding Jackson single family neighborhoods), and falling within the annual growth cap. While we're on the subject of Town adjacency…wildlife doesn't notice if the land is called 'South Park' or any other name. What's special about this valley is what's special about this valley – everywhere. Wildlife, scenery, and open space protections should have the same priority (first) - everywhere. In South Park, apply the same reduced, capped growth framework and the same permanent protections (wildlife permeability, open space) as elsewhere. Exhaust infill in Town before considering expansion into ANY County area – including the northwest corner of South Park. It's inspiring to revisit the words of the 1994 plan, with its inclusive view of County lands (Chapter 1, p 4): 'In Teton County, [the first area of concern] is "open space." These are lands on which ranching should continue, wildlife habitat [is] preserved, and the visual qualities of scenic vistas protected. Examples include the hay meadows of South Park, the Spring Gulch scenic area, ranchlands along the Teton Village road, Buffalo Valley, and the western-most entrance to Teton County from Alta. These lands also include the Snake, Hoback, Gros Ventre, and Buffalo Fork river corridors and those hillsides and butte sides which are crucial winter range for ungulates. These areas should be kept free of development to the maximum extent possible to help preserve rural character, critical wildlife habitat and important image-setting scenic vistas and river corridors, and to encourage the continuation of ranching and other types of traditional agriculture as a vital part of the community's character.' We need to keep all these things in. The 1994 plan got it right. The connectivity, scenic, and wildlife values are still there (including in South Park), and the community still cares about them in the same way. With all of these different (specific and clearly-stated) policies in place, we can then address the 2009 need for increased predictability, through their associated language in 2009-updated zoning regulations.
5/15/2009	Moberg, Jill Interested Public	You have slated far too much growth and development for the South Park area. We don't need that much housing in this areas. High School Road cannot support that degree of development. Wildlife migration will also be unforgivably adversely affected.The current economic situation has resulted in less demand for new housing in Teton County. You should re-evaluate all plans for growth, in all areas of the County, at this time, since your data and comments from the public advocating more housing are now outdated.
5/15/2009	Jerger, Karen Interested Public	I agree that the No. part of South Park is a logical place for residential growth outside the town of Jackson. I am encouraged by the possiblity that such growth will include attention to Safe Streets designs, and effective public transit. I am relieved to see the map include a mix of density types suggested for the South Park area. I really cannot picture what the proposed buildout might actually look like on the ground. It all sounds like A LOT.
5/15/2009	Rohrstaff, Kate Interested Public	I think the conceptual land use is acceptable. I live in Rafter J and believe that building between High School Road and Melody is a good option. Not only will adding homes in this area give people who work in Jackson places to live, but it will also provide jobs to all of the people who will be needed to build the homes.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Hazen, Diane Interested Public	The northwest end of South Park is a logical extension of town densities. This should be done by annexing in phases as development warrants. However, the text and the map have contradictions. The rest of South Park is very confusing. On the map, the area suggested for development seems to grow with each version of the map, the remainder being shown as Agriculture/Rural. But, while wildlife is significant during several times of year (particularly winter), Wildlife & Natural Resources are shown as next to last in terms of importance. Also, South Park is inexplicitly excluded from the list (Policy 1.6a) where conservation easements would be appropriate. Even though the importance of the Flat Creek corridor and view sheds are noted--there is no protection mechanism for these areas--much less wildlife migration/winter habitat protection.Density bonuses in the "node" of South Park are not clear--this node should be more of a transitional node to lower density housing. There needs to be more recognition of the importance of protected open space in South Park. It is not clear whether this node will be expanding dramatically in the future. On page 110 of the plan, in the first paragraph development of 1/4 to 1/2 mile in the NW part is described, then in the second paragraph "The northern 3/4 miles of South Park is appropriate for town-style development..." Is this all the way to Hwy 89 including the corner of High School Road? The language and the map related to South Park appear to be contradictory.Even 6 Pronghorns spent the summer in South Park as recently as 2006--to ignore wildlife in South Park is untenable. It is rich with birds and mammals.
5/15/2009	Gill, Robert Interested Public	I have been reviewing the latest version on the Teton County Comp. Plan. I know that you are looking for some feed back, but all I have is questions. I see that the Jackson Hole Hereford Ranch is targeted to receive the most density. What I do not understand (and I am not alone) is how it receives this increase. After talking with Jeff Daugherty anf Alex Norton it is confusing on how the commercail and higher density would be divided between the two owners of the Jackson Hole Hereford Ranch? There are so many questions that need answered for me to be able to make comments. What is the base density? What are the PRD multipliers? Are there going to be PRD's? How do we get density from other porperty owners? Are the affordable housing and workforce housing purchased at a discount? With out these answers plus the LDR's it is difficult to make constructive comments.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Gillete, Claudia Interested Public	Neighbors in the Cottonwood Park Subdivisions are concerned with some of the language written to describe our district and our neighborhoods. We find it surprising that of the seven individual themes identified through the process, four of them for district 13 have been defined almost identically. Although we feel strongly that "supporting the existing neighborhood" should be a priority, more weight should be placed on how each theme relates back to its original ideal, principles and how those work within the districts. The use of Neighborhood as singular in the themes of this district is not really what is going on and does not represent this district or others effectively. Each district is made up of varying neighborhoods of sizes, types and uses. The clustering, feathering and linking of neighborhoods makes them relate to each other and causes a district to be unified. We love our neighborhood and how it, with the other neighborhoods in our district, make them a great place to live. The individual designs, community services and circulation create a diverse yet whole district. The high density does leave something to be desired. Less density in our neighborhoods is important; please listen to the concerns and needs of many (older) citizen's, some of whom were born and raised in this valley, (scenic, wildlife, open space/migrant corridors; less crime, infrastructure needs, on and on!) When reading the written text pUblished in the draft plan we have the following comments: 1) Responsible Growth: We hope that the comp plan is using our districts neighborhoods as role models for future developments since we are almost built out. And since we are almost built out, responsible growth should not be District 13's first priority. The only future growth that may take place in our district is School growth which when designed needs to look further into its impact on the existing neighborhoods of our district. The huge Growth proposed in the neighboring District 12 in the NW corner of South Park is unnecessary and detrimental to district 13. The impact on the schools, roads, parks, scenic and natural resources of district 12 is immeasurable. This proposed growth should be scaled back tremendously. Utilizing open, available lots within the town makes more sense. 2} Town as Heart: Continuing to "support" the mixed-use neighborhood is top priority for District 13. The proposed growth of neighboring districts as well as the school district and the impact of the possible Tribal Connector will all affect pro & con, our district's character and attraction for the working families that we are designed for. Proposing more density in the NW corner of district 12 before infilling the town proper does not support this theme. Twisting the theme to state "develop adjacent to" causes more infrastructures to be built instead of using the city roads and utilities already installed. 3) Transportation: Balancing the needs of the community and constructing the Tribal connector detract from our district. Protection of these impacts needs to be first and foremost. In addition, the traffic impact of the High School as well as 5 other schools that are currently serviced through our district and the proposed growth in the NW corner of South Park need to be equally listed. Prior to any new development, the existing problems have to be addressed. The school district needs to be engaged further to reduce the impact students are having on the neighborhood. The missed opportunity of reducing single car use and increase alternate modes of transportation needs further consideration & forethought. Also the lack of small parking areas where county residents can access the amenities and bus stops provided in this district cause damage to personal property. 4) Workforce Housing: District 13 is mainly work force housing already. We are mostly built out and therefore this theme is the least priority. However adding the proposed 1500 units of Work Force housing to the neighboring district 12 creates a concentration of this demographic in one area in the county. Designing pockets of work force housing in other locations in the county is more desirable and creates a more diverse community over all. Any density bonuses should only be granted if, in fact, the work force housing developed by the bonus benefits directly from it. 5) Community Facilities: Future growth of the schools in this area will impact the district as it relates to traffic congestion, parking locations, impervious parking lots, and light pollution in the evenings and on weekends. Teton County Schools need to be looked at as a developer and held to the same standards of protecting existing neighborhoods as part of their future growth. In addition first responders of Fire & EMT should be considered as needing to have a home somewhere in our district especially when considering any future housing to be located in the NW corner of South Park. And finally new developments need to be required to create new parks within their neighborhoods and not tax the existing one found in District 13's. The proposed work on the high school ~stadium" is a bit much in dollars and ~improvements". 6) Wildlife Natural Resources: More and more wildlife is being directed into district 13 due to the growth and fencing/berming along South Park Loop Road which also detracts from our scenic vistas. The potential loss of a scenic corridor to the south due to future development and the blocking of the scenic view to the west is a great deterrent to all who live and travel through this district. Again the people who live and work here should be taken care of before future residents. District 13 should not have to sacrifice (~allowable trade offs for District 13" are the words from the planners) scenic views and wildlife to accommodate future workforce to the South. 7) Balanced Community & Economy: To maintain the existing residential neighborhoods as attractive places to live we should not and need not allow convenience commercial into the proposed housing directly to the south of us in the NW corner of South Park. The Smith's plaza is physically close enough, for both District 13 as well as the NW corner of South Park and it does not make sense economically to compete with a national chain for fuel and groceries.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	For South Park, the following 2009 Plan adjustments are in order: -Wildlife and Natural Resources should be first priority for the South Park district-Clearly articulate the entire district as containing important wildlife, connectivity, and scenic values, using language similar to that in the current (1994) comp plan.-Delete language that states South Park will be built out from 'North to South starting at High School Road.'-Exhaust in-fill in town before considering any expansion into new County nodes, including NW South Park.-Drastically reduce the proposed NW South Park 400-acre, 1,500-unit housing node, both in footprint and number of units, consistent with a less-growth plan.-Clearly state that any density incentives used for the reduced NW South Park node will be derived from permanent open space protection within the district only, not from Alta or Buffalo Valley.-At least 50% of any density incentive in any County node or targeted Town growth area to be derived from permanent open space incentives (not solely from workforce housing), still leaving 50% available to incentivize additional deed-restricted workforce housing.-The reduced NW South Park node to have a pull-back from both High School (for a park) and South Park Loop Roads, to respect the educational nature of HS Road and the scenic value of South Park Loop.-The design of any development in the reduced NW South Park node to allow wildlife movement permeability.-The placement of an East-West connector road in South Park should precede any new development in the Northwest corner of South Park and placed close enough behind the high school to alleviate traffic on High School Rd.-The design of the reduced Northwest corner of South Park should not be connected directly to High School Road but to the new East-West connector road. -No annexation of the new reduced Northwest corner of South Park until it is designed and approved under County LDR criteria. No annexation as a whole, to then fall into Town design standards.-The Tribal Trails connector between South Park Loop Road and HWY 22 not even considered until all solutions for improving the "Y' intersection are exhausted, and assurances made that no new traffic would be diverted onto High School Road.
5/15/2009	Heileson, Marv and Juli Interested Public	We strongly object to the density proposed for South Park. The community clearly expressed its opposition to such density during the Teton Meadows application, and also the Comprehensive Plan public input process. South Park has never been a "node"; it is a semi-rural suburban outskirt area of Jackson, with open space, water meadows, and wildlife dependent on those resources. The effect of designating it a node, and allowing higher densities, will be to severely impact one of the Valley's key wildlife corridors. Moreover, it would simply move Jackson outward, creating both the need and the excuse for more high density further south.
5/15/2009	May, Mike Interested Public	Greetings and thank you for taking my comments,In regard to district 12 I feel this plan misses the mark of what the community is looking for. I attended many meetings and had many more discussions along the way where I heard that wildlife and scenic values lie at the core of what our community values most. I heard from planning staff in the last Rafter J informational meeting that wildlife and natural resources can't be the priority theme in every district and agree there is some merit in that statement. However to place those values second to last in south park is completely contrary to what I heard the public say.To manage growth responsibly is something that we should strive for and I think most of us agree that south park is a logical place for SOME growth. I also like starting at the north end (closest to town and public services) with the most density and moving south accordingly. That said, the plan as it stands calls for too much growth - it seems like we're actually striving for build out when we should be moving more slowly and more carefully. I also have some concern about some of the vague language in the plan. The difference between development a half mile from high school road, continuing south along south park loop and three-quarters of a mile from HS road moving south is enormous and that seemed to be brushed over in the Rafter J meeting. I'd suggest setting firm 1/2 mile parameters so there is no grey area - we'll inevitably be fighting over those questions in the future if we don't.
5/15/2009	Bigler, Greg Interested Public	While I can not claim residence in the valley for a long time (6yrs), I can add some thoughts on what I hope occurs to my home current and future in Cottonwood Park. My thoughts:1. Keep growth rural in South Park 2. Open space along the High School Rd. 3. New development south of HS road, will need another east/west rd, and keep commercial nil or minimal as there is enough traffic and light pollution as it is.4. NO upzoning in town kill pmd's, and strict adherence to the plan/zoning that is/will be in place5. Keep the plan and just as important, future legislation and or zoning and property development decisions, in line with what the survey states.6. I understand that this area makes sense for some town like density, but lets not dump everything here. All of the county areas need to be part os the solution. Including the west bank and east jackson , my self just like me owners in those areas do not want their vision of Jackson to be overrun by growth and development.7. Do not over grow the valley. Just because it can be bigger does not mean better.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Hoke, Bland, Jr. Interested Public	Since the first studies were done in the 1980s the area of the Porter ranch in South Park has been identified as the most appropriate area for high density development. Here planners have the opportunity to work with a clean slat in their efforts to create new housing opportunities.This is very different from the Aspens and the Town of Wilson. Here you have existing communities who have over the years built and enjoyed small subcommuities. It is very unsavory to have a group of planners descend on these communities abd propose a significant change in the character of these communities.I believe that The Aspens and The Town of Wilson should be entirely removed from the consideration as nodes for increased development. 390 and 22 are already approaching capacity for comfortable and safe travel. With the additions to Teton Village and the increased density there, travel particularly on 390 is going to become unbearable.Those housing units slated for these two areas should simply disappear or be reallocated to the other nodes. Given wildlife, economic and infastructure considerations they really should just disappear.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Developing South Park from the North to the South is a logical pattern, but all of South Park should not be developed with a town development pattern. Appendix I shows that the 1500 units proposed for South Park are not needed to meet the community's needs for the duration of the Plan.- Any development at Town density should be to Town standards for streets, lights, and sidewalks. -There is no need for convenience commercial in northern South Park unless the downtown commercial is reduced by the same amount. Most convenience commercial will fail because residents will not pay more for inferior products. They will drive to Smiths for groceries, their favorite pub for a drink, or their favorite restaurant for a meal. It is an exercise in futility to attempt to control the free market. -Do not add traffic to High School Road. East west connector must be complete before development begins. This should be clearly stated in the Plan. Construction traffic on High School Road is unacceptable. -The view corridor on South Park Loop Road and High School road must be protected with a minimum set back of ¼ mile. This should either be shown on the map or clearly stated in this section. Berms are not an appropriate way to preserve the view corridor.
5/15/2009	Harmon, Scott Interested Public	I would like the following comments regarding the new proposed comprehensive plan made official. It is against my better judgement wasting more of our time concerning uncontrolled development in Wilson, Wyoming. The county never listens anyway proof from the latest comprehensive plan that is completely contradictory against what the people living in Wilson stated they wanted to see for our community 6 months ago at a work shop meeting. This new plan could triple the size of Wilson! When is it going to end? Wilson grew at a rate of tenfold with the Hardeman development, doubled again with the old school house development and is currently being hit with more development. Enough is enough! Forget the discussions of road safety, wildlife, and community character. Those comments have always fallen on deaf ears. I have lived in Wilson for over 30 years and paid property taxes helping to support goverment officials. It is past time the county respects our wishes for controlled development regardless for thier whishes for continued affordable housing. Especially when this so called affordable housing invites developers into the project and the county offers them density bonuses as well. Those of us living here for so long need to also be considered into the equation. We have paid to live here and our opinion must be sreiously considered. I was at that town meeting and I heard 95% of the comments opposed to continued mass development and this is exactly what the new comprehensive plan calls for; 500 homes??? Give me a break, 100 homes is too much in downtown Wilson. Have you driven through town lately? Tried to cross highway 22 with all the speeding traffic? Mass development belongs south of Jackson where we have the infrastructure to support it. Wilson has already been hit with too much density and taken more than it's fair share. Few of us in Wilson want this plan and will fight to keep controlled development. One day I can only hope the county listens to the peoples voice and reconsiders the monetary side versus the human side and shows more respect to the long term citizens of this valley.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	Hopefully if and when South Park does develop, that somehow preservation of the single family neighborhood is seriously enforced. What bothers me is the fact that 'growth' (theme #1) and work force housing (theme # 4) are higher priorities in West Jackson then (theme #7) "maintaining the existing residential neighborhoods as attractive places to live for our local workforce" which is last in the draft FLUP for West Jackson. West Jackson is already built out except for a few small lots and I don't think you can squeeze anymore workers in West Jackson except over stuffing single family home rentals with 5, 6 and 7 unrelated people. It's a catch 22 for working people here in West Jackson who keep this valley going for the large homeowners on the outskirts. They get the protection for wildlife and scenic vistas and we get the overcrowded neighborhoods and streets for trying to do the right thing for the valley. That's some trade off. What really upsets a lot of people here in Cottonwood Park is that the planners couldn't even set up a presentation here for the draft plan. I was told it was a scheduling oversight because of Spring break. I would think that since we are on the frontline of major up zoning and traffic impacts that a meeting here would have been obvious. Theme # 5 'community facilities' states that we should "continue the district's role as home for most of the school district and parks and recreation facilities". With no promise of open space in NW South Park like a set back for a park (the depth of the high school property) on High School Road to South Park Loop Rd, West Jackson's neighborhood parks and open space will be overburdened. The plan does mention a 1/8 of a mile setback along South Park Loop Road across from Three Creek to preserve the scenic vistas of that area. That's another slap in the face to the hardworking people of West Jackson. What are we going to do when we want to walk down the South Park Loop path to see the vistas, use our periscopes to see over the ugly berms that will be on both sides of the road like a gigantic half pipe? Again it's scenic vistas for those who can afford it. We do have great parks here in Cottonwood Park but they will be maxed out especially since the Blair Apartments and the new affordable neighborhoods like Ellingwood have only the bare minimum of open space. Parking is already an issue here when families come from outside the neighborhood to use the Range View and Cottonwood Parks. How much more traffic can the "failed" High School Road take, especially if the Tribal Trails connector is built and the major up zoning of South Park occurs. Theme 3 'transportation' states that there needs to be a "balance of needs between the existing neighborhoods of District 12 and the entire community". Where's the balance when all you are doing is tipping the scale of traffic jams from the "y" to High School Road. The comp plan needs to promise that the East West collector road in Northern South Park has to be in place before any new development in South Park takes place and before the Tribal Trails connector is started. Any new neighborhood in South Park should empty on to the new East West collector and not High School Road. The scale of the NW build out should be drastically reduced also. The new draft plan is asking West Jackson to bear a lot of the burden for this plan. Maybe that is why the 'Balanced Community' Theme is dead last for West Jackson. You need to come to West Jackson and walk with us to find out what works and doesn't work here if you are going to use our West Jackson as a role model for "responsible growth". Christine Walker from The Housing Authority walked around the neighborhood with us to see and hear our concerns; perhaps officials and planners could take a field trip. I will supply the coffee and doughnuts. We have some great neighborhoods here in West Jackson and we deserve a lot better then what the present draft plan has to offer us which is basically zip right now.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	-Development in South Park must not create traffic problems for West Jackson. Access for new development should not connect to High School Road.-Any development in South Park should have a visual buffer from West Jackson.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Bloom, Rich South Park Neighbors	This plan will guide the Valley's planning and development for the next 10-20 years. In the next step, it will guide us in amending land development regulations. Stakes are high, and outcomes permanent. We have to get this right. What follows is a summary assessment provided to my neighbors – major issues and changes needed. The current draft is not the community's plan – far from it. Yet! Thanks go to a number of South Park Neighbor economists, planning experts, developers, rural land owners, biologists, workforce homeowners, affordable homeowners, builders, educators and others that helped shape this assessment. We trust this collaborative work will assist you in reviewing the issues and addressing needed solutions. Comprehensive Plan Priorities – Major Issues, Changes Needed Overall: Community Vision vs. the New Plan Draft • Our plan, our responsibility, our legacy, is to guarantee that this valley, its wildlife, its vistas, its uniqueness, are preserved for all time. There are no bailouts if we fail. • We expect the plan to work to protect Jackson Hole's cherished wildlife and open spaces, while also addressing workforce housing needs in a measured way. • The new plan draft lacks the policy direction needed to accomplish these goals. • Although there are good things in the plan that respond to the community's desires (such as creation of an appointed, volunteer Environment Commission concerned with wildlife issues and human-caused impacts, or heightened emphasis on workforce housing), the foundation of the plan rests on a false assumption - that the community wants more growth. The existing (1994) plan says our community's vision is to 'promote economic sustenance that does not depend on population growth.' (p 5) The new (2009) plan says 'the concept of sustainability within the context of the community's vision delineates that...ecosystem preservation does not preclude growth and development necessary to meet our community's human needs.' (p 8) Hunh? • The draft also fails the community's mandate to consider the implications of build-out, and evaluate the consequences of overall growth in the valley. • By heading for a potentially larger build-out, not having clear prioritized open space incentives (especially in greater South Park, where density incentives will be directed 100% to workforce housing, not at all to open space preservation), and recommending almost 9 million square feet of new job-creating commercial space, we assure that workforce housing shortages will only get worse, open space likely will not be protected, quality of life will diminish, and most importantly wildlife and natural resources will erode further. All in a failed attempt to focus the plan solely on pattern of growth – and not respond to the public's desire for a less-growth strategy. • 'We cannot grow our way out of growth-related problems.' – Kristy Bruner, Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance • People and wildlife both lose in this plan. • The plan fails on all important points – quality of life, workforce housing, taxes, wildlife, open space, rural land owners. Wildlife, Natural Resources, Open Space • Wildlife and natural resources should be the top priority in all districts, without compromise • Draft Plan Principle 1.1: 'Maintain viable populations of all native species' Policy 1.1 g: Permeability of development for wildlife: 'In all areas, except those designated for mixed use or more intense development in the Town of Jackson or County nodes, development will be designed to accommodate wildlife movement.' We believe, to achieve Draft Plan Principle 1.1, the design of development in ALL nodes identified for growth must allow for wildlife movement permeability. • The existing (1994) plan includes an entire chapter on natural and scenic resources, defining them as distinct key assets of the community. The new draft de-emphasizes the importance of scenic resources. This is particularly evident for South Park. The existing (1994) plan (Chapter 1, p 4) identifies South Park as a key area for scenic resource protection. The Scenic Resources Overlay covers major sections of this district, including open space where 1) ranching should continue, 2) wildlife habitat should be preserved, and 3) the visual qualities of scenic vistas should be protected. The 1994 plan specifically identifies the hay meadows of South Park, the Spring Gulch scenic area, ranchlands along Teton Village Road, and Buffalo Valley as areas to be kept free of development to the maximum extent possible, to help preserve rural character, critical wildlife habitat, and important image-setting scenic vistas and river corridors, as well as to encourage the continuation of ranching and other types of traditional agriculture as a vital part of community character. The 1994 plan adds: 'where possible, the County should be flexible with its development regulations as an encouragement to land owners to permanently protect these wildlife, scenic, and agricultural areas' (p 5) • The new draft plan does not contain a mechanism to permanently protect rural open space. Moreover, it specifically removes South Park from areas

Date	Name	Comment
		now recommended for preservation. (Policy 1.6a) Growth • Growth will occur. Current entitlements are huge (with much of it 'shovel-ready' but currently on hold, due to financing and/or feasibility issues): over 6,000 new homes and over 4M sq ft of additional commercial space. These entitlements include platted but unbuilt lots, base property rights, and significant remaining resort development, which together will take our community from a current population of 20,000 to over 30,000. • At stake in current plan discussions is growth beyond existing entitlements - 'upzones.' Upzones will potentially add 2,100 more homes and 4.8M more commercial sq ft than where we were already headed (Appendix I). • So it is not growth vs. no growth – it is how much additional growth. • The draft plan foresees future growth as follows: [see comment for reference tabular data] • The number of housing units would more than double, from almost 10,000 existing right now to a total buildout of almost 20,000. Assuming approximately 2 residents per housing unit (Planner range is 1.74 -2.37), the housed population in Jackson and Teton County would also more than double, to almost 40,000 residents. • Commercial space would more than double. Assuming approximately 4 new jobs created per thousand sq ft of commercial space (Planners estimate 1 job/240 sq ft, Appendix C, p 16), that means over 35,000 directly-created new jobs and (see above) an even greater housing deficit than we have today – far greater. • All of these new residents and workers would create demands for additional workers in the form of new needed teachers, nurses, police, plow drivers, etc., further compounding the valley's already escalating housing shortage. • About 20,000 people currently live in Jackson Hole, others commute here to work, and at peak times of the year, about 20,000 more tourists are visiting daily. With the tremendous demand for new workers, the increase in new residents, increasing tourist visitation, and even more commuting workers, the plan leads to a deeper workforce housing shortage, tremendous increase in commuters, and doubling of the resident population. Just to illustrate, today's peak summer driving and parking conditions become the everyday norm – or worse. • 'Responsible Growth' should be deleted as a priority in the Comprehensive Plan. It isn't one (even if responsible). • Overall buildout should be reduced • Maximum build-out should be specifically defined, capped and permanent, with a slow, sustainable rate of growth over an extended time • Job-creating commercial should be constrained. • If a growth theme needs to be articulated in the plan, call it Reduced Build-Out/Growth Rate. Then consider 'managing the pattern of growth' as a critical sub-goal. Workforce Housing / Community Diversity • Workforce housing inducers need to be addressed as much as solutions. • Non-growth solutions should be prioritized • The community wants less growth while addressing workforce housing. This could be accomplished with minimal growth by: Identifying a permanent funding source to purchase and redevelop existing housing. Increasing housing mitigation rates on new residential and commercial development • The plan will worsen workforce housing. Commercial and homes create new demands. Example: Rocky Mountain Bank, recently approved on Broadway, will create 65 jobs. Mitigation is set to provide just over 1 (one) workforce housing unit. • The plan recommends new job-creating commercial that would require almost 12 projects of the size currently proposed for the NW corner of South Park, just to house all of the new workers (assuming 2 workers per home). Even with foreseen growth there won't be room for this many new residents, as the housing expansion won't keep up. • Reduce the job-creating commercial in the plan, and require all development to fully offset direct impacts on workforce housing and infrastructure demands. Achieve this through adequate housing mitigation rates (requirements for developers to provide housing for most of their workers) and exactions (fees to cover impacts to parks, roads, sewer, and water). • In-fill in town should be the first priority before considering expansion into targeted County nodes (including NW South Park) or Town "growth areas" • The plan prioritizes needs of humans who may live here in the future over the needs of current residents. The needs of current residents should take priority. Outcomes & Impacts • The final plan must have clear and specific data to show outcomes and impacts on wildlife, traffic, roads, schools, environmental, taxes, and other quality of life issues. • Costs of growth: Taxes will go up. Social services will get worse, not better, as demand increases and funding falls behind. Crime and traffic will go up. This is not wildlife vs. the people. All lose. In fact, people lose the most.

Date	Name	Comment

• Who benefits from growth? A few landowners will, while the majority of rural land owners will lose opportunities for economic return, even while they continue to support open space and wildlife.
• When clarifying outcomes and impacts, the plan should also look at documented motorist conflict zones, and require wildlife-friendly solutions
Plan Language
• New (2009) plan's vision statement: 'Preserve and protect the area's ecosystem and natural resources and meet the community's human needs in a sustainable and predictable manner.' (p 7)
• The plan needs to clearly define 'Human Needs'. These should be tied back to other priorities, recognizing that human needs will be best met when they do not depend on continued growth in a hopeless attempt to grow ourselves out of a growth-caused situation.
• The terms 'Human Needs' and 'Community Benefit' are dangerously vague, taking us back to setting policy with three votes on Town Council or County Commission.
• 'Sustainability' is a plan priority, yet growth limits are not defined, determined, or set in the plan.
• Sustainable development ties together concern for the carrying capacity of natural systems with the social challenges facing humanity. As early as the 1970s, 'sustainability' was used to describe an economy 'in equilibrium with basic ecological support systems.' Ecologists have pointed to the 'limits of growth' and presented the alternative of a 'steady state economy' in order to address environmental concerns.*
• In the new plan draft, sustainability is selectively defined so as to support growth. 'The concept of sustainability within the context of the community's vision delineates that …ecosystem preservation does not preclude growth and development necessary to meet our community's human needs.' (p 8)
• Can we really have our cake and eat it too? Others say no, not really. 'The idea of sustainable development is sometimes viewed as an oxymoron because development inevitably depletes and degrades the environment.' **
• We should replace the definition of 'sustainability' in the draft plan with the language of our current (1994) plan, where the overarching goal is to break our dependence on continued growth in order to achieve human needs. We want 'an economy not dependent on growth.'

_____
* Meadows, Meadows, Randers, & Behrens, 1971. The Limits to Growth. New York: Universe Books.
** Redclift, M. (2005). Sustainable Development (1987-2005): an Oxymoron Comes of Age. Sustainable Development 13(4): 212-27).

South Park – Poster Child for Growth
Question: does South Park have any wildlife values or open space worth preserving? The following picture and caption ran in the Jackson Hole Daily May 1:
[see comment for referenced picture]
A bald eagle perches on a fence post while looking for a meal in a field Wednesday morning in South Park. Bradly J. Boner / JACKSON HOLE DAILY
In the new draft plan, language states or implies a future for South Park that qualitatively could also happen to other valley 'nodes' targeted for growth.
• Unwinding of protections for open space, and scenic and wildlife values (Policy 1.6a; Policy 2.3b)
• Dramatic upzoning, commercial and residential footholds established, without protection from future expansion (Appendix I, p 4; South Park District description p110; Policy 2.5b)
• Density incentives directed to workforce housing only (and not to open space protection) (Policy 2.3b)
• Removal of wildlife connectivity values (no requirement for wildlife permeability in development design standards) (Principle 1.1, p19)
Example:
The plan proposes eliminating all language calling for permanent open space protection for portions of South Park, and for protection of scenic and wildlife values in the South Park region: 2009 Plan, Policy 1.6a: 'Conserve agricultural lands and agriculture throughout Teton County: The County will support efforts of landowners and land trusts to permanently conserve large intact parcels of land and to continue farming in Alta, Buffalo Valley, the Gros Ventre area, Spring Gulch, and south Fall Creek Road.'
South Park was first on the list in this section of the 1994 Plan. The new language strips South Park of such protection, implying that the entirety of the South Park district does not deserve conservation and directly unwinding the protection in our existing plan. (1994 Comprehensive Plan, Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1) - pg. 24).
For South Park, the following 2009 Plan adjustments are in order:
• Wildlife and Natural Resources should be first priority for the South Park district
• Clearly articulate the entire district as containing important wildlife, connectivity, and scenic values, using language similar to that in the current (1994) comp plan.

Date	Name	Comment
		• Delete language that states South Park will be built out from 'north to south starting at High School Road.' • Exhaust in-fill in town before considering any expansion into new County nodes (including NW South Park) or targeted Town growth areas. • Drastically reduce the proposed NW South Park 400-acre, 1,500-unit housing node, both in footprint and number of units, consistent with a less-growth plan. • Clearly state that any density incentives used for the reduced NW South Park node will be derived from permanent open space protection within the district only, not from Alta or Buffalo Valley. • At least 50% of any density incentive in any County node or targeted Town growth area to be derived from permanent open space incentives (not solely from workforce housing), still leaving 50% available to incentivize additional deed-restricted workforce housing. • The reduced NW South Park node to have a 1/8 mile pull-back from both High School and South Park Loop Roads, to respect the educational nature of HS Road and the scenic value of South Park Loop. • The design of any development in the reduced NW South Park node to allow wildlife movement permeability. • The design of any East-West connector road to not encourage further sprawl towards Rafter J in the future. • The design of the reduced NW node to not add traffic volumes onto High School Road. • No annexation of the new reduced node until it is designed and approved under County LDR criteria. No annexation as a whole, to then fall into Town design standards. • The Tribal Trails connector between South Park Loop Road and HWY 22 not even considered until all solutions for improving the 'Y' intersection are exhausted, and assurances made that no new traffic would be diverted onto High School Road.
5/14/2009	Nolan, Ellen Interested Public	In my opinion, one of the biggest flaws of the failed attempt to develop the Porter Estate was the commercial development slated for the frontage of High School Road. That plan was noxious in terms of density, undue increased traffic on High School Road, and the significant loss of green space to predictably intrusive commercial buildings.At our neighborhood meeting at the Cottonwood Park community center early this winter (prior to the May meeting), we discussed these concerns with the planners, with an emphasis on the imperitive of open space on High School Road. The planners indicated their understanding and agreement of the usefulness of this point. This new plan has no green space on High School Road, nor do I see any green space down toward Rafter J except for what I assume is the Lockhart property.I would like to see a significant buffer of green space, the same depth as the high school property, running all the way from the high school to South Park Road. Why does the plan specify the preservation of the scenic character of South Park Rd. but not High School Road? I agree it is a beautiful road to drive or bike down. However, the mostly part-time residents of Three Creek can't see the road over the berms, while Cottonwood residents enjoy the scenic vista of the Porter Estate from High School Road and the view is of enormous value.Better yet why not extend the green space to protect the scenic value of South Park Rd as well and simply centralize the development and extend it south to make up for lost space?The other imperitive is for one (or two) new east/west road(s) connecting the proposed mixed use parcel to Hwy 89 and preferably no entrance or exit on High School Road at all. If and when Hwy 22 is connected to South Park Rd. there should also be appropriate redirection of traffic flow to mitigate new traffic on High School Road coming from Hwy 22.The plan indicates the east/west road would be created as development occurs, but I think it should come first. If not, there is no way to avoid the huge trucks and other new construction traffic on High School Rd. during the lengthy development phase.Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.
5/14/2009	Stoffelmayr, Amy Interested Public	I live in Indian Trails and have a vested interest in maintaining our quiet, low-keyed neighborhood. I would not like to see Tribal Trail and Rt. 22 connected. The Conservation Easement on the land between Boyle's Hill Rd. and Rt. 22 is a particularly beautiful part of the Hole with the Tetons viewed to the west, encompassing Boyle's Hill and bordered by High School Butte and a small ranch to they east. It includes a wetland being rehabilitated, a horse farm, cattle (in the past.) It is a small wonderland, filled with birds and mammals, appreciated by many, not only the residents but also users of the bike path as a flat, natural area, from which to view spectacular scenery. Indian Trails is an area filled with families with young children. If there is another route which a connector road to take, it would save this little jewel in its beautiful setting.

Date	Name	Comment
5/14/2009	Mattson, Ann Interested Public	I am a resident of Cottonwood Park. We moved to Jackson 6 1/2 years ago from Salt Lake City, UT to enjoy the open space, wildlife, and small mountain town atmosphere. The proposed comprehensive plan would destroy many of the values that we hold dear.Growing up, I lived in Durango, CO. I watched minimally-regulated growth completely change the character of that town over the course of 30 years. Also, as a resident of Salt Lake City, I watched as rampant growth took over the Park City valley. What was once a mountain town became overrun by dense housing developments.To preserve Jackson, we must learn from the demise of other mountain communities. Please listen to the results of the public survey, and consider the consequences of the current proposal.1. Residents ranked what they saw as the valley's priorities. The planners are not using those findings as a guideline. a. Wildlife #1 b. Growth #2 c. Town as Heart #3 d. Housing needs #4 e. Economy #5 f. Transportation #6 g. Services #72. Open space must be preserved along the western portion of High School Road, south of the artery! With the current housing, schools and light industry in the area, the road cannot handle more traffic and the area needs more park space.3. NO commercial or light industry use. The eastern end of High School Road is densely developed, and additional light pollution would further deteriorate our night skies.4. Future development south of High School Road MUST have at least one east-west connector to Highway 89/189/191. High School Road is for SCHOOL traffic only and is already very congested.5. The valley growth rate must be limited to 1.5% per year. Even at these levels the town will grow quickly!Please review these comments and consider them in the course of developing a new comprehensive plan! This plan will guide our communities development for many years to come, and we need to take action now to avoid the pitfalls of other mountain communities.
5/14/2009	Hudnall, Marion Interested Public	When I went to one of the meeting about the plan, my first question was why do we think they will listen to us now? Obviously, they didn't pay attention to the survey results. I was assured everyone involved is trying to do a good job and was listening. Please don't let the community down. I think there already too many people in this valley. We should not be making grandiose plans for growth. Growth will occur naturally and is already planned in lots of areas. We need to protect wildlife and their habitat HERE, not just over in Alta or miles away from town. Many of these areas are restricted or on private access that would not be of any benefit to me. The reason people want to come as tourists is the wildlife and the scenery. If we continue to grow, take away wildlife habitat, and obstruct the view, there won't be a reason for growth, there won't be any tourists. Any plan for expansion should first consider and have in place, streets, parks, open areas, and necessary services. To plan 1500 homes on 450 acres means less than a quarter acre per home without taking out land for those necessities. That is too congested for the area. There are no plans to allow traffic access to highways. Poor High School Road will not be able to handle it. There are already too many stop gap, band aid measures because of poor planning. This valley cannot afford to grow itself right out of its livelihood. In the part of the plan about West Jackson it says that area will not be affected by this plan. In the part about South Park there are many plans and changes. How can Cottonwood be a part of both areas? And would the area be affected or not affected? We need permanently restricted areas for wildlife and their corridors of migration. These should not be an afterthought. We need to know how this plan will play out year to year. It would also be wise to look at the previous plan and see how it worked out year by year. Was this aspect monitored? Did the previous plan apply, was it implemented? When I moved here four years ago I thought this was an environmentally concerned area. Now I'm afraid it's being run by an obsession for money. Soon there won't be a scenic corridor of entry because our motto will be "Pave Paradise and Put in a Parking Lot".
5/14/2009	Olson, Greg Interested Public	I am a resident of Rafter J subdivision.1. We must have green space from Cottonwood Park extending fro the Highschool Rd. to South Park Rd, extending 1000 ft. to the south. This can be used as a park of future school property. The 2 parks in Cottonwood are used by everyone in the area and overused.2. NO commercial use. The Smith's plaza is enough. More light pollution is not needed.3. Future development must have at least one east-west connection to Hwy 89. Highschool Rd. MUST NOT be used as a main artery. IT SHOULD REMAIN A SCHOOL ROAD ONLY. 4. GROWTH RATE OF 1.5% per year.5. Planners are not following the survey. You have altered the results!a. Wildlife: #1 NOT 6b. Growth: #2 not 1c. Town as heart: #3 not 7d. Housing needs: #4 not 2e. Economy: #5 not 3f. Transportation: #6 not 4g. Services: #7 not 5
5/14/2009	Greger, Art Interested Public	I am writing to express my opposition to and disapproval of the Comprehensive Plan as it is being presented.To say that public input has been ignored or misrepresented is obvious. Having attended some of the planning meetings, one fact seemed clear to me, and that is that a low-growth formula was seen by almost all participants as the preferred alternative to achieve the outcomes desired, be it wildlife preservation or maintaining the character of Jackson. In the first round of discussions, compact centers and housing received the lowest favorability rating. How did this now become the plans centerpiece? All meetings I attended mirrored this response.If the sticky notes pasted at the meetings have not been filed in the trashcan, please review them. Ask yourself if the Plan as written takes into account the publics wishes. The recent outcry over growth in Wilson should help answer this question. If the answer is still not clear, review the annexation vote of the Porter estate from years ago. If you think things have changed since then, please learn from the publics outcry over the Teton Meadows proposal.The changes I would like to see are as follows:1)Reduce growth drastically.2)Reduce commercial growth even more drastically.3)Protect South Park. It is one of the most beautiful parts of the county.4)Put desired (by the community) growth in town, preferably as redevelopment, consistent with the desires of town residents.Thank you,

Date	Name	Comment
5/13/2009	Richman, Gordy Interested Public	Cottonwood park was the first neighborhood development for the "service industry" and working class of jackson. For over twenty years our community has been trying to catch up to the housing demands. I realize development will happen. District 12 has dover apartment, Blair place, and 3 creek employee units. Flat creek business center, gregory lane industrial park, and smiths plaza. 1) prior to any future development. please give us "open/green space" on the south side of cottonwood park. the "hole" strip from middle school road to southpark loop. it should extend far enough south to maintain the visual astetics of munger mountain region, green knoll, and mesquito creek. minimum of 2500 ft.2)The proxsimty(sp) of professional services and retail to our district is the highest per capita of all the districts in teton county. the is no need for future commercial growth.This proposal has negative effects for the goal of town (lets start saying community at heart, how about region at heart). You asked our opinion. your plan DOES NOT SUCCEED IN ACCOPMPLISHING ANY OF THE SURVEY RESULTS. TO ACHIEVE REGION AT HEART WE MUST WORK TOGETHER. YOUR ACTIONS DO NOT REPRESENT ANY OF THE HEART. The high school has all windows on the north side. the shop is on the creek and visable from the gateway(poor water quality/ visually bad). the year round soccer field where designed to have people kicking balls at cars not nets. these are just a few example of poor planning in our district. You dont need a phd to design an industrial park the can handle semi's. "s" turns on gregory lane?????????p.s. build out should not block lines of sight of pedestrians or vehicals.less angst + more trust + town/county/region at heart.I may not type well, or spell well. please dont make obvious mistakes. slow down.

Date	Name	Comment
5/13/2009	Wemple, Robert Interested Public	Development in the NW corner of South Park should be mitigated so it has no impact on High School Road. I strongly feel there should be a buffer between development and HS road. Growth should be limited as much as possible. I generally agree with comments that were developed by Kathy Tompkins and Rich Bloom., see below.Cottonwood Park District 13Neighbors in the Cottonwood Park Subdivisions are concerned with some of the language written to describe our district and our neighborhoods. We find it surprising that of the seven individual themes identified through the process, four of them for district 13 have been defined almost identically. Although we feel strongly that "supporting the existing neighborhood" should be a priority, more weight should be placed on how each theme relates back to its original Ideal, principals and how those work with in the districts.The use of Neighborhood as singular in the themes of this district is not really what is going on and does not represent this district or others effectively. Each district is made up of varying neighborhoods of sizes, types and uses. The clustering, feathering and linking of neighborhoods makes them relate to each other and cause a district to be unified.We love our neighborhood and how it with the other neighborhoods in our district makes a great place to live. The individual designs, community services and circulation create a diverse yet whole district.When reading the written text published in the draft plan we have the following comments:1) Responsible Growth: We hope that the comp plan is using our districts neighborhoods as roll models for future developments since we are almost built out. And since we are almost built out, responsible growth should not be District 13's first priority. The only future growth that may take place in our district is School growth which when designed needs to look further into its impact on the existing neighborhoods of our district. The huge Growth proposed in the neighboring District 12 in the NW corner of South Park is unnecessary and detrimental to district 13. The impact on the schools, roads, parks, scenic and natural resources of district 12 is immeasurable. This proposed growth should be scaled back tremendously. Utilizing open available lots with in the town makes more sense.2) Town as Heart: Continuing to "support" the mixed-use neighborhood is top priority for District 13. The proposed growth of neighboring districts as well as the school district and the impact of the possible Tribal Connector will all affect pro & con, our districts character and attraction for the working families that we are designed for. Proposing more density in the NW corner of district 12 before infilling the town proper does not support this theme. Twisting the theme to state "develop adjacent to" causes more infrastructures to be built instead of using the city roads and utilities already installed.3) Transportation: Balancing the needs of the community and constructing the Tribal connector detract from our district. Protection of these impacts need to be fist and foremost. In addition, the traffic impact of the High School as well as 5 other school that are currently serviced through our district and the proposed growth in the NW corner of South Park need to be equally listed. Prior to any new development, the existing problems need to be addressed. The school district needs to be engaged further to reduce the impact students are having on the neighborhood. The missed opportunity of reducing single car use and increase alternate modes of transportation is a big mistake. Also the lack of small parking areas where county residents can access the amenities and bus stops provided in this district cause damage to personal property.4) Workforce Housing: District 13 is mainly work force housing already. We are mostly built out and therefore this theme is the least priority. However adding the proposed 1500 units of Work Force housing to the neighboring district 12 creates a concentration of this demographic in one area in the county. Designing pockets of work force housing in other locations in the county is more desirable and creates a more diverse community over all. Any density bonuses should only be granted if in fact the work force housing developed by the bonus benefits directly from it. 5) Community Facilities: Future growth of the schools in this area will impact the district as it relates to traffic congestion, parking locations, impervious parking lots, and light pollution in the evenings and on weekends. Teton County Schools need to be looked at as a developer and held to the same standards of protecting existing neighborhoods as part of their future growth. In addition first responders of Fire & EMT should be considered as needing to have a home some where in our district especially when considering any future housing to be located in the NW corner of South Park. And finally new developments need to be required to create new parks within their neighborhoods and not tax the existing one found in District 13's.6) Wildlife Natural Resources: More and more wild life is being directed into district 13 due to the growth and irrelevant berming along South Park Loop Road which also detracts from our scenic vistas. The potential loss of a scenic corridor to the south due to future development and the blocking of the scenic view to the west is a great determent to all who live and travel through this district. Again the people who live and work here should be taken care of before future residents. District 13 should not have to sacrifice ("allowable trade offs for District 13,Äù are the words from the planners) scenic views and wildlife to accommodate future workforce to the South.7) Balanced Community & Economy: To maintain the existing residential neighborhoods as attractive places to live we can not allow convenience commercial into the proposed housing directly to the south of us in the NW corner of South Park. The Smiths plaza is physically close enough and for both District 13 as well as the NW corner of South Park and it does not make sense economically to compete with a national chain for fuel and groceries.

Date	Name	Comment
5/12/2009	Barney, Bodean Interested Public	I have the following concerns about the South Park Development:1.) 1/8 of a mile (660 ft.) set-backs from South Park Loop Rd. is inadequate. There should be set-backs of at least 1/4 mile from both this road and the High School Road. The only ditch that conveys water from the Leek Ditch over to the Dairy Subdivision (where there are water rights, appears to be the one along the South side of High School Road). Further, why do we care more about keeping this "gateway" (East of Flat Creek)open from development, while congesting the NW side of Flat Creek. Seems that we are giving preference to tourists visiting Jackson Hole at the expense of the folks that live and work here. Why not actually maintain open spaces and "scenic vistas" rather than giving that impression to passing travelers, who would find something very different if they drove just a mile to the West.2.) What about infrastructure? Will connector roads (East/ West) and other roads be in place before they determine how many units will be packed in to this area. What about open space? Rangeview seems to be very well planned and laid out, almost too well, as we get a lot of traffic from folks visiting Rangeview Park from all over town (but especially Blair Place and Ellingwood). As I understand it, the open space in Rangeview was detremined by the # of residents (when you add all of the additional use and potentially even more from the other side of High School Road, this makes me feel like I live in the center of a housing project). I'm concerned that there will be a toilet bowl effect, with Rangeview Park at the center (especially when the Tribal Trails conncetor goes through). Thank you for your time and consideration.
5/12/2009	McGee, Robin Interested Public	Too many units are allowed in this area. It would cause great damamage to the region and major traffic issues that are not addressed.
5/12/2009	Leslie, Craig Interested Public	I have further studied the Draft Comprehensive Plan, and want to strongly voice my concerns as follows;1) I do not believe it reflects the overwhelming desire of our community to protect wildlife and the environment. It talks about "responsible growth", but does not assess the impact of so many extra people, houses and motor vehicles.2) It seeks to "sacrafice" Wilson & South Park, against the wishes of these communities. Why do we need commercial growth, which will then require new workers and new housing? Vicious cycle.3) Jeff Daugherty is not acting in the interests of the community and the values they cherish; we want land protection, and not deed restricted housing that is only required if we build additonal commercial space.
5/12/2009	Pfeifer, David Interested Public	I am a resident of Cottonwood Park1. We must have Green space from cottonwood park extending fron the High school to South Park road, extending 1000 feet to the South. This can be used as a park or future school property. Our two parks in cottonwood are used by everyone in the area and overused.2. NO commercial use, we have Smiths and other stores 1/2 mile away!!!!! We Do not need any more light pollution. !!!!3. Future development MUST have at Least one east-west connector to Highway 189. High School Road MUST not be used as a main artery. IT IS A SCHOOL ROAD ONLY.!!!!!!!!!4. Growth rate of 1.5% / year.5. Planners are not following the Survey. Look at what the people said, you have altered the results.a. Wildlife, #1 not 6b. Growth, #2 not 1c. Town as heart, #3 not 7d. Housing needs,#4 not 2e. Ecomomy, #5 not 3f. transportation, #6 not 4g. Services #7 not 5
5/11/2009	Parker, Jon Interested Public	I do not know why you bother to take public comments on a comprehensive plan for Teton County. The public has repeatedly said that their priorities are for wildlife preservation, open space, and affordable housing. Yet your actions seem directed at development to the detriment of all of these three factors. Perhaps, it lets you feel better to believe that you have taken public comments, but public desires have had no impact. In addition, the expense of a master plan seems to be wasted. Even with the prior comprehensive plan, it seems to have had no impact on your approval of developments. The plan called for 35 acre lots in rural overlays. However, if 350 acres were to be developed, first it was increased from 10 lots to 25 as bonus density for clustering and leaving open space. Then, it was increased to 50 if affordable housing was included. Finally, “we don’t want affordable housing in our upscale project” so the dense housing was put in South Park. The final result was a project that instead of having 10 millionaire homes, we get 50 millionaire homes that probably put more strain on services and affordable housing than was solved. Either quit the charade or truly listen to the public. South Park is a major wildlife corridor, and currently has a rural character. We don’t want it to become a solid, high density housing development.

Date	Name	Comment
5/8/2009	Banks, Patrice Interested Public	I live in Cottonwood Park and am very concerned about adding more traffic to an already busy High School Road. We have 6 schools that create a lot of traffic (both auto and pedestrian). Cottonwood Park, Rangeview and Blair Apartments are very dense and adding 1000 or more homes would inundate High School Road. I firmly believe that there MUST be an East-West road connecting all these new homes/businesses to Route 89 as well as South Park Loop. I feel that this connector road should be worked out before any development whatsoever is started. Another concern is open space. With Blair Apartments having no playground of their own, they all come to the Rangeview Park. Please consider adding playground equipment/parks and more than 1/8 mile (660 ft) setback of open space. People love living in Cottonwood & Rangeview. It seems emulating our developments instead of cramming lots of homes in would make sense. Please help us keep High School Road safe and Cottonwood Park a great place to live.Thank you for your consideration.
5/8/2009	Remlinger, Brian Interested Public	Change the priority to "Limit Growth Responsibly"A main theme priority in South Park should be preservation of scenic vistas and open space. May tourists drive into town and stop to take pictures of the area from the highway. This open sace and scenic vista will contribute to sustaining our economy.The other theme should be limit all growth to the northwest corner adjacnet to high school road.Delete all references and statements about developing from north to south. This is a dangerous topic and gives a green light for extensive development in South Park rather than preservation of open space.The use of the term "town development pattern" does not fall under the definition of responsible. Please change this to "Community Needs Development Pattern". I do not know of a single person who would like to see Town Development in South Park.The addition of a priority to create very large areas of infiltration wetlands (could be stormwater treatment wetlands for Town runoff) to lands that are converted from flood irrigation practices in South Park. This will ultimitely provide groundwater recharge that Spring Creek (near 3 Creek Ranch) and other South Park wetlands need to be sustained. For example, portions of the Rafter J ponds stay ice free inthe winter and provide crucial winter habitat for Trumpeter swans.Flat Creek needs a minimum 150' buffer from development. Development of South Park with town level development from north to south will completey degrade this waterbody. This should be seriously stated in this section.
5/7/2009	Salter, Andy Interested Public	The recently released draft of the proposed update to the Town of Jackson /Teton Comprehensive Plan fails to reflect the interests and concerns of the majority of the residents of our Town and County. The draft plan is based upon the false assumption that the community favors growth, and regrettably ignores the considerable public input you received identifying preservation of wildlife and open spaces, and favoring slow and controlled growth. I share these views; growth in our Town and County should proceed only slowly and carefully. Preservation of our open spaces and our wildlife should be highest priorities. Our County officials and our Town officials are responsible for protecting this valley, its wildlife, its scenic vistas, and its uniqueness for all time. The draft Plan speaks to encouraging growth and development necessary to meet our community's human needs but there has been no demonstrated need for growth in our community. The public has told you just the opposite. Public input should provide the foundation and direction of the new Comprehensive Plan and should not be ignored, as you appear to have done. I am absolutely opposed to a number of aspects of the draft Plan. It de-emphasizes the importance of scenic resources and does not contain a mechanism to permanently protect rural open space areas. The draft plan contemplates more than doubling the housing population in Jackson and Teton County, and more than doubling commercial space. Rather than responsibly attempting to address and reduce the severe shortfall of workforce housing gin the area, these proposals will make this serious problem far worse. New residents and new workers will create additional demands for affordable housing, further compounding the existing shortage. Infill within the Town should be the first priority before considering expansion into other nodes within the County. I strongly encourage you to reduce the recommended overall build-out of the Town and County and specifically define maximum build-out, so that only a slow, sustainable rate of growth would be encouraged. As a resident of South Park, I am extremely concerned that the Plan proposes eliminating language from the previous Comprehensive Plan that called for permanent open space protection for portions of South Park and for protecting the scenic and wildlife values in the South Park area. Wildlife and natural resources have been and should remain a first priority in South Park. Sou8th Park contains important and irreplaceable wildlife, connectivity, and scenic values. If we do not protect them, they will be gone forever. Residents of the Town and County dutifully attended you many meetings of residents and community groups and voiced a preference for slow growth. I am deeply troubled by the suggestion that input from individuals and interests you now refuse to publicly identify led to a conclusion that he public's mandate was for more growth. Please revise the Comprehensive Plan to accurately reflect the will of the community and its residents and to property plan to preserve this spectacular place in which we live. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Date	Name	Comment
5/6/2009	Sundgren, Shelley Interested Public	I reside in Cottonwood Park. The following are some of my concerns regarding the proposed development in South Park.1. It is unclear whether all of District 12 will be developed (under this Plan) - from north to south - or if only the areas indicated on the map (400 acres in the northwest corner, Rafter J, Melody, and the industrial area east of Melody) - will have development beyond the rural classification. State specifically what areas will be other than rural. State that the areas shown as rural will be developed based on that designation and will NOT be developed to a greater density. What is meant by developing "north to south"? Either describe what is meant by that or delete it.2. 400 acres and 1500 residential units seems excessive. How about stating that development would be staged as demand supports, with an ultimate buildout not to exceed 400 acres and 1500 residential units? This way appropriate density can be achieved and services provided to a discrete area - not to all of the 400 acres immediately, i.e. avoid scattered development.3. In-fill should be stressed in Jackson (town as heart theme) prior to going wild with development in South Park.4. We had moose and deer moving through Cottonwood this winter. They will be back. Wildlife will be present in any South Park development. This has to be recognized. Wildlife corridors have to be designated and provided.5. Provide at least a 1,000 foot scenic buffer along the east side of South Park road. Do not allow anything other than access roads (perpendicular to South Park only - minimize road length in the buffer, also minimize the number of access roads crossing the buffer) in the buffer. Do not allow noise/view berms to be constructed in the buffer.6. Provide at least a 1,000 foot buffer along the south side of High School Road. 7. Perhaps the buffer area along High School Road could be developed as a town park - both for students and for the residents of the new development. Note that Range View Park gets lots of use by people outside of Range View and Cottonwood, since their developments do not have public parks (e.g. Indian Trails, Rafter J). Alternatively, require a public park to be included somewhere in the area to be developed in the northwest corner of South Park - and require it to be done at the start of development, not sometime in the dim future.7. Do not add any additional traffic capacity to High School Road. Keep it with a speed limit of 25 mph. Perhaps add a bike path/sidewalk south of and seperated from the road (similar to that on the west side of South Park Road).8. Cottonwood Park has only one exit from the subdivision and that is onto High School Road. That exit is too close to the Middle School Road intersection to allow a stop sign on High School Road for the Cottonwood intersection. High School Road (per its name) has several schools and lots of children walking along the road. No increase in traffic should be allowed on High School Road - both for safety and maintaining existing quality of life for existing residents. Traffic from the proposed development in northwest South Park should be directed onto the new connector from 89 to South Park Road. Require the construction of that connector before ANY development is allowed in northwest South Park. Note that the connector will have to cross Flat Creek in an environmentally responsible manner - which means it will be expensive. Require the development in the northwest corner of South Park to pay for this. 8. The development in the northwest corner of South Park should be required to pay for the expansion of town services (e.g. sewer and water) required for their development.9. Establish a buffer Flat Creek - especially the west side (if it is not already set). Show the buffer on the map.10. In general - stress the themes in the order of importance determined from public comment, i.e., wildlife protection is important, development is not. Development seems to be given more importance than wildlife.Thank-you for the opportunity to comment
5/4/2009	Wilson, Phil Interested Public	Classifying the Valley Springs Ranch as inappropriate for growth in the next 10-15 years, but possibly appropriate in the future makes sense and is something he agrees with. The existing road off of Hwy 89 that accesses the Valley Springs Park would be an appropriate connection from Hwy 89 to South Park Loop.
5/3/2009	Whetzel, Josh Interested Public	I have owned a unit in the Aspens for several years. I did not spend $800,000 to now be considered a place for more density and workforce housing. There are to many cars and trucks already on the road. Densities should be increased South of town where there is better and larger roads and access. I enjoy watching the Elk herd just outside the Aspens boundary.

Date	Name	Comment
4/29/2009	, Conservation Alliance	In brief, below are some of the key, broad issues that the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance believes are important to address in the upcoming meeting. The Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance will be submitting line-by-line, detailed comments on the new draft prior to the planning commission hearings. During future comments, we will provide detailed recommendations for changes in policy language and the structure of the plan. The current approach and key elements of the plan do not reflect the will of the community. On October 15, 2008, the Planning Team placed an ad to confirm recognition of top community concerns voiced during public comment. Unfortunately, the new draft falls short in addressing them. See ad text below: "The Comprehensive Plan Will Be Responding to Public Comment: What you said: • Wildlife and open space protection is the most important value in the community. • Buildout should be clearly identified and provide guidance in policy creation. • Growth rate regulation should be implemented to slow the impacts of development to natural resources and community infrastructure. • Workforce housing should be provided in greater proportion by commercial development and include a mix of rental and ownership options. • Commercial development potential should be limited with sensitivity to building design, community character, and not exacerbate the workforce housing shortage. • South Park should only develop at town level density in the northern portion in order to address the workforce housing needs of the community. • Plan format should be more clear, concise, and user friendly. " The current draft doesn't give appropriate attention to all factors (direct, indirect and cumulative impacts) that affect our ability to protect wildlife; buildout was not clearly identified and did not provide guidance in policy creation; growth rate regulation is identified as a step to take only iffuture monitoring indicates the need to do so; weaker language (than in the '94 Plan) is used to describe the relationships among different community issues/themes, particularly commercial development and workforce housing shortages; strong policies to limit commercial development are absent; proposed ranges for development in South Park far exceed the.geographic scope presented in surveys and policies indicate sprawling development (north to south) for future planrring in this district; and the plan format is not clear or user friendly given the map layouts and a number of vague and contradictory policies. Other Key Issues: • Amount of proposed development potential- residential and commercial- should be reduced. • The impacts of commercial development are inadequately addressed in theme chapters. Drivers of growth-related impacts are underemphasized and inadequately described. • Theme chapters, and the structure of the Future Land Use Plans inadequately address that our community must face, and answer, tough questions about carrying capacity (amount of overall development). As we increase the potential for direct, indirect and cumulative effects associated with human-related development impacts, there is a strong potential for crossing thresholds (in terms of survival of local wildlife populations). • The meaning of Theme 2 "Managing Growth Responsibly" has changed significantly through this process. • Geographic prioritizations (and district boundaries) in many node districts are highly debatable. • The draft does not cohesively link different themes and policies. The Future Land Use Plans, as currently drafted, would not uphold the policies outlined in the draft. • The draft rests on a number of assumptions that are not backed up with analyses. The draft suggests that the extent of development proposed within the nodes would have minimal ecological impact; however, we disagree, particularly given indirect and cumulative impacts. • Permanent Conservation is a top priority of this community. We need to make sure that policies are in place to encourage permanent protection. • There are MAJOR policy shifts from the '94 Plan to this new draft. The new draft reflects much more than an "update" of the '94 Plan. Key issues include: the lowered emphasis on scenic resources and rural character (in the county and town), transportation policies, and fundamental assumptions on the need for continued growth. • Indicators need to be refined in all theme chapters.

Date	Name	Comment
4/29/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I just think that unless you solve the problems we have right now and use the laws we have on the books to reign in the renting of single family homes to 4, 5 and 6 people by landlords in supposedly single family neighborhoods, this trend will just spread South to any new neighborhood and history then repeats itself. People are going to find a way to cram as many into a house to save on rent. All at the expense of the live in owners who are trying to make ends meet and make their home a home not just a frat house. There is no regard for the speed limit and safety of the children playing. These single family homes are suppose to have no more then 3 unrelated people in them. I just went around the corner of my place to a house and asked them to get the cars off the lawn (what was left of it!)clean up the trash and the empty beer bottles. At that time I think they had 5 kids living in the house. They had a bar set up at the end of the garage and fire wood and skis here and there. Not pleasant to look at. Plan all you want but it will be for nothing if you can't preserve the single family neighborhood. It is indeed an admirable proposal to try to persuade people to use alternate modes of transportation such as biking, taking the bus, car pooling and last but not least your feet. The Teton County, Town of Jackson Comprehension Draft Plan is trying to do just that, with an overall reduction of single occupied vehicles (SOV's). The plans' success relies on the good graces and athletic capabilities of our future residents that would live in the proposed new South Park town hub. A reality check is needed when we grow bigger instead of better. Before I get to the realty check I just want to say I love the proposed programs about home mail delivery, encouraging and or requiring students to take the bus, walk or bike (don't forget skateboarding) to school and employee carpooling incentives. We should back them 100%. Although I think we should forget about encouraging students not to drive to school. Bribing works best with teenagers. Now, fantasy verses reality. Do you really think people in the future South Park town hub, living that far away from their jobs and services in Teton Village, Wilson and town are going to give up their car to take the bus, walk or bike? The only South Park residents that will possibly walk or take the bus are the employees at the South Park convenience stores selling four dollar a gallon not so fresh milk, overpriced beer and cigarettes. Now suppose they do hop on their bikes or walk to the stores or work. Don't you think they'll have trouble getting through those unplowed pathways in the winter? I know several people including a lot of kids that have that problem right now. There is also that highly visible but nobody wants to do anything about it problem of overcrowded non family occupied rental homes with five and six cars in the driveways, on the lawns and on the streets (snow plow drivers love the last one). I don't think that a new South Park town hub is going to solve it. The rent is not going to be any cheaper and if tenants can save a lot of money and landlords look the other way; South Park is going to end up having the same problems other single family neighborhoods are having right now. That brings me to the calculations on the build out number of up to 1500 units for South Park over the next 10 to 15 years. I know, I'm not supposed to worry, it's just a number. Instead of 3,000 more cars coming out of South Park it will probably be more like 4000 cars when the above rental trend spreads there. I keep hearing the plan is just guidelines. Well, let's guide it a little more. Why don't we just take a breather, listen to the majority of the constituents who want "limited" managed growth and scale this plan back. What's the rush? The economy is not heading anywhere fast, anytime soon. In the mean time we can work on solving the problems we have by building more affordable Category 1, 2 and 3 homes in town, closer to work and services so our future residents don't wear out so many shoes and bicycle tires. Clear the most used pathways in the winter or groom them all and break out the cross country skis! Give single families back their neighborhoods by creating on work site employee housing like seasonal hostels with a few more creature comforts for the singles that just need someplace to sleep, store their skis, bikes and kayaks. Nothing fancy they're up all night and day anyway either working or playing. That's why they came to Jackson Hole. Improve the bus system we have by doing two way loops so you don't have to go all the way around town to get to Smith's from Cottonwood! I like sightseeing but we should leave that for the tourists.

Date	Name	Comment
4/28/2009	Aurelio, Linda Interested Public	Thank you for reading and considering the following letter. Most residents in Jackson feel the true values we have expressed were not prioritized in the Comp Plan. I look forward to discussions over the next few months. JACKSON'S HOLE Let's face it, if it were not for the unparalleled beauty of our Tetons, the abundance of open space, and the incredible wildlife outside our backdoors, how many of us would choose to move to Jackson? Without those qualities, this isolated town might as well be just a Hole. According to the most recent Comp Plan, we are about to lose two of those three qualities in the next several years, should this plan go unchallenged. With maximum growth as the Plan's priority, open space will be the exception and wildlife will be forced to retreat even further from our view. The South Park Neighborhoods are being targeted with attention to maximum build-out with minimal regard for our wildlife and scenic values. We, as a community, must be aware that this undeveloped area of town is our last chance to ensure that the qualities we value about Jackson will remain for future generations. There can be an incredible opportunity to create a better, 'green' community South of town, not just bigger, with careful planning. It is clear, the message our Planning Department has sent in favor of big development, is that Jackson Hole should be just a Hole. Survey after survey has shown overwhelming support for least or no growth options, protecting our wildlife, increasing transit over building new roads, and scenic values as the priorities for Jackson Hole residents. Our Comp Plan should not focus on build-out, but focus on build-in! Now is the time our Comp Plan should focus to improve our infrastructure: maintain least growth patterns though out Jackson, mandate all future construction be 50% green building materials, expand public transportation routes, redesign the Y intersection as a roundabout (solves traffic delays, saves fuel, reduces pollution) , expand recycling methods with curb pick up, require any new development must meet 1:1 minimum open space ratios, and promote and maintain all wildlife habitat/ migration routes. Let us look for solutions to make our town better, not bigger. Build-in strategies will keep us stronger for future generations, not weaken us through big build-out. Let's keep the name Jackson Hole much more than just a Hole.
4/27/2009	Boehne, Sonja Interested Public	why build all homes...just it makes more money for the developer... build some appartments in the south park node... use less open space to develop for 1500 homes a lot of people dont need houses and are perfect in appartments/condos...people move in and out of town a lot... how are 1500 homes justified...? It all comes down again, to maybe think about a population cap in this town. There are already high density neighbourhoods in South Park...and they were inteded to create workforce housing...what happened there and then. Its all in a dream/vision on paper but reality (money) brings it all down to...where quick big bucks can be made...wildlife, town of heart doesnt matter.....anymore.
4/26/2009	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	Let's talk sustainable. What do you want to be sustainable in your lifetime? I'm a grandmother. I might not be around to fight the next fight. The last comprehensive plan in 1994 I was at my parent's house on the Village road watching my mother die and trying to help my father cope. My mother was 57. There are some things in life that when you let go you can't get them back. The entire community said that wildlife in our backyards, in our meadows, on our hillsides, drinking from our ponds, creeks and river banks was our most important community value. And in this new comprehensive plan draft (let's hope it's only a draft) the planners are flipping us off. Once we've been taken advantage of they'll keep coming back for more. I made my husband go to the South Park planner's meeting. My neighbors wouldn't go because, well, you know the saying "Fool me Once". What I heard at my Planner's neighbor meeting was, "Cindy we are going to take your most important community value and transfer it to Alta, Buffalo Valley, Hog Island, and Kelly. Not to worry. The wildlife in your neighborhood will learn to use the cross walks and read the signs. If they do make it to Alta, Buffalo Valley, Hog Island, or Kelly there will be "Affordable Wildlife Housing" to meet their needs." In exchange we will take the development rights from Alta, Buffalo Valley, Hog Island and Kelly and move it to replace your wildlife's habitat. If the planners heard the valley say," slow the impacts of development" (News and Guide Oct 15, 08), by regulating growth", what dictionary are they using? In my dictionary, Daniel tells me that slow means to proceed at less than the usual speed. (It also means stupid or sluggish which is another can of worms.) Jeff Daugherty our county planning director and Alex Norton a county planner explained that this comprehensive plan would be a road map for citizens and elected officials as far as where development should be in the county and town. --------Who told Jeff and Alex? Who and where did their comprehensive plan data come from? It didn't come from "We the People". The Planner's power point slide show is just as smooth and creamy as your granny's fudge. But they don't say anything about where they bought the ingredients or what this comprehensive plan is going to do to our girlish figure.
4/22/2009	Leslie, Craig Interested Public	I am opposed to your proposals for South Park. You have NOT listened to South Park residents. I do not want "managed growth". I want the jewel that is Jackson hole protected. I do not want green fieds turned into housing.I support a moratorium on new development, and only new building on sites that are already develped with existing structures.I do not see the growth envisaged as responsible; more houses= more people = more cars= less wildlife and a damaged ecosystem.

DISTRICT 11: WILSON

Wilson Comment (4/13/09 - 10/13/11)

Date	Name	Comment
4/25/2011	Steinberg, Ethan Interested Public	I've lived in my home on West Street in Wilson for over 10 years. i was part of the outcry against the Node proposal the first time around. I thought it was very clear then the community as a whole didn't want it. I understand it has come up again. I appreciate how much feedback Teton County looks for from it's community. However, most of us who work and have families don't have time to mobilize every time the County proposes something we have strong feelings about (unlike a concentrated special interest might). Our vigor and focus gets worn down by the County re-hashing issues that are unpopular. I'm taking the time send these comments because I want to be clear that while there is vocal (albeit tired)oppositiion to this strategy, there is a much bigger quiet part of your constituency that is strongly opposed to this that doesn't have the time to attend 3 hour meetings (again, I think it's great that the County allows that feedback opportunity). As elected representatives we mostly trust that you 'represent' us. If the County pursues this strategy, I and many of my fellow Node inhabitants will have to start taking more prescious time out of our days to mobilize for County representation that better reflects our community goals.
4/16/2011	Hoyt, Clay Interested Public	Let your public control the Comprehensive Plan. Hear us. Wilson is overwhelmed with the current growth plans. We presently have 3 office buildings standing mostly empty with another in the plans to be built. These standing empty building prove that the present growth plan is irresponsible. Wilson and the West Bank have more than fulfilled our affordable housing quotas. The increase in the moose, elk and deer motor vehicle deaths is sickening. Please protect the wildlife who have been programmed to migrate our corridors for hundred of years. Please protect us residents, our property and rights. In comparison we have lived here a mere 30 to 60 years. The moose are being funneled down Fall Creek due to the widening of the road and building of retaining walls. After being hit by motor vehicles they die in our yards. Our forests, water flow and marshes are being consumed too. This node action is financially irresponsible, especially in the light of our debit laden economy. STOP. ENOUGH. Please be patient and think through the right growth plan for our needs.

Date	Name	Comment
4/15/2011	Poole, Steven Interested Public	Gentlemen, I am writing you with great concern that your recent meetings and changes to the draft comp plan are a grave mistake that starts your portion of this review of in a totally wrong direction. The Planning Commission did good work and heard the message that the citizens of this county have repeated in meetings that have spanned years. Wildlife is a priority, Wildlife habitat is a priority. Constraining development must happen NOW. Certain guidelines should be self evident. We will never be able to house everyone who wants to be in Teton County. We will never be able to provide jobs to everyone who wishes to work in Teton County. If we wish to maintain the basic human values that we think make it a special place in Teton County, the time to act is NOW (if it has not already past). The task is not easy. The results will not please everyone. You as our elected officials must listen to what has happened in the multiple arduous meetings that have already sorted these issues into the best wishes of the thousands of public comments. As I have recently witnessed in my efforts to sort out one boondoggle at the county planning level (Poole vs. Daugherty) the rules listed in the guidelines are not followed. The broad language in the titles, headings, and descriptions through to the individual meanings of a word in the text must be defined in such a way as to leave no room for the lawyers to roam. I was very disappointed by the Commissioners response to, "Neighborhood character" and "Reasonable effort" for example. The title of a section can't say one thing and the body of text another unless the document defines the intent as so in the definitions. It is very clear that the citizens think your recent revisions fail to protect wildlife or will allow the option for nodes, even if you say it is in a descriptive section you do not just say "sorry we didn't really mean that" later on. NOW is your chance to have the strength and the courage to have the vision for our future that the citizens of the county have repeatedly asked for, please find those values. I attended the planning meeting that voted out the Node concept as presented in the draft document. The issue was not one only of public concern but also one of the legal framework that would permit the kinds of transfer of development rights that the concept was built on. Please review the minutes from the meeting and discuss the idea with legal counsel. Then come back to me and show me the places in your proposed nodes that are not already overbuilt and do not contain wildlife habitat and wetlands. I feel the in my node, Wilson, you will not find one more development that does not effect these most important values. Private property rights exist for the present residents as well as those wishing to develop. In my recent case, mentioned above, the rights of the existing community were disregarded for a developer who is not even a resident of our community. Finally, I feel strongly that the town officials should not be voting on county issues without representing the entire county voting population. The County Commissioners need to hear the town officials of many aspects of the plan, the town has a great stake in the planning results, but they should not represent my opinion if I cannot vote for them. Thank you for your attention to these concerns and your commitment to serve.
4/15/2011	Springer, Kim Interested Public	I'm writing in response to the new watered down changes to the Comprehensive Plan. The recent decision to take out specific build out numbers and goals is in direct opposition to four years of the planning process. I would like to see an emphasis on predictability. I realize numbers are controversial but how else will we know how much development is possible? I cannot support a plan that more than doubles the commercial and residential development that already exists. The Wilson area is full of important wildlife habitat including wetlands, moose habitat and a migration corridor, making it inappropriate for major development, as the new verbiage would allow. I do hope world-renowned hydrologist, Luna Leopold, is incorrect in predicting the town of Wilson will one day be underwater due to the Snake River's path. Our levees have held so far but everyone on the downhill side of the Snake or on the West side of the Snake needs to understand the inherent risks of living here. A minor accident on Highway 22 already plugs up traffic for miles and unfortunately there aren't alternate routes. Wildlife, open spaces, and small town character are the key issues I'd like to see designed for in this plan. The public has spoken many times in support of these key issues. As our elected officials we depend on you to represent us i.e. use all the work and input done thus far on the plan. Let's improve upon the existing plan that has worked quite well for many of us and not leave open-ended growth possibilities.

Date	Name	Comment
4/14/2011	Hawks, Molly Interested Public	I have been a Teton County resident for 21 years and currently live in downtown Wilson. I am wrought with anxiety over the possibility of the reinstated nodes in Wilson and the Teton Village road. The charm and continuity of this little town is what dreams are made of. Having raised two boys in Wilson has been such an amazing experience because of the community character additionally with regards to less traffic, less pollution and the positive attributes to the amount of wild life we experience. With current entitlements, Wilson will already grow to twice the current size which already will be a huge strain on current infrastructure. The Wilson area has critical wetlands, Moose Habitat, and migration corridors that should never be considered for dense development. Nodes in Wilson will ruin the small-town character with increased traffic, more pressure to widen Highway 22, and immeasurable pressure on the Wilson school. When my children were in Wilson school 3 and 6 years ago, the student to teacher ratios were already well above the national average. Wilson already has more deed restricted affordable housing than any similar area in the county and the West Bank has already received the greatest portion of development since the 1994 plan. With similar issues, nodes reinstated at the Aspens location will be equally as devastating. With increased highway traffic and noise pollution, the quality of life for residents as well as wild life will suffer greatly. Please do not reinstate the nodes in Wilson or the village road.
4/13/2011	Walles, Mackenzie Interested Public	I am very dismayed with what is going on with the Comprehensive Plan revision. I am a resident of Wilson and have been involved with this plan from the beginning of this long process. It is hard for me to understand how after 4 years that you, our public officials, have not heard the PUBLIC. Your recent decisions have been in direct opposition to what the public has said is important to us in this plan. The public made it very clear that we want predictability in this plan, which you have decided not to provide. The public made it clear that we are not in favor of nodes and you have reinstated them. Why is it that the planning commissioners heard the public but you have chosen to ignore them and ignore us? I am also very concerned with the fact that the Town Council members are voting on decisions for the County when they have absolutely NO ELECTORAL ACCOUNTABILITY to us! Why are the Mayor and Town Council deciding what happens in Wilson and other areas of the County when we are not allowed to vote for these representatives? They do not represent our views and I am afraid not our best interest. The citizens of Wilson are against higher density than what is currently allowed which is twice what is in Wilson . It makes absolutely no sense to me to put dense development in Wilson so that our citizens are required to make more trips in their cars to town where the majority of jobs and services are. The West Bank and Wilson have received the highest amount of additional density since the 1994 Comprehensive Plan. Wilson is not an appropriate location for increased density now. Wilson has many critical wetlands, critical moose habitat and important migration corridors. It is not appropriate to put high density in Wilson which will increase the stress on our wildlife and wetlands. The public has made clear that wildlife, wetlands and migration corridors are important to our community. I am shocked that the elected officials in our community do not put a greater value on our wildlife and natural resources. The fact that you deleted the “Monitoring of Cumulative Human Impacts” on wildlife and natural resources from the plan is counter to the well documented public will. I understand that this was not a unanimous vote and I ask that you reconsider this ill-advised action and reinstate this in the plan. The people of Wilson want our quality of life preserved. Your voting public would like you to listen!

Date	Name	Comment
4/13/2011	Spence, Kent Interested Public	I am strictly against high density development in Wilson and area. I was sure we already visited this issue and the majority of public opinion was against this. I understand that the commissioners and town officials are seriously discussing this matter again in the light of "land owner rights". Yes, I believe in such rights but I also believe in the rights of the community and those who have long lived in the Wilson area. The Wilson area has critical wetlands, Moose Habitat, and migration corridor that should never be considered for dense development. Dense development in Wilson will ruin the small community character and Jackson Hole will get nothing in return. There will be increased traffic, more pressure to make Highway 22 into more lanes, more noise and degradation of environmentally sensitive lands. Putting thousands of people on dense islands of development in the outlying community only generates more trips to town to work, the grocery store, soccer practice, school etc. Please vote against the move to allow "Nodes" or high density development in Wilson and keep any growth in already dense areas where grocery stores and other services already exist. Thanks for considering my vote on this matter.
4/13/2011	Wakeman, Polly Interested Public	I am alarmed at the recent decisions made by the Teton County Commissioners, Jackson Town Council, and Mayor regarding the Comprehensive Plan, which are in opposition to the 4 years of planning and the will of the Jackson Hole community. Previous public comment has clearly expressed the desire to limit growth to a predictable maximum buildout set forth in the Plan's Appendix 1. To disregard this will irrevocably damage the small town character, wildlife, and quality of life of the proposed "Nodes". The town of Wilson stands to be especially impacted by this, as well as by the stresses to existing infrastructure, traffic, and pollution caused by such lack of foresight. To reinstate the development Nodes allowing for more than double today's buildout, with no limits to growth is shortsighted and negligent. I implore you to honor the previous years of circumspect planning and return the "Monitoring of Cumulative Human Impacts" on wildlife and human resources language to the Comprehensive Plan, as it is irresponsible to eliminate such and important policy of checks and balances. I also am shocked that "Flexibility" in the comprehensive Plan would replace "Predictability". It is imperative that a concrete and modest growth cap that is less than the doubling of buildout be established. If the goal of the Comprehensive Plan is to represent the wishes of the majority of the residents of Teton County, then you need to listen to us, as well as the special interests whose motives are driven by financial gain, rather than a respect for preserving the unique character of this place we love. Should a few larger landowners' property rights to develop their land supersede the rights of the majority of the county's citizens who wish to limit growth? While a few stand to gain, most of us stand to loose. Please use your position to make this place one you will be proud to have helped preserve.
4/7/2011	Unfried, Amy Interested Public	I was horrified to learn that after all the meetings, all the countless hours of effort put into the process by planners, electeds, and concerned citizens, all the progress that had been made on developing a plan that everybody could live with has been undone in a stroke. There has to be a limit on growth, and it should NOT be more than double the current amount of development and population in the valley. There have to be protections for wildlife, which was the number one value that the community identified in public meetings early in the process. Wilson must not be allowed to grow to five times its current size. There has to be respect for the property rights of small landowners who hope to live in a community much like the one they bought into, not just the rights of the big landowners wanting to maximize when they sell out. There has to be predictability, which means there have to be measurable standards. The community has been speaking throughout this process, and it seemed that it had been heard. Now it appears that although it may have been heard, it is being ignored. Please reinstate all those things that you've just taken out.

Date	Name	Comment
3/8/2011	Kochan, JP Interested Public	I originally submitted this commentary to Mr Norton regarding plans for Wilson: I read with great dismay, the county's proposed comprehensive plan for the future of Wilson. I refer to the front page article in the May 6th edition of the Jackson Hole News and Guide in which numbers between 120 and 690 were sited as the number of proposed new housing units including worker/low income/affordable housing. Based on the many commentaries published in the following two issues of the paper, there are many others with a similar sentiment. I have no desire whatsoever to trash Wilson by tripling its population density. Contrary to the vision of the commission, my personal vision is to see Wilson, and for that matter, the rest of Teton County left entirely as it is. I fail to understand this driving need to destroy the natural beauty that makes the county so unique by overdeveloping it and paving it over. The commission's proposals serve to benefit the developers and large land owners who might seek to develop their properties. The proposal does not clearly benefit the average resident, the land or the wildlife. As a tax paying property owner in Wilson, I look to the Commission to protect the township from overdevelopment, not promote it. In the Wilson plan described in the article referred to above, 7 themes were listed as priorities. The first two points sited were to "promote stewardship of wildlife and natural resources" and "manage growth responsibly". I might suggest building up to 690 new homes would be in direct conflict with both these goals. Planning for 690 new homes in a town of just over 200 residents is not being responsible and certainly not in the best interest of the residents of Wilson. It seems reasonable at some point to ask the residents of Wilson if this is what they want for their town. Item number 4 refers to "meeting the communities housing needs". Here again, I might suggest that the community affected by these decisions be the ones to determine it's own needs. This should not be a county issue. If the public opinion supports provision of affordable housing for Jackson, then Jackson should provide that housing. It is inappropriate to presume that Wilson should provide the low income housing for Jackson. We have been inundated with the excessive reference to affordable housing in almost every statement issued by the commission. The planning commission and it's perceived need to provide low income housing is in my opinion, excessive and out of control and does not reflect the vision of the current permanent resident majority of the community. I do however support the development of services for the community. I agree that projects such as improved transportation services and utilities should be a high priority in planning for the future of Wilson and Teton County. These represent efforts that would directly benefit all residents. In summary, a global rethinking of the future of Teton County should be considered.... How willing are you to sacrifice those assets thast make Teton County unique for the sake of growth.
3/8/2011	Hill, Megan Interested Public	Good afternoon, my name is Meagan Hill; I'll keep it short. There's three main things I want to hit on. I've been listening to the comments and I think the first one I'll start with is a statement of the obvious and that relates to growth. I want to make sure that we recognize the fact that, like it or not, global population is increasing and so, as we move forward in the Plan, regardless of whether we like growth in our backyard, we need to plan for it and we need to address it. With that in mind, I'll move to my second point, which is the concept of nodes. We do treat that as a four-letter word, we do some of the time for it. We need to acknowledge the fact that we have, you know, existing areas of density—Wilson, the Aspens, the Village, Town and so forth—and so it makes sense to focus our density on those areas to allow ourselves to best manage infrastructure costs for the Town and the County, and best provide transportation, whether it be walk, bike, or bus. My final point is our natural resources, and I would specifically like to encourage you to increase your emphasis in the Plan on water conservation. I think so far we've made great progress on energy conservation, energy efficiency with the ten-by-ten plan, the stormwater project, Wilson sewer and so forth. What I think we're missing at the moment is the opportunity to recognize the correlation between water conservation and energy efficiency in what may be the next ten-by-twenty plan. But the most important thing is the future burden on infrastructure costs that we don't even know about yet and we haven't forecast. If we continue to spend our water resources the way we are, it's going to bite us in the back pocket before we know it, so I would encourage you to increase that. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
3/4/2011	Harrington, Kathy Interested Public	Hi Charlotte, Thank you for sending me this, but at this point after spending the past 3 years trying to partake I feel the planning staff Mr. Doughtery in particular are deaf to the community, and the top priorities that you mention in line one of your note are totally disregarded. In dealing with the MESS we have in front of us presently in Wilson all our comments of the past Comp Plan Meetings have fallen on very Deaf ears. When Andy Swartz asked Jamie Mackay if postponing a decision on his mess in Wilson would cause him financial issues, I realized have been bought off. We have ended up with "A Node" we have ended up with a project that we don't need or want. I presented the commissioners with over 300 signatures of people that don't want what we are about to end up with in the heart of Wilson. I believe it quickly became Andy's fire starter. 6 months ago Susan Johnson told me "We love this project in Wilson" even worse, the planning staff has now become the developer, working diligently with the applicant to assure it's passage. How is it that the Senior Planner has the power to determine the use of wetlands is necessary. Frustrated, saddened, and sickened. I doubt you can find a citizen of Wilson, let alone Teton County that doesn't echo my feelings.
6/10/2010	Wallace, Herb Interested Public	Herb Wallace, Wilson, representing myself. I read in the paper today that you are going to reconsider reconciling nodes with the rest of the Plan, or at least you're going to potentially do so. There's no reason to do this. The Planning Commissions' vote to eliminate the nodes was in line with the wishes of the people of Teton County. Public comment was overwhelmingly against the nodes and a hugh unnecessary density that they bring with them. Building thousands of homes in the outlying County will only make our terrible traffic problems worse. Any additional housing than what is currently allowed will generate far more pressure on our highways when people commute to their workplace in Town, to go to the grocery store, to go to school, to go to church, to go to soccer practice. It goes on and on and on. Nodes will stress and kill more of our precious wildlife. Nodes would bring noise and light pollution. Nodes would also lead to the loss of quality of life and character in the communities where we live. Additional housing should be placed in Town where the majority of our population works and there is already four-lane highways and the infrastructure to support additional growth. I also read that one of the Planning Commissioners thinks that nodes would prevent our Valley from becoming 35-acre ranchettes. Simple economics prevents this type of development. According to the Teton County ??, only 40 pieces of property for 35 acres sold in Teton County in the past ten years and that was through the boom. That is an average of only four properties in a year, and this number includes tracts that are substantially larger than 35 acres. Large landowners will continue to put their lands under conservation easement and do not have to sacrifice the communities that were designated as nodes to do it. Nodes belong in anywhere suburbia and not in Jackson Hole, at least under the years of work on this process, hundreds of Planning Commission votes, and the vision of the people of this County. Leave the nodes out of the Plan where they belong. Thank you.
11/19/2009	Labelle, Ernest Interested Public	My name is Ernest Labelle. I'm a resident of Wilson. In my opinion, one of the most important criteria for a healthy livable quality-of-life environment in a place like Jackson Hole is to create opportunities for wildlife to move freely within the developed areas and through the developed areas. This is not a naïve notion. This can be done. One way to encourage it is to address the issue of fencing, which has been addressed at the Commission level, but it needs to be addressed at the neighborhood levels within the community. We are here in this Valley, among other things, a collection of subdivisions. I live in a subdivision. I'm on the board of directors. I'm the past president of the subdivision that I live in. And we have taken steps to see that we have a policy that sets forth the guidelines for stewardship within our subdivision. Stewardship that ensures that no fencing will be allowed that in any way prohibits the movement of wildlife within and throughout our subdivision. Can you imagine if every subdivision and neighborhood in this community, in this Valley, stepped forward and stepped up to the responsibility of making things like that possible? We will have achieved a great gain, what you want to achieve in terms of wildlife stewardship in your Comprehensive Plan. So, I would recommend to you that you find a way of putting guidelines and language in the Comprehensive Plan that will encourage neighborhoods to assume some level of responsibility with their own associations to ensure that we continue to maintain an environment that is friendly and accommodating and that encourages the movement, the free movement, of wildlife throughout our community. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
11/19/2009	Barash, Jean Interested Public	June Brash, Wilson, Wyoming. Today, Dave and I came home at noon and we walked into our living room and we were so excited because there on our pond was a fabulous swan. And at first we thought it was a trumpeter swan and then we looked and it had a big tag collar on it. It looked different. And we picked up the phone and we called Wyoming Game & Fish and we got Susan Powell. And we described what we saw and the number and so forth, and she was so excited and said, can I come out? It's a tundra swan. They don't often fly over Wyoming on their way to Utah. I urge you to incorporate Wyoming Game & Fish's comments into this Plan. They are such a hard-working organization. We have never called them as homeowners with concerns or questions that they haven't called us right back. They're so interested. They work so hard. I know they put a lot of time into writing this report. So, I urge you to please incorporate it into this vision statement. And then the second thing is this past weekend I took my grown children to Washington, DC. We hadn't been there since they were in grade school. And for whatever reason we had a chance to go back again. And we did all the tourist events. We had contacted Senator Lindsey's office ahead of time, and so we took a tour of the White House and we went to the Capitol, all of those things. My children were there the last time when they were ten, eleven, and fourteen. They're now thirty-nine, forty, and forty-four. And we had a wonderful time. We did all the things, went to all the memorials. It was great. It was a lot like what it was when we took them there so many years ago. And I was talking to someone at one of the memorials, saying, man, wow, this is so great, this is so fabulous. And I was at the World War II memorial and I hadn't seen it. And I said, you are so lucky that you can come and see all these things and it doesn't cost anything. And the person said, where do you live? And I said, Jackson Hole, Wyoming. And the person said, do you know how lucky you are to live in a place like that? And I know I've said this before, and it's so hokey, but this is a one-of-a-kind place. People can ski in other places. People can play golf in other places. People can have fabulous meals in other places. But there is no other place that has the wildlife values, the wildlife that we have. And whether it is because you feel a, you know, you're a tree hunter or you're a business person. If you're a tree hunter, you're going to come back because you love these places. If you're a business person, as people are in this community, it's good for business. So, that's all I have to say. Thank you all.
11/12/2009	Karahadian, Kathy Interested Public	Please get rid of the "node" concept and put the developement in town or in the village-where the JOBS are. What jobs are there in Wilson???? Everyone ends up driving on 22. The bus ridership is actually down.The community has made it CLEAR that open space and preservation of wildlife are the most important issues.Let's not forget that.Read Peter Pilapian's letter which was in the Jackson News and Guide a few weeks ago & take it to heart. It was well said. Thank you.
11/5/2009	Stearns, Clarence, "Stea Interested Public	With regard to Wilson planning: Having lived in Wilson for 60 years, owning Hungry Jacks, the post office and sometimes called the honorary Mayor, I think I have a pretty good idea of how most of the population feels. The village of Wilson is treasured as a small settlement. Most residents moved here because of the slow pace, friendliness, and lack of density. Thus they are positively against density. In the Plan the importance of preserving the environment and wildlife is stressed. Nothing mentioned of preserving the village for the people. We frequently have been warned about a major earthquake. Did you take this into account when planning high density for Wilson? What if the Jackson Lake Dam breaks? Wilson is 6' lower than the Snake River so you know where all the flood water will go. When the Gros Ventre Dam gave way, Wilson was under water. The post office Dept. says that because of the dikes I don't need flood insurance but that I must have earthquake. The insurance people say I better have both. Even in a big snow year with a late, fast runoff, Fish Creek overflows its banks and the water runs behind the post office. I give the Planning Dept. a lot of credit for doing their best in the problems they face and how they settle them. Thanks for listening – good luck and best to you.

Date	Name	Comment
10/19/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I would like to respond to a comment made at last week's Teton County's Comprehensive Plan rewrite meeting, during the public comment segment. A gentleman said that the Northern South Park area around the high school should be a receiving area for development because the area is already "messed up" or ruined. Please don't treat the residents of the neighborhoods around the high school as if we don't matter. I hope that the planning commissioners and the elected officials respect the small home owner's future in West Jackson as much as they respect the large landowners, concerning their property rights and the money they may gain or lose on their land investment. West Jackson also has a lot to gain or lose in the rewrite of the comprehensive plan, not only in our home values but the very existence of viable and safe family neighborhoods. There is a simple formula that we can aspire to for the location of any needed housing. If housing is needed, it should be placed where the jobs are generated. Affordable homes and rentals should be placed near or where service people are needed for the upkeep of high end homes, high end developments and resorts in town, Teton Village, The Aspens and the Wilson area. There should be a shared responsibility by everyone who generates the need for service people. If we dump dense new bedroom communities in Northern South Park, people will still rely on their cars to get to and from work in town, Teton Village, Wilson, and The Aspens. We do not need more traffic on the already overburdened High School Road, which will be even more dangerous if the Tribal Trails connector road goes through. It will threaten the safety of all our children in and around the schools here. It defeats the purpose of smart and managed growth. We need to keep commercial and unneeded residential development to a minimum in all areas, protect wildlife, open spaces and preserve our family neighborhoods. Most of all, everybody should share in these responsibilities, not just the small homeowner who works very hard to call Jackson their home. Please be considerate of the neighborhoods in West Jackson. We matter, pay taxes and vote too!

Date	Name	Comment
10/15/2009	Ankeny, Barbara Interested Public	During your 10/15/09 meeting a comment was made that perhaps having a 'node' in Wilson was not a good idea because the START bus only comes to this person's Wilson neighborhood twice an hour. According to her, this is not enough to 'get people out of their cars'. Thus, according to her thinking, a 'node' in Wilson is not a good idea (and later in the meeting another Wilson resident voted the same). I utilize the START bus system in Jackson and I was almost sure most stops in town are twice an hour; Wilson at no exception to its Jackson counterparts. So, I called the START Bus offices and verified that, yes indeed, most all stops are scheduled for twice an hour (stops increase for all areas during the Holiday Season). Thus, if START bus stops are governing where to place a node (affordable housing areas) and where to not place a node (affordable housing areas), I see simply changing the START bus schedule as a valuable tool. I highly disagree in the thought that nodes (affordable housing areas) should be withdrawn from Wilson and the Aspens. Is this Comp Plan not called the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan? Wilson and the Aspens are just as much a part of Teton County as Jackson and Teton Village. The affordable/workforce housing issue must be shared by all communities in this valley. One of our county's largest employers is in Teton Village - and arguably you could say Teton Village as a whole. To steer the Village's employees to find affordable housing in Jackson is ridiculous when Wilson and the Aspens are so much closer. I suggest that all communities/neighborhoods in this valley share the need for areas for affordable housing. 'Employees' live all over this valley! Keep in mind the definition of 'employees' – just not food service, office & retail workers. Where are most of the residences in this valley located that require maids, housekeepers, greens keepers, grounds keepers (gardeners) and caretakers? It's along the Westbank, Fall Creek Road and North of Town. Where are most of the construction trades (a huge section of our workforce!) driving to each day? Certainly not in the town of Jackson. Please, I don't care what you call the areas provided for affordable housing (zone, node, or developments), just don't treat Wilson and the Aspens as if they don't need it or deserve it. As I said before – EMPLOYEES ARE EVERYWHERE IN THIS VALLEY! And face it, you know as much as I do that the majority of employees will always drive. Do you? Of course you do. Most of us do. I suggest a couple days a week you take a ride on a START Bus all the way around Jackson … and actually see WHO uses the START Buses. Don't plan on affordable housing areas only where the START Bus stops. I have yet to see a START Bus take carpenters and subcontractors to their jobsites, or stop at the Pines or Crescent H Ranch to drop off the 'house help'. Gardeners, landscapers and groundskeepers will always drive their trucks to work (you can assume most not into Jackson proper). And how many people on any given weekday or on weekends do you think drive to Teton Village to ski or golf at the Pines or North of town? I hope I've proven my point …. We are doing something (playing, eating, working …) everywhere in this valley, all the time! Every community (the Aspens, Wilson, Teton Village, Jackson, and even north of town!) should be in this thing (providing affordable housing areas) together. No community should be exempt from pitching in and providing its share to affordable housing areas …. or higher density housing …. or nodes …. or whatever you want to call it.
10/15/2009	, Joint Planning Commiss	Wilson shall retain its existing base zoning(Superseded by Recommendation 147)

Date	Name	Comment
10/8/2009	Walles, Brooke Interested Public	I understand that Nodes and density bonuses within them are going to be discussed at tonight's meeting. I am glad that they are finally on the agenda as these concepts are at the heart of what is wrong with this plan revision as written. Nodal development patterns may work in larger areas such as the suburbs of Salt Lake. Nodes are probably discussed in the textbooks planning staff may have studied recently in school. Jackson Hole is a special place and planning tools from Anytown USA simply do not apply to our special valley unless that is what we wish to become. First what is a node? What are the nodes meant to accomplish? My understanding is that a node is an area that has sufficient services in a pedestrian friendly environment so that people may work and live in an area. I would assume that the main goal of nodal development would be to reduce traffic. There are only three areas that remain as "nodes" that are targeted for high density housing which are the Aspens, Wilson, and the northern portion S. Park. The first two areas simply do not fit any reasonable definition of a "node". With Highway 22 bisecting the town of Wilson will it ever be pedestrian friendly? Anyone who lives in Wilson knows that the answer is no. No one coming from Idaho obeys the posted speed limit. Maybe a traffic light would solve the problems? Do you want to be sitting in a line of traffic when a tractor trailer is speeding off Teton Pass? Every year there are multiple runaway trucks. Adding more pedestrians and traffic at the base of Teton Pass is not only bad planning but it would be irresponsible. It is a serious public safety issue that must be taken into consideration. Neither area has or ever will have a sufficient commercial core to reduce traffic trips to town enough to justify any additional density. If you were to allow density bonuses in these two areas you would be putting dense islands of housing in areas that by necessity people would be taking their vehicles to town to Albertsons, Smiths, work, kid's school, soccer practice etc. People may occasionally pick up a gallon of milk at Hungry Jack instead of making the trip to town but the vast majority will not be working in Wilson. In the real world people simply do not ride public transportation. The current ridership in Teton County is 1.96%. If you put thousands of more people on these islands and even assume that ridership increases by 500% (not going to happen) you would be putting substantially more cars on the already strained roads of Highway 22 and 390. It is time we start planning for the real world that we live in; not some utopia that will never exist. Increasing traffic not only would impact our wildlife in the short term but in the long term the nodes would increase the pressure to expand Highway 22 and 390 to 4 to 5 lanes which would kill even more of our wildlife in the long term. The nodes will not only have disastrous impacts upon our wildlife but will impact our quality of life. The people of Wilson have dealt with this issue for over seven years through the mixed use village planning process and I am shocked that this nodal concept is even up for discussion. In the Fall of 2007 the planning staff offered the people of Wilson the choice of a Density neutral Option "A" sub area plan that would allow for Wilson to grow to roughly twice the size within the development rights of the current zoning. They also offered option "B" which was proposing an additional 98 units in Wilson. The people of Wilson "overwhelmingly chose option "A". They chose option "A" for sound reasons. Wilson and the Westbank already had accepted the majority of up-zones since the 94 plan. The additional housing proposed in option "B" would negatively impact the character and quality of life in Wilson. Traffic, noise pollution, light pollution, and degradation of critical wetlands/ wildlife properties such as the Waldron Property were all valid reasons to allow Wilson to only grow to twice the current size. Staff said that option "A" was Wilson's preferred subarea plan with the caveat that it 2 could change during the Comprehensive Plan Revision Process. Change it did as they are proposing up to 500 additional homes making Wilson 4 times the current size. I attended nearly comprehensive plan meeting. I read the data provided by the surveys etc. There was little support for the nodal concept and zero support from the citizens of Teton County for the type of up-zones the planners are proposing. Just as the planning staff had done throughout the Wilson Mixed Use Village Planning process they failed to listen to the feedback provided. If they were not listening to the people who have they been listening to? They have been listening to a handful of special interests including commercial interests, affordable housing advocates, certain elected officials, and large land owners. While the above interests are part of the fabric of Teton County they do not represent the will of the majority of the people. I do not envy the position that this has put the town and county planners.

Date	Name	Comment
		You have to reconcile the irreconcilable. You are not getting the feedback you once were because people have been worn down by this lengthy process. The public comment you received in May is just as valid as the comment you are receiving today. If this plan moves forward to the County Commissioners with the nodal concept/density bonuses for the Aspens and Wilson areas the people of this county will see this process as the illegitimate farce it has been thus far. You have the power to make recommendations for responsible growth that reflect the people's will and are good for our quality of life into the future. I applaud the concept of a growth cap and I think that you are on the right track. My opinion is that the only reasonable areas for "receiving areas" are the north of South Park near the High School and the town of Jackson. The reasons are simple. The majority of the schools are in walking distance. Smith's and Albertson's are readily available. The highway is already four lanes. You have a blank slate to create the pedestrian friendly environment that is critical to a "node". The vast majority of jobs are available in the town. The numbers that the planners are proposing for either area are not justified and should be lowered. There should be language assuring South Park and Teton County that there will be no up-zones allowed outside of these two areas in the future. Thank you for all you hard work and taking the time to read my letter.
7/8/2009	Jones, Richard A. Interested Public	Like many other citizens of Teton County, my wife and I wrote to you last month, objecting to the April 3rd draft of a new Comprehensive Plan. But, then we were greatly heartened last week, by the newspaper's report of your thoughtful recommendations for substantial revisions of the initial draft. These recommendations made by your commission reflected careful consideration of the numerous letters and messages you received from the many segments of our community. Surely many hours of hard work were required to formulate such a thoroughly detailed report to our County Commissioners. All of the many citizens who have been so concerned about the unfavorable impacts threatened by the new plan, are indebted to you for your service. As volunteer members of the Planning Commission, you have undoubtedly given much more time, work and even stress to this effort than you could ever have imagined when you took on the responsibility. But, it has been worth the effort. Whatever direction the planning process takes from this point, your outstanding service has already been of great value to the community. My wife and I, like so many others, are very grateful to all of you for your contribution to the future of the valley that we all love. Thank you very much. Respectfully submitted, Richard A. Jones
6/17/2009	, STAG	The majority of the group felt that Wilson should remain a node because it has the components of a node today. However, a more realistic development potential should be developed based on Fish Creek, wetlands, existing CC&Rs, community character, and Highway 22. The Future Land Use Map should be revised to incorporate this additional level of detail.

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	, Grand Teton National P	Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Jackson Teton County Comprehensive Plan (plan). Although the Plan does not directly pertain to the management and administration of Grand Teton National Park, indirectly some elements of the Plan have the potential to affect the resources and values for which the park was established. As a neighbor and adjacent landowner, our comments are offered in the spirit of partnership, and are intended to be constructive. Although we take great interest in all aspects of the Plan and applaud the hard work and effort that has gone into the current draft, our comments are limited to those elements that have the potential to affect park resources, visitors, and employees. The Plan's vision statement, "preserve and protect the area's ecosystem and meet the community's human needs in a sustainable andpredictable manner, " sets the framework for the entire effort, and seems to capture the sentiment of the community. We think it also reinforces the community's context within the larger ecosystem, and specifically with Grand Teton National Park. Of the seven themes identified in the Plan, we think that themes 1,2,4, and 6 are critical in terms of the potential to affect the park. Guidance provided by the Plan on the location and density of future development have the greatest potential to affect wildlife habitat connectivity, healthy vegetation communities, and scenic viewsheds. The Natural Resource Overlay (NRO) is a valuable tool in managing development on lands that are particularly important as wildlife habitat or are otherwise important to the protection of the area's natural resource values. Maintaining connectivity between park lands and others, both public and private, are often crucial to sustaining bird, wildlife, and plant populations and associated values. We note that portions of the NRO are located within the park, and include some lands that are in private ownership. Inclusion of these private lands within the NRO would allow for development, yet would also help to ensure the continued protection of park resources. We would also offer our assistance should there be opportunities for collaboration regarding the identification and protection of additional focal species and habitats. We think that a broader spectrum of species and habitats should be included in a future refinement of the NRO so that all roles in the ecosystem are represented. In light of the fact that development actions outside ofthe park may have the potential to affect resources and values within the park, we encourage the planners to carefully consider the potential effects oftheir actions on the park. The Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) is a key element in identifying how growth will occur throughout the area, and should be more clearly defined before the Comprehensive Plan is finalized. Accurate buildout forecasts are important to understanding future development impacts and are needed to ensure protection of wildlife, natural, and scenic resources. Development on the west side of the Snake River along the Wyoming 390 corridor (Teton Village, Aspens, and Wilson development nodes) is of particular importance because of the potential to adversely affect a portion of the Moose-Wilson Road within the park as well as important wildlife habitat and movement corridors. The Moose-Wilson portion of the park contains some of the most rich and sensitive wildlife habitat within Grand Teton National Park, and is highly valued for its primitive values, opportunities for wildlife viewing, as well as access to the Laurance S. Rockefeller Preserve. The rustic, narrow, and winding character and slow travel speeds along the Moose - Wilson Road are key to enjoyment of this portion of the park, and because of its character, the road is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Traffic volumes along Moose-Wilson Road within the park are approaching levels that could diminish the quality of visitors' experience, and are likely not sustainable. Future growth on the Wyoming 390 corridor, as well as transportation-related actions, may significantly affect the park and should be carefully considered. We respectfully request that transportation strategies

Date	Name	Comment
		and development decisions be sensitive to the needs of surrounding jurisdictions, including Grand Teton National Park. In light of the potential for increases in traffic volume on the Moose-Wilson Road, the town and county should coordinate with the National Park Service to ensure that, in addressing development and transportation issues on Wyoming 390, additional transportationrelated and other impacts are not created within the park. Workforce housing is a central issue for all of us, and we encourage the planners to make every effort to meet the community's housing needs while upholding the other values expressed in the Plan. We are working diligently to address housing of the park's workforce within the park to the greatest extent possible in order to minimize impacts on the community. We welcome opportunities to work together collaboratively with the town, county, and other agencies. Thank you again for the opportunity to provide our input and comments on the Draft Jackson Teton County Comprehensive Plan. We look forward to continued dialogue on the issues and challenges that face our community and the amazing landscape in which we live. Should you have any questions on our comments, please contact Jennifer Carpenter, Park Planner, at 307-739-3465.
6/11/2009	Moniker, Joe Interested Public	My name's Joe Moniker and thanks for having a public comment period. Largely I've seen public comment periods being sort of disregarded in the past. And so I don't know how, you know, what your goal is, but if the proposed Plan, as I read it, is your Plan, then it doesn't really make sense in the long run to add that sort of population density to the base of Teton Pass. If you look at the current infrastructure of Wilson, you'd have to make some serious changes to that to prevent a lot of backup on Highway 22 as currently, the population, or the density on that is pretty much maximum. So you're talking about adding stop lights to the base of Highway 22, which is, I mean, it's a safety issue primarily. And, you know, I saw a comment that said that we'd make Wilson a stronger community to go ahead and develop it further. And I really don't think that that's been quantified initially. I think that it's…there's going to be a lot of dollars necessary to upgrade ?? bypass. Schools, current schools are already at capacity. There is no library. There is no substation. There's very little police presence that's required now. That type of development would require a dramatic increase across the board in every area that I just mentioned. So, I think until you have the actual infrastructure in place to accommodate that sort of development, you really can't responsibly go further. And lastly, from my perspective, what you're talking about is financially motivated. And I think that, you know, in the long term that's probably not going to be of benefit for anybody who comes into this community with an intent to stay for long. Thank you.
6/10/2009	McIntosh, Doyen Interested Public	Hello, I strongly object to plans to develop Wilson. Who decided on 65% housing for working force?
6/2/2009	Bullinger, Brooke Interested Public	I respectfully submit this letter to address my concerns about the proposed new comprehensive plan. I find it disturbingly more pro-growth than the plan in place now and I feel that the public has adequately spoken that they do not want such increased growth. Why not build out what is currently zoned for and see where we are-- this would also serve to alleviate the that is sure to arise with the new plan as it is now written. Also, since there is no funding in place for any of the infrastructure that this growth would require and with the economy still in question it might be prudent not to push ahead with this. In addition, it is unfair to the old timers (illegible) of the backbone of our community who are not necessarily rich at all having bought their property a long time ago when prices were more reasonable to increase property taxes forcing some to move away--all this to pay for infrastructure for people not yet here. My main problem with the proposed nodes is that there seems to be some faulty logic at play. To say that the Aspens is a good place for a node because it has a START bus stop is purely rationalization. 1% of the population rides the bus and the ridership is flat, not growing. And yes there is a bike path that 5 or 6% of people use-in the summer-for recreation. None of the facilities that are now present at the Aspens are enough to service the additional trips to town that would be generated by a large increase in population. Teton Village and the Aspens are on a dead end road for 6 months of the year. Wilson, also because of its unique character and wildlife, whilst sitting at the bottom of a steep pass, is not a good place for a node. Further consider, the above 3 nodes have to use the Snake River bridge--which in view of any catastrophic event and a possible evacuation this has to be considered. Teton Village road is already overtrafficked. How you can think of adding thousands more car trips a day to the road when there are no plans to widen it until 2018 or later is, in my view, downright impossible. Finally, we are failing in our providing workforce housing--we need more class 1 and 2s, not 3,4 and 5s. We need to take care of those already here not those not yet here. We keep adding resorts and commercial developments that add to the problem and we will never catch up. I urge that this plan not be adopted as proposed without major changes more in line with the public's directive. Most sincerely, Brooke Bullinger

Date	Name	Comment
5/31/2009	Zelazo, Barbara and Mi Interested Public	I am writing to express my thoughts about the current plan to dramatically expand housing in the Aspens and Wilson. I think the proposals offered are terrible ideas which will not help with work force housing. They will create more demand for services and they will increase traffic enormously on the Village Road. We want to reduce sprawl yes but the densities being proposed belong in town. This is where it belongs, this is where the community wants it. Everything about this plan seems too much too fast. Wilson is a small hamlet, you will overwhelm it with the growth being proposed. Some increased density there would be acceptable, but your plan goes to the extreme. The same can be said for the Aspens. Because some of us answered that density would be OK here, did not mean that doubling its size would be acceptable. The Cheney Lane area is also very low density and should stay that way. How this area could be designated for high density when it is by far over the ¼ mile necessary for walkable reange from the Aspen's minimal seervices is a mystery. It also presents a safety hazard if many folks start walking the village road in winter, as the pathway is only usable about 6 months per year. This seems to have been just included because the Housing Trust purchased land there, when they had no business doing so, and not because it is in the community's best interest. Between Teton Village and its growth, the Aspens and Millward there is already heavy use on the Village Road. There are minimal services for these existing "nodes" and you cannot guarantee that appropriate services will follow. Groceries, gas, and basic needs will have to be gotten in Jackson or possibly Wilson and will more often than not require a car ride. These facts will require expanding the road sooner rather than later, and the community is strongly against that. Listen to all the citizens and you will hear overwhelming dismay at what is being proposed. Scale this back, put high density development in town, where the jobs, stores and services are already located. The village deli is not a supermarket where any of us buy the majority of our food. It's great to have here but it's where you go when you forgot something at Albertsons or Smiths. Don't pretend people are not going to go into town, we do now and we will continue to have to. The more people housed on the Village Road, the worse the traffic will get, the greater the impact on wildlife and the less desirable it will be for all of us.
5/27/2009	Watson, Andrew P. Interested Public	Can the nodes proposed for the Aspens and Wilson, district 10 and 11 in the Comprehensive plan, work? For Teton County the answer is no. Community planning that incorporates "sustainable" nodes along high speed transit routes can achieve a viable alternative to car use and promote walking communities. But the key to success relies completely on a fast efficient transit system that moves a high number of residents to one location for the majority of their work and entertainment. Since we do not have, and probably never will have, a transit system that does not rely on roads, the idea of setting up numerous nodes around the county only makes matters worse. People won't leave their cars for something less fast and less convenient. The plan for nodes in Wilson and The Aspens does not create sustainable communities. It creates little "bedroom communities" with few jobs within the community itself, and little or no community amenities -- movies, music, live theater, libraries, restaurants, bars, drugstores or supermarkets. With the planned housing density, it will create thousands of car/truck trips to town where most of our amenities, already exist. Sure, some people will ride the bus, and some will bike to jobs when weather permits, but density in the nodes will only increase highway traffic. It is incredibly difficult to get people out of their cars. The Plan's Vision Statement contains a commitment to preserving and protecting the area's eco-system and natural resources, as well as meeting the community's human needs in a sustainable and predictable manner. Is there one bedroom community in our country where bus transportation has significantly reduced automobile traffic? It is impossible to see how these nodes advance the vision. Traffic will destroy the vision. There are only two sites in Teton county where a majority of residents work and play: the town of Jackson and Teton Village. Jackson is really the heart of our community, and the services most important to residents are found there. So, why not put the people where the services are and create a walking city? By creating housing in Jackson, residents, clustered there, can take public transportation to Teton Village for employment or walk to work in town. Take a look at Portland, Oregon, considered one of the best-managed cities in the nation. It is a walking city, with housing, services and entertainment, all accessible without a car. And it has public transportation to some outlying areas.
5/22/2009	Coburn, Broughton Interested Public	Dear Planners, I am a Wilson homeowner, and am not in favor of what appears to be an increased density concentration proposed for Wilson. The statement, "The priority in Wilson is the provision of housing opportunities..." is questionable at the outset, considering the small number of jobs and low level of business and industry in Wilson, to begin with. Who would expanded Wilson housing be providing jobs for? For future (uncertain) expansion of businesses and services? Or for people who will live in Wilson and work elsewhere? I feel that, at the least, the timing for this "upzoning" (if it can be referred to that way) is off, considering the state of the economy. Fish Creek Interiors is now vacant, and it doesn't appear that other businesses here are enjoying a great degree of sales. Wouldn't it be prudent to wait and get a better feeling for how and when growth and development are going to naturally and economically expand, before offering concessions to levels of growth that there may not really be that much demand for?

Date	Name	Comment
5/20/2009	Platt, Doris Interested Public	Back in 1962, Stanley Resor said, “With future improvements Wilson would be the most beautiful little western town in the United States.” There are many of us today who feel that Wilson, Wyoming is just that. Unique. Special. In July 1995 Wilson celebrated its 100th anniversary of its settlement. The Jackson Hole News wrote an editorial in commemoration. I’ve kept it displayed in my little log cabin. Here is the last paragraph. The piece was entitled “Thank God for a quirky small town” “Wilson is what Jackson Hole used to be – a low-key, funky community where you know your neighbors and help them out when times get tough. Tuesday’s celebration at Own Burcher Park across from the old red schoolhouse showed that spirit is still alive. Thank God for Wilson – and may it retain its independence and spunk for another century.” JHN 7/5/95 Drive around Wilson and see that it is truly a lovely little town. Sure, it can grow. But – “density bonuses”, “mixed use redevelopment of the commercial core” and all the services required for another 500 or more homes! Spare us! Let us not become “Anywhere, USA”. Surely the fault line which runs under Wilson must be shuddering at the image of fast food places, possible three or four-story magni-bulidings, apartment houses and other possible terrors all crammed around our funky beautiful little town.

Date	Name	Comment
5/18/2009	Harvey, Ann Interested Public	I am dismayed, to say the least, at the proposed new comprehensive plan. I know that, after the investment in expensive consultants and staff time spent producing this document, there will be considerable resistance to changing course--but PLEASE listen to the many, many citizens of Jackson Hole who care deeply about what makes this valley special. Please put the brakes on the rushed and confusing process we are now in, and reconsider what you are doing. This plan does NOT improve on the 1994 Comprehensive Plan; in fact it's a giant step in the wrong direction, toward the destruction of the very qualities that make Jackson Hole such a remarkable place.It isn't easy to figure out what exactly the plan proposes. Is this vagueness intentional? Why aren't "buildout" numbers and other crucial information presented in the sections on each district? Citizens shouldn't have to wade through voluminous appendices to figure out what's proposed. For example, when I opened the Wilson chapter, I expected to find detailed numbers, maps, standards, descriptions--in other words, I expected to find out what, exactly, is planned for Wilson. Instead, I found one page of vague text, and one "conceptual" map with a disclaimer at the bottom saying that this is only to be used as a starting point for more specific future planning. In other words, after reading the Wilson section, I know essentially nothing, except that the planners have decided (over the strongly expressed objections of the Wilson community at several public meetings) that Wilson is an appropriate place for "town-level" densities, and that there will be "increased residential development potential above 2009 zoning levels." It was from the newspaper, not the plan's chapter on Wilson, that I learned that 520 new units are proposed.Naturally when I discovered that Wilson is designated as a development node I wondered whether my home there is destined to be surrounded by duplexes, triplexes, four-plexes, multi-story apartment buildlings? Will what are now single-family lots be designated as appropriate sites for density bonuses for workforce housing? What density will those bonuses allow? Will setbacks be decreased, will height limits change? The plan doesn't say. Is it unreasonable to expect a comprehensive plan to lay out something more specific than "contextually-sensitive development that provides for community needs"? Anyway, in my opinion, adding 520 new units to a town of 170 units will destroy Wilson's character and is not exactly "contextually sensitive development"! "Community needs" or "human needs," something the plan repeatedly refers to, are undefinable and potentially infinite, and can be used to justify any amount of development. I think it's unfair to ask citizens to give their support to vague conceptual maps, with assurances that more concrete planning for zoning and development in the nodes will come later. Separating approval for the concept of dense development from the process of defining development regulations makes it impossible for us to know what we're actually approving. Objections we make now are countered with the statement that we shouldn't worry because we'll have a chance to influence regulations and zoning later. Later, when we're presented with upzoning and dense development, we will be told that it's too late to change because the comprehensive plan approved those concepts. In other words, this "plan", despite its stunning lack of concrete detail, will quite likely make sensible, fine-scale planning later difficult or impossible if it conflicts with the broad-brush "conceptual" maps we are now being asked to support.I don't think it's fair to the citizens first to ignore their input, and then to cloak the plan's true impacts in vague verbiage. Phrases like "Increasing the vibrancy of Wilson as a town-style node" are essentially meaningless. What is increased "vibrancy"--more traffic? More buildings? More commercial development? More noise? Less open space? Less wildlife? All of the above? "Managing growth responsibly" apparently means approving far more growth than the 1994 plan anticipated. While concentrating growth in the town of Jackson and immediate surroundings would make sense, this plan encourages much more growth in the "nodes" than ever before but seems to lack any real means of slowing or limiting growth in the County as a whole. Finally, some of the plan's assumptions (e.g. "Ecosystem preservation does not preclude growth and development necessary to meet our community's human needs") are highly questionable or flat-out wrong. If we really care about ecosystem preservation, it will take more than lip service and wishful statements about how we can have it all. We cannot maintain the current abundance, diversity, and health of Jackson Hole's wildlife species while steadily encroaching on their habitat--we just can't. It will come down to a choice--more people, houses, cars, pets, roads, and all their associated impacts will fragment remaining habitat, stress wildlife on their winter ranges, disrupt their migration routes, and diminish their numbers. The existing comprehensive plan is at least based on an attempt to delineate important wildlife habitat and scenic resources and to direct development away from those areas. The new plan needs to focus on this as well, and build in some scientific reality. If you give your approval to this plan's 9,880 new residential units and 8.8 million new square feet of commercial development, more than doubling the human footprint in this valley, there is no way we will have anything like the wildlife we have today.In short, I think this plan is deeply flawed, and I think it's moving way too fast, with too little understanding of its impacts and too little acknowledgement of the expressed wishes of the community's priorities. Please put on the brakes and reconsider what legacy you want to leave for future generations of wild and human occupants of Jackson Hole.

Date	Name	Comment
5/17/2009	McIntosh, Beth Interested Public	The current vision for Wilson as laid out in the Comprehensive Plan is unsustainable, unrealistic, and will prove devastating to any kind of life of value (or at all) in this magic valley. Please realize that there has to be a way to REPLACE SPRAWL with high-density nodes or the net effect of condensed living is worse than what we have now. During the next phase of planetary adjustment to resources, we need to be radical leaders in how to live WITH a landscape Planning for conventional growth is not a way to do this. Smart decisions limiting car traffic, using local resources (and less of them), changing our habits to accommodate wild animals and paying attention to our health and education needs as a community are ways that we can improve this place and our lives. If we want to accommodate 3-4 times more people in Wilson, then we must house them in square footage that has already been constructed, and create sensible commerce around existing infrastructure. The proposed density increase lies within the highest priority grizzly bear conflict zone. With the radical die-off of whitebark pine and the de-listing of the grizzly, it is highly possible that there will be no grizzly bears left in Yellowstone/Teton in the next few years, DUE TO CONFLICTS WITH HUMANS. Increasing density will increase conflicts, and create unmanageable stress levels for the bears. This is a time when we need to look very carefully at what we have left and what we want to do about it. Please LISTEN TO THIS COMMUNITY.
5/17/2009	McIntyre, Julie Interested Public	Wilson teems with wildlife. Further development will be very harmful to migration and nesting/breeding.
5/17/2009	Harrington, Kathy Interested Public	I was born in Teton County. I was fortunate enough to be of a family that arrived in the mid 50's and purchased over 300 acres in Wilson, not without looking from Astoria to Grand Teton National Park. I feel very strongly about this entire county, but due to the growth along with the popularity, I must choose an area that effects me most and that I have the energy to try to save. Teton County is my back yard, and I am getting exhausted and very frustrated. I have spent countless hours, and sent several comments to this planning commission, and I am speachles, I can hardly comment anymore, no one is listening. This is for many of us our second large battle against high density. I remember when the construction trades, real-estate agents and very large land owners were very in favor of the 94 plan. IS IT STILL ALL ABOUT THE DOLLAR?. I also distinctly and sadly remember the Hardeman expansion. We environmentalists after a long battle said, ok you want to put in 70 units ok, we don't like it, but ok, and than the county came back with 96, and the other 12 or whatever in Schwabacker property. My numbers are off, but the point is that the powers that be seem to want the biggest and most. Not everyone can live in Teton County and preserve what we barely have left. I never envisioned that you would come back to us with 100 times the density for the entire county. You can not fill this valley Butte to Butte. The 3 to 5% of vacant land is irreplaceable. I have never seen the elk migration march right up and down fish creek, due to no other avenues and stay as they have the past 3 years.. I live in the Wilson Node. The area that you want to add 520 units lies in direct conflict with migration of just about every wild animal that this area is famous for. Not to mention the disgusting amount of commercial space YOU THINK WE NEED. For the past two weeks, I have had every day, and I am not exaggerating moose, elk, bald eagles, osprey, fox's, deer, sand hill cranes, and coyotes IN MY BACK YARD. These animals pass thru my yard, which is at the south end of Ward Lane bordering the Rossiter property. These animals/birds do not abide by the fence or the road, they travel this area going in every direction to and from the Snake River, Fish Creek, Fall Creek. Please, Please Reconsider, update, and complete the NRO"s for all of Teton County, prior to signing this ludicrous amount of density. You are the very group of people that we have all taken the time to voice our concerns for the past two plus years, why have you given us a plan that is so far removed from so many comments opposed to so much density and outrageous commercial space. DON'T BE REMEMBERD AS THE STAFF THAT PLACED THE DEATH NAIL IN TETON COUNTY. YOU HAVE GREAT POWER TO DO SO MUCH BETTER. PLEASE, PLEASE LISTEN TO THE CITEZENS OF THIS INCREDIBLE VALLEY.
5/17/2009	Baldwin, Huntley and Jo Interested Public	It seems peculiar, if not suspicious, to invite public input on the creation of a comprehensive plan, set up community-agreed upon objectives, and then propose a plan that turns its back on them. What happened to the number one goal of protecting wildlife? What happened to the commitment to manage growth responsibly? What happened to the desire to preserve our open spaces and rural character? Nothing better illustrates the apparent disregard for community desires than the proposals for Wilson. There is no way that Wilson could support the 520 new homes the plan proposes without ruinous effect on wildlife, rural character and infrastructure. Obviously we can't hope to limit our population to that on Hungry Jack's nostalgic sign, but certainly we can de better than what is currently proposed. We urge you to take another hard look at the plan as it stands now, before we destroy the very aspects of the Valley that we all cherish.

Date	Name	Comment
5/16/2009	Thal, Laurie Interested Public	I have several concerns regarding the new draft of the Comprehensive Plan. The 1994 plan has a strong focus on stewardship of the land and protecting wildlife, & open space. This appears to be diluted in the new plan. Transportation will be a huge problem with the amount of additional residential & commercial development proposed by the new draft Comp Plan. Also, quality of life and neighborhoods, the reason we all like living here, will be compromised by that large of an increase. We need to set growth boundaries and implement sptrict zoning. Keep Wilson as it was described, a rural community. The majority in Wilson have already voiced strongly their opposition to becoming an “urban”area .The reasons were stated in the original plan, proximity to important wildlife habitat, traffic, impacts on school and community character. workforce housing will be a greater problem with the increased allowable commercial development. This kind of development must be held more responsible for finding solutions to relieve our workforce housing shortage. Thank you for taking your time to plan and help keep this valley the place we all want to continue to call home.
5/15/2009	Walles, Brooke Interested Public	RE: Waldron Property and Wilson Mixed Use BoundaryThe 15 acre Waldron Property and the properties located south on Fall Creek Road do not belong within the Wilson Mixed Use Boundary. The Planners inclusion of this piece within the boundary is arbitrary and is not consistent with public comment received in the Mixed Use Village Planning process or the current Comprehensive plan update. During the Wilson Mixed Use Village Planning process the citizens of Wilson made it abundantly clear that Wilson should only grow to the size currently allowed under today's zoning. Please reference Planner's notes from the October 4, 2007 Open House "All were opposed to additional density on the Waldron property." Throughout the Mixed Use Planning process the Waldron Property was shown in yellow or "single family low". Myself and many other citizens were upset when between open houses the 15 acre property changed from Yellow NC-SF which is the current zoning to MU-R or Mixed Use Residential. We were concerned that by including the Waldron Property within in the boundary would increase the likelihood that property could be slated for High Density Development. Repeatedly Alex Norton claimed that this was not the case. We realized our fears were well justified when the Comprehensive Plan Revision was released allowing for High Density Development on the Waldron Property. Furthermore the maps provided to the residents of Teton County by the planning staff during the during the Comprehensive Plan Update showed "South on Fall Creek Road" as a distinct area and the "Town of Wilson" as another. The demarcation point was Highway 22. The feedback that the residents of Teton County provided for "South on Fall Creek Road" was to preserve the rural character and not to allow any additional density. This only makes sense as the lots that are located south on Fall Creek Road are larger and adjacent to large conservation properties including the Rosseter property and the Fish Creek Ranch.The planners only justification for the inclusion of the Waldron property being located within the boundary was "walkability,Äù while ignoring the many reasons why this special property is not the appropriate place to have high density housing. The Waldron Property is considered Critical Moose Habitat by Fish & Game. It is vital wildlife corridor for a host of animals and is adjacent to hundreds of acres under conservation easement. The property primarily consists of pristine wetlands which according to the Wilson Charette/Mixed Use Village meetings were to be preserved and enhanced. The views as you enter Wilson and look south down Fall Creek road are spectacular. The views are just one of the many special aspects of the "character" of Wilson. The citizens of Teton County have stated that wildlife is their number one priority. The possibility of high density housing on the Waldron Property flies in the face of the expressed vision of the citizens of Wilson and Teton County. Please remove the Waldron property from the boundary and extend the same protections that are provided in the plan for all the properties located south on Fall Creek Road.
5/15/2009	Obering, Julie T. Interested Public	Wilson, precariously situated at the base of Teton Pass, is not only presently strained with it's own local traffic but also with the traffic traveling to and from Idaho. To increase the residential units and extensive commercial space in Wilson so greatly is not responsible management, will be a hazard,and should not be recommended by the Comprehensive Plan.Living in Wilson, I drive, daily, on Highway #22, passing the Stagecoach, Fall Creek Road, West Street, Hungry Jacks & the Post Office, Nora's Fish Creek Inn, Ida Ward Lane, and Second Street.Between the Stagecoach, going east to Second Street there are 8 or more access roads or driveways onto Highway #22.Fall Creek Road on the south is the only access for all the residents off Fall Creek Road to Highway #22. West Street and Second Street are the two primary access roads for the residents from the north to Highway #22, from the town of Wilson and from along Fish Creek Road.Having a vision in the Comprehensive Plan of the possibility of increasing by up to 520 new residential units within a quarter mile of the existing commercial core is excessive and would be a danger, particularly to the area between Fall Creek Road and Second Street. Presently the traffic is often a problem. There are many cars and trucks, as well as pedestrians, bike riders, and even some horseback riders. The vision for additional residential and commercial units should be far less than presently proposed in the effort to honor the stated "Priority: Manage Growth Responsibility".I agree with the statement that "While Wilson is designated as a node to accommodate some community needs, such as housing, the Town of Jackson should remain the lodging, retail, professional, and civic center of the region." Because Jackson is intended to remain the "center" of the region, I believe that Jackson should have more of the commercial and residential units that are now envisioned for Wilson.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Walles, Mackenzie Interested Public	I am writing as a resident of Wilson to tell you how disappointed I am with the Draft of the Comprehensive Plan revision. I have lived in Teton County, WY since October of 2000 and have been a resident of Wilson since January of 2007. We purchased a home in Wilson so that we could be a part of the character that makes Wilson such a special place to live. We wanted to live in an area of the County where we would be close to town, but far enough away so that we would be close to the wildlife that makes our valley so special. We became very involved in the Mixed Use Village planning process once we moved to Wilson. We joined with our neighbors to help shape what the future of Wilson. After countless hours of meetings, emails and phone calls, the planners provided Wilson residents with two options to be presented to the Planning Commission. Option A (density neutral) and Option B (increased density zoning.) Wilson chose Option A. We obviously made the wrong choice in the eyes of the Planning staff, because this was never presented to the Planning Commission. Option B was an increase of 98 units and now the planning staff is trying to increase our density by up to 400 additional units. Why did no one listen to Wilson? Why did we spend so much time planning in Wilson to have all of that work for nothing? How did we go from them recommending an additional 98 units to an additional 520? What happened to wildlife and preservation of wetlands being the #1 priority????As was stated by the great majority of attendees of the Wilson Mixed use village meetings, the Waldron 15 acre property in Wilson should be removed from the boundary that the Planners dreamed up. The Waldron property is NOT an appropriate place for increased density. The property is currently deeded for up to 5 residences and that is how it should remain. The Waldron property is a migration corridor for the wildlife that is so important in Wilson. It is adjacent to the Rossetter land which is adjacent to Fish Creek Ranch. Our property is adjacent to the Waldron property and we have wildlife viewings multiple times each week. The property seems to have a resident immature moose who lost his mother and twin brother due to traffic on our highways. The Waldron property is South on Fall Creek Road and should be put in the same zoning category as the rest of the properties South on Fall Creek. My husband and I attended all of the Comprehensive Plan meetings. It is very clear that our community said that protecting wildlife was the number one priority. It was not my intent nor do I believe it was the intent of the majority in attendance, that in order to protect wildlife in the county that the plan would cram high density in the places that most of us live! The Node concept is flawed!!! I think that the node concept should be removed entirely from the plan. Wilson is not a pedestrian friendly town, it is at the base a steep mountain pass! The plan does not take into account the infrastructure and services that will be necessary for all of the additional people it is planning for. Where will all of the children go to school? The Wilson elementary is already close to capacity. More vehicle trips will be created into town. We do not have an Albertsons and never will! I realize that the plan is planning for the future, but I do not believe that the planners planned for the future that the residents of Teton County envision. These are only a few of the issues I have with the draft plan and will continue to comment throughout this process. I hope that the Planning Commissioners will listen to the residents of our community and help create a plan that does reflect our vision.
5/15/2009	Pilafian, Peter Interested Public	Please REMOVE Wilson from the list of "Nodes." The level and density of growth that you are describing is completely inappropriate, and would be the Kiss of Death for Wilson as we know it.Your 'Plan' seeks to turn Wilson into a bedroom community to support Jackson businesses, and to supply convenient workforce housing for other employers all around the county. Your plan for Wilson is inappropriate and unacceptable, and ignores the wishes of local residents. To the extent within which Wilson might possibly be called a Node, it is entirely built out now, and does not need any significant additional density. You do not even realistically (or imaginatively) address the problem of Highway 22, around which the whole Wilson question revolves. As you know, the charrette cross-section was a serious compromise, and has already been violated by WYDOT.Nobody is in favor of your Wilson plan, except those that stand to profit from it, or those that dont live here. Wilson should be changed to 'Rural' designation. Wildlife, ranchlands, scenic vistas, riparian lands - this is the character of Wilson.Please -- remove Wilson from the list of 'Nodes' before this plan is submitted to the county. Do it Now!
5/15/2009	Baldauf, Jill Interested Public	Thank you for all the hard work you have done to complete the Comp Plan for the County. I am sure it is difficult to distill everything you hear into one clear, concise and strategic plan. I am afraid perhaps, you didn't clearly hear the residents of Wilson, Wyoming when the shared their concern for low/lowgrowth and protection of the wildlife. The ideas you have proposed are directly contrary to the voices of Wilson residents. We are in a wildlife migration pattern and we love it. Everyday we see moose, elk, fox, deer wandering through our backyards. They come down the hill above Fall Creek Road, cross the road and head toward the Snake River. The retaining walls on Fall Creek have already forced them into a narrow path. Adding homes to the Waldron property would end the pattern. Adding home to the Waldron property will also endanger human beings. Visibility is terrible around the curve for the houses that already exist there. To add additional traffic would be extremely dangerous. Just the thought of children walking along the road to Nora's or Hungry Jack's is terrifying. We can't handle more traffic on Fall Creek. And speaking of traffic, have you notice we don't have a traffic light in Wilson and we like it that way. If you really plan to sextuple the population, you will have to add in a myriad of traffic mitigation features that we certainly don't want. Can you please try to listen just a little harder, read just a little more carefully and really understand how we Wilson residents feel. Our quality of life and that of the wildlife that we care for is in your hands. Please be kind to all of us.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Hoke, Liza Interested Public	"While Wilson is designated as a node to accommodate some community needs such as housing, the Town of Jackson should remain the lodging, retail, professional, and civic center of the region." comp planAgain, you are zoning for growth in areas that do not have adequate infrastructure to accommodate density. There is no mention of impact on the school system (already at maximum), just mention of more parks. What about more grocery stores? Places to eat? This will just be another population pimple that feeds off the Town, which means addtional traffic.Too much density!Limit Growth across the board. That is what the community is saying.
5/15/2009	Spackman, Jarad Interested Public	As a Wilson resident I am very concerned with the large development densities being planned for this node. I attended multiple meetings last year with concerned citizens and I do not see where the planners incorporated any of our feedback and viewpoints into this new plan. This plan looks like or is even worse than the Option B that everyone was so against from the start of this process. Were these meetings just an exercise in futility? A necessary hurdle towards getting what our county planners envision rather than what actual residents envision? I feel wronged that our voice was not listened too. Wilson has already gone through a massive amount of new development in the last ten years with Wilson Meadows, HHR, and Stilson. Let's think smart growth. Giving bonus development densities only begets more growth and creates more systemic housing problems. If the goal is to create more affordable housing than make sure that any density bonuses are zoned as "affordable housing" and not as standard residential development. Any new marketable lots/buildings created in such a desirable area like Wilson will not be affordable to the working class. The affordable housing problem is due to commerical developers not having to provide enough affordable housing. Why does the comp plan have to allow our community to double in the next twenty five years? Quality of life and protection of wildlife soley comes from keeping our population at a sustainable thresh hold. The first goal in this plan should be a census on what maximum population numbers we can sustain without damaging our values.
5/15/2009	Dean, Gregg Interested Public	I really don't want to see 500 more houses in Wilson. It is too much growth too fast. There is not the job growth in Jackson Hole to support a doubling or tripling of the number of houses in Wilson. Not to mention that it will significantly impact the small town feel of Wilson. Please slow down with this planned growth business.
5/15/2009	Steinberg, Ethan Interested Public	i've been a resident of Wilson for about 10 years. i feel strongly that the planned/zoned growth for Wilson should be much less than what the plan looks like. I recognize there are many interests at work here but believe the vision of a majority people is not consistent with the plan. As planners/public servants i feel you're accomodating developers and people who 'have yet to move to Wilson' with this plan. That is not your constituency and come election time I expect to work hard to make sure my representation better reflects what i and what i believe the community actually wants. please don't increase the potential density in Wilson anywhere near the degree as is proposed right now. Thanks for your hard work.
5/15/2009	Doyle, Doug Interested Public	Please reconsider the plan adding over 500 homes to the wilson area the town can not take that incress. HWY22 crossing will not be safe, school will not be able to handle the incress #'s,character of the town will be changed for ever and wildlife inpact will be too large.Thank you,
5/15/2009	Phillips, Brian Interested Public	Wilson is NOT a "node" that should have additional subsidized housing and 100,000 squ ft of commercial space.....there are plenty of houses available right now.....there is plenty of commercial space available....walking town....where Hwy 22 ....give me a break....We voted you into office and we can vote you out....just remember you work for the tax payer and from the looks of it from the attendance at Wilson Elementary last week.....NO ONE SINGLE PERSON was in favor of this proposal. It is appalling that this meeting was not on the public record....shame shame shame
5/15/2009	Rossetter, Birdie Interested Public	Is anyone listening? How many more meetings do we have to attend? How many more letters do we have to write? How many more emails do we have to send? Wilson does not like or want the Comp Plan as written. Eighty or more houses plus at least eighty dogs plus one hundred and 50 or more cars on the pasture land on South Fall Creek Road in Wilson equals Night Light Pollution, Noise Pollution and NO Wildlife. As to the redevelopment of downtown Wilson.- We already have a Hardware store, Catering service, 2 Restaurants, a Bagel shop, a Bank, a Ski and Bike shop, a Barber shop, a Post Office, a Medical facility, an Elementary school, a Community Center and Hungry Jack's for everything else. People will always drive to the ski area parking lot, the golf course, the Snake River, Teton Park and Jackson no matter how many so called amenities are added to Wilson. Bus service is not an adequate option when you have jobs, errands appointments etc. both North and South of the Y. Do we really want Wilson to become "Every Town USA" ?

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Harvey, Ann Interested Public	This is a plan for the destruction of Wilson, and for Jackson Hole. Why did you hold all the public meetings if the wishes of the community were going to be absolutely disregarded? What a sham of a public process. I attended several of the meetings, and the residents of Wilson were very clear that we do not want our community destroyed by making it a focus for high-density development. The planners assured us that we had made our wishes clear and they understood that we do not want increased density in Wilson. I am horrified by what this new "plan" proposes for Wilson and for the rest of Jackson Hole. How many jobs does Wilson provide? The vast majority of people living in Wilson have to commute elsewhere to work. That won't change by adding hundreds of new units. What we will have is hundreds more cars on the road every day as the new residents commute to work.You also can't make a case that Wilson has little value as wildlife habitat and therefore is suitable for intensive human development. I have moose in my yard every winter, coyotes and foxes roaming around, trumpeter swans and geese and ducks on Fish Creek, elk in my yard this past winter, river otters using Fish Creek, and many other species of mammals and birds in all seasons. How many of them will persist with the intensity of development you are proposing?I am also dismayed at the lack of detail and vagueness of the "Plan". How is anyone supposed to be able to tell what's actually proposed? We need much more concrete detail in order to comment intelligently. Just saying things like "duplexes, triplexes, and four-plexes are appropriate" tells us nothing--where will they be? What areas will be upzoned? What amount of "worker housing" will entitle a landowner to upzoning? Which areas will be off-limits to increased density in order to protect wildlife?We need more time, we need more detail and less fluff. I, like many people I've talked to, am appalled by this pseudo-plan.
5/15/2009	Frisbie, Becky Interested Public	I do not think the current development guidelines for the Aspens and Wilson should be changed. The Aspens is currently a resort district and adding the possibiity of 300 + dwellings in a very small area will change the complexion and intent of this development. Currently, the commercial area benefits both visitors as well as full time residents and it accomplishes the goal set forth with the Aspens and Teton Pines developments. To state that any further commercial development has to be for the work force and not for the visitors is an unfair change to the current zoning. Wilson has always been a small village with some commercial development. Current density should stay in place.
5/15/2009	Fales, Ellen and Randy R Interested Public	We strongly urge you to scale back your density plans for Wilson. With the proposed density in the new plan, the character of Wilson will drastically change. Fragmenting Jackson Hole's population further by increasing the density of Wilson instead of within the city of Jackson, where it should be, is irresponsible planning - and certainly not "green". There is no reason other than to satisfy the greed of developers, to increase density in Wilson - and particularly NOT down Fall Creek road. What has happened to the vision to be a green community - to concentrate population around diverse commercial centers, reduce driving distances to community services and offer alternative transportation to the car? Increasing population density in Wilson only creates more long distance traffic; less efficient traveling for shopping and everyday life. Schools and other infrastructure will be impacted enormously necessitating further development. Teton County today does not offer adequately paying jobs to support a mortgage for many. Density with lower income housing in the mix, does not ultimately relieve the issue. Two years ago Teton County had too many jobs and not enough employees. This year we have too many employees and not enough jobs. Past and present residents of Wilson moved to Wilson for its unique and SMALL town character. At the very least IMPROVE Wilson’s walk ability and community character. Do not screw it up. Uphold the design that the residents of Wilson spent hours compiling in the public charrettes. It does not resemble your proposal. You have an opportunity to preserve a wonderful community and area for wildlife. Please do it.
5/15/2009	Linn, Ellen Interested Public	My comments on the Proposed Comp Plan for Teton County/Jackson regarding development in Wilson are: We, as residents of Wilson/Westbank are being pushed and cajoled into something that a "developer" wants when he/she wants to maximize the density. Ninety plus new units in Wilson is TOO MUCH for the VILLAGE of Wilson. Too much commercial is also included in the plan. The existing commercial seems to be very adequate. Adding a cleaners and/or a pharmacy will not keep people from going to Jackson. Most people will be working in Jackson anyway and will make at least five round trips a week. Increased traffic trying to get on Route 22, (in either direction) is not very smart. It's dangerous, particularly right at the bottom of Teton Pass. There is currently un-rented office space in Wilson as well as bank and/ or retail space. Regarding residential development - an additional 90 units is TOO MUCH. We cherish the wildlife and 90 new dogs will eliminate the wildlife. The habitat will be diminished by more houses. I feel that 20 to 30 residential units might be acceptabe. A good design with open space would still allow for some habitat and feeling of being in the country instead of in a city. The development is slated for a dangerous place with regard to entering the highway at the bottom of the Pass. I thought it was known as "Tommy's Truck Stop" for a reason. I believe that the back of the property contains a lot of wetlands. The bottom line is the proposed plan provides for too much density. Please consider keeping wildlife and reducing, not increasing traffic. Please remember this is the VILLAGE of Wilson, not a NODE.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Roman, T. Interested Public	As a resident of Wilson, I have seen many changes with the development of the area. Everytime a large area of land is dug up(SRA for an example)the animals of the area are misplaced. Once the ground was broken at SRA the coyotes moved south and started dining on many of the wilson residents pets since their prey moved upward on the mountains. A friend down the street came outside due to a ruckus by her door to find several coyotes ripping apart her small dog. Moose that frequented our street are found dead on the highway as their habitat continues to be consumed and many more vehicles are travelling on Teton Village Road. Travel surveys for Teton Village show almost a hundred vehicles entering the Village per half hour during the various seasons throughout the day and thats just entering not departing. Enough is enough, a ten percent growth each year will compound these problems with the New comprehensive plan. Less is more. Ten percent more people, ten percent more cars, ten percent more wildlife becoming carnege to selfish people rushing to their destination. How many more moose or other animals have to die on the Village road before anyone cares about the traffic. In the last three days I have seen three moose crossing Teton Village Road during the day between 11am and 3pm. It currently takes almost ten minutes for me to get out onto the Village road from my street due to the present traffic flow. How can ten percent growth each year sustain what we already have, once it is gone its gone. The current comprehensive plan screams sustainability for realestate companies and construction companies not wildlife or community.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	The proposed hi potential density for Wilson is 2.4x what is currently allowed and is 4x what is currently built. It would make Wilson significantly more dense than what the Town of Jackson is now and would be within the proposed density ranges for TownIncreasing the vibrancy of Wilson will not reduce traffic. It is in conflict with the Town as Heart and will change the character of Wilson. People chose to live There for its limited retail.
5/15/2009	Harmon, Scott Interested Public	I would like the following comments regarding the new proposed comprehensive plan made official. It is against my better judgement wasting more of our time concerning uncontrolled development in Wilson, Wyoming. The county never listens anyway proof from the latest comprehensive plan that is completely contradictory against what the people living in Wilson stated they wanted to see for our community 6 months ago at a work shop meeting. This new plan could triple the size of Wilson! When is it going to end? Wilson grew at a rate of tenfold with the Hardeman development, doubled again with the old school house development and is currently being hit with more development. Enough is enough! Forget the discussions of road safety, wildlife, and community character. Those comments have always fallen on deaf ears. I have lived in Wilson for over 30 years and paid property taxes helping to support goverment officials. It is past time the county respects our wishes for controlled development regardless for thier whishes for continued affordable housing. Especially when this so called affordable housing invites developers into the project and the county offers them density bonuses as well. Those of us living here for so long need to also be considered into the equation. We have paid to live here and our opinion must be sreiously considered. I was at that town meeting and I heard 95% of the comments opposed to continued mass development and this is exactly what the new comprehensive plan calls for; 500 homes??? Give me a break, 100 homes is too much in downtown Wilson. Have you driven through town lately? Tried to cross highway 22 with all the speeding traffic? Mass development belongs south of Jackson where we have the infrastructure to support it. Wilson has already been hit with too much density and taken more than it's fair share. Few of us in Wilson want this plan and will fight to keep controlled development. One day I can only hope the county listens to the peoples voice and reconsiders the monetary side versus the human side and shows more respect to the long term citizens of this valley.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Huff, Mercedes Interested Public	I am sorry to say that I have waited until now to write this letter, but I have been listening, reading and reviewing in hopes of understanding. However, I feel very strongly that what has been proposed will be very detrimental to Teton County. I'm sure it has been a thankless task to compile all of the information from all of the surveys and meetings, and I appreciate that your team has attempted to do this. But it isn't clear to me how you came up with the suggestions that you did, because I know that I heard very different voices at all of the meetings that I attended – and from people that I spoke with, particularly in Wilson and the Westbank , before this draft came out. Teton County continues to be a special place because of all the hard work that has gone into keeping it that way. I can attest to that first hand, from my 37 years of living In the valley. If this concept of nodes and intense growth is allowed to go forward, we will no longer have the environment that sets us apart. I thought the whole point of the Comprehensive Plan was to avoid going down the same path that Aspen, Vail and Sun Valley did. We are supposed to have learned from their mistakes. I think a question that was asked loud and clear, was "Why do we have to continue with the growth pattern from the 1994 Plan?" I think what we saw in the 1994 plan has begun to be built, and it is no longer just words on paper – it has taken on a dimension, and not one that people want to see built out to its maximum – let alone made larger. I understand that there are basic rights for the landowners, and removing that density would be considered a "taking". But think of all of the landowners who have worked within that Plan and been able to preserve large acreage, and still been able to build what they want on their property. Sending all of the development to these "nodes" is so structured and unnatural! It's hideous to think about! Who will want to come here to see a series of dense, built-out communities? Who will want to live in these dense, built-out communities? I think we should continue to let the large landowners develop their properties according to their rights – not forcing them to transfer or sell their development rights to these nodes. We don't need the commercial and residential growth that has been proposed. Adding so much commercial just creates more work force, which means more services, more schools, more contractors to build the schools – and it's an endless cycle for more growth. Who says we need all of these people to live here? Who says that everyone is entitled to live here? I came here as a 22 year-old, and I took all sorts of jobs to make ends meet. I didn't look to the community to provide affordable housing for me and I didn't feel entitled to stay here. I don't feel that my 20 and 22 year-old daughters are entitled to have affordable housing provided for them. It wasn't easy to make ends meet back in 1972, and it's not easy now – but I think it's all relative. I have always believed that there should be affordable housing – but nothing like the amount which you have proposed. I especially don't think the affordable units need to be owned; I feel that as a community we would be much better off to offer more rentals. There are hundreds of people who want to come to work and play in this valley for a few years, without the commitment of ownership. Seasonal employees don't necessarily want ownership. We have gotten way ahead of ourselves on these numbers. You say that 65% of the work force should be housed in Teton County. I'm sure you have some calculation of how many are currently housed. Have you counted me in that number? I can tell you that I consider myself a fulltime worker, and a lot of people I know are in my position – but I don't think you've considered us as "work force", which may skew your numbers. In addition, there is quite a bit of inventory in today's market that should be considered affordable – and interest rates are affordable. Let's not add hundreds of units in these nodes, We don't have the people to fill all of those units – so let's not encourage the growth that would be necessary to build and fill them! There are so many topics that I would like to address in this plan, but this one letter can't contain it all. I would like to say "ditto" to the insert from the Conservation Alliance, and from a letter written to you by Ernest Labelle, as well as many other Wilson/Westbank residents who are opposed to this enormous density and change of character that you have proposed. I realize how important it is for each of us to continue to go to meetings, talk to each other and talk to all of you – and I'll continue to do that. Thank you for listening!

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Grossman, Steve Interested Public	Our family became members of the Wilson community following the last Comprehensive Plan, and while we certainly had some notion of what we were joining, it has turned out to be so much more than any of us expected. We are in awe and humbled by what we have become a part of, and a few of the many lessons we have learned in the process (and this includes our 14 and 10 year old children) are (1) respect for the physical, wildlife and human elements of the entire community, (2) recognition of our role as temporary inhabitants and in that role stewards for generations to come, and (3) acknowledgment of the vast reservoirs of wisdom that we can tap into by listening to both the vocal and more silent members (including our local wildlife) of the community.As background, we chose our location for many reasons - including the unique mix of connectedness and openness. We are a quarter mile from the commercial district on Hwy 22 and yet the orientation of our modest home on a little over an acre is toward Munger Mountain, with wide vistas provided by the adjacent combined 80 acres of conservation easement property. We take advantage of the proximity to walk or bike to the commercial district for much of our shopping and in so doing we have the privilege of sharing part of the commute with moose, fox and elk who either inhabit portions of our and adjacent lots, or who use them as part of their migratory pattern. It is just this ability to (1) connect to both the town of Wilson and the wildlife whose land we have taken over, at the same time as the ability to (2) immerse ourselves in the openness of physical beauty of all that touches and surrounds Wilson that inspires the strength of the emotional tie to the community that we love and imparts those life lessons.While on one level as a recent member of the Wilson community I applaud the overall vision and themes and their county-wide priority, at the same time I am deeply concerned about how that vision and those themes have been applied to Wilson. Moreover, my concern is even greater due to the apparent lack of adherence to my lesson # 3 - this effort does not evidence the willingness to listen to the voices previously communicated based on the earlier proposals for Wilson. I strongly urge that the application of the plan to Wilson more closely reflect both the priorities of stewardship of wildlife and responsible growth management without abandoning the effort to include Wilson as one of the county nodes for further development. Allowing for housing growth in areas such as the area bounded by Fall Creek Road, Highway 22 and Fish Creek based on the single family mixed use zoning ignores the impact on wildlife that is a significant element of that part of town. From my perspective the plan is doomed if it is not at least more internally consistent in prioritizing the themes. How can one be "contextually-sensitive" in addressing development without taking into context the adverse impact on the wildlife that such a change to that area would cause? While I did not participate in the earlier town meetings addressing the proposals for mixed use development in Wilson, I understood that similar views were effectively communicated. Also, it appears that my reaction and approach is consistent with the survey results. Thank you for the opportunity to comment and I will provide more detailed suggestions in a future communication.
5/15/2009	Barash, Jean Interested Public	Repeatedly during the Comp Plan process the Community stated that its top priority was/is PROTECTING WILDLIFE. Those results were seen in the Keypad poll, the Online survey and the U. of Wyoming phone survey. The Comp Plan, as drafted, does not reflect the sentiment of the community. Growth: The draft Comp Plan proposes too much development - up to 9,800 new residential units and 8.8 million new square feet of commercial development. Such growth goes against the stated desires of the Community. Additionally, the draft fails to analyze the implications and consequences of such massive development. Such massive commercial development can only make our workforce housing shortage worse.Nodes:The draft contends that allowing significantly increased development in designated nodes will result in more open space protection, without harming wildlife. As a resident of Wilson, I strongly disagree with that blanket statement. The proposed draft would allow up to 520 new homes in Wilson - 400 above the 120 currently allowed. As shown on Page 109 of the new draft, downtown Wilson could grow from a village of 170 units to almost 700. Fish Creek flows through the heart of Wilson. Wilson's riparian areas are home to moose, elk, fox, cutthroat trout, ducks, osprey, eagles, deer, otter, bears and an occasional mountain lion. The area immediately south of Highway 22, where we live, provides safe calving grounds for moose as well as crucial moose winter habitat. It is a complete contradiction of priorities for the Plan to say that the area's natural resources are its top priority when promoting density changes that would irrevocably degrade wildlife habitat in Wilson. Even more distressing than the proposal for such density nodes, is the fact that these nodes were designated using 15 year old Natural Resource Overlay mapping. To designate nodes, without using the newest maps - most of which have been available for over a year - is PUTTING THE CART BEFORE THE HORSE. It is also very unscientific.DATA:This draft does not give us enough specific information about the impacts of this Plan on our infrastructure - the impact of 20,000 more people on our schools, roads, taxes, water, recreational areas, our way of life.SUGGESTIONS:I urge the Planners, as well as our town and county elected officials, to keep zoning as it is under the 1994 Comp Plan. I urge our elected officials to immediately update the Natural Resource Overlay maps, using the most current scientific information - including data gathered by the Teton Science School, Wyoming Game and Fish and other sources. Would any of us rely on 15 year old information when buying a car, pricing a house, or choosing the best surgeon to do a knee replacement? I don't think so. In conclusion, I urge all involved to remember what the community has said it wants - in the order in which they said it:1. Protect wildlife and open space.2. Manage growth responsibly. Limit growth, if necessary to protect the above.3. Provide affordable housing opportunities for most of our workforce - keeping in mind that we are currently at that 65% rate.

Date	Name	Comment
5/14/2009	Pfeifer, David Interested Public	Your plan in Wilson is out of control. You should rethink the number of houses you want to approve and cut it to zero. No growth in Wilson, and I don't even live there!
5/14/2009	French, Peter Interested Public	Our family lives in Wilson, inside the single family area of "District 11". Our primary concern with this plan is that the Mixed Use Orientation will allow dense redevelopment of the commercial core of our town, destroying the character of this small town gem. We absolutely oppose 3 story structures in the core and are much more comfortable with the scale of the PS Bagel/ Wilson Backcountry building. Please take into consideration the character issue.It cannot be recreated and even in the long term our county does not need an abundance of 2 and 3 story condo projects.Finally there seems to be an argument that adding rooftops will lead to more retail which will reduce traffic. I fundamentally disagree. More people=more traffic.Thank you for your consideration of residents!
5/14/2009	Cook, John and Cynthia Interested Public	My husband and I bought a tiny place here in 1979. The whole reason for buying was the beauty, peace, quiet, wildlife and low population. We were able to move here permanently a little over three and a half years ago. We were shocked at the extra development, but you expect some changes in such a time. However, your plan will ruin everything we moved here for: the beauty, peace, quiet, wildlife and low population. You will destroy everything nearly everyone here cherishes. The whole Hole will be destroyed. Please change the plan. Wilson too will be utterly ruined and lose its charming character. With the long winter here the planned extra growth will put too much strain on everything: traffic, air quality, quietness, wildlife, low crime, and on and on. It will become an ugly Piccadilly Circus. Yes, I am an ex-Londoner so I treasure this place more than people from the country. I can't imagine either how all of us will pay for all of the changes.
5/13/2009	Hocking, Scott Interested Public	What is the number of residents going to be in this comp plan?When I moved here,and invested in this county,the proposed build out was 20,000.Let all know what the new number will be-don't hide that number.Please do not punish the residents of Wilson with the increased housing that we all know should be built at Teton Village.
5/13/2009	Wilbrecht, Erich Interested Public	In light of a tight deadline for comment by Friday the 15th I will address my overall reaction to the plan as explained and setforth at the Wilson School meeting last Friday. First, thanks for all of your hard work. Second, I don't think this draft plan focuses on the feedback and desires of the majority of residents in Teton County. My overall reaction to the proposed buildout numbers is shock and disgust. I agree with the majority of residents that the first priority should be the preservation of open space and wildlife. This plan needs to nuture a sustainable community. By doubling our valley's current size we will outgrow all of our current infrastructure (schools, hospital etc), create an ugly mess of traffic, grow government which will lead to spiraling tax increases, etc, etc. Enough is enough. I would support a plan that allows future growth only on those lots already platted and vested with development rights. Beyond this, the only new growth I support is to address the needs of employee housing of critical county and town employees. All new employee and deed restriced housing should be built either in Teton Village, to fulfill the needs of employers IN Teton Village, or in Town, where current commercial and commuter infrastructure exists to accomodate their needs. The concept of tripling the size of Wilson is absurd. Most of Wilson lies in the wetland corridor of Fish Creek, (and several feet below the level of the Snake River). It is surrounded by land under easement with the Land Trust. The only housing needs I would support in Wilson are for teacher housing for the Wilson School, or for affordable housing for businesses that currently exist, or could be built under existing develpment rights. Regarding the "node" in the Aspens; again, the only housing I would support there would be for employees of businesses located at or near the Aspens/Pines/Westside store. I would support deed restricted housing for critical workers in Teton County; ie; teachers, emergency workers, health care providers, firemen, police) near the new High School, along the High School road, near commercial centers and public transportation. We do not need to double the size of Jackson Hole. We have no obligation to feed the lion of progres. Many other civilized cities and towns throughout the world thrive without rampant growth. They remain sustainable, desireable, and liveable. Let's not hang ourselves on the cross of affordable housing, nor the misguided concept that we can create affordability through more density. I appreciate your efforts and I look forward to the recrafting of the draft comp plan.

Date	Name	Comment
5/13/2009	Mortensen, John and P Interested Public	We wish to express our observations on the proposed plan for Wilson. • Although protection of wildlife is expressed as the number one consideration for the county, it is only number five for Wilson. Wildlife populations in Wilson are already challenged. Moose populations in Teton County are down over 50% from ten years ago, attributed to loss of habitat. Are we willing to forsake these precious resources for yet to be identified new residents. • Growth and workforce housing are the driving elements of the plan, when Wilson already a higher percentage of subsidized affordable housing and homes for "workforce" residents than any other sector in Teton County. • And, it's hard to say who is the real beneficiary of subsidized affordable housing. Is it the occupant? Is it their employer who can continue to pay a less than adequate amount for employees to afford home ownership? Is it not contributing to otherwise un-sustainable commercial development? What is the real benefit to the community? • Recent re-development of West Street has been sited as a model for this plan. Yet few "workforce" residents could afford the resultant new homes, all exceeding $1,5000,000 in value. This re-development has resulted in property tax increases in our case of over 60% and even higher for others. Continued development of this kind could well drive current working residents to leave their homes in Wilson, no longer being able to afford increased costs of living. • While stating future development will be designed to protect Fish Creek, simply enforcing the current 50 foot set back will go a long way in achieving this goal without any changes or unclear plans. • There is not sufficient infrastructure to accommodate such dramatic growth in Wilson. Not the schools, roads, sewer capacity, water resources or commercial development. Why are planners so willing to forsake our present rural character for, future unknown residents? Wilson more than doubled its size with the development of Wilson Meadows just over a decade ago. Wilson and Jackson have always been very special parts of the west, created by rugged individuals. If this plan is so beneficial for all of us tripling Wilson's current population, why stop there. Maybe ten or twenty times would better serve the needs of our future unknown populations. It is apparently not for long time residents to say, having consistently expressed our views of slow, low density growth.
5/13/2009	Poole, Steven Interested Public	Density as proposed is far to high. Limit any growth to wilson workforce only. Do not increase commuter traffic by promoting people who work in other areas to live in Wilson. This plan is not about its stated goals, appears to be a rubber stamp for unpresidented growth that is not benefit to anyone but developers. Waldron property off Fall creek rd should recieve highest protection as wildlife corridor not as increased housing. Animals coming off pass are forced into narrow hillside area by fall creek retaining walls and a high fenced pasture at base of Heck of a Hill. This corridor is used daily by multiple animal species. Property provides key link to Rossitter open space, Fish creek waterway and protected Hardeman lands beyond. Plan must address current highway 22 traffic and speeding issues before any other growth priority. Include all comment recieved at recent Wilson charettes in planning documents. Listen to community before planners and developers.
5/13/2009	Pilafian, Peter Interested Public	Planning is almost always a good thing. And the current version of our comp plan revision is a lovely piece of work, written in a very literary way with lots of nice graphics. The long hours and hard work on this project are greatly appreciated. However, it is not only off the mark, it is full of contradictions as well. In seeking to provide answers, what it primarily does is raise more questions. A big one that comes to mind is: what happens after the much-touted "Build-out limit" is reached? Does everything come to a creeching halt? I don't think so. That's not human nature. So 'buildout' is just a conceptual smokescreen. And what really is a "Node?" When you describe Wilson as a designated 'node' of the future, you are not only giving today's Wilson the kiss of death, you are contradicting the concept when you say it will be used for housing development only, thereby maintaining 'town as heart' (i.e. keep the retail business in Jackson). In other words, you want Wilson to become a Bedroom community, with triple or quadruple the population! Shame on you, planners! A comprehensive plan should get specific about recommended new platting for public spaces like parks and pedestrian areas, and new layouts for communityoriented street and transportation systems. This one does not. And why do we NOT see the phrase 'Community Character' peppered throughout the document? Well, apparently it is because the planners in their infinite wisdom decided that Community Character could not be given a precise, black and white definition, so they would just leave it out! Go figure! The authors show a further lack of connection with this community when they say that the existing Wilson services, school and small businesses need "increased viability and sustainability" (their words.) Ridiculous! Every service and business in Wilson is the very Definition of Sustainability! And in fact, they are pretty much running at desired capacity most of the time. The big exception, of course, is that brand new two-story office building which sits empty on highway 22, but we tried to tell the developer it was not needed before it even got built. And now your plan talks about putting more "offices" in Wilson. I have one specific request: please take Wilson off of the list of "Nodes." Wilson can grow slowly, in its own "Rural" way. And maybe we can do without your "daytime vibrancy" – whatever that means.

Date	Name	Comment
5/13/2009	, Conservation Alliance	Wadda ya mean, 'There goes the rope'?: Sometimes, even the best laid plans go awry [published pamphlit, see actual pamphlit for content, headings below] Please help, It takes a community to find community solutions What's a Comp Plan? And why should you care? Take a second look: Analysis of the new draft Comp Plan revieals major flaws. Community's top priority: protecting wildife. Whose plan is this, anyhow? Why are so many of the things people asked for missing from the new draft? What does "managing growth responsibly" mean? Depends on when you asked. One step forward, two steps back? New dradt loses key protections of the plan it was meant to improve. Numbers Matter. Will "future land use plan" maps will get us where we want to go? Not if Wilson's any example… Iffy foundation? Now, how can we fix it? Solutions won't happen without your help. What can you do? Help creat a plan that works. Make your comments count.
5/13/2009	, Interested Public	I strongly disagree with the direction of the proposed comp. plan. I have lived in Wilson for 19 years and previously lived in California. To see the result of rampant growth which destroys a place, one only needs to go to Southern California. Our assets her are the open spaces, wildlife and clean air. Read the guest shot in last weeks paper by Kristine&Paul O'Brien and then re-read it. Protecting our "environmental capital" is the only way to ensure that Jackson doesn't become just another ruined destination. Where is it written that everyone who wants to live here,should live here? Why do we need a total build-out? Let's rethink the idea of living within our means-what our environment can sustain.
5/12/2009	Pollak, Ernest LaBelle a Interested Public	We are writing as residents of the West Bank area of Teton County to express our concerns about the basic premise and specific content of the Teton County Comprehensive Plan update which proposes to embody a 10 to 15-year vision for our community's future. We respectfully believe the plan in its present form is seriously flawed in the following areas: The high density "nodes" proposed for the West Bank (Teton Pines) and Wilson communities will significantly compromise the quality of life for both human and wildlife inhabitants of those neighborhoods by greatly increasing traffic volumes on highways 390 and 22. The plan should not in any case be offered for adoption until an updated natural resources overlay can be applied to those areas. Otherwise it will fail to take into account wildlife corridors and wildlife winter range locations and will increase the probability of failing to provide for the use of existing and proven methods of facilitating the free movement of wildlife and reducing the levels of road kill on highways 390 and 22. The proposed system of "nodes" will contribute to an imposed and unrealistic separation of human and wildlife inhabitants as opposed to the encouragement and facilitation of the co-existence of those populations which is the basis for Jackson Hole's unique character and quality of life. To be truly wildlife-driven, our vision should be one of creating a porous environment in which wildlife can move about with relative safety and freedom both in and through populated and open space areas. Otherwise, the open areas become little more than viewing zoos and our communities become sterile segregated zones that are not as wildlife friendly as we want them to be. The plan as drafted does not seem to recognize that wildlife habitat is and should be everywhere and not just in so-called outlying areas. That is what differentiates the unique area of Jackson Hole from a Vail, Colorado, or Sun Valley, Idaho. There is no evidence that the planning authorities have asked themselves why Wilson and Teton Pines are already successful as wildlife-friendly communities with a high quality of life and then looked at how those characteristics can be maintained and improved upon, not how they can be changed into something it was never meant to be and that the existing population would abhor and reject. Communities can and do change, but they should be encouraged to change for the best, not the worst. The idea of becoming a "node" to accommodate some planner's idea of growth and progress does not have much appeal to us or to our neighbors. In conclusion, we believe that the comprehensive plan should be wildlife-driven, not growth-driven and that the entire process should be slowed down until these important questions can be more carefully addressed and understood.
5/12/2009	McGee, Robin Interested Public	Tripling development in Wilson does not seem feasible given the current nature of the region and lack of public transportation to the area. I think tripling the size would have a very negative impact on the character and wildlife in the area.
5/12/2009	White, Marylee Interested Public	I look forward to Wilson being better connected to Jackson with pathways and public transportation. Wilson is a node and always has been. I support that concept. Concentrating new development is good for shared transportation, good for wildlife and will improve diversity in Wilson.

Date	Name	Comment
5/12/2009	Leslie, Craig Interested Public	I have further studied the Draft Comprehensive Plan, and want to strongly voice my concerns as follows;1) I do not believe it reflects the overwhelming desire of our community to protect wildlife and the environment. It talks about "responsible growth", but does not assess the impact of so many extra people, houses and motor vehicles.2) It seeks to "sacrafice" Wilson & South Park, against the wishes of these communities. Why do we need commercial growth, which will then require new workers and new housing? Vicious cycle.3) Jeff Daugherty is not acting in the interests of the community and the values they cherish; we want land protection, and not deed restricted housing that is only required if we build additonal commercial space.
5/11/2009	Wakeman, Polly Interested Public	I am distraught at the growth proposed in the comprehensive plan. I am concerned with your plans to double the population of Teton County, and specifically, as a resident of the town of Wilson, with your proposal to triple the number of homes in our village. Why is such drastic growth necessary? Can you prove that there are so called "human needs" sufficient to justify this enormous growth? Why do we need to succumb to the sprawl that has ruined other once charming mountain towns? Why do we need another 9 million square feet of commercial space? I agree we need more affordable housing, but not at the price of such character altering growth. For those of us living on the west bank, we have chosen to live in Wilson because we prefer to be away from the hustle and bustle of Jackson. If you were to proceed with your projected growth from 170 to nearly 700 homes in downtown Wilson - our one horse town will become just like its east bank neighbor. The quiet,charming Wilson we love would be changed for the worse. Traffic would triple; and where would all the new children go to school? The "new" Wilson School is already at capacity, so a significant school expansion would be necessary and with it probably a traffic light where HHR road intersects Highway 22 to deal with all the increased school traffic. Who is it exactly that wants to triple the size of Wilson, besides the developers, and the planners who do not live there? If you were to take a vote of Wilson residents, I am sure they would vote such a proposal down. And what about the wildlife that we profess to care about protecting? With the documented decrease in moose population over the past 20 years, it is unethical to further deplete their crucial habitat, thus continuing their decline until we no longer get to enjoy their presence on the west bank. The proposed density of 9 units/acre in critical moose winter range ignores your responsibility for protecting one of the things which makes Jackson Hole such a special place. Please don't ruin our village of Wilson or Teton County by moving ahead with a comprehensive plan which lacks proof of the necessity for such significant and rapid development, as well as the backing of its residents. It would be a tragedy to move so quickly and permanently damage the nature of the community of people and wildlife we love. Please slow down, we don't want such growth!
5/11/2009	Hobbins, Karen W. Interested Public	Having attended the County Neighborhood meeting in Wilson on May 7th, it sounded as though the majority there were in agreement with with Theme One of the Community Vision which states: Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources. However at the meeting people seemed betrayed by the Plan's prioritization for Wilson of 1: Responsible Growth and 2; Workforce Housing, with 5; Wildlife and Natural Resources much lower on the priority list. Is this really the priority for Wilson given the input people gave in the pre-draft comment period?The people in attendance seemed further horrified at the suggested build-out numbers, allowing up to 520 new homes in this node. Basing build-out numbers on the density of West Street and allowing that density on all areas of the single family mixed type areas on the map for Wilson seems too dense. The recent economic downturn will likely diminish the growth rate, and therefore I would suggest a re-evaluation of build out numbers be contemplated. A diminished build-out number would perhaps accommodate people's wish to protect wildlife and natural resource, while still allowing the increases in density currently permitted under the existing zoning regulations.In general Wilson residents are not opposed to some growth, but fear that density allowances will damage the character of the town.. Specifically, classification of the properties south of Highway 22 and east of Fall Creek Road for town-level densities, allowing up to 9 units per acre of single family mixed type development seems inappropriate. Given the wildlife corridor there from hillside to Fish Creek and surrounding wetlands, it would be better to transition from town to rural and conservation lands with much lower density there.Thank you for all the work you have put in on the draft comp. plan, and for the opportunity to have input at this stage.

Date	Name	Comment
5/11/2009	Rosenberg, Vicki L. Interested Public	I am submitting a full comment on the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan in this District 11 (Wilson) section of the Feedback portion of this website. I am also submitting portions of my comment in other sections. It does not appear that any comments have been submitted as yet, which I find worrisome. My husband and I attended the community meeting on May 6, 2009 at the Wilson School. It would be extremely disappointing if the important questions raised and the many impassioned comments made at that meeting were not appropriately recorded. 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. It was the character of the region that drew us here: the sheer, naked beauty of the mountains and the valley; the friendliness of the residents; the hominess of the town; the ubiquitous commitment of all who lived here to protecting the character of this unique region. We moved here to be a part of this community that so closely aligns with our own personal character. We live in Wilson; our home is less than ten miles from Hoback Junction. 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. 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? The Comprehensive Plan states that "the priority in Wilson is the provision of housing opportunities to benefit the community.,Äù 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. 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." 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

Date	Name	Comment
		for town expansion, and that criteria will be adopted to guide such seizure appropriately. We wholly support the promotion of the Town of Jackson as the "heart" of the region. From a sustainable perspective, it is certainly desirable for at least 65% of the Town's workforce to reside in the immediate vicinity. The vast majority of workers are unable to afford a home valued at $2 million, the current average. Perhaps employers should, indeed, take on a larger responsibility for housing their workers. Perhaps it will be necessary to develop multi-family housing. We agree with the majority of community members that the need for local workforce housing conflicts with other community values such as preservation of wildlife habitat and natural resources, reductions in traffic, and preferred development patterns. We believe that that provision of deed restricted workforce housing should take priority over additional commercial or resort development make room for the workforce before developing businesses that require more workers. This would uphold Theme 5, which calls for the community to remain a community first, and a resort second; to maintain a vibrant economy while preserving wildlife, natural resources, and community character. As the Plan reports, the community expressed concern that growth primarily oriented to serving visitors, has little community benefit and may compromise community character. Theme 6 of the Comprehensive Plan addresses the transportation issue in Teton County, stating that ideally, any strategy adopted would reduce resident and visitor reliance on single-occupancy vehicles while still allowing safe, efficient, and economic travel. Repeatedly, the notion of bicycle and transit use in the Town of Jackson and in and between county nodes is suggested as a means to alleviate local traffic. We certainly agree that mass transit is desirable, but dependence on bicycle use anywhere outside of the Town itself is unrealistic. More importantly, we believe that Teton County planners should develop a working relationship with WYDOT to increase the viability of alternate modes of transportation within the Town of Jackson as well as in/among other county locales, not simply investigating internodal transit. 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. 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. 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. In terms of the first priority, the Plan seeks to maintain viable populations of all native species and to preserve the natural, scenic, and agricultural resources that define Teton County's character. There's that term "character" again. In the chapter detailing this first community theme, the Plan once again addresses the need for updated mapping before any decisions about development or community change can be made. Many residents of Teton County are seriously concerned about the disruption of wildlife migration corridors, should any regional development plan be adopted before mapping is updated. Community residents apparently agreed with the limitation of development and population growth to county nodes, the "Y" and downtown Jackson. In no part of the Comprehensive Plan or its appendices is it recorded that community residents agreed where those county nodes would be located. 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

Date	Name	Comment
		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.
5/11/2009	Rambo, Jeff Interested Public	This is not a must do project in Wilson, there is no need for this many homes. This is just developers being developers. There are no jobs or businesses or buildings to put a business in Wilson and it will not change any time soon. The jobs are at the ski hill or in town so built there when it is necessary, we have enough traffic from Victor and Driggs every morning. This town has very low density and that is the attraction. This project is not needed in Jackson at this time, maybe once things turn around and then a project in the town of Jackson makes more sense.
5/11/2009	Becker, John Interested Public	Thank you all for the presentation in Wilson. I now understand how you've reached your numbers. The numbers for Wilson are staggering to me. The conflict with the wildlife vision is the main stumbling block for me, combine that with the teton pass factor,traffic and doggies etc., I can't support the numbers the plan proposes. One thing that wasn't discussed at the meeting is Wilson's close proximity to some of the most important scenic easments. The Ordway Fish Creek Ranch, the Rossetter easment, the Wilson Wetland Trail and both Hardeman meadows. I worked on fourr of these projects with the JH Land Trust aand realize how incompatible the proposed density is. I was amazed to find out that the current zoning allows for 120 new units. That number also seems too high to me. Thanks to you all for the opportunity to comment.
5/11/2009	Zellmer, Theresa Interested Public	In regard to the Wilson Plan, I cannot support the housing density and feel the numbers are too high. I'm also concerned about wildlife conflict that high density housing may create, coupled with high traffic converging at the bottom of Teton Pass. Thank you,
5/10/2009	Zvegintzov, A, A. Interested Public	I own the 5 acres between Hardeman's Barn and Fish Creek. My house in virtually on the creek and is built up so I have an incredible view up and down the creek and across the meadows. I see swans and geese and ducks and teal, eagles osprey and countless song birds. There's a herd of 15-20 elk that move from just upstream of me all the way down the creek. Moose rub against my house at night and feed on the willow and in the creek - and get killed on the highway. This spring there are actually two fox families raising their families around the Hardeman buildings; about 13 kits. Some of them will perish on the highway also. Otters are making a comeback and so are beavers. I have endless wonderful wild life stories seen right from my kitchen window. But the creek is already being degraded by the unnaturally high water that continues so much of the year; the baetis hatch is nearly gone and the caddis hatch is sparse.The amount of growth proposed by the plan can only speed and increase the degradation of the whole area. Our natural treasures need more protection - as our Wilson community keeps telling you- than is proposed in the plan. Please be more sensitive to what the community is saying.
5/10/2009	Randall, Joy & Edward Interested Public	We are opposed to the plan. We feel it doesn't have enough protection in it to maintain the current atmosphere/environment in the Aspens and Wilson. We oppose anything that would bring or encourage more traffic to the area.
5/10/2009	Gronberg, Don and Sue Interested Public	Increased density in Wilson and Aspens will create need for wider roads to accomodate for more vehicle traffic, further impacting already heavily affected wildlife. Any further density should be developed near services and jobs in TOJ. We should maintain the westbank as a more rural area of the county as currently zoned. We oppose the nodal concept as proposed in the draft plan.
5/10/2009	Nice, Kristin Interested Public	I am in full support of the proposed growth plan in Wilson. I have always felt Wilson to be too exclusive & under utilized as an area for the future growth of Jackson. If development is executed with intention & a focus on maintaining the strong sense of community that exists in Wilson I strongly agree with the proposed growth projection. Thank You.

Date	Name	Comment
5/10/2009	, Interested Public	Increasing housing in Wilson will only increase traffic on Hwy 22 to and from Jackson. As stated in the plan (increasing housing in Wilson will decrease the need to drive into town for errands etc.) where do these numbers come from?? I would like to see a valid assessment. If my assumption is correct, a large portion of workers live in the town of Jackson, not Wilson, therefore wouldn't it be a better option towards creating workforce housing where a majority of residents work? This would be a more sustainable option. Not built below one of the most dangerous mountain passes in the U.S. Can anyone say "Tommy's Truck Stop" again??And more importantly, why has the largest proportion of workforce housing been developed in Wilson? Tripling or even doubling housing in WIlson will only destroy the character and sustainability of the town. Places like Hungary Jacks or Westside Groceries will not be able to keep up with the demand. Will a new post office need to be created to supply mailboxes to new residents? Will a new school need to be built?? Where? How? What is the plan for an increase in traffic on Hwy 22?? I believe in "no growth" We should work with what we have. I would saw half of all the condos in the Aspens are empty during the year. There are places for people to live here in Jackson. I think the solution would be to place a Cap on rental fees etc. to make it affordable. Building more is not the answer.
5/9/2009	Phillips, Theresa Dowlin Interested Public	For the past 1 1/2 years, many locals have been participating in what the Planning Dept. called the "People's Plan." We spent countless hours attending meetings and readjusting our time to be in the valley for what we considered to be critical decision times. We were lead to believe that our input was forming the new Comp Plan. Now that the plan has been revealed, it is not what anybody asked for at all. The new Teton County Comprehensive Plan is a huge disappointment with tragic consequences. Comments will be directed to Wilson and the Waldron property. Too much growth Wilson - Not a "walkable" community Waldron property - "South on Fall Creek" boundary Moose habitat being ignoredIn October 2007, the people clearly chose "Option A" with neutral density. Teton County's published hand-out called Mixed Use Village Sub-Area Plan WILSON DENSITY stated "Based on the public input received at the October 4, 2007 Open House, the vast majority of Wilson residents support Option A (density neutral) and are opposed to Option B (increased density)." Wilson has already doubled in size in the past decade with the addition of the Wilson Meadows sub-division. Most importantly, Wilson is not an appropriate place for high-density housing. Wilson is not the cute little isolated mountain town that the County tries to portray it to be! It is a town that was built at the base of a steep mountain pass, 10% grade, which serves as a major commuter highway for multiple communities in Idaho going to and from Jackson and Teton Village. WYDOT considers it to be one of the busiest and most dangerous highways in all of Wyoming. Traffic count figures for July and August 2008 average around 12,500 cars per day traveling through Wilson. Yet the County seems to believe that this is a great place for high-density housing! To propose a significant increase in high-density housing immediately at the base of this dangerous run-out is not only irresponsible but grossly negligent. In addition there has already been two affordable housing projects built with the additional project at the old Wilson School underway.The Waldron property should remain in the "South on Fall Creek" boundary which is rural in character. Alex Norton, on April 20, 2009, explained that high-density was going to be put where high-density already exists. This is not true for "South on Fall Creek" and the Waldron property, which has been platted for five parcels on 15 acres for decades. In addition, Teton County's "Comments from Wilson Mixed Use Village Sub-Area Plan Meeting--10/4/2007" states on the 3rd bullet point "Waldron Property - ALL were opposed to seeing increased density there."Critical moose habitat is being ignored. The Waldron property provides substantial wetlands for moose habitat and provides the necessary wildlife corridor to the Rossetter Land Trust and the Snake River. Please refer to the article in the Jackson Hole News & Guide dated March 25, 2009 - "Moose on the decline in Jackson Hole area."In conclusion, to propose high-density at the Waldron parcel, with deadly access at the base of Teton Pass, is not responsible planning.
5/9/2009	Doyle, Elizabeth Interested Public	I attended the meeting at the Wilson School on May 7th. There was obvious emotion and opposition to the proposed plan. The plan, in my opinion does not focus enough on the impact the increased traffic will cave on these "nodes" but especially on Wilson. I feel that the three identified "Nodes" on the westbank are unfaily matched. Teton Village was soley developed to support the resort. The Aspens was developed for residential housing. Wilson is not and never has been a "development". Wilson is a town with a grocery store, bar, restaurant, park, community center & school. It is also the only "node" with a highway that splits the town in half. Increased traffic on Hwy22 would only divide our town in half even more and destroy the already threatened wildlife poulation. I have three children we live down Fish Creek rd. We ride our bikes to Hungry Jacks everyday in the summer and it is already scary enough to ride my kids down Main St. & West St. The thought of potentially doubling the amount of vehicle traffic on those, already narrow, roads if frightening. My children are unable to cross Hwy22 by themselves because it is too dangerous. It would be a shame to prevent them from even riding to school because it would be too dangerous. I am not opposed to growth. I want my children to be raised in a community that provides for them. However; the current proposed plan is not smart growth. I would strongly suggest that the commissioners treat Wilson very differently than the rest of the proposed "Nodes" because it is not at all a fair comparison. Thanks for your consideration of this matter,

Date	Name	Comment
5/8/2009	Spitzer, Horton Interested Public	The Wilson school was filled with concerned neighbors to hear the planners tell us what may be in store for our special community. The universal sentiment was that the unique character of Wilson will be destroyed forever by the concepts as presented, particularly the tripling of the population. No mention was made of preserving the CHARACTER and VIEWSHEDS we all hold as reasons to live here. These features were given emphasis in the previous plan. Why have they been totally eliminated in this new proposal for the entire valley? These words seem to have been buried by academic planning definitions. Also the proposed method of planning accountability with an annual review of decisions made by government officials during that year by the same officials who made the decisions is ludicrous. Such a review should include nongovernmental personnel, not those who instituted the decisions. Lastly, why weren't the many thoughtful Comments made by Wilsonites recorded and made a part of the public record. The rules not to record public comment were made by our government officials who work for us. We should require them to change this policy in the future. I feel insulted to have taken the time to participate in a public meeting and not have comments recorded. Is this an exercise in appeasing the public with little consideration to its input. More work and changes need to be done to address the heartfelt concerns of our community before the Plan, as proposed, can be considered acceptable.
5/8/2009	Chassard, Bryan Interested Public	I think the Wilson expansion is inevitable and a great idea. I am excited to hopefully purchase a home there one day. I have lived in the Jackson Hole area for 9 years off and on and have desired to own a home in the Wilson area. I am also a member of Cornerstone Church that meets at Wilson Elementary School and hope to make Wilson my permanent community. This new plan would do just that - it would make Wilson a more united and self-sufficient community that doesn't have to rely on driving into the town of Jackson constantly. Thanks for all you are doing!
5/8/2009	Epstein, Steven Interested Public	In light of the current economic situation it seems to me that it would make much more sense to concentrate as much growth as possible to the greater Jackson area and the Teton Village area. This would eliminate the need for many of the services that will probably need to be added to the so called node areas,ie schools,transportation,law enforcement,fire safety etc.Since the plan seems flexible as conditions improve other areas could be added.
5/8/2009	Davis, Eric Interested Public	I would like to comment briefly on the proposed Wilson expansion. Overall, I think the plan is very well thought out and a benefit for Wilson and west bank residents. My wife and I have lived on the west bank off and on over the past 8 years and have grown to love the area. One of the difficult things, especially during the summer, is making the trip into town for shopping and errands. In our opinion, Wilson and the west bank could use such a commercial expansion as you propose. Yes, we, like many residents love the quiet and peaceful aspect of the west bank. Growth and change can be scary, as I'm sure many have inidicated to you. However, its contradictory for us to totally oppose growth, especially responsible growth as your plan proposes. We all contribute to the population here and therefore need to embrace responsible growth. Though many will likely fear this plan, I am confident that, if and when it is executed according to your responsible measures, residents will be surprised how well it works and subsequently embrace it. Growth and change are inevitable. They are a normal and positive part of life and community. One question I have for the planning committee is this: Does or will the committee include a lot-designation for the possibility of a future church in Wilson? This would add diversity and a positive community aspect to such growth for Wilson.Thank you for taking the time to read this. We heartily support the plan to responsibly add the several hundred home sites and commercial property as you propose. Thank you for all your hard work. Keep up the good work.
5/7/2009	Vaughan, R H Interested Public	As a 17 year resident of Wilson I am totally opposed to proposed plan for the future development of Wilson as set forth in the May 6th edition of the JH News & Guide. The statement by Mr. Daugherty that Wilson's character "COULD" change by virtue of the plan is disingenuous at best. If that reflects his judgement he should seek a new line of work and try to sell bridges in New York.
5/7/2009	Harris, Suzanne Interested Public	I strongly oppose the addition of 500 possible new homes in the Wilson "node." Wilson and the Aspens should not be "nodes," as the additional traffic caused by so many new housing units would kill animals and make our roads and schools overcrowded.The residents of Wilson came out this evening in strong and emotional opposition to so much growth. It would ruin the good conditions which attract people to live here.

Date	Name	Comment
5/7/2009	Rizzotti, Ken Interested Public	Please listen to the citizens who attended the Draft Comp Plan Presentaton in Wilson on 5/07/09. The citizens desire no change to the already outstanding character which exists in Wilson. We are at a tipping point, where additional population and their associated impacts will adversely affect wildlife and scenery. Consider the fact that Hwy 22 runs through the center of Wilson, which is a dangerous mountain pass.Focus on making the community better for the citizens who live here. Where did all the results from the past charettes go. Density neutral was the consensus. This "node" is a beautiful place, and like many others in this community, I fear that the "density bonuses" and "afordable housing" are more important than the wildlife who has resided here longer than us.THere is to much focus on balancng wildlife with growth. Soon enough, there wont be any wildlife, and we will be like any other western resort town.It is time where the County officials actualy listen to the citizens that pay the taxes that make their paychecks. Manage growth so it is acceptable to the citizens of Wilson, meaning growth neutral. Work with WYDOT to improve Hwy 22.running through Wilson.Dont get caught up in the self perpetuating philosophy that we need to continue to grow to fuel the affordable housing programs. Wilson is a special place which can not sustain any more development without sacraficing the real character of this community.
5/7/2009	Miller, Teresa Interested Public	Sounds like the Jackson Hole Community is speaking out against your growth plan. Are you listening? Kristne & Paul O'Brien say it best in their "Guest Shot" article in the weekly JHN&G (May6), bottom line is sustainable--continued with minimal long-term effect on the environment.The key word is "minimal", not massive.Please don't ruin the community we love with this plan. Please don't ruin Wilson. I do not like this plan.
5/7/2009	Pardo, Hernando Interested Public	I am writing to voice my opinion on the planned development of Wilson, WY. As a long time resident of Jackson (30 plus years) I am opposed to the high density planned for the town of Wilson. It will negatively affect many aspects of the small town. Wildlife will suffer, traffic will be too much for it as is and would need further development of reads and highways, which again, I oppose. DO NOT CHANGE WILSON TO A HIGHER DENSITY AREA.
5/7/2009	McClellend, Porgy Interested Public	What have you done to get us all so stirred up? The planning department seems to have a radically different view of what this place should look like in the future. While attending planning meetings, we have heard that protecting wildlife, and preserving community character play the leading roles in plan development. We have also been told repeatedly that community input will be incorporated into the plan. I have never heard anybody beg the county for tripling the size of Wilson, and the draft plan County wide seems to have hit us with shock and awe when the cumulative impacts are pondered. Simply put, there is too much growth allowed to preserve what we have asked you to protect. The county Commissioners and others have stated that we have a crisis due to the lack of affordable housing and the planning department seems to have to have let this be their guiding light in drafting this plan. In 1979, I sold a small house and lot to Clarene Law who contacted me within hours of the for sale add appearing in the paper. On closing the deal, I asked Clarene why she was interested in this sort of property and her response was, "I can see a day when my help won't be able to find a place to live". My point: Clarene is a very smart woman who was able to address her business needs. When the next Sooting Star arrives, I doubt the developers would have the insight that Clarene did, but the county should be able to predict the number of slaves required and enforce the developers to build the required housing. The businesses that take care of their employees will flourish, and those businesses that rely on someone else to provide housing for their workers will have a harder time-just like in the free market. I am sure that the planning department cannot address affordable housing through the creation of nodes as increasing the supply side will only work in the short term and with much sacrifice to the values we cherish. I know the tremendous amount of time and energy that has gone into the plan to date and realize your desire to get it right. I hope you take the time to measure the impacts on "wildlife and character" before you allow densities that will destroy both.
5/7/2009	Day, Clint Interested Public	I realize the commercial zoning has been on the Hwy 22 corridor for awhile (I've been in town 19 years and it's been the same I believe). I understand and respect that any landowner has the right to maximize their property's potential, especially commercial, within the bounds of the law. I do wonder what other services a town like Wilson requires though. We have a gas station, P.O., awesome general store, hardware store, bar, bank, welding shop, Dr's offices, contractor, bike/ ski shop. To me the town is extremely viable and already meets you requirements allowing residents to avoid trips to town. For years, I've been able to NEVER cross the Snake to fulfill daily needs and then some. In fact, there have been months where I never had to leave "the Loop" (except to see friends) in order to be completely sufficient in today's world.I think a satellite Sheriff's office is just plain dumb. Enough said.It also seems from the orange area on the map that most of the property for future home development is currently held in private hands. I could be way off-base on this. So, in some ways, the future of Wilson's development potential lies in the hands of current owners not giving in to an upzone of their property and early retirement if they sold out. Our 2+ acres on the loop can be taken out of your calculations. Thanks

Date	Name	Comment
5/6/2009	, Interested Public	The comprehensive plan for 10.11 District 11: Wilson, does not represent the cultural beliefs of the residents of Wilson. The plan states the increase in housing and commercial building will reduce the need for Wilson residents to take trips to Jackson, thus reducing traffic. This statement is false and cannot possibly hold true. The majority of WIlson residents work in Jackson ad many use the Stillson parking lot to reduce traffic. Increasing housing by almost 3 times will only increase traffic, period! And ten years from now a new comprehensive plan will need to be created to try and figure out how to decrease traffic by expanding highway 22. Growth is not in the best interest of Wilson residents, we live in Wilson because we wish to get away from the chaos. I have lived in WIlson for over 25 years, born and raised and to be honest, I avoid Jackson like the plague and I do not need to go to Jackson because Wilson has a grocery store, a hardware store, post office, coffee shop, gear store, doctors, and two restaurants and a bar, plus all the close wonderful restaurants in the Aspens and the Village. So the statement that increasing housing to reduce traffic and trips to Jackson is absolutely ludacris and a statement that is attempting to justify building MORE AND MORE AND MORE. Please stop.
5/4/2009	Walker, Darrick Interested Public	As a local resident in Wilson I am concerned about adding higher densities in an area that serves as a natural wildlife corridor. The impact of more homes, business and more roadways ccan and will impair the natural movements of the wild animals. However an even bigger issue will be done during the construction period which could permanently change their natural habitat. From cement mixers, loud noise, diesel and gas emmissions, carbon dioxide, dust, trash debri, paint fumes etc, these aformentioned pollutants have no place in Wilson or in Jackson Hole.
5/1/2009	Zvegintzov, A, A. Interested Public	I don't think the planned Wilson node reflects what the locals have been saying. The plan includes too much growth. Our wonderful wildlife natural resource is not being adequately protected. And on and on. Keep it simple. Keep it small.
4/27/2009	Stevens, Sally Interested Public	For the past 1 1/2 years, many locals have been participating in what the Planning Dept. called the "People's Plan." We spent countless hours attending meetings and readjusting our time to be in the valley for what we considered to be critical decision times. We were lead to believe that our input was forming the new Comp Plan. Now that the plan has been revealed, it is not what anybody asked for at all. The new Teton County Comprehensive Plan is a huge disappointment with tragic consequences. My comments will be directed to Wilson and the Waldron property. Too much growth Wilson - Not a "walkable" community Waldron property - "South on Fall Creek" boundary Moose habitat being ignored In October 2007, the people clearly chose "Option A" with neutral density. Teton County's published handout called Mixed Use Village Sub-Area Plan WILSON DENSITY stated "Based on the public input received at the October 4, 2007 Open House, the vast majority of Wilson residents support Option A (density neutral) and are opposed to Option B (increased density)." Wilson has already doubled in size in the past decade with the addition of the Wilson Meadows sub-division. Most importantly, Wilson is not an appropriate place for high-density housing. Wilson is not the cute little isolated mountain town that the County tries to portray it to be! It is a town that was built at the base of a steep mountain pass, 10% grade, which serves as a major commuter highway for multiple communities in Idaho going to and from Jackson and Teton Village. WYDOT considers it to be one of the busiest and most dangerous highways in all of Wyoming. Traffic count figures for July and August 2008 average around 12,500 cars per day traveling through Wilson. Yet the County seems to believe that this is a great place for high-density housing! To propose a significant increase in high-density housing immediately at the base of this dangerous run-out is not only irresponsible but grossly negligent. The Waldron property should remain in the "South on Fall Creek" boundary which is rural in character. Alex Norton, on April 20, 2009, explained that high-density was going to be put where high-density already exists. This is not true for "South on Fall Creek" and the Waldron property, which has been platted for five parcels on 15 acres for decades. In addition, Teton County's "Comments from Wilson Mixed Use Village Sub-Area Plan Meeting--10/4/2007" states on the 3rd bullet point "Waldron Property - ALL were opposed to seeing increased density there." Critical moose habitat is being ignored. The Waldron property provides substantial wetlands for moose habitat and provides the necessary wildlife corridor to the Rossetter Land Trust and the Snake River. Please refer to the article in the Jackson Hole News & Guide dated March 25, 2009 - "Moose on the decline in Jackson Hole area." In conclusion, to propose high-density at the Waldron parcel, with deadly access at the base of Teton Pass, is not responsible planning.

Date	Name	Comment
4/27/2009	Duke, Marva Interested Public	I have been reviewing the Comprehensive Plan with particular regards to Wilson as that has been my hometown for the last 33 years. I have learned that the property of most interest for development is the Waldron property located at the corner of Teton Pass and Fall Creek Road. I have major concerns if development is to occur on this property. I have seen many accidents involving semi trucks coming off Teton Pass in the years that I have lived just off the Pass road. One truck in particular hit a shed on the Waldron property (known as Tommy's Truck Stop for many years after the accident and the newly constructed building is Bill and Tom's New Truck Stop). God forbid that any person, least of all a child should be struck by a run-away truck while crossing Highway 22 to get to the Wilson School which is located on the north side of the road. There are hundreds of cars that use Teton Pass Road on a daily basis. I have waited at the head of my road for many minutes to get onto Teton Pass during the busy rush hour early in the morning and have worried about being rear-ended coming home at night and turning off of Teton Pass because of the traffic. In my opinion, putting dense development at the base of a very steep mountain pass road is a very poor idea and does not show responsible planning. Will there be a traffic light at the base of the pass so that those people living in that high-density area could get out of that development? Can you imagine how far up the pass cars would be backed up if that were the case? Putting more traffic onto a currently highly used road would only compound the problem. Another major concern of mine is for the wildlife that uses the Waldron property and adjacent properties to access Fish Creek. We have many moose on our land, especially during the winter. One very distinctive moose, plagued by ticks and mostly hairless from scratching himself, used that corridor this winter. He spent many afternoons in our yard, but then I would see him the next day down on the Waldron land. In the winter the animal tracks are numerous and obvious as the animals go from the bench above the Fall Creek Road down to the valley below. I would appreciate your consideration of my concerns as a local who has witnessed the activities and environment of this area over the last few decades!
4/26/2009	Rossetter, Birdie Interested Public	I always thought that I lived in the Village of Wilson. Do I now have to refer to it as the Node of Wilson or Wilson Node? I live on 38 acres 2/10 of a mile south of Wilson with both Fish Creek and Spring Creek running thru it. The first thing Tom and I did when when we bought the property 20 years ago was to put a Conservation Easement on it. Almost every wild animal (including baby cougars last winter) and wild bird in this Valley either live on our Property or migrate thru it. Moose twins have been born on our land almost every year. Two years ago Moose twins were born on the Waldron Property. The proposed Comprehensive plan for high density development of lands south of Wilson-land immediately adjacent to my property, would seriously impact moose habitat and migration. Moose move back and forth from the Wilson bench to my land. They feed on my willows. They calve in the oxbow of Fish Creek which is also my land. I am sure other people will speak about the nightmare of having 100s of cars trying to get onto Rt. 22 at the base of a steep mountain pass. Several years ago Tom and I were having a conversation with Luna Leopold (Aldo's son) about rivers. In his wonderful deep voice he said "The best thing you can do for a river is "Leave it alone." The best thing you can do for Wilson is "LEAVE IT ALONE
4/24/2009	Poole, Carol Interested Public	The density for the region you have labeled 'single family mixed use" is too high. The entire town of Wilson is a wildlife corridor. Scale it down or our wildlife will suffer. Keep the density at current levels south of highway 22.
4/23/2009	Walles, Brooke Interested Public	Are you aware that no meeting has been scheduled for Wilson or the West Bank until May 5th at the Village? That leaves only 10 days left in the comment period. How could they not have a meeting scheduled in the areas that will be the most negatively impacted by the plan? Thus far the planners have ignored and disregarded the feedback provided by the citizens of Wilson and the citizens of Teton County during the mixed use village meetings/comp plan revision update. This is yet another example of the planners trying to shape the feedback and response to the plan. Their job is not to sell us their vision but to come up with a plan that enacts the vision of the citizens of Teton County. Please have them schedule a meeting at the Wilson school as soon as possible so that the citizens of Wilson will have a chance to be informed and comment on the plan before the deadline. Thanks for your attention to this matter.
4/23/2009	Walles, Mackenzie Interested Public	I am writing to request that a County Neighborhood meeting be scheduled immediately in the Town of Wilson. The citizens of Wilson should have the opportunity to meet with the planning staff and hopefully planning commissioners and County Commissioners to discuss the new draft of the Comp. Plan. I am requesting that a meeting be scheduled at the Wilson school. The planning department has completely ignored the feedback they received during the many meetings held in Wilson regarding density and the "Mixed Use Village" concept. Just because it now has a different name, "county node" does not change the feelings of the citizens of Wilson. I request that this meeting be schedule before the end of April so that the citizens of Wilson have time to actually provide feedback before this short comment period expires.

Date	Name	Comment
4/23/2009	Rossetter, Birdie Interested Public	I have been reading the Comp Plan and would like you to consider some of the following things. 1) Separate Wilson Meeting: As Wilson has been slated as one of the key "nodes" I think that it is very important that Wilson have its own meeting for a presentation and discussion of the plan IN THE TOWN OF WILSON. The Elementary School would be a good place. It would be great to have the meeting as soon as possible so Wilson residents would have time to respond before the plan goes into effect. (2) WILDLIFE PROTECTION SOUTH OF HIGHWAY 22, WILSON VILLAGE: I am very concerned with the proposed high density zoning that borders my immediate north boundary up to Hwy 22 and Wilson Village. High density development, as proposed, would potentially provide for hundreds of new housing units with impacts from humans, pets, cars, lighting, pollution and noise. These impacts could have serious negative consequences on the quality and health of the wildlife habitat and populations on my land. The Waldron Property that abuts my western boundary is also slated for high density development. That development would seriously effect the ability for moose to migrate from the Wilson bench eastward onto my land and their habitat area. The Waldron land is in crucial Moose Winter habit as defined by WY Game and Fish and deserves protection. As you know, Tom and I put conservation easements on our 38 acre property thru The Jackson Hole Land Trust because of its very important and unique year round wildlife habitat, especially for moose and Elk. Our land includes wetlands, willows, spring creeks, riparian zones, and extensive Fish Creek frontage (including a large oxbow). It is designated prime Crucial Winter Moose Habitat as mapped by Game and Fish. The last couple of years we have had twin moose born here. We also have deer, eagles, osprey, foxes, trumpeter swans, otters, cutthroat trout and an occasional bear. A small Elk herd winters here and last winter we even had two mountain lion cubs. Hank, I would love to show you this land so you can understand and appreciate its unique wildlife value. Would it be possible for you to come over some time soon for a short walkabout? I can't tell you how much I appreciate what you do and are doing for our community and valley!- It's a tough job!!

DISTRICT 12: ASPENS/ PINES

Aspens/Pines Comment (4/13/09 - 10/13/11)

Date	Name	Comment
6/3/2011	Whetzel, Josh Interested Public	Do you have any maps or drawings showing the areas where development and at what densities will take place according to your draft plan? Its hard to visualize the intention of the written plan without an on the ground interpretation. I live in the Aspens and have seen a previous map showing future development making that already congested area even more so. I think the written intensions are good but without a map it is hard to comment. So I think that it would also be difficult for the Council and Commissioners to adopt a plan without giving enough time or discussion of the whole package. I guess what I am saying is that the meetings you are having now an the comments you are hoping to get will be pretty much meaningless without the maps or at least written specific designations of the areas and expected densities of future development.
4/14/2011	Hawks, Molly Interested Public	I have been a Teton County resident for 21 years and currently live in downtown Wilson. I am wrought with anxiety over the possibility of the reinstated nodes in Wilson and the Teton Village road. The charm and continuity of this little town is what dreams are made of. Having raised two boys in Wilson has been such an amazing experience because of the community character additionally with regards to less traffic, less pollution and the positive attributes to the amount of wild life we experience. With current entitlements, Wilson will already grow to twice the current size which already will be a huge strain on current infrastructure. The Wilson area has critical wetlands, Moose Habitat, and migration corridors that should never be considered for dense development. Nodes in Wilson will ruin the small-town character with increased traffic, more pressure to widen Highway 22, and immeasurable pressure on the Wilson school. When my children were in Wilson school 3 and 6 years ago, the student to teacher ratios were already well above the national average. Wilson already has more deed restricted affordable housing than any similar area in the county and the West Bank has already received the greatest portion of development since the 1994 plan. With similar issues, nodes reinstated at the Aspens location will be equally as devastating. With increased highway traffic and noise pollution, the quality of life for residents as well as wild life will suffer greatly. Please do not reinstate the nodes in Wilson or the village road.
3/8/2011	Hill, Megan Interested Public	Good afternoon, my name is Meagan Hill; I'll keep it short. There's three main things I want to hit on. I've been listening to the comments and I think the first one I'll start with is a statement of the obvious and that relates to growth. I want to make sure that we recognize the fact that, like it or not, global population is increasing and so, as we move forward in the Plan, regardless of whether we like growth in our backyard, we need to plan for it and we need to address it. With that in mind, I'll move to my second point, which is the concept of nodes. We do treat that as a four-letter word, we do some of the time for it. We need to acknowledge the fact that we have, you know, existing areas of density—Wilson, the Aspens, the Village, Town and so forth—and so it makes sense to focus our density on those areas to allow ourselves to best manage infrastructure costs for the Town and the County, and best provide transportation, whether it be walk, bike, or bus. My final point is our natural resources, and I would specifically like to encourage you to increase your emphasis in the Plan on water conservation. I think so far we've made great progress on energy conservation, energy efficiency with the ten-by-ten plan, the stormwater project, Wilson sewer and so forth. What I think we're missing at the moment is the opportunity to recognize the correlation between water conservation and energy efficiency in what may be the next ten-by-twenty plan. But the most important thing is the future burden on infrastructure costs that we don't even know about yet and we haven't forecast. If we continue to spend our water resources the way we are, it's going to bite us in the back pocket before we know it, so I would encourage you to increase that. Thank you.

Date	Name	Comment
10/19/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I would like to respond to a comment made at last week's Teton County's Comprehensive Plan rewrite meeting, during the public comment segment. A gentleman said that the Northern South Park area around the high school should be a receiving area for development because the area is already "messed up" or ruined. Please don't treat the residents of the neighborhoods around the high school as if we don't matter. I hope that the planning commissioners and the elected officials respect the small home owner's future in West Jackson as much as they respect the large landowners, concerning their property rights and the money they may gain or lose on their land investment. West Jackson also has a lot to gain or lose in the rewrite of the comprehensive plan, not only in our home values but the very existence of viable and safe family neighborhoods. There is a simple formula that we can aspire to for the location of any needed housing. If housing is needed, it should be placed where the jobs are generated. Affordable homes and rentals should be placed near or where service people are needed for the upkeep of high end homes, high end developments and resorts in town, Teton Village, The Aspens and the Wilson area. There should be a shared responsibility by everyone who generates the need for service people. If we dump dense new bedroom communities in Northern South Park, people will still rely on their cars to get to and from work in town, Teton Village, Wilson, and The Aspens. We do not need more traffic on the already overburdened High School Road, which will be even more dangerous if the Tribal Trails connector road goes through. It will threaten the safety of all our children in and around the schools here. It defeats the purpose of smart and managed growth. We need to keep commercial and unneeded residential development to a minimum in all areas, protect wildlife, open spaces and preserve our family neighborhoods. Most of all, everybody should share in these responsibilities, not just the small homeowner who works very hard to call Jackson their home. Please be considerate of the neighborhoods in West Jackson. We matter, pay taxes and vote too!
6/17/2009	, STAG	The majority of the group felt that Aspens should remain a node because it has the components of a node today. However, additional development potential should not be allowed until Hwy 390 is redesigned and the transportation impacts of additional development are understood. The Future Land Use Map should be revised to address this change.
6/11/2009	Cottingham, Mike Interested Public	My name's Mike Cottingham. I'm a 33-year resident of Teton County, 25-year resident of the Aspens. And I have submitted personal comments via the internet in the very limited space allocated to do so. I volunteered to hand deliver a very brief statement to the County Commission and to the Town and County Planners this evening from the Aspens Homeowners Association first filing. We represent 36 single-family residences in the Aspens. Dear Teton County Commissioners, the first filing homeowners association board of directors vehemently disagrees with and challenges hereby the District 10 future land-use plan as proposed in the Teton County Comprehensive Plan and urges the County Commissioners in their entirety to vote against it. And so I'm going to hand this to you folks and you can pass this on to the County Commissioners

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	, Grand Teton National P	Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Jackson Teton County Comprehensive Plan (plan). Although the Plan does not directly pertain to the management and administration of Grand Teton National Park, indirectly some elements of the Plan have the potential to affect the resources and values for which the park was established. As a neighbor and adjacent landowner, our comments are offered in the spirit of partnership, and are intended to be constructive. Although we take great interest in all aspects of the Plan and applaud the hard work and effort that has gone into the current draft, our comments are limited to those elements that have the potential to affect park resources, visitors, and employees. The Plan's vision statement, "preserve and protect the area's ecosystem and meet the community's human needs in a sustainable andpredictable manner, " sets the framework for the entire effort, and seems to capture the sentiment of the community. We think it also reinforces the community's context within the larger ecosystem, and specifically with Grand Teton National Park. Of the seven themes identified in the Plan, we think that themes 1,2,4, and 6 are critical in terms of the potential to affect the park. Guidance provided by the Plan on the location and density of future development have the greatest potential to affect wildlife habitat connectivity, healthy vegetation communities, and scenic viewsheds. The Natural Resource Overlay (NRO) is a valuable tool in managing development on lands that are particularly important as wildlife habitat or are otherwise important to the protection of the area's natural resource values. Maintaining connectivity between park lands and others, both public and private, are often crucial to sustaining bird, wildlife, and plant populations and associated values. We note that portions of the NRO are located within the park, and include some lands that are in private ownership. Inclusion of these private lands within the NRO would allow for development, yet would also help to ensure the continued protection of park resources. We would also offer our assistance should there be opportunities for collaboration regarding the identification and protection of additional focal species and habitats. We think that a broader spectrum of species and habitats should be included in a future refinement of the NRO so that all roles in the ecosystem are represented. In light of the fact that development actions outside ofthe park may have the potential to affect resources and values within the park, we encourage the planners to carefully consider the potential effects oftheir actions on the park. The Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) is a key element in identifying how growth will occur throughout the area, and should be more clearly defined before the Comprehensive Plan is finalized. Accurate buildout forecasts are important to understanding future development impacts and are needed to ensure protection of wildlife, natural, and scenic resources. Development on the west side of the Snake River along the Wyoming 390 corridor (Teton Village, Aspens, and Wilson development nodes) is of particular importance because of the potential to adversely affect a portion of the Moose-Wilson Road within the park as well as important wildlife habitat and movement corridors. The Moose-Wilson portion of the park contains some of the most rich and sensitive wildlife habitat within Grand Teton National Park, and is highly valued for its primitive values, opportunities for wildlife viewing, as well as access to the Laurance S. Rockefeller Preserve. The rustic, narrow, and winding character and slow travel speeds along the Moose - Wilson Road are key to enjoyment of this portion of the park, and because of its character, the road is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Traffic volumes along Moose-Wilson Road within the park are approaching levels that could diminish the quality of visitors' experience, and are likely not sustainable. Future growth on the Wyoming 390 corridor, as well as transportation-related actions, may significantly affect the park and should be carefully considered. We respectfully request that transportation strategies

Date	Name	Comment
		and development decisions be sensitive to the needs of surrounding jurisdictions, including Grand Teton National Park. In light of the potential for increases in traffic volume on the Moose-Wilson Road, the town and county should coordinate with the National Park Service to ensure that, in addressing development and transportation issues on Wyoming 390, additional transportationrelated and other impacts are not created within the park. Workforce housing is a central issue for all of us, and we encourage the planners to make every effort to meet the community's housing needs while upholding the other values expressed in the Plan. We are working diligently to address housing of the park's workforce within the park to the greatest extent possible in order to minimize impacts on the community. We welcome opportunities to work together collaboratively with the town, county, and other agencies. Thank you again for the opportunity to provide our input and comments on the Draft Jackson Teton County Comprehensive Plan. We look forward to continued dialogue on the issues and challenges that face our community and the amazing landscape in which we live. Should you have any questions on our comments, please contact Jennifer Carpenter, Park Planner, at 307-739-3465.
6/11/2009	Burwen, David M Interested Public	I am the owner of 2221 Weatgrass located in the Aspens. I think that it makes sense for the county to have development nodes to protect open spaces, so I am not against this proposal in principal. However, I am concerned that the recommended density of 350 condo units next to the Aspens is much too high. Since it is much higher than the current density of the Aspen, it will not look good and will have a negative effect on the wildlife corridor that is along the creek next to our Weatgrass unit. For example we often have Moose browsing along this creek.Given this situation, I am asking that the density of the proposed condo rezoning on the west side of the Moose Wilson Road be the same as the overall density of the Aspens, and that the area on the east side of the Moose Wilson Road road have higher density in order to provide the total number of additional units that the county is trying to create. This will provide a more attractive node when looking at the Wilson faces and the mountains (from the Moose Wilson Road), protect the wildlife corridor through the Aspen that is near the Moose Wilson Road, while providing the additional units required. Thank you for considering this sugestion.

Date	Name	Comment
6/8/2009	Swift, Phelps Interested Public	Dear Planning Officials, Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Comp Plan. General Comments to Public Process. Your written comment period is too short in the context of such an aggressive, complex, and game changing Comp Plan. No public meeting was scheduled for the Aspens/Teton Pines area despite the huge proposed change to the character of this area. This oversight should be corrected by scheduling a local meeting with appropriate notice. I attended the Teton Village public hearing and was offended that staff prematurely cutoff public comment and failed to record any of the thoughtful comments. General Comments Regarding Substance of Comp Plan. The Camp Plan attempts to do too much too fast. By "rezoning" the County in a single document, much is lost from the traditional scrutiny of site specific review. The "ivory tower/laboratory" approach to planning our community fails to square with the existing "on the ground" character and land use conditions, ignores the reasonable expectations of our residents, and destroys investments premised upon thirty (30) years of land use regulations. The textbook principles establishing unodes" based on location, services, and infrastructure ignore existing legal restrictions, including private covenants and State laws, fail to protect the character of existing neighborhoods, and promote chaos, uncertainty, and unpredictability for the areas targeted for huge growth and density such as Wilson and the Aspens. AspenslRaintree Area. Pam and I have lived on the Village Road since we purchased our first home in Nethercott in 1977. We have resided in the Raintree subdivision since 1986 so we are significantly affected by the proposed transformation of our neighborhood to node. The Raintree subdivision is a low key subdivision inhabited by local working residents often outnumbered by wildlife. The thought of adding a hundred or more homes at thirty (30) times existing density to our neighborhood is unthinkable. The Aspens/Raintree neighborhood represents a diverse and vital neighborhood comprised of longtime residents, local workers, visitors and second home owners; it is not a blighted community in need of redevelopment. The Raintree subdivision is currently zoned NCSF in recognition of its long established single family three (3) acre neighborhood. Existing land development regulations promote the stability of existing land uses and insure the protection of desired community character of each zoning district. Private restrictions and State law also protect our neighborhood character and values. The proposed Comp Plan targets the Raintree neighborhood for mixed use high density residential development which could increase housing density thirty (30) times. It is unclear whether these are poker faced negotiating tactics hoping for some lesser density or an honest planning effol:'t. The planners have no "skin in the game." None of the existing stakeholder owners in the neighborhood were contacted for their input prior to the release of the draft Comp·Plan. The proposed Aspens/Raintree rezoning destroys the reasonable expectations and investment of the neighborhood residents. It represents an overly intrusive impact to an existing single family neighborhood and ignores existing legal rights, restrictions, and covenants including an open space dedication, express deed restrictions, private covenants, and Wyoming law. Surgical site specific infill which encourages compatible growth in an existing neighborhood is the preferred course to broad brush rezoning with a blunt instrument such as proposed under the draft Comp Plan. Density for the Aspens/Raintree area should be reduced to mirror the existing platted single family neighborhood. Otherwise, our neighborhood character will be destroyed. There is no need to throw out the 1994 plan. What happened to the idea to update it? Thanks for your consideration

Date	Name	Comment
6/2/2009	Bullinger, Brooke Interested Public	I respectfully submit this letter to address my concerns about the proposed new comprehensive plan. I find it disturbingly more pro-growth than the plan in place now and I feel that the public has adequately spoken that they do not want such increased growth. Why not build out what is currently zoned for and see where we are-- this would also serve to alleviate the that is sure to arise with the new plan as it is now written. Also, since there is no funding in place for any of the infrastructure that this growth would require and with the economy still in question it might be prudent not to push ahead with this. In addition, it is unfair to the old timers (illegible) of the backbone of our community who are not necessarily rich at all having bought their property a long time ago when prices were more reasonable to increase property taxes forcing some to move away--all this to pay for infrastructure for people not yet here. My main problem with the proposed nodes is that there seems to be some faulty logic at play. To say that the Aspens is a good place for a node because it has a START bus stop is purely rationalization. 1% of the population rides the bus and the ridership is flat, not growing. And yes there is a bike path that 5 or 6% of people use-in the summer-for recreation. None of the facilities that are now present at the Aspens are enough to service the additional trips to town that would be generated by a large increase in population. Teton Village and the Aspens are on a dead end road for 6 months of the year. Wilson, also because of its unique character and wildlife, whilst sitting at the bottom of a steep pass, is not a good place for a node. Further consider, the above 3 nodes have to use the Snake River bridge--which in view of any catastrophic event and a possible evacuation this has to be considered. Teton Village road is already overtrafficked. How you can think of adding thousands more car trips a day to the road when there are no plans to widen it until 2018 or later is, in my view, downright impossible. Finally, we are failing in our providing workforce housing--we need more class 1 and 2s, not 3,4 and 5s. We need to take care of those already here not those not yet here. We keep adding resorts and commercial developments that add to the problem and we will never catch up. I urge that this plan not be adopted as proposed without major changes more in line with the public's directive. Most sincerely, Brooke Bullinger
5/31/2009	Zelazo, Barbara and Mi Interested Public	I am writing to express my thoughts about the current plan to dramatically expand housing in the Aspens and Wilson. I think the proposals offered are terrible ideas which will not help with work force housing. They will create more demand for services and they will increase traffic enormously on the Village Road. We want to reduce sprawl yes but the densities being proposed belong in town. This is where it belongs, this is where the community wants it. Everything about this plan seems too much too fast. Wilson is a small hamlet, you will overwhelm it with the growth being proposed. Some increased density there would be acceptable, but your plan goes to the extreme. The same can be said for the Aspens. Because some of us answered that density would be OK here, did not mean that doubling its size would be acceptable. The Cheney Lane area is also very low density and should stay that way. How this area could be designated for high density when it is by far over the ¼ mile necessary for walkable reange from the Aspen's minimal seervices is a mystery. It also presents a safety hazard if many folks start walking the village road in winter, as the pathway is only usable about 6 months per year. This seems to have been just included because the Housing Trust purchased land there, when they had no business doing so, and not because it is in the community's best interest. Between Teton Village and its growth, the Aspens and Millward there is already heavy use on the Village Road. There are minimal services for these existing "nodes" and you cannot guarantee that appropriate services will follow. Groceries, gas, and basic needs will have to be gotten in Jackson or possibly Wilson and will more often than not require a car ride. These facts will require expanding the road sooner rather than later, and the community is strongly against that. Listen to all the citizens and you will hear overwhelming dismay at what is being proposed. Scale this back, put high density development in town, where the jobs, stores and services are already located. The village deli is not a supermarket where any of us buy the majority of our food. It's great to have here but it's where you go when you forgot something at Albertsons or Smiths. Don't pretend people are not going to go into town, we do now and we will continue to have to. The more people housed on the Village Road, the worse the traffic will get, the greater the impact on wildlife and the less desirable it will be for all of us.

Date	Name	Comment
5/27/2009	Watson, Andrew P. Interested Public	Can the nodes proposed for the Aspens and Wilson, district 10 and 11 in the Comprehensive plan, work? For Teton County the answer is no. Community planning that incorporates “sustainable” nodes along high speed transit routes can achieve a viable alternative to car use and promote walking communities. But the key to success relies completely on a fast efficient transit system that moves a high number of residents to one location for the majority of their work and entertainment. Since we do not have, and probably never will have, a transit system that does not rely on roads, the idea of setting up numerous nodes around the county only makes matters worse. People won’t leave their cars for something less fast and less convenient. The plan for nodes in Wilson and The Aspens does not create sustainable communities. It creates little “bedroom communities” with few jobs within the community itself, and little or no community amenities -- movies, music, live theater, libraries, restaurants, bars, drugstores or supermarkets. With the planned housing density, it will create thousands of car/truck trips to town where most of our amenities, already exist. Sure, some people will ride the bus, and some will bike to jobs when weather permits, but density in the nodes will only increase highway traffic. It is incredibly difficult to get people out of their cars. The Plan’s Vision Statement contains a commitment to preserving and protecting the area’s eco-system and natural resources, as well as meeting the community’s human needs in a sustainable and predictable manner. Is there one bedroom community in our country where bus transportation has significantly reduced automobile traffic? It is impossible to see how these nodes advance the vision. Traffic will destroy the vision. There are only two sites in Teton county where a majority of residents work and play: the town of Jackson and Teton Village. Jackson is really the heart of our community, and the services most important to residents are found there. So, why not put the people where the services are and create a walking city? By creating housing in Jackson, residents, clustered there, can take public transportation to Teton Village for employment or walk to work in town. Take a look at Portland, Oregon, considered one of the best-managed cities in the nation. It is a walking city, with housing, services and entertainment, all accessible without a car. And it has public transportation to some outlying areas.
5/17/2009	Emrick, Madeleine Interested Public	I think the proposed increased density in the Aspen's is proposterous. Teton Village Rd is basically a dead end road. Enough growth in this area. Please. Lets re-direct the money that is being spent in shifting around denisties and spend it in studying "0% Growth". We know we ultimately have to get there so why don't we start now.
5/16/2009	Margolis, Fred Interested Public	I live north of the Aspens off the Village Road. Other than during the "off season", trying to make a right turn varies between being problematic to a nightmare; turning left, forget it. Permitting more growth at the Aspens and Teton Village will undermine quality of life, as reflected in only one measure---traffic---materially. I vote no.
5/15/2009	Cottingham, Helen Interested Public	I have been a resident of the Aspens for over 26 years. The wildlife, the neighborhood, the community atmosphere, to mention a few, have kept us here. This "node" idea is one of the most ill-planned, ill-conceived ideas I've ever encountered. Jackson Hole is not a "textbook" community. It is unique in every way and has unique needs. The guise of protecting wildlife by forming these "nodes" is ridiculous. They are already very stressed. This density would kill them. By the way, there are already "vultures" out here meeting with businesses to capitalize on this plan. The young work force does not want to live here. They want to be in town, where the action is. This whole plan needs revamping. It's Jackson Hole.
5/15/2009	Webb, Deborah Interested Public	I am very opposed to the plan for both the Aspens and Wilson. My primary reason is that both of the "pods" on the Westbank are home to year round wildlife. Of course our biggest wildlife population concern in this valley is the decrease numbers of moose. This is not due to predation in this part of Jackson Hole, but due to human development and loss of habitat. Are you all familiar with Dr. Joel Berger's extensive study of our valley's moose population? Teton Village Road is has the highest moose mortality rate in Jackson Hole according to his study. Those of us who live along 390 and 22 are sick of seeing the moose carcasses along the side of those roads.And increase in traffic that has been profound and detrimental.I do see some good ideas and positive aspects to the proposed plan, but the overall number of humans proposed in these two nodes is excessive and the resulting stress on the highways and further degradation of the wildlife habitat is unacceptable.I also own property in Teton Village and vehemently opposed the scale of development that was approved there. Further development on highway 390 in light of what has already been approved is ludicrous.I don't support the high amount of growth set forward on the westbank in this plan draft. I believe we need to grow, modestly, first by redeveloping areas near elementary, middle, high schools as well as jobs in and near the existing "Heart of Jackson Hole". Just looking at the Gregory Lane region, many of those lots could be smartly redeveloped (and using green techniques) where children and adults can easily bus, walk and ride to their destinations.I fully support exploring the 'Hostel' housing idea for our many seasonal employees and would like to see the planners address this low cost alternative immediately.Thank you for your time.I expect to see large changes made to this first proposal. I believe this valley was never meant to house 'everyone' that might want to live here and this plan does not address smart, slow growth or our precious resources.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Hoke, Bland, Jr. Interested Public	Since the first studies were done in the 1980s the area of the Porter ranch in South Park has been identified as the most appropriate area for high density development. Here planners have the opportunity to work with a clean slat in their efforts to create new housing opportunities.This is very different from the Aspens and the Town of Wilson. Here you have existing communities who have over the years built and enjoyed small subcommuities. It is very unsavory to have a group of planners descend on these communities abd propose a significant change in the character of these communities.I believe that The Aspens and The Town of Wilson should be entirely removed from the consideration as nodes for increased development. 390 and 22 are already approaching capacity for comfortable and safe travel. With the additions to Teton Village and the increased density there, travel particularly on 390 is going to become unbearable.Those housing units slated for these two areas should simply disappear or be reallocated to the other nodes. Given wildlife, economic and infastructure considerations they really should just disappear.
5/15/2009	Cottingham, Mike Interested Public	I studied planning in graduate school and the presentation I saw at Teton Village was a textbook planning presentation.Jackson Hole is not a "textbook community". Our community is an extraordinarily unique place and requires an unconventional approach in order to protect it's special features.I am outraged that this high density node concept is even being entertained. I am also outraged that certain developers appear to have had privileged access to this concept.Finally, I am extremely angered over the timing of this concept and the limited time for public comment. It could not have been planned more perfectly in order to minimize home owner opposition. Nobody is here now and you know that.
5/15/2009	Frisbie, Becky Interested Public	I do not think the current development guidelines for the Aspens and Wilson should be changed. The Aspens is currently a resort district and adding the possibiity of 300 + dwellings in a very small area will change the complexion and intent of this development. Currently, the commercial area benefits both visitors as well as full time residents and it accomplishes the goal set forth with the Aspens and Teton Pines developments. To state that any further commercial development has to be for the work force and not for the visitors is an unfair change to the current zoning. Wilson has always been a small village with some commercial development. Current density should stay in place.
5/15/2009	Hoke, Liza Interested Public	Aspens' growth: The density suggested for the Aspens is wrong. There is not the infrastructure in the commercial area to support more people, except as a commuter society. No post office; no gas station; limited banking facilities; limited food marketing; limited food choices in a range of price levels; limited space at the elementary school and all older students would be part of the mass transport problem. There are not enough jobs to support the workforce, so they will all be community to their employment. This flies in the face of everything you are preaching about limiting road use and creating 'Nodes' of communities. No more growth at the ASPENS!
5/15/2009	HItschler, Lynn and Ton Interested Public	General Comments to Public Process:The Comment period is too short for adequate representation. Many of the owners of properties in the Aspens and surrounding areas are seasonal residents and will not have had the opportunity to even know of the potential changes you are suggesting for their residence areas. They do not receive the local newspapers at their other residence and there have been no mailings or emails sent to inform them of this planning process. No public meeting has been scheduled for the Aspens/Teton Pines areas despite the fact that the proposed housing increase here is 20% greater than proposed for Teton Village, which generates most of the traffic flowing from JAckson, Wilson areas to the Teton VIllage, not Aspens/Teton Pines. Specific Comments regarding the Apens/Teton Pines Planning Comp Plan:The two lots identified in the Aspens "Future Single Family Mixed - Type" plan, i.e., dense housing category, have Deed Recorded zoning restrictions on them that prohibit such development. These restrictions PROHIBIT the single family residential subdivision PROPOSED IN THE COUNTY PLAN. These restrictions are State protected and zoning cannot override private restrictions.SHOULD SUCH A PRECeDENT BE SET THAT SUCH DEED RESTRICTIONS CAN BE OVERRIDDEN, THEN INDEED, ALL EASEMENT RESTRICTIONS AND DEED RESTRICTIONS THAT ARE THE BASIS OF JACKSON HOLE LAND PROTECTION EASEMENTS ARE AT RISK. THIS IS WHAT YOUR PLAN FOR THE ASPENS/TETON PINES PROPOSES. IN ADDITION, AT THIS SITE, IT PROPOSES OVER 300 DENSE HOUSING UNITS ADJACENT TO A HIGHWAY WHICH WILL ONLY INCREASE IN TRAFFIC.CONVERSELY, THE AREA OF TETON VILLAGE, WHICH REQUIRES A GREAT DEAL OF EMPLOYMENT FOR ITS ACTIVITIES, IS ONLY SLATED FOR SOME 200+ HOUSING UNITS. TETON VILLAGE INDEED IS THE AREA WHICH WILL GENERATE THE GREATEST GROWTH OF THE TWO AREAS.Might I also ask the obvious but highly unpopular question: Why have we not looked into a low rise building in Teton Village, which would be somewhat invisable against the mountain background and also consider the much needed bridge across the Snake River near the Teton Village location. Both of these suggestions, would provide significant changes to the thinking process to date.Thank you for your consideration.

Date	Name	Comment
5/14/2009	Kehr, Cathy Interested Public	The biggest incremental impact in this plan is on the Aspens where there is currently little to no allowable incremental residential development under current zoning, and where the new draft comp plan anticipates the potential for an aggregate 85% increase in residential units. When did the Aspens become designated as a node for increased density? There is no mention of the Aspens as a node for increased density in the prior Comprehensive Plan. The 1994 Comprehensive Plan only cites limited commercial growth potential at the Aspens. As discussed in Appendix B - 1994 Plan Analysis, "the 390 corridor is not called out in the 1994 Plan as a location for Affordable Housing"The community survey used to compile the current plan asked participants a rather innocuous question of whether there should be "additional residential development within 1/4 mile of the Aspens." While the results were not overwhelmingly positive, I doubt the community response would have been positive in the least to a question of doubling the size of the Aspens - as has been proposed in the draft plan. This is such a meaningful break with the past contract with the community, it should not take place.Defining Cheney Lane as part of the "Aspens Node": According to the document, development of this node should be within 1/4 of a mile of the Aspens. (The industry standard for walkability is 1/4 mile). The start of Cheney Lane is 1/3 of a mile from the Westside Store. It is 3/4 of a mile from the end of Cheney Lane to the Westside Store. There is no place to safely walk on or near Hwy 390 in the wintertime. In fact it is downright dangerous. There is no way that the comp plan can mandate that private property owners provide access to others across their land to mitigate access to the commercial areas of the Aspens.To quote the draft comprehensive plan on page 74 - Incremental, site-specific decisions, which are emotionally, politically, and largely tied to a particular application, are not an effective way to implement this plan. Following on - If the Housing Authority didn't own the two parcels at the end of Cheney Lane, would this section be included in the "Aspens Node" at all? Cheney Lane has no place for inclusion in the Aspens node as defined.
5/14/2009	Cook, John and Cynthia Interested Public	My husband and I bought a tiny place here in 1979. The whole reason for buying was the beauty, peace, quiet, wildlife and low population. We were able to move here permanently a little over three and a half years ago. We were shocked at the extra development, but you expect some changes in such a time. However, your plan will ruin everything we moved here for: the beauty, peace, quiet, wildlife and low population. You will destroy everything nearly everyone here cherishes. The whole Hole will be destroyed. Please change the plan. Wilson too will be utterly ruined and lose its charming character. With the long winter here the planned extra growth will put too much strain on everything: traffic, air quality, quietness, wildlife, low crime, and on and on. It will become an ugly Piccadilly Circus. Yes, I am an ex-Londoner so I treasure this place more than people from the country. I can't imagine either how all of us will pay for all of the changes.
5/12/2009	Springer, James Interested Public	The increase in the number of nits in the Pines area seems extreme. HIghway 390 is already under stress in volume and yet the increased amount of traffic will only increase the problem. Although there are commercial businesses in the area none of them satisfy the day to day needs of residents in the area. The market is great for emergencies like running out of eggs but I have never seen anyone there with a more that a few convenience items in their basket. It is time to quit stating in planning documents that the proximity of a convenience store will reduce traffic to Jackson.Another point in the plan promotes the increased population as it will help justify more off season START bus service. Again and again the bus service is used to justify development. I live next to the Calico and no matter how much the START bus stop is heralded as a solution to traffic volume, the ridership is still very small. Increased density in the area benefits neither the wildlife nor already critical traffic problems. I would like to see the justification based on something other than the fact that there is already density in the area and more empty busses will be made available. Thank You

Date	Name	Comment
5/12/2009	Pollak, Ernest LaBelle a Interested Public	We are writing as residents of the West Bank area of Teton County to express our concerns about the basic premise and specific content of the Teton County Comprehensive Plan update which proposes to embody a 10 to 15-year vision for our community's future. We respectfully believe the plan in its present form is seriously flawed in the following areas: The high density "nodes" proposed for the West Bank (Teton Pines) and Wilson communities will significantly compromise the quality of life for both human and wildlife inhabitants of those neighborhoods by greatly increasing traffic volumes on highways 390 and 22. The plan should not in any case be offered for adoption until an updated natural resources overlay can be applied to those areas. Otherwise it will fail to take into account wildlife corridors and wildlife winter range locations and will increase the probability of failing to provide for the use of existing and proven methods of facilitating the free movement of wildlife and reducing the levels of road kill on highways 390 and 22. The proposed system of "nodes" will contribute to an imposed and unrealistic separation of human and wildlife inhabitants as opposed to the encouragement and facilitation of the co-existence of those populations which is the basis for Jackson Hole's unique character and quality of life. To be truly wildlife-driven, our vision should be one of creating a porous environment in which wildlife can move about with relative safety and freedom both in and through populated and open space areas. Otherwise, the open areas become little more than viewing zoos and our communities become sterile segregated zones that are not as wildlife friendly as we want them to be. The plan as drafted does not seem to recognize that wildlife habitat is and should be everywhere and not just in so-called outlying areas. That is what differentiates the unique area of Jackson Hole from a Vail, Colorado, or Sun Valley, Idaho. There is no evidence that the planning authorities have asked themselves why Wilson and Teton Pines are already successful as wildlife-friendly communities with a high quality of life and then looked at how those characteristics can be maintained and improved upon, not how they can be changed into something it was never meant to be and that the existing population would abhor and reject. Communities can and do change, but they should be encouraged to change for the best, not the worst. The idea of becoming a "node" to accommodate some planner's idea of growth and progress does not have much appeal to us or to our neighbors. In conclusion, we believe that the comprehensive plan should be wildlife-driven, not growth-driven and that the entire process should be slowed down until these important questions can be more carefully addressed and understood.
5/11/2009	Schwender, Craig Interested Public	Let's see-- you want us to absorb a 30 fold increase in density over what is now allowed. Why? to help out those developers who are building in Teton Village and in town. Can't see a good reason to do that for them. These hot shot planners said they wanted to bring predictability to the process. What kind of predictability did they bring us? For the last 30 years the area near the Aspens was to be built one per 35 acres. Then in one quick thrust while everybody is out of town, surprise-- not 10 units, but 310 units. That's predictability!!!
5/10/2009	Randall, Joy & Edward Interested Public	We are opposed to the plan. We feel it doesn't have enough protection in it to maintain the current atmosphere/environment in the Aspens and Wilson. We oppose anything that would bring or encourage more traffic to the area.
5/10/2009	Robinson, Steven Interested Public	I have lived in the Aspens subdivision since 1975. In 1976 I purchased a condo, in 1979 I built my first home here, and in 1988 I built my present home. The Aspens was designed and is still today a resort development with seasonal occupants in the units. This has allowed the subdivision to have a minimum inpact on the environment and wildlife with very little full time use. The actual number of single family residencies is quite small with most lots well over 1/2 and acre or larger. The clusters of multi-family units have limited parking with no garages, vacation type aminities and lots of open space for tourist to enjoy. Your idea to impact this area with full time densly populated full time residence will have a serious negative impact on the full time residents and more importanly, the wild life in the area. (a natural corridor between Fish Creek and the Snake River for the majority of wildlife in the Jackson area). We addressed this concern in detail with the Osprey Subdivision which fortunately was prevented from development. Now it appears you want to create a similar problem to the north in and around the Aspens. Your proposal to develop 50 by 150 size lots for single family homes is completely out of character with the current size homes and acreage in the area. There are no 50 by 150 lots in this area because of wild life concerns when the first comprehensive plan was developed and implimented. It limited growth in this area to protect wild life and the character of the current road. When Teton Pines Resort was developed, it was made quite clear under comprehensive plan that any development would be limited. At that time, the county commissioner even rejected a plan to hook the sewer from the Aspens and Teton Pines into a single line to town (which we agreed to pay for as well as a deposit to the town of $1,500,000.00 for future development of the town sewer system) because the commissioner did not want dense development on Teton Village Road. Under the comprehensive plan, having a sewer line down the village road would lead to increased density and development. We put in our own system as a result. Years later, the county put in the very line down the village road that we had proposed. The commissioners were right to reject the proposed line because the very concern they address is being proposed today. Teton Village Road is a very unique corridor along the Tetons. Don't ruin it forever with the dense over developed plan that you now are proposing.

Date	Name	Comment
5/10/2009	Gronberg, Don and Sue Interested Public	Increased density in Wilson and Aspens will create need for wider roads to accomodate for more vehicle traffic, further impacting already heavily affected wildlife. Any further density should be developed near services and jobs in TOJ. We should maintain the westbank as a more rural area of the county as currently zoned. We oppose the nodal concept as proposed in the draft plan.
5/10/2009	Robinson, Sami Interested Public	I have actively followed this comp plan since the beginning, attending meetings, and being hopeful of an outcome that protects wildlife and the people who have lived in this valley for years. The people have spoken in loud terms...WILDLIFE, WILDLIFE WILDLIFE...have you not heard it? Both Teton Meadows and Osprey Creek (huge density developments) cause an outcry among everyone who loves this valley...we do not want this kind of density. The village road has too much character to be lost with the numbers in which this plan proposes. This plan is out of character, much too dense, and the people of this valley do not want it.
5/8/2009	Jern, Ken Interested Public	I am a property owner living in the Raintree Development for the past 21 years; adjacent to property that may be rezoned from one home per 3 acres to a much higher density. I was previously a 12 year homeowner in the Aspens. Today I observed a deer, a fox, and a cow and calf moose; this is why I came to this valley 40 years ago. Have the designers of this Comprehensive Plan come out and made observations of the wild life or have they hired professionals to do a scientific count of the wildlife and their habits? Have the drafters counted the number of people who now live within walking distance to the West Side Market, a small local convenience grocery, who still drive to get their gallon of milk as compared to the people using no motorized means of travel? Can this small grocery even handle an increase in customers? Or will they need to expand, hire more workers, thus increasing the need for more housing to accommodate increased growth? Have you tried to turn left out of the Aspens during peak travel times? Why is the priority changed for the Aspens area? I think the Aspens area is just as important to the wild life and its scenic value as any other location in this valley. Maybe the Planners should get feedback from the moose. This new Comprehensive Plan isn't smart growth; there is no balance of wildlife and scenic values to human sustainability. The projected expansion of human growth will drastically decrease the wildlife numbers, that's science. The more dwellings created will not enhance the scenic character of his valley. More people, more crime, more traffic, isn't going to lead to a better quality of life. I am against this new plan!
5/7/2009	Ballard, Ken Interested Public	VERY BAD IDEA! The impact of The Plan will drastically impact the wildlife, natural, and scenic resources. In the long run, Jackson will become just another resort. That is not why people buy in The Aspens or the Jackson/Wilson area. The community is unique and totally in tune with the wildlife and natural resources. I want moose and elk walking by my home and the tress and open spaces for birds and other wildlife to inhabit. The growth plan for The Aspens and the Jackson/Wilson areas in general jeopardize the integrity of the community, in spite of The Plan's claims to "mitigate impacts to wildlife and should allow for wildlife movements and crossings,Äù. LOL what a bunch of bull!!! To mitigate, means to cause to be less harsh or hostile. So who's going to determine what is less harsh or hostile? What is the metric? Anything less than the status quo is not acceptable! If The Plan cannot guarantee that future development will have "NO IMPACT" on the wildlife and natural resources, then it should have never been considered in the first place. WHAT ARE YOU THINKING???
5/7/2009	Yurgalewicz, Jean Interested Public	It's dusk, I'm looking at a group of 4 mule deer plus a set of twins bedded down in the wildlife corridor tangent to my Aspens condo. Out my back door today, I viewed a cow moose and her yearling calf grazing on the shrubs, territorial red squirrels, pairs of chipmunks, and the lone female 2 yr. old moose wandered by-her mother was the one killed on the Village Rd. last Jan.'08 by a snowplow during the blizzard-...She keeps close to home here since her mother showed her all the great spots to browse here in the Aspens. A fox has been seen here of late, making his early dawn and dusk rounds, keeping the rodent population in check. These are just some of the wildlife that I experience daily from my condo here at #2111 Windflower, one of two condos that are west of the proposed future bldg.site of residential/commercial growth slated for the east side of the Aspens. It is my understanding that the private land owned by certain valley realtors along our buck rail fence line (our backyard) is scheduled to be developed into perhaps a police station, laundromat, shops, etc. If you head down Kennel Lane on your immediate left all the way down to the split in the road, there is a known wildlife corridor,(mentioned above), that shelters and is habitat to maybe 20-40 different species of wildlife at any given time year-round. Last nite I heard a Great Gray Owl calling. The stately Lodgepole Pine forest is home to a myriad number of bird and waterfowl species in the surrounding wetlands further along the creek there. Now, I ask you, Is this PROMOTING STEWARDSHIP OF WILDLIFE AND NATURAL RESOURCES as your proposed ideal THEME #1 states in The Comp. Plan??? Please, I invite you to come sit on my back deck, or take a walk along Kennel lane and just keep your eyes and ears open and take in all that will disappear if you consider high density commercial/residential growth here.

Date	Name	Comment
5/5/2009	Foyster, Pam Interested Public	Thank you for the extensive report and information.I would like to correct one element of your Conceptual Future Land Use Map - the Aspens subdivision is mostly owner occupied, rented as long term workforce housing, or as second-home for owners. The Aspens is a very good model of what can be done as a focused area of development. However I hope you do not intend that this area should be increased in density to town-levels. The Town-As-Heart concept should be maintained, and not allowed to spread along highway corridors (ala Steamboat Springs).Thank you.
5/3/2009	Whetzel, Josh Interested Public	I have owned a unit in the Aspens for several years. I did not spend $800,000 to now be considered a place for more density and workforce housing. There are to many cars and trucks already on the road. Densities should be increased South of town where there is better and larger roads and access. I enjoy watching the Elk herd just outside the Aspens boundary.
5/2/2009	Fleming, Francine Interested Public	I have owned a condo in the Aspens since 2000 and recently bought another for my children. I bought here because it is so serene and shows to full advantage the Wyoming I have grown to love----living with nature with wonderful wild views and sightings of wildlife. I DO NOT wish to look at further commercial property or other homes in this wonderful wild area. Please do not make the Aspens like residential city blocks in Jackson. I bought here because of what it is like NOW and not to become a little city.Please note that I am adamantly opposed to additional building in this area.
4/29/2009	Winter, Richard Interested Public	I own a unit in the Aspens. What is the meaning of the Statement on Page 80,in the description of "Single Family Mixed -Type" that states "In the county, single family mixed development is only appropriate to provide workforce housing." For example, does it only allow workforce housing? Or does it allow/require a mixture of workforce and full-price housing? Besides answering my specific question, Please clarify this critical definition in the final document. Thanks
4/29/2009	Stahl, Zippora Interested Public	I have owned a condo in The Aspens since 1987 and wish to object to the further growth of multi family development in this area. I wanted to express my desire to not have the area around The Aspen rezoned to provide the buyers that option. Please consider this as my widh for this growth in theis area. Thank you.
4/28/2009	Moyer, Robin Interested Public	I am writing to oppose the whole notion of proposing such a massive upzone of the acreage around the Aspens . Furthermore, I can't believe we pay you planners to come up with such ludicrous ideas. 310 additional units? Do you honestly think it makes sense to burden the Teton Village Road with more traffic? Where are all the supposed workers going to work? In the town most likely, which will just create more congestion on the TV road and the SR bridge. I live off of Cheney Lane and have moose,fox, raccoons and sometimes elk reside on our property all winter long. Adding more traffic will surely jeopardize their survival, especially the moose where it has been shown that they are already hard hit by traffic accidents. I thought the community's goals were to preserve wildlife and open space in balancing future growth. You apparently didn't listen.
4/25/2009	Williams, Jodi Interested Public	I am a nurse and a longtime westbank resident. I was unhappy to hear that the aspens area was being considered as part of the future development plan. Firstly, the aspens is already congested if you ask any year round resident. People who choose to live on the westbank, choose NOT to have TOWN the heart of the area... Thats not what attracted me to jackson wyoming in the first place. The pace at which this town is expanding is very sad. Yes we need workforce housing, but not at the rate proposed nor in the locations suggested. Why not take over more old buildings that are tear downs etc.. Secondly workforce housing should be in town.. not in the aspens. What percentage of jackson residents work in teton village year round.. less than 3 percent?? I work at the hospital and even the hospital doesnt want to develop much out there because their employees want to be close to the hospital. The westbank store and surrounding shopping area is a danger to drive into during the summer due to increase in traffic. The condos areas practically face each other and I do not look forward to the increase in noise and traffic. The construction and cookie cutter housing would provide a decrease in the charm and serenity of the westbank. I already have replaced two windshields last summer due to the debris dropping off of trucks that were on their way to Shooting star ranch. In addition, shooting star has already mapped out affordable housing in that project which I feel in addition to the downtown Wilson development and the one by calico.. we have enough affordable housing. Not to mention the decrease in open land in the residential neighborhoods you are proposing. This is the reason people choose to live on the westbank and you are taking that away from people. I have already seen a dramatic decrease in wildlife since I have lived on the westbank. Basically I strongly oppose and will fight til the bitter end. thank you

Date	Name	Comment
4/15/2009	Pratt, Warren Interested Public	Regarding the future development of the Aspens on the Village Road (390): Is the expansion being planned for after the North Bridge on highway 390 is constructed or after the road has been expanded to 5 lanes with a half dozen traffic lights? We already have seen a significant increase in traffic volume with the Shooting Star area and the Millward affordable project having been added with no change in the road. Not to mention all the development in John Dodge, Teton Pines, and Teton which have all occurred without any change to the road system. The road is already considered over burdened and unsafe by current standards. Will the necessity of creating adequate infrastructure be realized before allowing further development? Is the governing body proactive or reactive? There may be sewer and water but there is certainly not an adequate road system. It will be interesting to see how traffic flows when WYDOT repairs the Snake River Bridge this summer.

DISTRICT 13: TETON VILLAGE

Teton Village Comment (4/13/09 - 10/13/11)

Date	Name	Comment
3/8/2011	Hill, Megan Interested Public	Good afternoon, my name is Meagan Hill; I'll keep it short. There's three main things I want to hit on. I've been listening to the comments and I think the first one I'll start with is a statement of the obvious and that relates to growth. I want to make sure that we recognize the fact that, like it or not, global population is increasing and so, as we move forward in the Plan, regardless of whether we like growth in our backyard, we need to plan for it and we need to address it. With that in mind, I'll move to my second point, which is the concept of nodes. We do treat that as a four-letter word, we do some of the time for it. We need to acknowledge the fact that we have, you know, existing areas of density—Wilson, the Aspens, the Village, Town and so forth—and so it makes sense to focus our density on those areas to allow ourselves to best manage infrastructure costs for the Town and the County, and best provide transportation, whether it be walk, bike, or bus. My final point is our natural resources, and I would specifically like to encourage you to increase your emphasis in the Plan on water conservation. I think so far we've made great progress on energy conservation, energy efficiency with the ten-by-ten plan, the stormwater project, Wilson sewer and so forth. What I think we're missing at the moment is the opportunity to recognize the correlation between water conservation and energy efficiency in what may be the next ten-by-twenty plan. But the most important thing is the future burden on infrastructure costs that we don't even know about yet and we haven't forecast. If we continue to spend our water resources the way we are, it's going to bite us in the back pocket before we know it, so I would encourage you to increase that. Thank you.
2/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	1/22/10 rewrite Policy 2.2.a allowance for the addition of nonresidential potential in any Resort if a commensurate amount of residential potential is eliminated should only apply to Teton Village
2/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	1/22/10 rewrite Policy 2.2.a allowance for the addition of nonresidential potential of in Teton Village if a commensurate amount of residential potential is eliminated should only allow an increase in local convenience commercial for a decrease in lodging
2/18/2010	, Joint Planning Commiss	1/22/10 rewrite Policy 2.2.d incentivization of local convenience commercial in Teton Village must respect the cap on Resort nonresidential development

Date	Name	Comment
2/17/2010	O'Donoghue, Tim Chamber of Commerce	Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan Theme 4, “Meet Our Community’s Housing Needs” Issues and Positions of the Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors The following positions of the Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors were approved in its February 17, 2010 meeting. ISSUE 1: Regulations versus incentives for developers JHCC POSITION: Do not increase current regulations for mitigation rates and exaction fees in the current economy. Maintain current sharing of affordable housing mitigation by both residential and commercial development. Develop stronger and more diverse incentives for developers to provide workforce housing. ISSUE 2: Rental housing for workforce JHCC POSITION: Shift focus from ownership units to the creation and preservation of rental units, including but not limited affordable and attainable rental units, free market units, etc. These rental units should be for seasonal workers as well as year round workers. Regulations should be modified to promote and govern the amount and density of rental housing stock. Establish an affordable rental housing program with principles and criteria similar to that established for the affordable ownership program. ISSUE 3: Sources of funding for affordable housing JHCC POSITION: The pursuit of funding for affordable housing should continue tap Federal and State grant funding to the greatest extent possible in addition to the other current sources of funding, i.e., private donations and current exaction fees. Private and public cooperative partnerships should be explored and facilitated. No increase in taxes should be pursued during the current economy. Consideration of further SPET funding should be delayed until a strong economy is restored. ISSUE 4: Location of workforce housing JHCC POSITION: With an emphasis on redevelopment instead of new development, workforce housing should be concentrated in the Town of Jackson and Teton Village. The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors recommends that the Town of Jackson and Teton County conduct a study to explore the feasibility of moving the fairgrounds and jail from Town neighborhoods to the County to create additional space for workforce housing. Employee housing should be established near downtown Jackson and near any centralized mass transit locations rather than outlying areas to support the “Town as Heart” goal. Quality affordable housing should be mixed with free market homes rather than creating dedicated affordable housing subdivisions or developments. ISSUE 5: Limiting or promoting new developments to provide more affordable housing units or funding for affordable housing. JHCC POSITION: Emphasis should be placed on redevelopment of existing developed land versus the expansion of new development on undeveloped lands. Teton Village should be provided with enough square footage for workforce housing as well as commercial development to be a sustainable village center and lessen traffic impacts. Incentives should be created for landowners to work with developers on existing properties rather than build new developments. ISSUE 6: Economic basis for housing at least 65% of the workforce in Teton County, Wyoming JHCC POSITION: The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce strongly agrees with the goal of at least 65% of the workforce housed locally. The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce understands that approximately 65% of the current workforce lives in Teton County, Wyoming. Further decreases of workforce housed locally equate to further losses in revenue for local businesses as well as losses in sales tax revenue for Teton County and the Town of Jackson. The economic rationale for supporting this goal and maximizing the percentage of workforce housed locally is based on studies indicating that for every $100 spent at a locally owned business, approximately $63 remain in the community. In addition, money spent locally has a “multiplier effect” where the more people that spend money locally, the greater the percentage is of the money that stays locally because of the greater financial success achieved by local businesses. For example, increasing local spending from 50 to 80 percent more than doubles the local effect – from $200 to $500 (ref: Entrepreneur.com, Sustainable Seattle and Civic Economics). Money spent outside of the community by workforce housed elsewhere remains outside of the community. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS: - The data from the 2007 housing needs assessment and related studies needs to be updated in order to establish an accurate basis for making policies. - Housing agencies and organizations should explore the purchase of existing “stressed” or affordable housing stock

Date	Name	Comment
1/5/2010	O'Donoghue, Tim Chamber of Commerce	The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce respectfully submits the following recommendations for Theme 3, "Town as Heart" of the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan:1. Place an emphasis on redevelopment versus expansion (new development) in Teton County with the exception of Teton Village. Provide Teton Village with enough commercial square footage to be a sustainable community center.2. Develop architectural design and energy efficiency standards for redevelopment corridors3. Zoning in Town of Jackson promotes mixed commercial/residential redevelopment on North Cache, the five-way, the â€œYâ€, Jackson-King sections, Pearl-Hansen sections, S. Glenwood between W. Deloney and W. Gill, Scott Lane and other arteries off of Broadway, and Gregory Lane.4. All development and redevelopment applications should address community transportation needs and concerns.5. Any development of the â€œYâ€ should consider the completion of the â€œBrown Cutoff.â€6. All development and redevelopment should place consideration on affordable rental housing7. Develop density transfer regulations (TDRs) that will help land owners maintain their land values, provide incentives for redevelopment within the current town boundaries, and greatly reduces impacts to currently undeveloped lands in Teton County.Sincerely,Tim O'DonoghueExecutive DirectorJackson Hole Chamber of Commerce
11/12/2009	Karahadian, Kathy Interested Public	Please get rid of the "node" concept and put the developement in town or in the village-where the JOBS are. What jobs are there in Wilson???? Everyone ends up driving on 22. The bus ridership is actually down.The community has made it CLEAR that open space and preservation of wildlife are the most important issues.Let's not forget that.Read Peter Pilapian's letter which was in the Jackson News and Guide a few weeks ago & take it to heart. It was well said. Thank you.
10/19/2009	Tompkins, Kathy Interested Public	I would like to respond to a comment made at last week's Teton County's Comprehensive Plan rewrite meeting, during the public comment segment. A gentleman said that the Northern South Park area around the high school should be a receiving area for development because the area is already "messed up" or ruined. Please don't treat the residents of the neighborhoods around the high school as if we don't matter. I hope that the planning commissioners and the elected officials respect the small home owner's future in West Jackson as much as they respect the large landowners, concerning their property rights and the money they may gain or lose on their land investment. West Jackson also has a lot to gain or lose in the rewrite of the comprehensive plan, not only in our home values but the very existence of viable and safe family neighborhoods. There is a simple formula that we can aspire to for the location of any needed housing. If housing is needed, it should be placed where the jobs are generated. Affordable homes and rentals should be placed near or where service people are needed for the upkeep of high end homes, high end developments and resorts in town, Teton Village, The Aspens and the Wilson area. There should be a shared responsibility by everyone who generates the need for service people. If we dump dense new bedroom communities in Northern South Park, people will still rely on their cars to get to and from work in town, Teton Village, Wilson, and The Aspens. We do not need more traffic on the already overburdened High School Road, which will be even more dangerous if the Tribal Trails connector road goes through. It will threaten the safety of all our children in and around the schools here. It defeats the purpose of smart and managed growth. We need to keep commercial and unneeded residential development to a minimum in all areas, protect wildlife, open spaces and preserve our family neighborhoods. Most of all, everybody should share in these responsibilities, not just the small homeowner who works very hard to call Jackson their home. Please be considerate of the neighborhoods in West Jackson. We matter, pay taxes and vote too!
6/25/2009	Adams, Justin Interested Public	Unlimited employee housing? You have to be kidding. How does this factor into a buildout cap? Those guys have gotten too many free lunches already.
6/17/2009	, STAG	Group discussed balance of additional local convenience commercial with need to complete Hwy 390 infrastructure improvements before additional development.

Date	Name	Comment
6/11/2009	, Grand Teton National P	Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Jackson Teton County Comprehensive Plan (plan). Although the Plan does not directly pertain to the management and administration of Grand Teton National Park, indirectly some elements of the Plan have the potential to affect the resources and values for which the park was established. As a neighbor and adjacent landowner, our comments are offered in the spirit of partnership, and are intended to be constructive. Although we take great interest in all aspects of the Plan and applaud the hard work and effort that has gone into the current draft, our comments are limited to those elements that have the potential to affect park resources, visitors, and employees. The Plan's vision statement, "preserve and protect the area's ecosystem and meet the community's human needs in a sustainable andpredictable manner, " sets the framework for the entire effort, and seems to capture the sentiment of the community. We think it also reinforces the community's context within the larger ecosystem, and specifically with Grand Teton National Park. Of the seven themes identified in the Plan, we think that themes 1,2,4, and 6 are critical in terms of the potential to affect the park. Guidance provided by the Plan on the location and density of future development have the greatest potential to affect wildlife habitat connectivity, healthy vegetation communities, and scenic viewsheds. The Natural Resource Overlay (NRO) is a valuable tool in managing development on lands that are particularly important as wildlife habitat or are otherwise important to the protection of the area's natural resource values. Maintaining connectivity between park lands and others, both public and private, are often crucial to sustaining bird, wildlife, and plant populations and associated values. We note that portions of the NRO are located within the park, and include some lands that are in private ownership. Inclusion of these private lands within the NRO would allow for development, yet would also help to ensure the continued protection of park resources. We would also offer our assistance should there be opportunities for collaboration regarding the identification and protection of additional focal species and habitats. We think that a broader spectrum of species and habitats should be included in a future refinement of the NRO so that all roles in the ecosystem are represented. In light of the fact that development actions outside ofthe park may have the potential to affect resources and values within the park, we encourage the planners to carefully consider the potential effects oftheir actions on the park. The Future Land Use Plan (FLUP) is a key element in identifying how growth will occur throughout the area, and should be more clearly defined before the Comprehensive Plan is finalized. Accurate buildout forecasts are important to understanding future development impacts and are needed to ensure protection of wildlife, natural, and scenic resources. Development on the west side of the Snake River along the Wyoming 390 corridor (Teton Village, Aspens, and Wilson development nodes) is of particular importance because of the potential to adversely affect a portion of the Moose-Wilson Road within the park as well as important wildlife habitat and movement corridors. The Moose-Wilson portion of the park contains some of the most rich and sensitive wildlife habitat within Grand Teton National Park, and is highly valued for its primitive values, opportunities for wildlife viewing, as well as access to the Laurance S. Rockefeller Preserve. The rustic, narrow, and winding character and slow travel speeds along the Moose - Wilson Road are key to enjoyment of this portion of the park, and because of its character, the road is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Traffic volumes along Moose-Wilson Road within the park are approaching levels that could diminish the quality of visitors' experience, and are likely not sustainable. Future growth on the Wyoming 390 corridor, as well as transportation-related actions, may significantly affect the park and should be carefully considered. We respectfully request that transportation strategies

Date	Name	Comment
		and development decisions be sensitive to the needs of surrounding jurisdictions, including Grand Teton National Park. In light of the potential for increases in traffic volume on the Moose-Wilson Road, the town and county should coordinate with the National Park Service to ensure that, in addressing development and transportation issues on Wyoming 390, additional transportationrelated and other impacts are not created within the park. Workforce housing is a central issue for all of us, and we encourage the planners to make every effort to meet the community's housing needs while upholding the other values expressed in the Plan. We are working diligently to address housing of the park's workforce within the park to the greatest extent possible in order to minimize impacts on the community. We welcome opportunities to work together collaboratively with the town, county, and other agencies. Thank you again for the opportunity to provide our input and comments on the Draft Jackson Teton County Comprehensive Plan. We look forward to continued dialogue on the issues and challenges that face our community and the amazing landscape in which we live. Should you have any questions on our comments, please contact Jennifer Carpenter, Park Planner, at 307-739-3465.

Date	Name	Comment	
6/11/2009	O'Donoghue, Tim Chamber of Commerce	The Jackson Hole Chamber Commerce commends you for your extensive work developing the Jackson/Teton County comprehensive plan. Your commitment has greatly enhanced our community's ability to provide input and participate in the development of the comprehensive plan, thereby creating a greatly improved plan from 1994. We are pleased to submit our comments on the Comprehensive Plan as formal input and recommendations for strengthening the Comprehensive Plan. The attached comments are general to the plan and specific to the separate Themes. The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce supports a plan that is based on planning, not politics, spin or headlines. We encourage a dialogue that helps the public understand that this is a 60+ year vision. Furthermore, we encourage a dialogue that informs the public with the fact that each and every development proposal will be individually reviewed by multiple levels of analysis--planning staff review, planning commission review and recorded votes by elected officials accountable to the voters. In addtion, the Comprehensive Plan will be reviewed on an annual basis based on "Indicators" to assess the performance of the plan's implementation and to assure that we are achieving our community vision and statements of ideals. It is important to understand that the comprehensive plan is a vision document, not an entitlement. The public should be informed that these are not expotential developments scheduled imminently for next year. The potential build out numbers are used as a tool for planning, not a recommendation for what development should occur in the next 10 years. As such, the Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce encourages dialogue among advocacy groups that is responsible. We hope that more effort is made to restrict and reduce fear-based threats that potentiall mislead or misinform the public and are counterproductive. The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce believes that planning cannot be based on arbitrary fear about the word "growth" any more than business can be based on unbridled commerce. The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce believes that 'growth' is not a bad word -- and that 'responsible growth' is a worthy, desired and needed community goal over the next 60+ years. The Comprehensive Plan is a tool to alleviate uncertainty at the policy level while providing guidance at the regulation level. The Future Land Use Plan, however controversial, has certainly provided greater predictability in response to the community's desire for such. The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce believes that we need to make sure that we plan to allow an economy that at least keeps up with the rate of inflation. We cannot codify the recession as part of the Comprehensive Plan with "no growth." The Comprehensive Plan must be able to counteracCeconomic downturns that trigger significant unemployment and sales tax crises. (Not only to protect our quality of life, but to help control the potential need in the future to raise local taxes to make up-revenue shortfalls, or to limit local services.) The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce believes that the recovery period for this downturn is unknown, with some estimating up to 5 years for recovery to pre-downturn levels. If that is the case, 5 years would be half the life of the drafted Comprehensive Plan, meaning that vibrancy/responsible growth must be an active part of the planning. No growth during thjs recovery period would essentially prolong the downturn beyond projections. The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce takes no position on the projections of growth in one node verses another. But we do encourage a vision that includes open space for wildlife and signature scenic vistas, as well as people space for vibrancy and quality of life for the community residents as well as seasonal visitors. The Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce wants our grown children to be able to live, work and raise their families locally. We need responsible growth to ensure that our future generations are able to remain in Jackson Hole. Thank you once again for your hard work developing a vision for our community's future. - We are in support of the following: 1. Balanced Economic Development with Stewardship of Wildlife, Scenery, and Natural Resources. The strength and stability of our economy is dependent upon the health and diversity of our wildlife, scenery, and natural resources. According to tourism industry surveys, wildlife and scenery are consistently the top two reasons why visitors come to Jackson Hole. Our tourism economy has significantly contributed to our real estate and construction economies, as well as the supporting financial institutions. Any development policies must take this into account and strive towards a balance of development with stewardship of wildlife, scenery, and natural	GENERAL:

Date	Name	Comment
		resources. These natural resources include but are not limited to protection ofland along current scenic byways (Highway 26/89/191) and protection and improvement of (removal ofpower lines) potential scenic byways, such as highways 22 and 390. 2. A Strong Annual Review Mechanism. The annual performance reviews of the Comprehensive Plan should be based on rigorous, valid, and comprehensive criteria found in the Indicators section at the end of each thematic chapter. In order to provide flexibility in strengthening the Comprehensive Plan between the five- and ten-year reviews, the annual reviews should enable adjustments to the Comprehensive Plan in response to dynamic economic, social, and environmental circumstances. The Comprehensive Plan should provide an up front, sufficient explanation of the nature and process of the Comprehensive Plan; i.e., that the Comprehensive Plan is providing a future land use plan for the near and long-term future, not just the next 10 years but the next 60 years and longer. 3. Rate of Growth. Concerns for growth should address and focus upon rates of growth, not solely build out numbers. 4. County Development Nodes. The nodal development concept as laid out in the Comprehensive Plan centralizes development in specific County nodes while preserving open space. Greater specific definition ofnodal boundaries would facilitate public discussion and understanding of the nodal development concept. The integrity of nodal boundaries and the rural characteristics of the land outside ofnoJlal boundaries should be ensured. 5. Resident and Visitor Transit. Ensure that all workforce housing and nodes be part of an interconnected, community-wide and regional, multi-modal transportation system with an increase in public and visitor transit. These should include the encouragement of carpooling and vanpooling. 6. A More Sustainable Teton Village. Provide enough square footage of commercial space for Teton Village in order to create a node that can sustain workforce/family housing and local convenience commercial space to ensure a vibrant local community and reduce traffic on Highway 390. The additional commercial space needed should be based on an analysis performed with the support of Teton Village Association and in concert with a transportation impact analysis for Highway 390. 7. At Least 65% of the Workforce Living in Teton County, Wyoming. To remain a community first and resort second, we must strive to ensure that at least 65% of the community workforce lives in Teton County, Wyoming. 8. Incentives for Housing and Open Space. In addition to Town and County mandates for providing affordable housing, incentives should be provided for affordable housing in addition to that created by current mitigation percentages. Workforce housing definitions should include all forms of housing, including deed-restricted and free market, ownership and rental. In addition, incentives should be provided to landowners to keep their property as open space in order to help preserve the wildlife and scenic values of Jackson Hole for visitors and residents alike. 9. Workforce Rental Housing. The Comprehensive Plan needs to have very strong provisions for workforce rental housing. References to workforce housing should contain language promoting rental housing and an increase in rental housing. 10. Provisions for growth of current and new businesses. Our business community is dealing with a very dynamic economy as well as high cost of living. The Comprehensive Plan should contain provisions for maintenance and growth of a healthy customer base and new local businesses. II. Additional Analysis. Data and models should be developed to analyze and

Date	Name	Comment
		understand the impacts of commercial and residential development upon employment, workforce housing, transportation, and wildlife, scenic, and natural resources. Draft Input to Theme 4: Meet Our Community's Housing Needs Statement ofIdeal: Remain a community first and resort second by ensuring that at least 65% of the community workforce lives in Teton County, Wyoming. Principles: 4.1 House a diverse population in a variety of housing types 4.2 Require that development and redevelopment mitigate the workforce housing impacts. 4.3 Prioritize the preservation of existing workforce housing stock. 4.4 Incentivize the creation of workforce housing. Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce Recommendations & Comments: The JHCC strongly agrees with the goal of at least 65% of workforce housed locally. Please provide a definition of how much of workforce housing would be deedrestricted and how much is free marketing rental and ownership housing. The Comp Plan provides the following definition for "Workforce Housing": "all housing occupied by people working in the community regardless of whether the unit is deed restricted or not." Please provide a definition of what working in the . community means, e.g., number of hours (weekly and/or annually, period of employment including seasonal). Place greater emphasis on maintaining workforce rental housing and creating additional workforce rental housing. The availability of sufficient rental housing is critical for persons entering the workforce in our community. To this end, we recommend that all definitions and discussions of workforce housing include emphasis on rental housing. NEW POLICY= Policy 4.4.b (change the current 4.4.b to 4.4.c): Provide Incentives for existing businesses to create workforce rental housing. Existing businesses can be provided incentives by the Town and County to develop, redevelop, convert, and lease space to create workforce rental housing. This workforce housing can be deed-restricted and free market rentals. Revisions to Indicators (on page 51 of the Comp Plan): - For "Percentage of workforce housed locally", change the Review Period from every 5 years to every year. With such an ideal and critical goal as 65% of workforce housed locally, this should be monitored annually. - For "Number of Rental Units", change the goal from "monitor" to "increase. Draft Input to Theme 5: Provide for a Diverse and Balanced Economy Statement ofIdeal: The community will remain a community first and resort second by balancing its commercial, resort, and housing growth. Principles: 5.1 Maintain a strong and diverse economy 5.2 Balance economic development with workforce housing and community character Policy 5.2.a Balance workforce housing, commercial development, resorts, and civic uses Policy 5.2.b Limit commercial development consistent with the Future Land Use Plan Policy 5.2.c Maintain a strong economic basis for a high level of services and amenities Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce Recommendations & Comments: CHANGE PRINCIPLE 5.2 to 5.4 and associated policies from 5.2 to 5.4 also. NEW PRINCIPLE = 5.2 Balance economic development with stewardship of wildlife and natural resources. The strength and stability of our economy is dependent upon the

Date	Name	Comment
		---liealUland diversity of our wildlife and natural resources. According to tourism industry surveys, wildlife and scenery are consistently the top two reasons why visitors come here. Our tourism economy has been significant in the health of our real estate and construction economies as well as the'financial institutions that work with these economies. Any development policies must take this into account and strive towards a balance of development with stewardship of wildlife and natural resources. NEW PRINCIPLE = 5.3 Orient economic development towards community self-reliance As the community strives towards energy efficiency, the Town of Jackson becoming a "Pioneer City" and other means of economic self-reliance, commercial development should encourage the recruitment, formation, and growth of businesses that support our goals of self-reliance. Such "green" businesses would be consistent with our community's orientation towards balancing economic, social, and environmental interests and concerns and create "green collar" jobs for our community. Our community's tourism economy would be strengthened by the attraction of discriminating travelers who select Jackson Hole as their destination of choice because of our community's economic development orientation and progress towards energy efficiency and self-reliance. - Policy 5.3.a Attract commercial development that supports community energy and sustainability goals and initiatives. Incentives should be provided to businesses that support community energy efficiency, recycling, and other sustainability goals and programs and demonstrate that their operations are consistent with these goals and programs. NEW POLICY= Policy 5.4.d Strengthen community orientation of tourism economy. Jackson Hole and Teton County should appeal to a broad range economic demographic. A continued and new focus on middle class families should be integrated into our plan. Family visitation has been central to the success of our community's tourism economy. Left unattended, current economics are driving new commercial development towards high-end business that is unaffordable for many families. In order to continue to attract families, commercial development policy will support affordability for visiting families. The policy and tourism goal of providing a high level of services and amenities is not limited to highend development and high priced services. Revisions to indicators (page 57 of the Comp Plan): - For "Percentage of workforce by industry type", change this to read "Percentage and number of workforce by industry type" - For "Lodging occupancy rates", change this to read "Lodging occupancy rates by district." - Add the following indicators: "Jackson Hole Airport enplanements" with "Maintain or increase" as the goal and a review period of I year. "Unemployment rate" with "Decrease" as the goal and a review period of I year. "Visitor Center visitation" with "Maintain or increase" as the goal and a review period of 1 year.

Date	Name	Comment
6/2/2009	Bullinger, Brooke Interested Public	I respectfully submit this letter to address my concerns about the proposed new comprehensive plan. I find it disturbingly more pro-growth than the plan in place now and I feel that the public has adequately spoken that they do not want such increased growth. Why not build out what is currently zoned for and see where we are-- this would also serve to alleviate the that is sure to arise with the new plan as it is now written. Also, since there is no funding in place for any of the infrastructure that this growth would require and with the economy still in question it might be prudent not to push ahead with this. In addition, it is unfair to the old timers (illegible) of the backbone of our community who are not necessarily rich at all having bought their property a long time ago when prices were more reasonable to increase property taxes forcing some to move away--all this to pay for infrastructure for people not yet here. My main problem with the proposed nodes is that there seems to be some faulty logic at play. To say that the Aspens is a good place for a node because it has a START bus stop is purely rationalization. 1% of the population rides the bus and the ridership is flat, not growing. And yes there is a bike path that 5 or 6% of people use-in the summer-for recreation. None of the facilities that are now present at the Aspens are enough to service the additional trips to town that would be generated by a large increase in population. Teton Village and the Aspens are on a dead end road for 6 months of the year. Wilson, also because of its unique character and wildlife, whilst sitting at the bottom of a steep pass, is not a good place for a node. Further consider, the above 3 nodes have to use the Snake River bridge--which in view of any catastrophic event and a possible evacuation this has to be considered. Teton Village road is already overtrafficked. How you can think of adding thousands more car trips a day to the road when there are no plans to widen it until 2018 or later is, in my view, downright impossible. Finally, we are failing in our providing workforce housing--we need more class 1 and 2s, not 3,4 and 5s. We need to take care of those already here not those not yet here. We keep adding resorts and commercial developments that add to the problem and we will never catch up. I urge that this plan not be adopted as proposed without major changes more in line with the public's directive. Most sincerely, Brooke Bullinger
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Last line of the test states "The Town of Jackson will remain the resort, retail, professional, and civic center of the region." Why is the Town the Resort center of the Region? This furthers the battle between Town and Teton Village for tourists.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	There should be no additional Resort Development beyond what is in the approved Resort Master Plan. Teton Village should take workforce housing out of approved development.-Additional commercial in Teton Village is in conflict with Town as Heart. Past experience has shown the public is not willing to pay higher costs for lower quality goods as a convenience.
5/15/2009	HItschler, Lynn and Ton Interested Public	General Comments to Public Process:The Comment period is too short for adequate representation. Many of the owners of properties in the Aspens and surrounding areas are seasonal residents and will not have had the opportunity to even know of the potential changes you are suggesting for their residence areas. They do not receive the local newspapers at their other residence and there have been no mailings or emails sent to inform them of this planning process. No public meeting has been scheduled for the Aspens/Teton Pines areas despite the fact that the proposed housing increase here is 20% greater than proposed for Teton Village, which generates most of the traffic flowing from JAckson, Wilson areas to the Teton VIllage, not Aspens/Teton Pines. Specific Comments regarding the Apens/Teton Pines Planning Comp Plan:The two lots identified in the Aspens "Future Single Family Mixed - Type" plan, i.e., dense housing category, have Deed Recorded zoning restrictions on them that prohibit such development. These restrictions PROHIBIT the single family residential subdivision PROPOSED IN THE COUNTY PLAN. These restrictions are State protected and zoning cannot override private restrictions.SHOULD SUCH A PRECeDENT BE SET THAT SUCH DEED RESTRICTIONS CAN BE OVERRIDDEN, THEN INDEED, ALL EASEMENT RESTRICTIONS AND DEED RESTRICTIONS THAT ARE THE BASIS OF JACKSON HOLE LAND PROTECTION EASEMENTS ARE AT RISK. THIS IS WHAT YOUR PLAN FOR THE ASPENS/TETON PINES PROPOSES. IN ADDITION, AT THIS SITE, IT PROPOSES OVER 300 DENSE HOUSING UNITS ADJACENT TO A HIGHWAY WHICH WILL ONLY INCREASE IN TRAFFIC.CONVERSELY, THE AREA OF TETON VILLAGE, WHICH REQUIRES A GREAT DEAL OF EMPLOYMENT FOR ITS ACTIVITIES, IS ONLY SLATED FOR SOME 200+ HOUSING UNITS. TETON VILLAGE INDEED IS THE AREA WHICH WILL GENERATE THE GREATEST GROWTH OF THE TWO AREAS.Might I also ask the obvious but highly unpopular question: Why have we not looked into a low rise building in Teton Village, which would be somewhat invisable against the mountain background and also consider the much needed bridge across the Snake River near the Teton Village location. Both of these suggestions, would provide significant changes to the thinking process to date.Thank you for your consideration.

Date	Name	Comment
5/11/2009	Fuchs, Junie Interested Public	Teton County Staff and Commissioners have obviously put alot of time and effort into this plan and it shows. I believe it is a good basis for a plan and supports the communities interests as a whole.The idea of nodes which can contain the needs of certain parts of the valley shows some great vision.I would like to see more study and research in Teton Village to be sure it can support the 6000 to 8000 people that visit, live and work on any given day in the winter. I am not sure there is enough diversity or quantity in the commercial area to support the guests, workers and residents.Jackson as heart is a good theme as long as we don't create this MECCA that sends everyone in the valley on our roads to MECCA and contradicting Theme #1 our Natural Resources. There needs to be a good balance between having enough support in the nodes and not truly competing with Jackson as Heart.Thank You
5/6/2009	Shore, Kenneth Interested Public	My comments begin generally on the draft Comprehensive Plan -- and perhaps with a comment that you really do not hear much, certainly as often as you should. Thank you. The staff and elected officials worked hard, and community-wide we should give it our general support. As with any comprehensive document, it is a work in progress and the feedback is very important -- but please don't let those loud voices who oppose this or that particular provision drown out the larger message that generally this is a positive and important document. You are headed in the right direction and have presented and good balance between protecting both our community of great people and this special place with wildlife.Your plan shows an increased protection of wildlife, reduction in development in rural areas and an emphasis on workforce housing. The nodes are smart planning. And it will be a given that they won't please everyone. But we all have to live as a larger community and accept front and backyards alike. It was interesting to hear the public presentations that indeed we are talking about a very, very, very small section overall of private land as a base. One tenth of 1 percent indeed is a small place for people habitat.I'm grateful for the recognition of the economy in this plan. Responsible growth is important. In fact, if you didn't include responsible growth -- as some of the opponents are asking -- it would be highly irresponsible of you as elected officials! This community is suffering with the rest of the nation from the downturn economically. I hope you remember this: The fact is the majority of our community goes to work every day. Payrolls and paychecks are the majority of us -- and some are too busy working to earn a living to comment or get involved in this. More than ever, we need to emphasize our economic health here in Teton County.Specifically in Teton Village, workforce housing is welcome, but I too hope you work with us in a positive dialogue to create the best Teton Village mix and plans. Only workforce housing -- without accompanying planning for interesting commercial and diversity -- will risk a man-camp in Teton Village. If only workforce housing allowed, you will drive up car trips in record numbers as people will need to travel to get economically better priced daily living services. The workforce is a vital and active part of our community. To deny the kinds of commercial interests that appeal to workers and visitors -- with pedestrian qualities -- is poor planning for Teton Village. The Village needs vibrancy. For quality of life, for good business and for positive tax revenues flowing to County and Town. Furthermore, keep in mind, Teton Village as an economic engine of the County is a green one. Recreation and fun. That should be encouraged via smart planning.In general, Teton Village must be a well-planned, positive place that is aesthetically pleasing with many options and choices for everyone. We look forward to an active dialogue with the County in the future to achieve that goal.But again, generally many of us give you our support of this draft plan overall.
5/1/2009	Kroposki, Michael Interested Public	The Conceptual Land Use Map for Teton Village, Page 105 show green bands along Michael Drive and Rachel Way. The legend indicates these are "open space/parks". This designation makes no sense. The existing use is multifamily residence buildings. There is almost no open space. Most of the area not covered by buildings is paved parking lots. This needs correction or explanation.
4/20/2009	Palfrey, Cheryl Interested Public	Traffic is a real issue. What about a bus that services Teton National Park with stops along the route within the park? They have this in the Grand Canyon and it is great. People could also use this for a loop backpack trip instead of taking 2 cars or hitching a ride.

DISTRICT 14: ALTA

Alta Comment (4/13/09 - 10/13/11)

Date	Name	Comment
9/11/2009	Camenzind, Franz Interested Public	These comments are presented in order of appearance in the April 2009 Draft Comprehensive Plan and are meant to reflect my opinions only. Thank you for considering these comments and for your dedicated work on this important process. Principle 1.5Maintain the scenic resources of the area The last sentence should be re-written as follows: “Interruption of those natural forms by built forms detracts from the character and will be regulated.” Rationale: This simply gives direction to write LDR’s that will regulate this activity, it does not say to what degree. Without this, is a weak directive. it Policy 1.5.a: Maintain natural skylines. I agree that this language should be tightened to include “…as seen from all public roads, streets and parks. Policy 1.5.b: Maintain expansive hillside and foreground vistas The last sentence should be re-written as follows: “…landscape that screens natural vista will be restricted.” Rationale: Again, ‘restricted’ does not prohibit, it only strengthens the directive when writing specific LDR’s to allow such activity under determined circumstances. This does not prohibit berms and vegetative landscape screening, it simply allows for the LDR’s to establish standards that would avoid the unreasonable blockage of natural vistas. Policy 1.5.c: Maintain natural landforms The last sentence should be re-written as follows: “All land disturbances will be completed and mitigated implementing “Best (Landscaping) Management Practices” so as to resemble the natural landscape. Rationale: “Resemble natural landscapes” does not mean recreate, it allows for a reconfiguration plan that blends with the natural, surrounding landscape. It gives direction without requiring the development to exactly replicate the former, natural landscape. Policy 1.5.d: Maintain dark night skies The third sentence should be re-written as follows: “Some lighting is required for safe urban transportation corridors; however, non-essential lighting will be limited and all lighting will be designed to meet dark skies “Best (Dark Skies) Management Practices.” Rationale: This allows for lighting in urban areas, but not along rural roadways and pathways etc. throughout the county. ADD: Policy 1.5.e: Maintain ambient sound conditions Quiet environments, like dark skies are signature features of Teton County. Restrictions should be put into place protecting natural, ambient sound levels within and immediately adjacent to Residential areas and those areas designated as NRO and SRO. Rationale: We know that not all humancaused sound can be limited everywhere, but with recognition of the importance of noise control in residential areas and within the NRO and SRO, we should manage as best as possible longterm humancaused noise pollution in and adjacent to these special areas. ADD: Policy 1.5.f: Establish a Scenic Resource Overlay for the County and Town of Jackson The scenery found in Teton County is world-class and is a major component of our community character and quality of life in addition to being a foundation of our tourism economy. Updating the current SRO map and accompanying standards is central to guiding future development so as to best protect our unparalleled scenic resources. Rationale: Adding the Town of Jackson is appropriate because it has many scenic viewpoints and with the majority of our visitors spending some time within the town, we should do what is reasonably possible to retain views of the surrounding mountains. For what is this place called butJackson’s Holea valley surrounded by mountains? Lets us not forget nor degrade this asset. Principle 1.6Conserve remaining agricultural resources Policy 1.6.a: Conserve agricultural lands and agriculture throughout Teton County The second sentence should be re-written as follows: “The county will support efforts of landowners and land trusts to permanently conserve all parcels of land being used for agricultural purposes and/or determined by professional land trusts and resource management agencies to have importance as open space, wildlife habitat and/or as wildlife movement corridors.” Rationale: We should not suggest to any landowner that their parcel is not worth putting into a conservation easement. In the end every acre thus protected is an investment in what makes this place unique and therefore it is an investment in our future. Policy 1.6.b: Prioritize conservation of agriculture in Alta Alta should not be given special attention over other agricultural areas of the county. Remove exclusive reference to Alta. The first sentence describing this Policy should be removed. The remainder of the Policy should be re-written as follows: “Viable agricultural practices operate through the county and should be encouraged to continue so as to maintain historic lifestyles, open space stewardship, and the calming rural setting residents and visitors alike have come to associate with Teton County. The county will continue to explore incentives to assist landowners in conserving agricultural lands.” Rationale: This should be obvious, doing this will not only perpetuate historic uses but will also maintain open spaces and wildlife values throughout

Date	Name	Comment
		the county. This effort should not be focused on Alta only. Policy 1.6.c: Recognize agriculturalists for their stewardship This entire policy can be eliminated as it only re-states what is in the Principle. In particular, the last sentence must be removed because as currently written- ("Regulatory exemptions and allowances will be provided to ensure that continued operation of agricultural stewardship…"), it allows for a complete circumvention of all land use plans that now apply to rural, agricultural lands. This provides an open door to non-planning. Rationale: As now written, this Policy allows for an agriculturalist to propose nearly any activity if he/she can make the case that it will help perpetuate agricultural use. That could include a request to simply develop a portion of their property without regard to existing LDR's so as to "increase operating cash flow." However, IF this is meant to apply only to activities directly tied to and supporting continued agricultural practices (developing new or modifying existing irrigation systems etc,), then this should be made clear in this Policy so that the LDR's can be written to only accommodate such circumstances. Principle 1.7Maintain public access to public lands This title should have the following phrase added to the end: "…while minimizing impacts" Rationale: Protecting the public land environment from degradation brought on by inappropriate types or levels of recreational uses is as important as retaining authorized public access. In addition, this Principle is confusing and should be re-written for clarity and consistency- is it meant to address public lands only or in combination with private land recreational uses? Policy 1.7.a: Provide recreation opportunities on private land The last sentence should be removed from this Policy and placed at the end of Policy 1.7.b. It should also be re-written as follows: "Additionally, public and private efforts will be made to prevent resource damage on public lands from harmful recreational activities. Rationale: It is a public land concern and fits better in Policy 1.7.b and I don't believe we need to promote recreational activitieswhich are selfstarters in this community, we n eed to protect the resource from damaging recreational activities. Or: The last sentence should be re-written as follows: "Additionally, public and private efforts will be made to prevent resource damage on private lands from harmful recreational activities. Rationale: Perhaps by separating the public lands recreational activities from the private lands opportunities this confusion can be eliminated. Policy 1.7.b: Provide continued access to waterways and public lands The second sentence should be re-written as follows: "Local government and private interests will coordinate with state and federal agencies regarding the (omit: creation and) maintenance of access points to …." Rationale: I am not aware of any situation where reasonable access to public lands (or waterways) is now being denied. In addition, with every access opportunity there comes the danger of increasing impacts to native habitats and wildlife populations through more habitat fragmentation via establishment of new human use corridors. Maintenance of existing access points is the most that this Policy (and subsequent LDR's) should address. STRATIGIES Strategy 1.1: Establish an Environmental Commission The wording should be re-written to say that this commission will make recommendations to both elected officials and planning commissions. Rationale: Environmental information should be available to both the Planning Commissions as well as the elected bodies. The first bullet point should be re-written as follows: "The Environmental Commission should be made up of 5 or 7 individuals with a majority having a professional background in the environmental sciences and with at least two but not a majority of members who are not required to have a professional background in the environmental sciences, but have a significant interest in and familiarity with local environmental conditions and are fulltime residents. Rationale: This Environment Commission should have members familiar with environmental sciences as well as individuals who have a significant interest in and familiarity with local environmental conditions. This combination of backgrounds should generate credible and representative perspectives to environmental stewardship discussions and recommendations. Strategy 1.2: Update Natural Resources Overlay (NRO) mapping and natural resource protection standards Added to this should be "Update Scenic Resources Overlay (SRO)." This addition should be reflected in each 'bullet point' where appropriate and should incorporate all defensible data, not just that coming from the Wyoming Game and Fish Dep artment. OR- There should be a new Strategy 1.3 (Moving the remaining Strategies down one count): "Update Scenic Resource Overlay (SRO) mapping and view shed protection standards. This should incorporate the existing SRO district and be reviewed by the Environmental Commission with consultation with professional land trusts and with public input." Rationale: The discussion on including an updated SRO with a review of standards is essential. Where it appears in this Comp Plan should be left to staff. The second bullet point should be re-written as follows: "Reevaluate and amend where necessary standards for development location, density, intensity, and design within the NRO to reduce development footprints and minimize impacts to native wildlife and their habitats."

Date	Name	Comment
		Rationale: Placing more emphasis on habitat protection is warranted. The third bullet point should be re-written as follows: “Evaluate and amend where necessary natural resource protection standards to increase protection of water bodies, wetlands, and riparian areas.” Rationale: As now written, an amendment could also include weakening standards. This Strategy should direct the LDR’s to maintain current protection and where possible/necessary, to increase protection. The fourth bullet point should be re-written as follows: “Create or adopt a bestscience vegetation cover map of the county.” Rationale: It may not be necessary for the Town or County to “create” a vegetative map if a scientifically defensible map is available from a government agency or private sources. Strategy 1.3: Map natural hazard areas The three bullet points are adequate, but there should be a concluding statement (for each point or collectively) that directs the LDR’s to minimize these threats, set standards, including restrictions on development etc. Rationale: As this now stands, it asks for data/information to be collected but neglects to direct that standards be included within the LDR’s. Strategy 1.4: Amend Land Development Regulations and the zoning map This is clearly a ‘catch-all basket’ of concerns, all of which deserve more attention luded: than one-liners. Having said that, there should be at least one more item inc• Adopt standards for the recycling/disposal of items generated through re-development projects. Rationale: We generate a great deal of refuse through our redevelopment projects and this will only increase as we do more infill and redevelopment both within the county and the town. INDICATORS Number four should be re-written as follows: “Water quality and sediment loading in all waterways.” Rationale: Clearly, every waterway in the county is subject to sediment loading, some naturally occurring but others not so. There should be at least five more indicators added: • Acres of land rehabilitated to improve either or both wildlife value and scenic view sheds (In support of Policy 1.1.f). • Population and distribution changes of the ‘Focal Species’ • Air quality • Dark skies • Noise pollution Rationale: Rehabilitated land can be measured with the assistance of land trusts and county records. Focal Species data should be available from government agencies and from information gathered through private/public partnerships such as the Nature Mapping effort now underway. Air quality data should also be available from existing monitoring efforts and where inadequate data exists, programs that will provide the necessary data should be explored, and when possible implemented. The last two points, noise and dark skies may be a challenge, however, listing them as Indicators respects their inclusions within the Policy section AND should encourage the incorporation of such information when monitoring techniques are available. The discussion of inconsistencies regarding the wording of access to public lands can be addressed in the Goal column of the Indicators section by adding: No net lossof authorized access points.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that maintaining residential density allowances are important in rural areas to allow for the dedication of conservation easements.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group's primary recommendation was designating enough land for future community facilities to remove some reliance on Idaho jurisdictions.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Durtschi, Grant Interested Public	I was raised here in Alta and my siblings (Dick, Dorothy, Ralph, Mark, Jim, Heidi, Mike, and Roger) and my mother, Marian Butler, all own property here. All through the years, there have been businesses in Alta. Farming, in many cases wasn't sufficient to sustain our families. For example, Arnold Grossnickle has a chiropractor clinic, Ralph Linseman had an excavation business. Fritz Kaufman had a lumber and fence business, Mark Wilson hadquite a few ideas, one of which was building furniture, Rex Christensen had a door and cabinet business and the list goes on. This was part of the Alta culture. It allowed economic diversity, which in my opinion was an asset to the entire community.Now Teton Valley is experiencing challenging times. People are leaving the area because there are no opportunities for employment. Our area is focused on real estate and associated services. Now that real estate is suffering, the entire area is suffering. It appears that this recession in the valley could last a long time. If our community had some small technology, manufacturing and associated businesses, that would soften the recession issues.There is the feeling that these businesses should be in Idaho. Teton County, Idaho is also having difficulties. From personal experience, finding a location to operate a business in Teton Valley, Idaho, has been difficult. Rent prices are high, locations to build are extremely hard to find and expensive. I note that since the recession, commercial property is easier to find.I am recommending an allowance for some limited commercial zoning. I am totally opposed to commercial activity like Wal-Mart or Target. I would like to see a small commercial area where small businesses could be located. For example, an accounting office 1400 squre feet or less, a hair salon, a marketing center 1400 square feet or less, a computer technology assembly plant of 2500 square feet, a light manufacturing facility 3000 squre feet or less, etc. All commercial activity would be located in a commercial area off the main road with a tree buffer. In this manner, the commercial area would not be seen from the road and therefore quality of life in the area would not be diminished.Land in the area could also be donated to the County for future County facilities such as a post office or recreational facility. Three years ago, it was never dreamed that Alta would need land for a library. The community is fortunate that the local church made land available for sale.In summary, a commercial area in Alta prevents commercial sprawl in the community, creates economic diversity, gives the community a place for future growth, and makes a space for current commerical to become "conforming". Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on the draft comprehensive plan.

Date	Name	Comment
5/15/2009	Durtschi, Beth Interested Public	I understand from reading the plan about Alta that you propose the vision to be our community as solely agricultural and residential. I find this very surprising since this doesn't reflect our current community and seems to put an unfair burden on our farmers. I'm surprised that this became "our" Alta vision since both my husband and myself were at the original input meeting and this doesn't represent our vision.Like most people, I love the scenery associated with farming but I can't fairly say that I expect our local farmers to provide this for me. In fact, Alta has no full-time farmers in our entire community. All the farmers/ranchers I know have other means to support themselves.Here is what I know about our local Alta farmers. Warren Kaufman has a Polaris shop, Liza Wilson has a kitchen cabinet business, Jim Wilson has a library database business, Leland and Anita Christiansen have other jobs. Steve Green works at Stock Lumber. Marian Butler is a retired nurse practitioner. Janice Wilson is a retired school paraprofessional. Rex and Marie Christiansen have other jobs. Jim Christensen is a retired college professor. Meredith Wilson has a bug-spraying business. Would it really be fair to continue to zone all their property as agricultural and expect them to continue to provide all the scenic, natural, and wildlife resources on their property? I don't think so.Adopting this plan that identifies this community as agricultural and residential leaves out much of the current community which surprises and disappoints me. In fact, it makes me completely opposed to this part of the comprehensive plan, the Alta portion. One of the themes of the proposed Teton County comprehensive plan which is in direct conflict with the Alta portion is "Theme 5: A diverse and balanced economy. Maintaining local ownership of businesses is a key element of sustaining a community." No kidding, you can't sustain Alta on only farming and residential. That would be forcing many people to move their livelihood to Driggs. We wouldn't dream of asking the farmers to do such.There is a lot of commercial activity in our community, that is, locally owned businesses. I'm afraid this new plan gives specific permission to pinch out these activities over time based on the sentence that says, "in non-agricultural areas, existing non-residential non-institutional uses should be redeveloped as residential." I know that you create regulations based on the comprehensive plan. I object most to this part of the plan. I don't believe it is realistic or sustainable. Your proposed plan must address the existing business operators. Your vague language puts their operations at risk.Let me describe our commercial activity in Alta. We have a 9 hole golf course. We have a restaurant, "Lost Horizons" My brother-in-law, Dick Durtschi, had a welding shop on Stateline Rd for 30 years. My husband, Grant, now occupies that spot with his construction business. We have local lodging and a restaurant at "The Teepee". Reed Dayton has a construction business based out of his home. Mel Hammond has a landscaping and building business based out of his home. Dave Green has a wood-working business based out of his home. There are other home businesses such as Wade Treasure's and even have a local farmer, Warren Kaufman who owns a snowmachine shop and works on snowmobiles in Alta. Janice Wilson has a bed and breakfast inn, Alta Lodging is also a bed and breakfast inn. I'm sure there are many others that I am not aware of. It isn't my vision to expect Alta to be a bedroom community for all except for a handful of part-time farmers. This isn't the current culture of Alta and I don't believe should be the long-term vision. Everyone else has to make a living elsewhere or only in a non-visible home office?The fact of the matter is that our community is composed of resourceful, motivated, and hard-working members that should be allowed to pursue their commercial activities in Alta. It actually feels quite discriminatory to limit commercial activity to farming only and forcing others to move their shops, restaurants, equipment, and lodging to Driggs. Likewise, it would be ridiculous to ask the farmers to move their equipment and non-residential activities to Driggs.And of course, we have Grand Targhee Resort, a major commercial activity that earns forgiveness in the new comprehensive plan. Of course, no one dares suggest we get rid of that commercial activity. But it is quite absurd to suggest that this ski resort is not part of our community and that we should as a matter of practice pretend it isn't there as we go about our agricultural and residential activities.I would like to talk a moment about our future Alta library which should be open for business this year. Your proposed plan stated that people did not want a heart of community. In fact, the proposed plan suggested having a "heart of community" is our very last priority. This library came about because people were indeed interested in some kind of heart of the community contrary to what your proposed comprehensive plan states. Your plan states that community facilities should come from Idaho and that there should be no development for the heart of our community. I believe that the process of creating our library from our community input goes directly against what you mistakenly perceived as our community desires. This alone should give you the idea that unfortunately your planning process didn't adequately represent the current culture of Alta or its proposed vision.I must state what I believe the vision and community character of Alta is. Our community is a combination of legacy farming, resort vacation living, legacy commercial, and bedroom community. We have legacy agricultural because no commercial farmer could move here, buy farm land and go into business. Land isn't available and if it were, it would be too expensive to make agricultural viable. Why make zoning and the comprehensive plan regulate economics? Let's change the plan to include everyone. My vision of Alta is indeed not limited to agricultural and residential. Heck, I live in a big non-modest house on a golf course, 7 miles from a ski resort. Making this community agricultural is something like trying to create Nebraska in the middle of Las Vegas. It isn't realistic or sustainable. Your plan states that homes in Alta should be limited to modest, rural character homes. That is insulting to many people in our community who have created comfortable, large homes in our resort like area. In fact, some of these people provide employment to hundreds of local citizens.So, I propose you drop the priority of agricultural and residential and let the culture and community develop based on current community input and desire. Isn't that democratic? Isn't that how we made a library happen in our neighborhood contrary to your proposed plan? This can be created through the Alta Advisory board and let the zoning and planning revert to what it was before. In no way, should current commercial activity be allowed to be pinched out and redeveloped as

Date	Name	Comment
		residential. I believe there should be some modest area that is allowed to have some commercial activity that supports "Theme 5: A diverse and balanced economy. Maintaining local ownership of businesses is a key element of sustaining a community." Commercial activity is going to continue to go on in a "non-conforming" manner, anyway. Recognizing it and making room for it reduces commercial sprawl and allows development to happen in a controlled and regulated manner.Thank you for allowing me to comment on your comprehensive plan.
4/29/2009	Henley, Markida Interested Public	Thank you for the meeting in Alta. I came in late so I don't know who did the presentation, but the presentation was excellent, as was the speaker. As co-owner of Targhee Village Golf Course, my primary concern for our property would be to ensure that a future owner would be allowed to expand the golf course to 18 holes on either adjoining or neighboring property so that it can realize its potential. Our current 91 acres isn't enough land and I would hope the Mixed-Use Visitor Orientation land use classification would carry over to additional property,as opposed to perhaps being limited to our current acreage. Thank you very much!

Date	Name	Comment
4/25/2009	Melville, Chi Interested Public	I'm writing to you with my comments on the Teton County Wyoming Draft Comprehensive Plan, specifically for Alta, Wyoming.My main concerns are with the Transportation section. With your recent approval of the Grand Targhee Resort expansion, traffic through Alta has the potential to increase dramatically, so more mitigation of the traffic increase should be put in place.Pathways / Pedestrian / CyclingThere are no pathways or bike lanes in Alta. People who want to go for a walk or run, especially in the winter and spring, have to do so on the roads. I often see people walking their dogs, parents pushing strollers, runners and cyclists mixing with the traffic on Ski Hill Road. Combine that with the tendency for skiers to speed through Alta to and from Targhee with sporadic law enforcement and you have a potentially dangerous situation. The road through Alta is wide enough to re-stripe it with narrower travel lanes and provide bike lanes on the side. Reducing the travel lanes to 10' would have a traffic calming effect plus additional traffic calming methods should be considered. There are bike lanes on the Idaho side of Ski Hill Road, but they stop at the State Line Road junction. Even the current shoulders in Alta are rarely swept which means that cyclists who don't want flat tires are riding in the traffic lanes - annual sweeping should be done.That said, there is probably enough right-of-way along the road to place a separated pathway through Alta. That should be pursued as the long term choice but as a temporary measure, simple re-stripping and signage for bike lanes would be easy and inexpensive to implement. Another road that has had increased traffic is Alta North Road. It's a narrow 20' wide road with no shoulders and short sight distances due to the frequent hills. Combine that with the fact that many people drive considerably faster than the posted 35mph and you have another potentially dangerous situation. This is a favorite place for people to walk their dogs, push strollers, run & cycle - school children often ride their bikes on it to the Alta school. It would probably too expensive & impractical to widen the road so a separated pathway along Alta North Road should be pursued. Chip Sealing Policy / Designate Ski Hill Road as a Shared Use RoadSki Hill road from Alta to Grand Targhee currently gets high use by cyclists, runners, walkers and roller skiers during the dry months - that type of use will only increase as the population grows. The county commissioners approved a policy of not chip sealing mixed-use roads, but apparently it needs to be enforced, as since that approval, several roads in Jackson were indeed chip sealed. Protecting the road with a smooth treatment option, not chip seal, will allow these important non-motorized uses to continue on the road from Alta to Grand Targhee. The Ski Hill Road from Alta to Targhee should be designated and signed as a mixed use road.Paved RoadsThere are several gravel roads in Alta with considerable traffic that are currently being graded and treated with dust guard. While the treatment does make the roads better in the summer, they quickly fall apart during the mud seasons and when it rains. The treatment used for dust guard is magnesium chloride - a highly corrosive salt - it's even etched holes into my concrete parking apron as the muck drips from my car. While mechanics may love mag chloride as it causes premature replacement of under carriage parts, car owners don't - the county should consider stopping the use of mag chloride on county roads. A goal of gradually paving as many roads as possible over a period of time would eliminate much use of mag chloride. While a considerable amount of money has been spent on Alta roads over the past 5 years, almost all of that was spent to upgrade the section of State Line Road that Wyoming is responsible for - North of Ski Hill Road. This upgrade has cost about a million dollars and primarily is used by Idaho residents. I don't know who made that decision, but that amount of money could have instead been used to pave most of the Alta roads where Teton County Wyoming taxpayers actually live. Interestingly, Idaho has done almost nothing to upgrade the section they're responsible for.There has been considerable debate about finishing the upgrade of State Line Road all the way to South Leigh canyon. There are about a dozen vocal Teton County Wyoming residents who live up there and have been trying to get that road completed. I think completing that road would be a mistake and not the best appropriation of our tax dollars. It would require condemning property and paying for easements, constructing an expensive bridge, and building about a mile of new road - if it were built, on a benefit per tax payer basis, that could end up being the most expensive road in Teton County. Plus, there are more residents on the Idaho side of South & North Leigh canyons so again this would primarily serve Idaho residents. We need to have Alta road money spent where it's going to serve the most tax-paying Alta residents.There are two roads in Alta that are good candidates for pavement - Alta North Road and Targhee Towne. Alta North Road needs only 3/4 of a mile of pavement and would serve over three dozen homes housing over 50 residents. At least one subdivision at the end of that section would like to pave their subdivision road, but doing so makes little sense until that section of Alta North Road is paved. The road in Targhee Towne is longer but the density is even higher. These are the roads the county should prioritize for spending money on and paving in Alta, not the road that primarily serves Idaho.Teton County Wyoming offers its' residents many good and valuable amenities but for some reason, it seems that it has never prioritized its' roads, or at least not the somewhat rural roads. To me, the road infrastructure is part of basic services that should have a higher priority in the county. I've been told by county engineers that after the initial cost of paving, maintenance costs for pavement are about the same as those of gravel roads since the resurfacing of paved roads only gets done about 5-7 years. If the county were to gradually pave more roads each year, the number of miles of paved roads will increase, but maintenance costs would not - it just takes that initial investment.I've lived and paid taxes in Alta for over 20 years, have had no kids in the school system and rarely get over to Jackson to take advantage of county services where most of them are. I realize that the county has spent money recently in Alta for the new Library and the waste of money spent on upgrading State Line Road. But as the tax base has increased with recent construction of a number of multi-million dollar homes in Alta, I feel that services, namely good roads, should be increased as well. I've received few direct benefits for the tens of thousands of dollars I've paid

Date	Name	Comment
		the county in taxes over the years and few paved roads and pathways would go a long way to make me feel I'm getting some benefits from my tax dollars.
4/24/2009	Eliason, Annette Interested Public	We in Alta pay full Wyoming taxes but feel neglected and cut off from the rest of the state. We would like to have better access-- i.e. continuation of stateline road to 600 north so it is not necessary to make a long detour through Idaho to get to the school, library and ski resort. We would also like better maintenance of roads in the northern part of Alta and protection of sheriff services. Without the continuation of State Line Road, we have been denied these things. Please make this a high priority item. We have been waiting for years.
4/19/2009	Hunt, Lorelle Interested Public	I reside at 700 Lois Lane off Stateline Road on the Wyoming side, just south of where 500 N Road intersects Stateline. I am one of four lots in the Kiln Creek Subdivision.I have concerns about the status of my address - am I in Alta, WY? Silverstar Communications says I am not - that I am in Leigh Canyon. Leigh Canyon is not a real address - there is no zip code for it and even Silverstar in their published telephone book gives the (307) 576 prefix as 83452 zip code - which is actually the zip code for Tetonia, Idaho. It makes it extremely complicated to get deliveries - and companies are always calling to confirm my address because my telephone number tells them I am in Leigh Canyon.My main concern, though, is emergency services finding us and my neighbors on Lois Lane if they think we are up in Leigh Canyon - and we are not! You cannot get from Leigh Canyon or vice versa to Lois Lane directly on Stateline road. Stateline Road does not go through to Leigh Canyon because there is a creek that cuts off the road. Emergency services - if they head for Leigh Canyon thinking that is where we are - will have gone eight to 10 miles out of their way to Leigh Canyon and then will have to double back to Highway 33 going south and then east on 500 N Road to Stateline and then south to Lois Lane to find us.I would like to know how I can get us listed with the County of Teton, Wyoming and consequently with the telephone company as residing in Alta. I've talked with representatives at Silverstar and they said that Teton County, WY determined on a map that we were in the Leigh Canyon area.I don't know if this is the proper forum for addressing this issue. Any response or information would be appreciated.
4/14/2009	Irwin, Chuck Interested Public	I will be unable to attend the meeting in Alta (April 21) on the comprehensive plan update. I hope nothing new has been added to the draft that would restrict the "BC" designation for the 3.5 acres I own at the entrance of Teton Canyon which encompasses the Lost Horizon Restaurant. The District Boundary Amendment for commercial use was approved on 5 January 1984 ("VC" - visitor commercial). The attached letter of 20 July 2005 still reflects our thoughts on this matter. [see email for referenced attachment]

Date	Name	Comment
4/14/2009	Koster, Ken Interested Public	My name is Ken Koster. I reside in a small subdivision in Wyoming accessed from South Leigh Creek Road. Over the years, I have spoken with various County representatives, including Jan Friedlund, Craig Jackson, Don Varney, Bill Paddleford, Jim Darwich along with others, from Teton County Wyoming concerning the completion of the State Line Road project. This project goes back to the agreement between Idaho and Wyoming as to the responsibility of the road improvement and maintenance north and south of Ski Hill Road. At one of the Alta Community meetings circa 1997-98 a commitment was made by the then Teton County representatives at that meeting stating that funds had been committed to improving State Line Road over a five (5) year period. The "plan/commitment" was to improve sections of State Line Road moving from Ski Hill Road northward up to and including the section to cross over South Leigh Creek and to complete State Line Road tying into 600 North. I suspect Dick Steiger would have notes to this effect as he was conducting the Alta Community meeting. In addition, I have contacted Jay Pence of the Forest Service and a meeting was held in his offices with County representatives mentioned above, including myself as a representative of our homeowners association, to reach agreement on South Leigh Road improvement and maintenance. At that time, agreement was verbally made that maintenance would be completed up to the Forest Service Boundary when such time as State Line Road was completed. When maintenance was to be done, such as grading and dust control, on State Line, continuation would be then made on up South Leigh Road to the Forest Service parking lot at the boundary. Now, we find ourselves with newly elected Commissioners /representatives, new County Engineer, and still no completion of State Line Road to which prior commitments had been made. It would appear that these commitments made by predecessors are not valid when a change in governance is made. I find this very discouraging as a tax paying resident of Teton County Wyoming. Why should I/we have to continually "prod" every year to remind our County government to complete their commitment? A deal is a deal in my book. It appears it is not so with the present County Commissioners. Am I wrong? I hope not. The condition of South Leigh Road is deplorable and even to the state that an ambulance or other emergency equipment would have difficulty during certain periods of the year. The mention of sheriff services is a myth. These services are a part of what I would think could be expected in return for our tax dollars Meanwhile, contact has been made with various Teton County Idaho officials to encourage completion to State Line Road as a part of Emergency Services needs including, but not limited to water access from South Leigh Creek for fire suppression, ambulance access to residents and so on. The School District may at some time in the near future, have need to provide school transportation services. At present, a bus routing could require travel from south of South Leigh Creek down to Highway 33, travel north, then back east up to State Line Road and South Leigh Creek Road which with present road conditions could again be difficult. At present, the residents here now have to travel to State Highway 33 to have any access to the Alta community, schools and proposed library. State Line Road must be completed as the increased growth will need this necessary infrastructure for the services already addressed. Thank you for your anticipated cooperation.

DISTRICT 15: COUNTY PERIPHERY

County Periphery Comment (4/13/09 - 10/13/11)

Date	Name	Comment
11/19/2009	Lockhart, Kelly Interested Public	My name's Kelly Lockhart. I'm speaking for myself and my family and properties that we steward in Buffalo Valley and South Park. I was out on Flat Creek the other day fixing a fence and Tommy and Betty Trout were coming back from ??, coming back to Snake, and they ran into Jake. And said, well, Jake, where's Martha? He said, well, Martha was up in ?? this summer. She was in this one hole and she kept trying to eat and she ate this bug and it hooked her right in the mouth and dragged her to shore and these people would come and they'd grab her, they'd stomp in the grass in the riparian area and they'd grab her and they'd throw her back. Sometimes she'd go belly up. They did that about three days in a row and all of a sudden she didn't make it; she died. So, she didn't come back. <<inaudible>>. And Tommy said, well, how did…did you get to lay the eggs? She said, well, we did but then there were all these people that kept stomping across the rocks to find beds where the eggs were and they just…people would come every day and every day and every day and just stomp across the spawning beds, and so I don't know, I don't know if we've been very successful this year. And I thought, boy, that's kind of an interesting story. So I was down at the house the other day on Spring Creek where my house is and Donald and Daffy Duck were coming by the house, swimming, and I heard them talking. Donald said, Daffy, what'll we do this afternoon? And she said, well, I don't know, you know, I was down on South Park feed ground the other day with Susie and Herb, and we were just going along and minding our own business and some people come up and wanted to talk. There were these loud bangs and all of a sudden my two friends were dead, killed dead right there in front of me. So, I don't know if I'm going to go back down there. And so I'm listening to these stories and I thought, well, gee, you know, the County's doing a Plan on chapter one on wildlife and natural resources and what's going on. So, obviously, the County must be doing something with respect to fish and ducks. So, I go to the first page and sure enough, you know, we're going to protect the resources. The community recognizes policies ?? development, transportation, recreation. So, obviously, <<inaudible>> down in South Park. Obviously, we're going to take care of killing wildlife, right? What could be of more direct impact on the wildlife than killing them dead. <<inaudible>> So, I get into the policies and sure enough, you know, I start to read some of these policies that talk about direct impacts on wildlife. I see policy 1.1, we're going to limit human noise, 1.2 we're going to talk about wetlands and riparian areas, 1.5 we're going to limit recreation to public lands, we're going to limit impacts on nearby public lands. I guess that might be Daffy and Susie and the ducks and the trout and so we're going to limit those. And I thought maybe the next sentence would then be that we would not allow humans to kill wildlife. But then it goes on to say we're actually going to build dog parks. I'm having trouble here guys. I really am. We talk about the impacts to wildlife and I think you have recognized that humans have impacts on wildlife. I think they probably do. I'm not sure what greater impact that we have than our intrusion into their habitats and into their life. And if we're killing 'em, which obviously continues killing wildlife, and you want to protect them, maybe you ought to limit ??. If fishing hurts fish, which I've seen some fish get hooked in the gill and I've seen them go belly up and have seen them floating on the river. They're dead. I haven't seen anything in here that limits humans' affect on wildlife and killing them. I can't find one sentence in the stewardship of wildlife and natural resources chapter. If I missed it, please point it out to me. I can't find one. I did see an indicator. I did see an indicator in that our access points to waterways and public lands. I guess that's people, trampling in the riparian areas, fishing, pulling their boats up on the rocks, wandering around in these habitats. We want to make sure there's no net loss. You've got to help me out here. How is no net loss of access points to waterways and public lands helping wildlife? What's it doing in this chapter? What does it have to do with wildlife at all other than putting more people in their habitat, putting more fishermen catching them, fondling them? All the fish don't make it. I'm on the river quite a bit. I see people wandering around. I would argue that perhaps something in fishing do do damage to wildlife and probably would kill them. Now, I'm not saying this is necessarily my point of view that you should prohibit that, but I'm saying in the chapter where you pretend to deal with recreational use and its impacts on wildlife, there's not a sentence about it. You do absolutely nothing. I think I know why. I think I know why. I think it might be that members of the public view themselves as having property rights for the access to the wildlife, to the use of the wildlife, and they view themselves as having some property rights to be able to kill them, to be able to fish for them, to be able to stomp around in their habitat, to be able to mountain bike right through the middle of their habitat, to be able to ride horses through the middle of their habitat, to be able to go climbing where the birds of prey often wander. And I believe that the public doesn't want to give up any rights to help wildlife here. And I believe that you did not put any of that in here because you felt that there might be a public outcry because you might have taken some of their property rights or some of their rights to enjoy their wildlife. And so it's not there. Lisa daCosta's public comment talks about property rights. What I see here is a lot—actually, every bit of it—that speaks to landowners and their rights to their property and how you're going to limit their…maybe the setback of their house. I can tell you my house sits on a stream and Daffy Duck swims up and down the stream every day. I didn't kill her. And yet you spend a whole chapter, two months, three months, four months, five months talking about my house and not talking about anybody who walks over the bank and shoots her. I don't get it. I suspect that's because there's not too many of us who have property rights that can come to these meetings and say, hey, you know, shouldn't we balance property rights and wildlife values, which I think you should do, which I don't think you've done here. I don't think you've done it at all. And, in fact, that one indicator to provide more public access into crucial wildlife habitat is exactly the opposite. Exactly the opposite. Show me a study where more public access to waterways is going to be beneficial to the wildlife. I'll give you my e-mail; please send me the study that says more

Date	Name	Comment
		people there will help. And yet there it is in your indicator in the final draft. Thanks for your time. If I missed something, please let me know.

Date	Name	Comment
9/17/2009	Wolff, Susan Interested Public	Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the Teton County, Wyoming, Comprehensive Plan update. As stated in the Wyoming Local Sage-Grouse Working Group Charter "The purpose of Local Sage-Grouse Working Groups (LWGs) is to develop and facilitate implementation of local conservation plans for the benefit of sage-grouse, their habitats, and whenever feasible, other species that use sagebrush habitats. The plans will identify management practices and the financial and personnel means to accomplish these practices, within an explicit time frame, for the purpose of improving sage-grouse numbers and precluding the need for listing under the Endangered Species Act." Although our working group area is dominated by public lands and our group's plan (http://gf.state.wy.us/wildlife/wildlife_management/sagegrouse/index.asp) reflects that, Greater Sage-Grouse are directly affected by development and human impacts on private lands and public rights of way in Teton County. In addition, the Jackson Hole population constitutes one of the core sage-grouse populations in Wyoming as designated by the Wyoming Governor's Office. Recommendations: Sage-Grouse Species of Special Concern Based on the comments submitted by the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (June 26, 2009: Tim Fuchs, Regional Wildlife Supervisor and Rob Gipson, Regional Fisheries Supervisor) we request that Greater Sage-Grouse be considered as a species of special concern with subsequent consideration related to: the Natural Resources Overlay (NRO); Indicators and Monitoring of Ecosystem Health; Inclusion of Important Habitat Types, Buffer Areas between Nodes and adjacent NRO Designation; Build Out; Maintain Viable Populations; Dispersed Recreation; and Wildlife Vehicle Collisions. We expect that the Planning Departments and, eventually, the Environmental Commission will work with the Local Sage-Grouse Working Group and the Wyoming Game and Fish Department regarding impacts (initial and cumulative) of development on Greater Sage-Grouse. Development in Critical Habitat Specific development impacts of concern include, but are not necessarily limited to issues related to habitat connectivity and direct mortality. Greater Sage-Grouse are sagebrush obligates although recent research in Teton County has found birds using treed areas for winter shelter even as feeding occurs in the open sagebrush (B. Bedrosian, Craighead Beringia South, unpublished data). Winter habitat should be considered as limiting, and critical winter habitat on private land (e.g., East and West Gros Ventre Buttes) thus requires special consideration during development. Although dependent on sagebrush overall, Sage-Grouse have different seasonal habitat needs for breeding, nesting and brood rearing in addition to crucial winter habitat. Transportation Issues Transportation has significant impacts on habitat connectivity and direct mortality and additional development can be expected to have additional, cumulative impacts on Sage-Grouse. The airport and its surroundings are a critical area for the local Sage-Grouse population because they use the area year-round. Transportation issues include direct mortality (e.g., airplane strikes, vehicles driving to and from the airport and through the Park) and, potentially, disruption of other life-cycle phases (e.g., breeding, nesting and brood rearing). A significant number of Sage-Grouse mortalities resulting from vehicle collisions have occurred recently on HWY 191 and the Gros Ventre road and should be included in data regarding wildlife-vehicle collisions. At a minimum, speed reductions should be enacted on Highway 191 to benefit all wildlife. Development of the new pathway between the Town of Jackson and Grand Teton National Park adds an additional bisection of critical habitat (e.g., the National Elk Refuge and the pastures and cottonwood forests between Highway 191 and Spring Gulch Road) and potential negative impacts due to increased human presence on the landscape. Impacts will need to be monitored and mitigated (e.g., through seasonal and potentially other closures as identified in the Environmental Assessment). Conservation of Open Space Conservation of existing open space could be beneficial to Sage-Grouse on several fronts. Restoration of pasture and hayfields to native sagebrush vegetation could increase habitat connectivity and/or availability. Research ongoing in Grand Teton National Park will contribute to the development of best management practices for such restoration (J. Moeney, Grand Teton National Park, unpublished data). Removal of fencing and/or requirements for wildlife friendly fencing that includes consideration for birds could increase connectivity and reduce potential direct mortality from collision with fencing. Prohibition of man-made or altered water features that permit mosquito breeding will reduce potential direct mortality from West Nile Virus. Effects of Fire on Habitat Development can both increase the risk of fire (e.g., many fires are ignited by humans) and alter the patterns of fire (e.g., buildings in the wildland urban interface (WUI) force fire fighting to focus on saving property). Historically fire would have played an important role in maintaining functional sagebrush habitat over large areas. Currently, however, local sagebrush habitat has become fragmented by human use, and fire has removed areas that historically were important grouse winter range. Protecting key sage grouse habitat is now essential for the survival of the local population. Therefore, current fire management plans need to recognize that some high-value sagebrush areas may need to be aggressively protected from fire even if fire may have been beneficial in the past. That said, creation of defensible space could permanently remove sagebrush habitat, and such development actions must be required to be mitigated (e.g., restore meaningful habitat elsewhere). Summary

Date	Name	Comment
		Development in Teton County, Wyoming, can be expected to affect the local Greater Sage-Grouse population particularly in relation to habitat connectivity and direct mortality. However, development planning through specific consideration in both the Comprehensive Plan and subsequent Land Development Regulations can ensure that the negative effects on Sage-Grouse are minimized and the potential to improve and restore habitat is realized. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions now or in the future.
6/28/2009	Adams, Justin Interested Public	The sewer pipe north of Town is a vector for development that people do not want. State School Lands near Mormon Row can access this pipe. And there is a fair amount of private property along hwy 189 that can go for PRSDs with the sewer pipe because they can build near the highway, access the sewer pipe, and not have to build expensive access roads to their property.And the airport? Is this a deal to accomodate the airport, enabled by the Park?
6/25/2009	Adams, Justin Interested Public	Just stay the hell out of here. We do fine without any 'good' ideas from the high command.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that maintaining residential density allowances are important in rural areas to allow for the dedication of conservation easements.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that local convenience commercial near Golf & Tennis within existing entitlements to reduce trips to town is appropriate.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that maintaining residential density allowances are important in rural areas to allow for the dedication of conservation easements.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group recommended looking closer at the buildout range due to the Wild and Scenic rivers designation.
6/17/2009	, STAG	The group agreed that maintaining residential density allowances are important in rural areas to allow for the dedication of conservation easements.
5/15/2009	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	Agree expansion of JHGT is not appropriate.
5/7/2009	Danford, Susan Interested Public	As a north of town resident I am happy with the plan for this area. I would like to see the adition of a pathway to Kelly and arround antilope flats as very many people both local and visiter bike this route and it is hazardous. Human powered travel could reduce car traffic which would be good for people and animals. I would also like the plan to specify no speed route from the airport to the village as there is too much wildlife habitat that would be distroyed. What is not mentioned inthe plan can be interpreted as allowed.
4/23/2009	Spitzer, Austin Interested Public	I am in agreement with the guidelines listed for district 4. This is an important wildlife area that requires high priority protection.The continuation of the bike path from Moose to the southern end of Grand Teton Park or to town would be deserving of consideration.Also worthy of consideration is the establishment of minimal flow standards for the main channel of the Gros Ventre river to prevent diversion from "drying up" the river each summer and thus damaging the fish population.
4/17/2009	, Interested Public	Do not enlarge the airport. Enforce stricter policy of noise abatement close to airport
4/15/2009	Friend, William D. Interested Public	Some of the area identified as MultiUse Visitor Orientation should perhaps instead be classified as MultiUse Local Orientation, since portions of this area consist of single family homes occupied year-round by local residents.

Date	Name	Comment
4/13/2009	Boynton, Beverly Interested Public	looks like no changes for kelly, gros ventre area, which seems both appropriate and lucky for us residents. my only other comment is to question if there is any way to have antelope flats road plowed during the winter. this would reduce the number of miles driven for anyone from kelly, gros ventre road, or science school going to the park and other points north. it would also reduce traffic at gros ventre junction, which is a somewhat dangerous intersection. i suppose that is in the hands of gtnp.

COMMUNITY OPEN HOUSE & WORKSHOP SUMMARY

Community Open House & Workshop Summary

Wednesday, November 7, 2007 – 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
St. John's Episcopal Church, Fellowship Hall, Jackson

Format/Agenda:

- Presentation about "Working Vision" and its role, mapped areas of change and stability, land use capacity and build out information, community character concepts, and balance and trade-offs within the Vision's elements. The presentation also discussed the mapping exercise.
- Table Mapping Exercise. Participants reviewed and worked on two maps focused on: (1) countywide mapping and (2) Town of Jackson.
- Wrap-up
- Individual "Working Vision" and Goals comments - Individual participants commented on posters.

Participation:

Over 120 people attended the meeting.

Staff: Jeff Daugherty, Blair Leist, Amy Kuszak, Alex Norton, Susan Johnson, Maggie Schilling, Mary Shouf, (County), Jeff Noffsinger, Abbie Bilotta, and Shawn Hill (Town), Ben Herman and Lesli Ellis (Clarion), and Bill Collins (Collins Planning).

Meeting Summary:

Objectives:

1. Share ideas about the "Working Vision" and goals,
2. Define "community character" and preferences, and
3. Develop preliminary ideas for land use concepts (countywide and for the Town of Jackson) to assist the team wit preparing a range of land use alternatives.

Comments on the Community "Working Vision" and Themes and Guiding Principles (organized by theme)

Stewardship of Natural, Scenic, and Environmentally Sensitive Areas:

- We are too quick to throw out NRO protection
- No development in existing NRO or sensitive designated lands.
- Wildlife is what make this a special, unique place. Every effort to protect, preserve, enhance wildlife habitat, migration routes, and sustainability is essential.
- Protect wildlife habitat. Please don't compromise effectiveness of conservation easements with density in adjoining areas.

Meet Our Community's Diverse Housing Needs:

- Unless commercial development is limited, employee housing will never be totally satisfied. Limit the number of jobs in Teton County by restrictive zoning and enforcing it and an adequate amount of attainable employment housing can be achieved. Teton county may not need the same percent of worker housing as other counties.
- Community needs to be protected. There are too many second homes and a shift to fractional ownership condos.
- Specify affordable housing qualification beyond income.
- Integrate affordable housing in town neighborhoods.
- Maximize Town of Jackson development and redevelopment possibilities that include workforce ownership and rental housing – no less than 60% mitigation rates.
- How about affordable rentals for our workers?
- Provide affordable housing with space. Do not cram on top of each other. Give kids room to play.
- Concentrate development (housing) in Town of Jackson near transportation, services, and schools.

Comprehensive, Integrated Transportation Strategy:

- Get good baseline date for non-motorized travel so we can measure changes (in addition to monitoring afterwards)
- Round-abouts work well and are great for slowing down traffic.
- Add grocery stores/ services to areas that are lacking to decrease motor traffic to reach services.
- Funding mechanisms for alternate transportation. Link to growth development. (transfer tax?)
- Increase transportation and increase walking areas with closure to traffic so people have to ride the bus.

Manage Growth Responsibly:

- I see no data to support the statement that we "accommodate necessary changes while preserving the defined build out" All developers expect up-zoning.
- Set a cap on building for the county. No up-zones.
- Preserving open lands and natural resources" should be the paramount theme to Teton County's comprehensive plan. If this is truly adhered to, all other community

values will follow. Otherwise, what is unique about this place will be sacrificed to greed and growth.

Jackson as "Heart of the Region":

- Town as "Heart of Region" is going too far when zoning regulations allow excessive building height to squeeze more people in—increase density.
- Restore essential services (grocery store) to downtown / core area (within pedestrian and biking distance).
- Agree—more pedestrian-friendly throughout. Significant problems with cross- walks.
- Yes on concentration of development in town where the services are.
- Add: Pedestrian system, complete streets, reduce free parking to encourage modal shifts.

A Diverse and Balanced Community:

- Outdoor-based recreation and tourism are no longer the economic backbone. Real estate and development are.
- Guiding principles should incorporate "wildlife" values. Nit simply commercial and recreational.
- Last sentence of Guiding Principle is ill-defined catch-all. Delete!
- Remember that a balanced community is made up of people of <u>all</u> ages. Where do seniors fit in?
- Affordable/attainable housing; that allows home owners a small business downstairs and reside upstairs (i.e., Wilson Plan already allows this. New affordable – could incorporate this.)
- We are losing our working class. Need more affordable rental properties.

Mapping Exercise

This section summarizes the work done by the groups at the meeting (for County and Town and for the subareas within them). The more detailed notes from each table are attached separately. The summary below presents the general range of ideas from all the tables.

County Planning Areas – Range of Alternatives to Explore

General Comments:

- Need to show wildlife habitat on maps, especially critical winter range and migration corridors.
- Most groups agreed that South Park is an appropriate place for some neighborhood growth, but it needs to be balanced with conservation.
- Some groups would like to see little to no growth overall.
- A lot of conversation about the need for pedestrian-friendly development.
- Many, but not all, viewed clustered development as a decent option.
- Some suggested eliminating resort zoning as a future option.
- Many discussed whether there should be an end point to expanding roads? Roads affect community character.

The results below reflect the range of ideas discussed for each county planning area:

Alta

- Current zoning: Rural.
- More focus on agriculture conservation (TDRs).
- More focus on clustering
- Small convenience commercial potential (if local residents need).
- Targhee – address separately (small ski area versus 450 units).

Buffalo Valley

- Current zoning: Rural.
- Convenience commercial pontential (if local residents need).
- Clustering, but less excited about it.

Kelly

- Residential on smaller lots on former town site (NPS housing)
- Current zoning: Rural
- Small convenience commercial potential.

Airport/Golf and Tennis

- Potential node for mixed-use core area.
- Convenience commercial potential.
- Current zoning: Suburban Residential and pockets of rural clustered.

Aspens/Teton Pines

- Seen as a good model for other areas – with Village center, bike and pedestrian-friendly , and accessible by transit.
- West side of 390 with Village Center (as is) with east side low density clustered with some agriculture.

Spring Gulch

- Current zoning: Mostly rural
- More aggressive conservation.

South Park

- Conservation (especially around river and in scenic area near road).
- Current zoning: Very low density rural.
- Neighborhood residential, just near town on Herford Ranch – near town.
- Neighborhood residential, spread further to South Park Loop Road with Convenience or local Mixed-Use Village Commercial (no big box).
- Blend of all of above, matching density to surrounding neighborhoods.
- Appropriate location for receiving site for TDRs.

Moose-Wilson Road

- Plan for Teton Village as a node. It could be an appropriate receiving area for TDR and more density (especially from Moose-Wilson Road).
- The Village has reached its peak for allowable density. Strong conservation emphasis (downzoning?).
- Current zoning.

Wilson

- Defer to Wilson plan – not much if any increased density except for some housing.
- A few groups suggested some density increase.
- Fish Creek and wildlife protection important.

Fall Creek Road (South)

- Conservation west of road (wetlands, wildlife, riparian areas around Fish Creek).

- Current zoning: Single family and rural.
- Some groups discussed the golf resort concept, but none advocated for it.

Hog Island

- Area south of Evans could be neighborhood development.
- Current zoning: Rural.

Hoback

- Current zoning: Rural.
- Conservation for wildlife is important.
- Some increased convenience services. Small node/core at the Junction? Doesn't seem to have much potential to expand though.

Town of Jackson – Range of Alternatives to Explore

General:

- Most groups would like to see growth occur in and around the town rather than dispersed. Sequential development instead of leap-frog was a common theme.
- A number of tables discuss the mix of affordable housing in new development mix (ranging from 0% to 60%).
- A number of groups mentioned "Green areas" integrated with density as being important.
- Gateways and appearance important.
- There are natural resources and wildlife habitat areas even in town (e.g., Mule Deer, Cache Creek corridor, hillsides). Make sure alternatives address conservation and open space in town too.
- Enough commercial in town, but need more residential.
- Enough high-end lodging; perhaps a need for family-friendly lodging.
- Western character important to a lot of the participants.
- Add Flat Creek Corridor as a planning area.
- Some concern about four stories. Many tables seemed to be more comfortable with three stories.

Downtown

- Town square – historic overlay
- Range of density options from no increases (2 story) to 3 to 4 stories near Town Square and just beyond.
- Housing is a recurring theme – mix of more housing.

- Pearl is locals district with strong desire to keep some separation between locals and tourists.
- Expand to include Cache

Commercial Corridor

- Current auto-oriented zoning
- Area for increased mixed use and more housing with some more intense nodes for local commercial services. Needs to be more pedestrian-and bike friendly with increased transit. Improve appearance.

Downtown Residential "East Jackson"

- Current zoning.
- Protected primarily single family (with some single-family, townhome, and condominium dwellings.
- More mixed-use and higher density housing between downtown and Snow King.
- Incorporate grocery store, small commercial.
- Auxiliary units.
- No lodging.

Snow King

- Address as separate area with potential for housing.

Build out

Some groups were concerned that the number seem high and that a TDR or stronger focus on conservation approach or down zoning might make sense.

Comment Forms (11 received at the meeting)

1. Comments about the draft "Community Vision"

- Limit growth to 1.5% per year. This will be sustainable.
- I think this process is extremely important and essential to keeping our community as a wonderful place to live.
- I like it, but I have some problems with the last sentence.
- Provide planned growth and development for working class concentrated in South Park area.
- Very concerned about Wilson Mix-use Village. The density in Wilson is fine. Wilson character is great! Don't place restrictions on building styles. That is what makes Wilson unique. We bought into Wilson because of this, not to have planners essentially place CC&R's on our property. Is the mix-use plan a part of the comprehensive plan? If it is, separate it out and work on separately.
- Means think small and inexpensive; means community not grandiose development; means small, with town of western character and wildlife. Do not want a large over developed town.
- I would like to see defined "affordable housing" category. These developments should be clustered, and dispersed around the county and town.
- Fine.
- Continue to up-zone in 1,3, and 4. If it means taller buildings, then so be it. City condos (like across from the Police Station) should continue with businesses downstairs and condo's upstairs.

2. Comments about the draft Themes and Guiding Principles

- Do not simply create an open door for developers, who are transient and profit-oriented by nature. Make a plan that is beneficial for families and permanent residents.
- Very comprehensive and yet requires more detail.
- Ok.
- Affordable housing.
- Add: conservation, western character, wildlife. We don't need to fill everyone's needs—the rich or the transient.
- Sustainability—balance of energy/environmental concerns, and affordability (to create a viable community).
- Pathways through town are important. Parks where possible and then up-zone areas around the Virginian and Snow King.

3. Comments about a definition of "Community Character" (for the County, for the Town)

- Most important driving force for future planning. Keys words: Rural, western (as in cowboy __(word?)), friendly, personal, and low density. Note: Modern, Denver-style, urban architecture is not appropriate.
- We need some strict design guidelines so Jackson/Teton County does not become like Vail or some other non-unique place Limit the number of Avante Garde-style structures.

- It is very hard to define, but I know that the bigger we get, the more we lose. The enemy of preservation is people.
- Western/contemporary mix is welcome!
- Western, small, homely, fun not looming 2-3 story buildings from Aspen or Vail.
- Local, western-themed identity. Preserve sense of history and dedication to wildlife preservation.
- Workforce and volunteer housing
- Why do visitors come here? They want to see open spaces preserved as much as possible because that is too why we came.

4. Comments about locations for growth or conservation

- If we up zone South Park and Sherr-Thoss, we must create a new Town Center to serve the thousands of suburbanites south of town. This means a town square, post office, grocery store, etc. Also, Teton Village must be treated like a new town, and given the approved new construction under SRA. Do not include Wilson for a commercial "node." It will be ruined.
- We need much more conservation from Wilson along Fall Creek Road. Jackson (the town) has more space for growth, especially Northwest Broadway.
- Allow high density rental housing in area 4 (See Attached letter.)
- If you truly believe in (the community vision and the themes and principles), the current build-out projection is unacceptable. I feel that we need to determine the county's "carrying capacity". Pick that number, and then back into everything else. The population of the valley should be determined by tallying the number of residences, plus all the condos, time-shares, and motel rooms to determine the total number of people who can be here on any given day. That's the number of people that will affect community character.
- Growth potential: Teton Meadows, Hog Island, Hoback must incorporate infrastructure; transportation, pathways, and sidewalks. Affordable housing for working class.
- Always need conservation everywhere. For growth: Melody Ranch – its already altered. Put caps on buildings regardless of developer's applications. Just say "no" and don't let them cry "loss of revenue, etc."
- Preserve open land and ranches along Hwy 89/191 south of town. Reject building Teton Meadows Ranch's – much too high density. Instead, change zoning laws in downtown and East Jackson to allow greater density development. East residential Jackson is incredibly strange versus most other communities. Instead of sprawling out south of town, we should build up East Jackson and allow greater density. Teton Meadows Ranch will ruin the beautiful scenic corridor south of town. A much larger highway will be required as well as commercial development to support that development if you let them build it. Do not chip seal any more roads! Do no chip seal Ski Hill Road next spring. Use asphalt! Follow the Complete Streets Plan, and Safe Routes to School. Put multi-use pathways all the way through town.

Other Miscellaneous Comments

- Transportation traffic not showed.
- Wildlife corridors.
- Park - How much does county drive?

- What does "very low density" mean? Definitions of "type"
- NRO- conservation/ no build → 1/35 acre
- Boundaries - can't lump all together (Wilson, Mark "3Sts".)
- Mixed-use leads to huge up up-zones, no expanded commercial.
- Conservation in all.
- South Park – low density – no village center equates less traffic. Traffic concern huge.
- Make sure we include: Pathways all the way through town; complete streets. Safe routes to school.
- No large hotels in down town.
- No buildings taller than current zoning laws permit.
- Keep/ maintain small town, small building unique western character in zones 1 and 2. No strip malls. No commercial/ industrial parks alone Hwy 89/191- keep them behind a more pleasant streetscape.
- Essential to educate new home buyers and other newcomers about the comp plan.

Notes for Group Mapping Work and Discussions

Table 1

County

General Themes:

- Preservation of key wildlife crucial winter range and migration corridors was very important to this group. We had Rich with the Teton Science School at our table who had knowledge about the major wildlife migration corridors (this was mapped with red arrows).
- Preserving Teton County's night sky was also a dominant theme.
- Enforcing strict skylining regulations was also important to this group.
- Conservation of land within the County seemed to be a key theme. Members of this group primarily wanted to see density increases within the Town to deal with population increases and to place needed affordable housing.
- The only area identified as a good place for affordable housing within the County by this group was within the South Park Loop.
- This group did not like the "leap frog" like developments of Rafter J and Melody Ranch. They believed that development should be sequential and should start close to Town and then move out within the County.

Town

- Affordable housing was a key discussion for this group when reviewing the Town map. The Town was identified as a good place to locate affordable housing since it is close to services, transportation, etc.
- This group believed that at least 60% of the housing approved within the Town should be housing that is affordable, but not necessarily affordable housing. They made this distinction because they believe that our current affordable housing excludes segments of the population that cannot get into affordable housing, but also cannot afford market rate homes.
- This group identified areas 1 and 2 as good places for mixed-used development (commercial on the bottom floors and residential on 2nd or 3rd floor). While they liked the idea of mixed-use development in these areas, they wanted to make a point that they did not like the architecture depicted in the example pictures. They felt like those pictures did not fit within Jackson or the western architectural character they would like to see.
- Did not want to see buildings getting over 3 stories. They also wanted to see green areas within densely packed developments.
- This group focused a lot on the "gateway" areas located on Highway 22 as you are entering Town from Wilson and on Highway 89 as you are entering Town from the

National Park. This group believed that the industrial uses at the gateway on Highway 22 should be eliminated over time and replaced with more attractive development. Overall, this group wanted to see development in these areas that would be architecturally sensitive to the "gateway" status.

- Area 4 was identified as another important area for wildlife.
- A fifth area was identified by this group on the map. This area is depicted as just north of the "Y" junction in Town. This group was concerned about the development occurring in this area. Specifically, they were worried about how landowners were obtaining access to these areas (ugly access roads scarring up the side of the butte). They were also worried about skylining within this general area and thought it should not occur.

Table 2

General comments:

- Integrate affordable housing in all areas; do not segregate.

County

Alta

- No commercial seems necessary given Alta's proximity to Driggs, but need input from residents.
- Need to preserve public access
- Need to incorporate Grand Targhee

Development patterns: E and possibly F (Alta core/ church and school), A (outside Alta Core), no pattern - Grand Targhee Resort

Buffalo Valley

- Recommend no additional commercial, but need input from residents.

Development patterns: A (Highway 26 – 287)

Kelly

- Kelly needs a store. Recommend local convenience store (zoning to accommodate) where uses are restricted to neighborhood needs.

Development patterns: A and F but not mixed-use.

Airport

- Needs a general store near Golf and Tennis, again recommending Local Convenience Commercial Zoning, not Mixed-Use.

Development patterns: D (assumed to be Rafter J density, clustered development) Golf and Tennis, A and B (Solitude, East Zenith/Prince Place).

South Park

- Need another connecting road between highway 89 and South Park Loop Road paralleling High School Road; Like Eagle Village for mixed-use character; pedestrian-friendly with pathways and local convenience uses.
- Need small node of Local Convenience Commercial

Development Patterns: F and D (assumed to be Rafter J density, clustered development) for area south of Highway School Road; no specific boundary depth, C for inner portion of south end of South Park Loop Road, A and B for west side and south side (riparian areas) of South Park Loop Road.

Moose-Wilson Road, north of Nethercott

- Need to better integrate Teton Pines and the Aspens as a common neighborhood; promote pedestrian access between two developments.
- Remaining portion: Maintain character of current NC zoning (NC densities)

Development Patterns: E and F for Teton Pines/Aspens.

Wilson

- Maintain Wilson character, no large scale commercial, no mixed-use

Development patterns: E in Wilson Core, A in riparian areas, and B south of Highway 22

Fall Creek

- Maintain and/or increase public access to river.

Development patterns: A

Hoback

Development patterns: F in Hoback Junction

Teton Village

Need Teton Village Area

Town

General

Require underground parking for commercial uses; encourage connectivity between neighborhoods, grid streets, sidewalks.

Town Square

- Maintain reasonably priced lodging for tourists; don't allow redevelopment of lodging in the form of time share condos and townhouses; redevelopment of area should be transitioned to neighborhoods. West boundary should start at Flat Creek Bridge.

- Encourage Mixed use with residential to re-vitalize Town Square and encourage local residents to use Town Square in evenings; more park benches; close Center Street and Deloney Avenue/Town Square to vehicular traffic.

Development patterns: G, C, and B; No to C (north and north west of Town Square). F (Town Square)

South Highway 89

More landscaping; parking to the rear or landscaping to screen parking from Highway; make more friendly by creating two road corridors, one for heavy traffic, separated by trees from a more local road.

Development patterns: E, strip allow south Highway 89

South Highway

Development patterns: D

East Jackson

Integrate affordable housing; need small grocery store, Local Convenience Commercial, not a Commercial Mixed-Use area

Development patterns: A and B

South Jackson/Snow King

Development patterns: A and B

Snow King Resort

Needs its own area.

Table 3

County

Development Pattern Types

A. Conservation use was defined as a meaningful amount of land that either: (the group didn't feel that the three definitions were necessarily exclusive of each other but thought they were different)
   1 Has <1du/35ac
   2 Is completely void of development
   3 Creates connectivity
B. Very Low Density use was defined as 1 or 2 dus/35ac
C. Low Density Clustered was defined as a development with at least 70% land meeting the conservation definition and greater total density than the "very low density" category, but also having clustering with a minimum cluster density that went undefined at anywhere from town size lots to 3 acres

G. Low Density Neighborhood was added to define development of 2-10 acre lots of uniform size.
D. Neighborhood Residential was defined as Rafter J or Wilson Meadows density/feel
E. Village Center was defined as town sized lots
F. Village Center Mixed Use was defined as commercial in the vicinity of Village Center or Neighborhood Residential. Vertical mixing of uses was not embraced, but never explicitly left out of the definition, it seemed like they meant it to be purely commercial surrounded by residential.

General Comments:

The conversation started with a statement that all increases in density in the County should happen in South Park defined as shown on the map. The group generally agreed with or at least didn't speak against this comment. They talked about sewer being appropriate and they talked about the importance of protecting scenic views from the highway and natural resources along the Snake and Flat Creek. That opening statement drove the conversation.

Alta

A and B appropriate excited about some C

Buffalo Valley (Kelly not included)

A and B appropriate less excited about C

South Park

They all thought that A and D were appropriate. About 2/3s felt F was appropriate but only to the north near the existing commercial and should not be big box, should be local service commercial. They all thought a lot of D exists and should be replicated. One thought that G would be appropriate and some thought C and E would be appropriate as well. Toward the end there was a discussion and general consensus that the build out numbers were scary and through a TDR, or buying conservation easements, or down zoning potential units should be moved from most other places in the County into South Park. This was a strong feeling by some with others sort of silent and not arguing, but not everyone was as excited about this idea as a few.

Wilson

In Wilson downtown they felt that D and F were appropriate, and to be honest our definition of F may have been influenced by Wilson voices, but Hoback was also discussed. Some felt that additional density would be appropriate but only for affordable housing. Some felt that no additional density should be added to Wilson. All felt that the town shouldn't be allowed to grow. We never got to the areas surrounding Wilson.

Fall Creek Road

Only A and B were deemed appropriate on Fall Cr. Rd. with no dissent

Hog Island

In Hog Island C and G were wanted to continue with what exists. In Hoback they felt residential should exist as it is platted but that the remaining commercial should be forced to remain commercial to avoid complete conversion to residential.

New Area: Spring Gulch

They talked about creating a new area for spring gulch road and discussing what would be appropriate there, but got side tracked and never came back.

Not Discussed

390 never came up.
North of Town was never addressed

Town

Development Pattern Types:

A. Single-family = 50x150 lot with a detached single family home
B. Residential Infill = 50x150 lot with one or two ARUs plus a single family home
C. Townhomes was not further defined
D. Lower density, larger unit, smaller building apartments/condos
E. Stripmall purely commercial development
F. Retail or Office with residential development in the building as well
G. Lodging was not further defined
H. Mixed Use, but entirely non residential
I. Higher density, smaller units, bigger building apartments/condos
J. Lodging with residential (employee housing but other long term residential was also mentioned after the definitions were done)
K. Light industrial

General:

After we got done with the County a number of the people at the table became disinterested and sort of drifted away or got quiet.

Downtown

Downtown they felt that F, H, I, and J were appropriate. They also felt that D should be an option for flexibility sake but were not enthused about seeing that development type. They didn't want to see any more G unless it was associated with employee housing ie no G all J.

Corridor Commercial

In the corridor commercial area they felt that F and H were appropriate but didn't like the idea of any more E. They seemed to distinguish between E and H vertically and by site design favoring a non-residential complex that did not involve a "sea of asphalt" but looked more like a smaller individual building (this is my interpretation, no one actually put a finger on the difference).

Downtown Residential

In the downtown residential they felt A, B, C, and D were appropriate, although there was some, but strong, dissent against C. They felt that C and D were only appropriate in the transition from the Downtown or around Snow King. They did not feel that any commercial was appropriate, in one case in order to keep the neighborhood quiet.

Town Residential

Town residential was again no commercial with A and B appropriate and some C and D near current density and current commercial. People had enough and wanted to go home at the question of creep.

Table 4

General consensus:

- No growth, but all realize that is not reasonable/possible – growth is necessary. Most would prefer things to stay the same. Some would like more non-single family development in town.
- Everybody would like more pedestrian friendly neighborhoods and valley in general. Safe pedestrian access in town.
- Most people are in favor of affordable housing but a few don't like it at all. Those in favor think it should be distributed equally throughout the County.
- When discussing the County they felt high density should be mainly in town but believe that traffic in town is already unbearable.
- Entire Valley is viewed as a wildlife corridor and important to provide protection.
- More growth will not solve housing problem
- Designated protection areas like the NRO should not be compromised for housing / development.
- If we are not careful, we will loose community to resort.
- Clustered Development is good.
- Green development.
- "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." Most of what we have is good.
- Diversity of people and housing.

County

Airport/Golf and Tennis

Most would like to see Airport/Golf and Tennis as a node/core area and more density. They would like to have some local convenience – grocery store, restaurants, etc. Some thought that if density is increased, then half of it should be affordable.

Alta

Consensus – a little more development – a little more density. No more commercial in Alta. Alta is more connected to ID then Teton County, WY.

Buffalo Valley/Kelly

No commercial

Local commercial – grocery store

South Park

No consensus. Range from total conservation to mixed use village center

Aspens/Teton Pines

Great model for other areas – pathways, live, work, shop in one place -- can bike to Wilson and TV – can catch the bus too. Leave as is.

Greater Wilson Area

Most would like to see a Village Center. Node/core area. More density near downtown. One person would like to see it stay as it is – no density, conservation wildlife protection, Fish Creek protection.

Fall Creek Road

Consensus – not a place to solve housing issues, low density – conservation and very low density. Would like density to stay the same as it is.

Hog Island/Hoback

Area south of Evans could be neighborhood development. Smaller lots ok. Small node/core.

Town

Downtown Commercial/Mixed

- Some thought this area should be expanded a couple blocks to the south and a couple to the east.
- Some thought the area should shrink to the area around Town Square.

- Mixed-use
- Most, not all thought more density. Those that did not want density said so because of traffic and parking issues
- Locals avoid this area. Would like more local convenience in this area.
- Safe pedestrian access.
- Phase out traffic, pedestrian only area.
- Split on multi-story buildings
- Would like pedestrian friendly – eat, live, drink, shop, work in same place
- Those who want more density want more housing options not just SFD – like apts, condos, townhouse, etc. They want to live downtown.

Corridor Commercial

Consensus – don't like this area – its ugly – ugly entrance to town – not pedestrian friendly.

Town Residential

Needs more local convenience

Higher density would be good.

Table 5

General

As there was significant consensus of what the geographical distinctions should be within the group, the following are comments for the geographical areas redefined by the group.

County

I. Teton Village

Although the group felt that the Village was, for the most part, built-out, there was widespread support for the current "F" type development that currently characterizes the area. The group also felt that Teton Village was an appropriate receiving area for the transfer of development rights, particularly if said rights came from Moose-Wilson Road. In the event of a TDR scenario, the group felt that the Village should continue to be developed as a high-density, mixed-use center with the intensity of development dissipating from the village core, providing a scaled transition to the permanent open space surrounding the Village.

Alta

Development in Alta should retain the agricultural character that currently exists but actual agricultural operations are not likely to continue long-term, the group felt. As such, the development scenario "C," along with realistic conservation efforts, was the preferred development pattern in Alta.

Kelly/Buffalo Valley

The group felt that there were key differences between Kelly and Buffalo Valley. Kelly is a former townsite with small, single-family lots within reasonable commuting distance of Jackson (although it was acknowledged that there are some commuters from Moran and Buffalo Valley). Furthermore, the Park Service owns a significant amount of property in Kelly and may seek to develop employee housing there. The group felt that neighborhood residential development exhibited by scenario "D" was appropriate in Kelly, as it represents the existing level of entitlement. Buffalo Valley, the group felt, should keep a low-density character envisioned in scenario "B" while taking advantage of any conservation opportunities.

Airport/Golf & Tennis

The group felt that this area was built out and that the existing character, which was deemed to be scenarios "C" and "D," should be preserved. When asked if this area was a possible receiving area for a transfer of development rights, it was widely felt that more density was not appropriate and thus, no density should be transferred here.

South Park

South Park presented the most variation of preferred development scenarios among the group. Some felt that the "A" and "B" scenarios were appropriate as South Park was deemed to be at its development peak, whereas others who felt that more density was appropriate leaned towards the "E" and "F" scenarios. "D" was excluded because those that felt that more density was appropriate also felt that the maximum amount of open space possible should be preserved. There was also some sentiment expressed that density should be related to its proximity to the Town.

Moose-Wilson Road

The vast majority of the group felt that Moose-Wilson Road (or the "Village Road") had reached its peak for allowable density and that minor, incremental increases could occur in redevelopment scenarios. It was felt that what exists in this area should be preserved. As such, Scenarios "A," "B," "C," "D," and "E" were appropriate to the extent that were existing development patterns.

Town

Downtown

Scenarios "J," and "D" were recommended by the group as they were understood to be the most dense development patterns presented. There was much emphasis on increasing the population in the Town Square area and providing services to support such a population. The group also felt that more housing Downtown was essential to address projected population growth.

Corridor Commercial

The group felt that there was a significant amount of potential in this area for more housing. As such, Scenarios "J" and "D" were recommended. The density represented in these development patterns also, the group felt, were likely to bring about attractive redevelopment of existing commercial areas. Architectural design quality and pedestrian connectivity were stressed as important factors in the future development of this area.

Downtown Residential

The group felt that this area (which was referred to as "East Jackson") is currently a mix of single-family, townhouse, and condominium dwelling units. This mix of uses was generally found to be acceptable because there was adequate greenspace, sunlight, and clear expectation of development potential. The group felt that a "C" level of density may be appropriate but should emulate the character found in "B" and "A."

Town Residential

Due to time constraints, the group was not able to comment on this area.

Table 6

County

General

After a lengthy preliminary discussion regarding the definitions of character types, the table began to talk about designated areas. The following brief summary of the evening's discussion is broken up as such- zone by zone:

Alta

- A strong conscientious to keep Alta a rural place governed this discussion. By having Victor/Driggs the main commercial area, Alta has the ability to remain rural.
- One point brought up was the elementary school and it's luring charm. By keeping Alta a rural community, the school will continue to have such charm.
- There was not much knowledge on the proposed Targhee development and not much concern. One member of the table stated that Targhee should be kept as low density development.

Buffalo Valley and Kelly

- A quick agreement at the table to preserve the rural character of Buffalo Valley and Kelly. All agreed it was important for the wildlife in the area that the area is conserved.
- This should be the last place to develop in the county, one member stated.

Airport/Tennis and Golf Area

- There was a lengthy discussion on this area's definition. Most people felt that the boundary of the area was too large and/or not well defined. Some time was spent defining what the area currently is- residential.
- Getting beyond that, a Town Councilor, ceased all discussion on this area as he stated "it is neighborhood residential and will always be neighborhood residential". End.

South Park

- This area sparked the most controversy at the table and the lengthiest discussion.
- Part of the table thought it best to match development patterns with what is currently surrounding it- neighborhood residential. This would increase traffic only during commuter hours, for all around traffic increase would occur if there were a village, mixed-use center. This would also allow for neighborhood members to join other parts of the town and not just be "stuck" in the South Park area.

- In opposition, the other members thought it best to have a village center, mixed use area (or multiple). This would increase pedestrian and bicycle use, providing for a more community feel. This would also allow for local to have a local center and not have to go shop with tourists. Also, an increase in neighborhoods, as is inevitably going to happen, will necessitate a village center.
- Why not have bus stops down in Rafter J/Melody Ranch? It only makes sense for the neighborhoods to promote and increase bus service. START has tried many times to have bus stops in those respective neighborhoods, but no one rode the bus so service ceased.

Aspens/Teton Pines

This area yielded little to no discussion. Keep as is- a neighborhood residential area with a village center. Also, keep bus stop running and regularly available.

Greater Wilson Area

- Focusing mostly on downtown Wilson (section of town along Highway 22 which includes Prime Properties/Pearl Street, Hungry Jakes west to Stagecoach Bar). Most members of the table wanted no development in Wilson. Strong desire to keep Wilson development free. Want to keep rural, small town, USA.
- No more village centers (discussion split because half the table thought there to be an existing village center while the other half thought there not to be an existing village center).
- An increase in a village center, whether a new one or an additional, would only increase traffic. This would produce more of a traffic problem. Conscientious of the table was no increase in automobiles. No one could think of alternatives to transportation.

Fall Creek Road (South of Wilson)

- Emphasized the importance of keeping this area of the county under conservation for the wetlands, wildlife and Fish Creek. Keep as very low density, as low as possible.

Hog Island and Hoback

- Not much discussion regarding Hog Island except that some members of the table thought it was a "weird place" and should remain isolated.
- Increase in development should occur as is, low density residential along the highway. An increase at the already existing village center should occur. Hard to imagine more village center mixed use, opposed to just village center, as the village center is located right on the highway and the residences are so spread out. Doesn't seem to have pedestrian/bicycle increase possibilities.

Extra Notes on the County:

- Why isn't Teton Village a part of the county plan?
- Most members of the table thought a road from the Airport to Teton Village is most optimal, however all stated it "will never happen" because of who owns homes along

the Snake west of the airport. One member liked the current roadway as it forces visitors to Teton Village to drive through town, perhaps seeing some shops, restaurants that sparked their tourist desires.

- Desire by all members of the table to continue to develop within the Town boundaries and outward from there. ("Why develop Wilson when there are empty lots in town?" a couple of members vocalized. Should be town development first so the surrounding area can stay rural and be a healthy habitat for wildlife.

Town of Jackson

General

With hopes to improve the discussion and create a broader sweep of ideas, we disregarded the photos of character types. These were brining confusion to the table as all members were highly concerned with doing the project "right". We simply looked at the map provided for the town and discussed geographic zone by zone.

Downtown Commercial/Mixed

- Promote mixed use, allowing for more residential. Suggested allowing developers to build more than two stories within the downtown commercial area. Members of the table were tentative to agree with this, but did say downtown should constantly be reviewed and discussed by the planning commission and council. Downtown should never get stale nor should it have all the same shops and restaurants. Variety is the key to keeping downtown a desirable place to go.
- Someone raised the question of making the downtown area like Pearl Ave. This was quickly opposed, reasoning being Pearl is the place locals go and the downtown commercial area is the place tourists go. Seemed to be strong desire amongst members of the table for keeping locals and tourists separated.
- Comments were made regarding the downtown commercial area and it's extension. When the table discussed the "Downtown Commercial" area, they wanted to be certain it meant the block (or two) surrounding the Town Square, not the area within the boundary North/Northwest of Town Square. This area should contain more residential units to shops.

Corridor Commercial

All are in fear of this zone becoming primarily auto zone. There is a strong need for pedestrians, the table agreed. No strip malls, no duplicate businesses (ex: same banks), with huge parking lots that have no landscaping. There is a need for more lofts/apartments in this zone to mix the use. Bike paths should be added throughout this area and public transportation should be enhanced.

Downtown Residential

- This zone is most viable for housing opportunities. A dense residential could be very feasible here. In order to provide for more housing and draw in more housing, more

commercial services and local conveniences should be added, such as a village mixed use center.

- The idea of keeping a "locals only area" was brought up again at the table. Create a place where locals can live, walk, bike, shop which would eliminate the need to go into the Downtown Commercial/Mixed area. (By "shop", members of the table were referring to shopping for groceries).
- Auxiliary units should be used in this area.

Town Residential

- Build only residences in this area- single family, residential infill, town homes. Members of the table commented on the picture of the town home used on the worksheet and how disliked it was. Jokingly, a member of the table reached over to cross-out the picture, displaying how aesthetically displeasing this town home is.
- Bike lanes on the existing roads are very necessary, as are sidewalks. The town should not have five feet be the standard for sidewalks. In addition, the placement of sidewalks should not be so fragmented. One member said that "it is such a waste" to have wide sidewalks that are not connected to another sidewalk.
- Omit lodging units from being built in this area, keeping this area a place for locals.

Table 7

County

Missing Planning Areas

The following were identified as missing Planning Areas:

- Teton Village
- Spring Gulch
- The Wilson area should be expanded north to include all of Fish Creek Road.

Alta

Area for possible Village Center (E) to provide local convenience commercial in future, if Targhee expands.

Buffalo Valley

Desired development patterns were Conservation (A) and Very Low Density (B).

Kelly

Desired development patterns were Conservation (A) and Very Low Density (B) for undeveloped larger parcels, with Low Density Clustered (C) or Neighborhood Residential (D) for areas near existing development.

Airport area

Desired development patterns were Conservation (A) and Very Low Density (B).

South Park

Desired development patterns were Conservation (A) by the Snake River. Suggested a gradient of little to no development along rivers and creeks to the west, with increasing density as you approach the highway (from A by the river to C by highway). Village Center (E) and Village Center/Mixed Use (F), including workforce housing, acceptable for Porter Estate. Neighborhood Residential (D), Village Center (E) and Village Center/Mixed Use (F), including workforce housing, acceptable for Scherr-Thoss/Lower South Park Loop Road. Mix of density and open space desired. Have to keep summer pasture to keep agriculture in the valley.

Teton Village Road

Desired development patterns were Conservation (A) and Very Low Density (B). Preference is for it to be a three-lane road.

Wilson

Comment: "it's cool." Desired development patterns were Conservation (A), Very Low Density (B), and Low Density Clustered (C). Local commercial was acceptable in core of Wilson. Height limit in core desired. Desire expressed to continue planning efforts for Wilson separate from Comp Plan process.

Fall Creek Road

Desired development patterns were Conservation (A) and Very Low Density (B). No Resort designation for remaining ranch lands (such as for a golf course).

Hoback

Desired development patterns were Conservation (A) and Very Low Density (B), with a strong emphasis on (A) along the Hoback River due to wildlife concerns. Identified Hoback Junction itself as location for Village Center/Mixed Use (F).

General county comments:

- include a time limit on applications (too much negotiation, takes too long)
- consider eliminating resort zoning as a future option
- traffic is part of community character
- how much further are we going to expand our roads? What is the end point? Consider capping road growth.

Town

Missing Character Types

The following were identified as missing Character Types:

- Conservation. There are natural resources worth protecting even in town.

- Not all residential options for higher density have been included in the choices; (D) and (I) were too modern and tall; possible to build Lofts/Apartments in different styles that would be more appealing

Missing Planning Areas

The following were identified as missing Planning Areas:

- Need to add the Flat Creek Corridor as a Planning Area

Town Square

Commercial/Mixed Use (F) acceptable but not if three to four stories; (I) and (J) were not acceptable character types for this area. Residential Infill (B), including Lofts/Apartments acceptable for east edge but not if look like (D) or (I); no three to four story buildings. Overall objection to heights greater than 32'-35'.

Corridor Commercial

Need to identify and protect mule deer migration corridor across here; consider overpass. Desired development patterns were Conservation and Single Family (A) along Flat Creek. Higher density affordable housing should go where it was originally proposed bordering Karns Meadow, so people in denser situation can take advantage of proximity to open space of park.

East Jackson

Desired development patterns were Single Family (A) and Residential Infill (B).

Residential South East

Conservation desired along Cache Creek corridor.

Hillside Residential

Desired development patterns was Single Family (A). Need to include conservation of wildlife corridor through this area up to US Forest Service lands to the south.

General Town Comments:

- We have enough commercial. Need more residential. No one has trouble finding a job, but no one can find a place to live.
- We need to ask, do we have enough lodging? Some say yes; we don't need any more. Some say no, we need more family-friendly lodging, but agree we have enough high-end.
- Do not build any more high-end townhomes (C) anywhere in town. We need to look at the income data of our workforce and build for it.

Definition/elements of western character:

- Covered sidewalks.
- Building height of two stories max.

- Less glass. All glass buildings are not characteristic of the Old West.
- Use colors and materials (wood) of Old West.

Need to include conservation of Flat Creek corridor from the Elk Refuge, through town, to the US Forest Service lands on Snow King.

Table 8

General Comments

- South Park is primary area for increased development.
- Downtown Commercial/Mixed-Use Core should be expanded to include Cache – Snow King to Willow.
- Cottonwood area (far west town boundary) should be included in #3 Town Residential Zone.
- Community Character should define our capacity. Capacity should not be determined by maximum physical infrastructure potential.
- Need for affordable rental housing.

Table 9

County

Adjust Planning Areas

- Separate Kelly from Buffalo Valley
- Make Red Top area part of Area 7 instead of part of Area 8

Other County Features

a) Significant Corridors:

- Wildlife Corridors: Spring Gulch Rd (from Golf Course to Gros Ventre River), South Hwy 89 (Rafter J to Horse Creek), Hwy 22 (east and west of Snake River), Fall Creek Road (Wilson south to USFS boundary), entirety of Hwy 390, along Snake River from Wilson Bridge to South Park Feed Grounds, and all existing NRO areas
- Scenic Corridors: East and West Gros Ventre Buttes and all existing identified SRO areas
- Transportation Corridors: Build a second bridge across Snake at Hwy 22 that would serve vehicles (existing bridge should remain to serve bikes and peds and to serve as an emergency access when accidents happen on vehicular bridge)

b) Important Neighborhoods:

- Teton Village should be identified as a neighborhood because of the transportation implications with no redundancy for access
- Hwy 390 "Established Neighborhoods" should be protected from upzoning

- South Park need further consideration for meeting housing needs—should be mix of protection of open space, views, wildlife corridors, and a mix of housing types and densities, including a small local convenience commercial node

c) Important Conservation Areas:

- Existing NRO, SRO, and any new areas identified as critical to wildlife should be conserved

Preferred Character Types and Growth Patterns:

Alta

Low Density Clustered (State Line Road Area) & Neighborhood Residential with the opportunity for some minimal Local Convenience Commercial (Ski Hill Road Area)

Buffalo Valley and Kelly

Conservation and Very Low Density

Airport/Tennis and Golf Area

Low Density Clustered

South Park

Mix of Low Density Residential, Neighborhood Residential, Village Center, and Mixed Use (mixed use should only include limited local convenience commercial should high-density development occur)

Aspens/Teton Pines

West Side Hwy 390 should continue to provide Village Center/Mixed Use, but East side of Hwy 390 should be Low Density Clustered with some Agriculture and existing Neighborhood Residential should be preserved

Wilson

Village Center/Mixed Use

Fall Creek

Very Low Density

Hog Island

Low Density Clustered & Hoback: Neighborhood Residential

Town (ran out of time)

Downtown Commercial/Mixed

Commercial Mixed Use & Lodging

Comments: Square should have a 2-story limit with mixed residential and commercial; off square should be 3-stories mixed use; lodging OK, but fractional timeshare ownership not OK; North entry into town (great redevelopment opportunity to do it right) should be commercial/mixed use with 2-story along Hwy and 3 stories behind (buffered by butte)

Corridor Commercial

Development types: E, F, G

Downtown Residential:

Single family and townhomes with more affordable rental units (we are losing a lot of those to redevelopment), but protect Gill Addition as a single family neighborhood

Town Residential

Single Family and Townhomes

Comments: Tourists should be concentrated near Town Square and Snow King (although locals use ski hill and ice rink). Protect open space in town (Karns Meadow)

Table 10

County

Alta

- Need to define and maintain character
- Preserve small ski area character…not 450 units

Character Types
A. Conservation
B. Very Low Density
C. Low Density Clustered

Buffalo Valley and Kelly

- BV and Kelly should be considered separately
- Annex by national park

Character Types:
A. Conservation
B. Very Low Density
C. Low Density Clustered (for Kelly only)

Airport, Tennis and Golf Area

Character Types:
A. Conservation
C. Low Density Clustered
D. Neighborhood Residential

South Park

- North end of Porter Estate has important role for scenic character
- Should be focus area for conservation
- Teton Meadows Ranch is a great area for a neighborhood
- No! TMR is not a great area for a neighborhood
- -Add density in town
- Teton Meadows Ranch should be more than 50 less than 500; in favor of lower cap
- Need to be other areas beside town for high density housing

Character Types:
A. Conservation
C. Low Density Clustered
D. Neighborhood Residential

Aspens/Teton Pines

- Don't add more density
- No more commercial around Aspens
- Great corridor to get people using transit

Character Types:
A. Conservation
B. Very Low Density
E. Village Center

Greater Wilson Area

- -Connect pathway…maintain character
- -Maintain conservation; river corridor and west side of town
- -Protect winter range
- -Density should be in Jackson

Character Types:
A. Conservation
C. Low Density Clustered
E. Village Center
F. Village Center/Mixed Use

Fall Creek Road

- Protect wildlife areas
- No more chipseal

Character Types:
A. Conservation
B. Very Low Density
C. Low Density Clustered

Hog Island and Hoback

- Don't change Astoria and Snake River Sporting Club to dense housing

- Put in pathway from Hoback to Jackson
- Protect Snake River Corridor in all zones
- More housing at Junction area, but no upzone
- Wildlife concerns

Character Types:
A. Conservation
F. Village Center/Mixed Use

Town

Downtown Commercial/Mixed

- Pathways/Pedestrian safety and connections
- Complete streets and safe routes to school
- Concern about Pearl and Broadway intersection
- Keep good looking and funky

Character Types:
A. Single Family
F. Commercial Mixed Use
G. Lodging
H. Commercial Mixed Use

Corridor Commercial

- Keep local businesses
- -No box stores/sprawl

Character Types:
E. Corridor Commercial
F. Commercial/Mixed Use
G. Lodging
H. Commercial/Mixed Use

Downtown Residential

- Single Family/Residential Infill
- Pedestrian Friendly
- Keep funky
- More affordable housing and density

Character Types:
A. Single Family
B. Residential Infill
C. Townhomes
F. Commercial/Mixed Use

Town Residential

- Conserve open space (Karns, Flat Creek, etc.)

- Don't remove southeast Jackson from zone 3…currently in 4.

Character Types

A. Single Family
B. Residential Infill
D. Lofts/Apartments
F. Commercial/Mixed Use
I. Lofts/Apartments

JOINT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING SUMMARY

Joint Planning Commission Meeting – Summary

Thursday, November 8, 2007 County Commission Chambers Time: 6:00 – 8:00 PM

Attendance

Four town planning commissioners attended. No county planning commissioners were present.

Agenda

1. Reports from Public Event and STAG Meeting
2. Present Working Vision, land use capacity and build out, and balance and tradeoffs
3. Vision and Goals Discussion
4. Map Exercise to define preliminary Land Use Concepts – Countywide and for Town
5. Wrap-up

Discussion

Summary of Vision and Goals and General Discussion

- Prioritized goals will be necessary and provide predictability in development approval process. Within the vision, which aims are first, second, etc.?
- Transportation is a big nightmare; tourism swells traffic. Traffic growth is local.
- Provide mixed-use within town (e.g., neighborhood grocery).
- "Wildlife" needs to be added to the vision and goals, as well as "stewardship."
- Targeting specific areas for housing and funding important (which leads to more civic and community involvement). Rental housing an important niche to address.
- "pattern" of development is important to mention (balancing needs with patterns).
- #5 – Transportation – Pedestrian network and transit system needs to be expanded.
- #6 Diverse and Balanced - is not true (See Schechter's articles for good explanation of that and good tools.)
- Tourism is important but not the "backbone" any longer.
- Check *Atlantic Monthly* article on "a Tale of Two Condos" (Malibu versus Dallas). for a good explanation of how zoning makes prices exorbitant.

Existing Conditions Report / Buildout Discussion

- P. 21. Combined total – Assumption about most new mixed-use development is non-residential in town. (This assumption could be changed, but that is how this first set of buildout calculations has been addressed.)
- Need to include policy language to not allow surprise changes and provide predictability. The perception is that approvals are inconsistent.
- An audience member suggested that buildout should be presented as a range and the numbers may be low.
- Consider a "point" system for essential workers for housing.
- See Aspen Background Study regarding mixed-use and costs.

- The Town appears to be over-zoned for commercial. But, if you restrict commercial space then rents go even higher. They are already very high.
- Should we look at a ratio of commercial and residential? (What has been the historical split? – Reconsider that).
- Targhee should not get too big – no greater than 450 units.

Summary of Mapping Exercise

Town Preferred Development Character

Downtown Core

- Define fairly tight Town Square "Historic District" (see map); for this area. The purpose would be to replicate early architecture in terms of pattern and form, using the old photographic record. It isn't really a "historic" district as much as a character district, because very few historic structures remain.
- It would support residential above commercial.
- Steer development toward traditional Jackson character. (Group had some discussion that it is eclectic)
- Area 1 could support higher density (4 story buildings).

Corridor Commercial

- Area out towards "Y" intersection should be targeted as a new "town center" for locals. This is a good spot for increased density and more housing….
- Look at the possibility of high-density housing on the mesa area, across from/to west of "Y" intersection, but consider wildlife habitat needs there too.

Downtown Residential

- Extend Downtown Core to the south to include Snow King commercial area. New large hotels are pushing the "commercial" boundary should. There is underutilized residential there. This good area for more mixed-use and some lodging.
- Look at role of Kelly Street and Snow King. These are arterials that locals use for commuting.
- Focus denser housing to the south of Simpson. This area could accommodate higher density residential, so that adjoining downtown residential areas can retain their integrity and character.
- Consider a non-residential "small node" concept

Town Residential

No comments.

County Preferred Development Character

General Comments:

Show winter range habitat and wildlife corridors on the maps.

Affordable housing does not all need to be single family. Consider some rentals, some mixed-use, and multi-family. Locations: The Village also, and town.

1. Alta

No comments

2. Buffalo Valley and Kelly

Comment by one planning commissioner: area up north should be designated as its own resort zone.

3. Airport/Golf and Tennis

No comments – mostly rural pattern to remain

4. South Park

- More density/mixed use here.
- Hereford Ranch (adjacent to town) should develop before Meadows because it is adjacent to town.
- The Meadows project is too big and away from town and should not develop until Hereford develops.
- May be some options for nodes of mixed-use on east edge and in limited nodes.

5. Aspens/Teton Pines

- Nodes of Mixed-use.
- Density node around Calico.

6. Greater Wilson Area

- Mixed-use with more residential density

7. Fall Creek Road

No comments

8. Hog Island and Hoback

No comments

STAKEHOLDERS ADVISORY GROUP MEETING #2 SUMMARY

Stakeholders Advisory Group Meeting #2 - Summary

Thursday, November 8, 2007 4H Building, Miller Park Time: 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Present Working Vision, land use capacity and build out, and balance and tradeoffs
3. Workshop to define preliminary Land Use Concepts – Countywide and for Town
4. Working Vision and Draft Goals
5. Wrap-up

Attendance

CAC: Deb Sprague, Franz Camenzind, Darrel Hoffman, Rob Cheek, Kelly Lockhart, Bland Hoke, Anne Hayden, Scott Pierson, Sean O'Malley, Kniffy Hamilton, Lorin Wilson.
Staff: Blair Leist and Jeff Daugherty (County), Jeff Noffsinger (Town), Ben Herman and Lesli Ellis (Clarion), and Bill Collins (Collins Planning).
City Council/BOCC: Bob Lenz, Leland Christensen
Guests (signed in): Stacy Stoker, Janine Teske, Brian Grubb

Meeting Summary

General Discussion

Buildout Calculations: It seems low in the county according to one committee member. Teton Meadows – How was it counted?

Vision and Goals Discussion

STAG did not spend time discussing Vision and Goals. They will be reviewing the draft and sending comments to the planning team.

Mapping Exercise

The committee divided into three groups to complete the mapping exercise addressing preferred development patterns for the county and development character for different parts of town. The results are summarized on the following pages for each group.

Group 1 (Jeff Daugherty and Blair Leist, facilitators)

Teton County – Planning Areas

1. *Alta*

- Continuation of agriculture-conservation easements; need focus for Alta.
- Real Estate Transfer Tax (RETT) for acquisition of development rights.

2. *Buffalo Valley and Kelly*

- These areas fit RETT also.
- Use a TDR for agricultural rights—needs to be banked—good tool but not sure how to make it really work.
- Clustering—need large contiguous areas.
- Conservation easements need to be publicly funded.
- RETT for open space, not for housing; applies to Buffalo Valley and Gros Ventre also. Market will help there.
- No development types selected.

3. *Airport/Tennis*

- Only redevelop in existing character – single family; preserve neighborhoods
- No development types selected.

4. *South Park*

- Certain portion should be annexed.
- Transitional levels of density from most to least moving away from Town.
- North area of South Park contiguous to current development.
- Development types: A

5. *Aspens/Teton Pines*

- Hate affordable housing because traffic can't handle it; change to 5 lanes on Village Road.
- Keep existing character, easements, big lot subdivisions – 35 acres and bigger.
- Existing 35s – Allow 3 units maximum; "by right incentive to donate" will result in greater number of conservation easements.
- 3 units per 35 acres will give more than PRD easements.
- In rural zone, promote outright use of 3 units per 35 acres.
- Develop agriculture overlay.
- Don't need clustering for wildlife.
- Incentivize open space through the 3 units per 35 acres program.
- Everything is regulatory; no incentives.
- Need less subjective resort zoning.
- All open space requirements must be in county.
- Development Types: A,B

6. *Greater Wilson*

- No additional density—put all density in Town.
- If put in Wilson, it will result in transportation problems and school problems.

7. *Fall Creek*

No comments

8. *Hog Island*

- Leave grandfathered commercial and existing pattern of residential character in redevelopment; incentivize for non-conforming to "go away."
- No development types apply.

Town of Jackson – Character Areas

Downtown Commercial/Mixed

- Town needs to accept more growth; more residential and commercial; best area to accept additional growth.
- Emphasis on residential, not commercial.
- "Aspen model is broken."
- Hate commercial/mixed-use; kill FAR in District 1.
- To drive projects, need to provide parking; good for all character types.
- 46' height in Town will work.
- Want to see town square stay at 35'; square should get rid of 22' alley setback; eliminate FAR of 2 on square.
- No sense to park on square; parking needs to be "fee in lieu" or underground.
- Development Types: B, D, G, and H.

Town Residential

- Snow King needs to be its own zoning district; year round residents; concentrated residential with commercial on fringes.
- No development types selected.

Group 2 (Lesli Ellis, facilitator)

Teton County – Planning Areas

1. *Alta*

- Maybe a village center (not all in agreement about this), but Driggs is close with small commercial.
- Ski resort has a different character (more like "E").
- Development types: A, B, and C

2. *Buffalo Valley and Kelly*

- Divide into two planning areas: 2A – Buffalo Valley and 2B – Kelly
- 2A. Buffalo Valley:
  - The area is important to tourists traveling through. It has some low density rural cluster development but that isn't preferred (also KOA, Hatchet is there).
  - What's there now may suffice for services. Not enough demand for more.
  - Development types: A and B.
- 2B. Kelly:
  - It is ranch land, highlands, active store and gas station. Some commercial services might be appropriate, but the concept of a village center (choice E) is too much intensity for the area.
  - Continue to reflect its "Northern Exposure" character.
  - Keep the center, but conserve land around it.
  - Will growth in Golf and Tennis affect this area because kids go to school in Kelly? If bridge fills in then growth might occur in Kelly.
  - Development types: Should be based on existing development patterns and platting.

3. *Airport / Tennis and Golf Area*

- A lot of the area is platted with larger acreages. The resort is pretty high density with some services.
- Important wildlife habitat is in this area, so it shouldn't be higher density subdivision.
- No more commercial.
- Development types: A, B, and C

4. *South Park*

- Between Flat Creek and highway conserve agriculture and open space.
- South Park is important wildlife area. Some agriculture should be conserved.
- Type D – Housing that is a mix of free market and employee and workforce could also be a part of this area.
- Development types: some A, some D (Flat Creek to S. Park Loop)

5. *Aspens/Teton Pines*

- A lot is platted (denser on one side) Ranch housing is closer to river. A lot of conservation potential on east side of road near river (John Dodge).
- No bridge.
- Development types: A

6. *Greater Wilson Area*

- Concern about expansion of Wilson's footprint. Downtown versus outside are different characters.
- Development types: B to the north, E downtown (without intensifying).

7. *Fall Creek Road (S. of Wilson)*

- This area borders National Forest. Wildlife is important.
- Large acreages okay (Fall Creek road area is important for conservation).
- Development types: A

8. *Hog Island and Hoback*

- Hog Island and Hoback need to be addressed separately (Other areas: Hog Island, Canyon Club, And Gail Porter Elk Creek)
- Development types: E and F for Village Junction.
- Development types: A, B, and C outside the Junction.

Low Density Clustered Type

Could include some smaller lots, "workforce" housing. (S. Park) integrated.

Other topics and Question of Buildout

Areas 8 and 3 stick out as remote outlying areas. What is the expectation for services (e.g., safety)? People are saying they do not want much more growth, but the community has a housing need, so any growth should focus on that need. With current zoning, we are falling behind in housing. This has ramifications on ability to provide services (i.e., essential workers – see Schechter articles).

- Mixed use density. South Park, Hoback?
- Can't talk about density without the town's participation.
- County "Futures Map" from 1994 Plan was a good starting point.
- How much growth? Is it based on what is projected?

Wildlife

The group was concerned about higher rates of wildlife road kill. Are we making sure we don't encroach in wildlife habitat too much and increase safety concerns on highways? Highway 22 is a concern and a hot spot for wildlife conflicts.

Housing

The group debated whether concentrating affordable housing in certain locations creates neighborhoods of "haves and have nots," but was also concerned that dispersed housing creates traffic problems. They would like to see "integrated" affordable housing that is part of the community—not dispersed. Different types of housing are necessary. They noted that a lot of employees would like to be part of town. They also recognize that housing in town might not always be single family and might be on smaller lots or could be apartments. But balance preservation of single family within Town of Jackson.

Town of Jackson – Character Areas

General Map

- Add four gateways. These should address the adjacent properties that develop.
    - Provide a transition in height, with lower heights at the north entrance of town (i.e., from one story to intensification of density). The group didn't want to see an abrupt town entrance of 3 or 4 stories. Provide transitions from the refuge sign to the next intersection, as a "gateway zone". It is also part of the scenic byway.
    - For the southern gateway, use the same strategy of transitions. Encourage a design that reflects the western heritage and western culture. Avoid generic architecture.
    - For the 3rd and 4th gateways. Limit commercial encroachment.
- Add hospital/civic commercial services district in "East Jackson."
- Snow King area – call the roads "pedestrian-roadways," where it is understood people will be on the roads.
- Workforce housing is a huge concern for the town. Integrate social services.
- The Chamber's perspective is the region needs housing where there's density (i.e., in town or immediately adjacent). The plan should say something about mitigation in town or just outside. Build affordable housing in town first, then county.
- Don't want to be a resort only.
- Affordable rental housing is also important for filling professional services jobs.

1. Downtown Commercial/Mixed-Use

- Add workforce housing

2. Corridor Commercial

- Workforce housing could be a focus in Area 2.

3. Downtown Residential

- Employee housing shouldn't be on slopes – put on flatter areas. It affects viewsheds.
- Critical winter range is on slopes even in town. Plan for it.
- Development types: A, B

4. Town Residential

- Development types: A, B

Group 3 (Bill Collins and Ben Herman, facilitators)

Teton County – Planning Areas

1. *Alta*

- Recognize that this is a stand alone area.
- Needs small commercial node (if viable) but may be too close to Driggs.
- Preferred patterns are conservation, B and C.

2. *Buffalo Valley and Kelly*

- Options include conservation, but include some areas of community services and possibly more employee housing in Moran (NPS employees).
- Kelly seen as mostly built out.
- Primary use is A.

3. *Airport/Golf and Tennis*

- Mostly status quo-type development.
- Some possibility for clustered
- Density increase may trigger need for highway widening.

4. *South Park*

- Look at options for all.
- Seen as key area that determines how much growth occurs in town vs. county.
- Could look at F as a part of a scenario that is density-neutral for the region.

5. *Aspens/Teton Pines*

- Possibilities for more infill development in limited nodes (Aspens), but will be difficult to achieve with existing residents.
- Density increase may trigger need for highway widening.

6. *Greater Wilson Area*

- Issue discussed was more about amount of new development, rather than pattern or type.
- Several options – status quo, status quo/limited, or enhanced area with E and F.

7. *Fall Creek Road (S. of Wilson)*

No comments, don't see much change

8. *Hog Island and Hoback*

- Limited opportunities for any development due to road, infrastructure limitations

Town of Jackson – Character Areas

Downtown Core

- Should have a small core area that is lower-intensity "Old Jackson", more traditional character
- Outside of core area, more urban character is okay.
- Particular interest in tying density to preservation of areas elsewhere in the county (i.e., buy it and bring it into town).

Corridor Commercial

- Area out towards "Y" intersection should be targeted as a new "town center" for locals:
    - More office uses, redevelopment of suburban-scale development.
    - Transition plan for underutilized sites.
    - Need to define street grid to get away from parking lot patterns, so that over time the area can develop its own circulation network, reducing density on the highway.
    - Need to transition from superblocks to gridded pattern.

Downtown Residential

- Need to draw some hard lines in some locations to avoid "bleedover" from core area.
- Look at possibility of labeling Redmond as a local's "Main Street".
- Cache corridor as connector from south side neighborhoods to core area.
- Need to look at Snow King commercial area (existing UC2 zoning) as potential town center for south side area.

Town Residential

No comments.

Wrap Up

The planning team will notify the community when the next meeting date is set. It is likely to be the last week of January 2008.