

**COMPOSITE LIST OF INCONSISTENCIES IN THE 2010 JACKSON/TETON  
COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN THAT HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED BY  
INDIVIDUAL PLANNING COMMISSIONERS BUT DEEMED  
IRRECONCILABLE**

**Jackson/Teton County Community Vision**

**Barbara Allen**

I cannot recall whether in our second review of this we agreed to the rewrites that are throughout. I thought this was one of the only chapters where we did actually vote on exact wording. I am concerned with the insertion of the word “sustainability” which is then tied to the concept in other communities. We voted to redefine the phrase, and I thought, remove much of it because we were concerned by the implications or the standard definition in other areas.

**Theme 1 – Practice Stewardship of Wildlife, Natural Resources, and Scenic Vistas**

**Theme 2 – Manage Growth Responsibly**

**Paul Dunker**

I see two overarching contradictions between the policies outlined throughout the Revised Comprehensive Plan and the directives the Joint Planning Commission have issued. The first is the elimination of ARU’s in the unincorporated county. Apparently, much of the public agrees with me on this. I feel that the abundance of public comment opposed to this directive will insure that it gets brought up for discussion and resolution by revote.

The second major contradiction is the elimination of the concept of Nodal development. As outlined in my previous written comment, a nodal development pattern is exactly what we have on the ground in Teton County today, and it is aligned with many of the other significant goals of this plan such as increased mass transit opportunities, compact development footprints and the preservation of open space. Failing to acknowledge this is hypocrisy. Failing to correct it would be unconscionable.

I have organized my reconciliation list to address the second inconsistency (Node elimination) rather than by Theme.

Nodal Development Elimination Contradictions:

- Policy 1.2.d: Improve air quality “Strategies to improve air quality will include reducing vehicle miles traveled.” A nodal development pattern would help reduce vehicle miles traveled.
- Policy 1.3.b: Maintain expansive hillside and foreground vistas: “Development in such areas will retain these vistas by being located at the periphery of the expanse and naturally screened.” The opposite of a nodal

development pattern is a sprawling development pattern which would cover the valley floor in a uniformly spaced sea of houses.

- Rec # 172: “Maintenance of the existing residential and/or nonresidential pattern allowed today is the desired land use pattern in the areas formerly known as nodes.” The existing land use pattern in Teton County is nodal. A land use pattern which focuses development to a single area (town) is not “maintenance of the existing residential and/or nonresidential pattern allowed today.” Recommendations #147 and #172 conflict.
- Theme 2, 3rd paragraph text (p26): “35-acre ranchettes are valuable and easy to create but are inconsistent with the community’s goal to preserve large open spaces for their ecological and scenic value. To achieve the community’s ideal of preserving undeveloped lands as perpetual open space, land owners need to be able to achieve value from a development that also preserves large amounts of open space and clusters development out of ecologically sensitive and scenic areas, near existing development.” These sentences explain why nodal development should be preserved rather than eliminated.
- Policy 6.2.a: Develop a land use pattern based on transportation connectivity; That’s a nodal development pattern.
- Theme 8, 3rd paragraph text (p92): referencing the avoidance of sprawling development patterns directly contradicts the elimination of Nodal development pattern. Same is true for Principle 8.2, Policy 8.2b, 8.2c, 8.3b,

Remove language stating that the only Node will be Town, and language that Wilson, The Aspens, Teton Village and northern South Park will be eliminated from the Plan as nodes appropriate for increased development (172 and 147.) Allow PRD development transfers into specific Targeted Growth Areas within these Nodes, as designated by the FLUP, in association with permanent conservation. Once these Targeted Growth Areas have been filled to capacity with transfers related to permanent conservation, all PRD density bonuses will have to occur on site or in other rural areas of the county.

Policy 2.3.b: Fit the contextual scale and design of existing development in town: “development in Town must be consistent with existing contextual scale and design.” This contradicts “Theme 3 – Uphold Jackson as “Heart of the Region” – defines the characteristics of areas in Town appropriate for preservation and areas targeted for growth.” Targeted growth areas will not match the existing contextual scale and design. Omit the sentence.

## **Ben Read**

At this point, as the comp plan advances to elected officials of town and county, I have two overriding hopes or concerns.

One of these is that in rural areas that are of importance to the community in terms of open space, ranching and wildlife values, we move as far away from traditional Euclidian zoning practices as possible, by reverting to base line development

potentials and mobilizing, on the other hand, incentives (like the non-contiguous PRD) to shift development into areas that can better absorb growth.

Under the heading of discussion points:

- Are we offering property owners in rural locations as much flexibility as possible in our efforts to minimize the impacts of new development on open space and wildlife?
- Do accessory residential units have a constructive role to play in terms of meeting the community's diverse objectives?
- Separate from the decision to designate town as a focal point for nodal development, should relatively small and discreet amounts of additional development potential be allowed in areas like Wilson and the Aspens area that have local convenience services (when such development is density neutral)?

Other questions depend largely on how our concluding conversations develop.

### **Tony Wall**

- 1) Places where the desire for “predictability” is affirmed:
  - a. pg. 25 “Development that is not predictably managed to enhance community character will degrade it”
  - b. pg. 26 “The community now desires predictability”
  - c. 2.3 (pg. 32) “Conservation and development will occur in a predictable pattern and with a predictable character”
  - d. 2.3.e (pg. 34) “Limit discretion in land use decisions” and “discretionary regulations and incentives do not provide predictability”

Places where the concept of “predictability” is contradicted (ANY reference to UNQUANTIFIED “bonuses”, “incentives”, or “conditional” developments

- a. 2.1.c (pg. 28) “Allow residential density bonuses in order to conserve open space” without any quantification this statement directly contradicts “predictability”
  - b. 2.3.e (pg. 34) “the intent and limits of the incentivized or conditional development will be clearly stated” which is saying that incentivized and conditional (both unpredictable) development is OK if it is “clearly stated” undermines our desire for predictability
  - c. 4.3 contradicts the desire for predictability when it says that we will “provide incentives for the preservation and creation of workforce housing”. This is repeated in 4.3.a. Both of these errors could be corrected by adding the language “without increasing the potential levels of density or intensity”
- 2) 2.1.e (pg. 29) Allow development of County residential potential in Town” is contradicted by vote #144 which FAILED to approve TDRs

- 3) 2.2.c and 2.2.d appear to contradict each other. One advocates for “clustering” non-residential development, then the next one encourages “dispersing” of that same development
- 4) Place where a residential development “cap” is noted
  - a. 2.1.a (pg. 27) “Limit base development rights to those allowed today”

Place where the development “cap” is compromised

- a. 2.1.c (pg. 28) “Allow residential density bonuses in order to conserve open space” If the phrase “without increasing the potential levels of density or intensity permitted under the 1994 Plan” is added to this statement then it would not conflict with the concepts of “no additive growth” and “predictability:

## **Jamie Walter**

### Areas of Existing Dense Mixed Use Development (Nodes)

Principle 2.1.b Preserve existing county neighborhoods (development in existing nodes, except Town to remain at existing levels). This Policy is contradicted by the following policies and principles:

- Policy 1.1a ...encouraging clustered development to be located outside the NRO
- Policy 1.1.d ...conserve large, contiguous, and connected open space
- Policy 2.1.c ...Teton County will encourage that development resulting from bonuses be clustered outside of crucial wildlife habitat and scenic corridors, adjacent to existing development
- Policy 2.2.c&d ...cluster county nonresidential development and encourage local convenience commercial in appropriate areas (If you add more commercial development to these existing nodes but do not allow for additional residential units, who will work at and or patronize these businesses? People from Rural areas, from Town, or neighboring communities will commute to support these businesses, increasing traffic, adding to pollution, and intensifying wildlife conflicts.)
- Policy 4.1.a ...achieve all four housing goals (Town can only fit so much density, once this level has been reached, and if additional density can not be added to the existing nodes, the only place for homes to be built are in the large undeveloped open lands within the County. Lots/homes developed in this location will most likely be large in scale and very likely owned as second homes. But by allowing density to be incorporated within existing areas of dense development more small lots/homes will be constructed that are more likely to be occupied, full time, by members of our workforce, therefore reducing traffic and pollution and adding to our sense of community by having homes occupied year round.)
- Principle 6.1 ...increase the share of trips made by alternative transportation modes (Because of convenience, people living in areas of

existing dense mixed use development are more likely to walk/bike to work, run errands, visit friends, etc... than those living in a more rural setting.)

- Policy 8.2.b ...encourage mixed use, compact and connected land use patterns
- Policy 8.2.c ...guide future development into already developed areas
- Policy 8.3.b ...promote alternative modes of transportation (See
- Principle 6.1.)

Accessory Residential Units (ARUs):

Strategy 2.1 ...prohibit accessory residential units associated with residential development in the County (Does this eliminate Guest homes entirely, or just renting them, ie, ARUs? If this eliminates Guest Homes, I feel that this is contradictory to other sections of the plan that encourage the maintenance of community character. If guest homes are eliminated, people will build larger homes with attached guest wings, which will increase the bulk and scale of the dwellings. It is my opinion that clustered smaller homes (main houses and guest houses) are more in line with our existing community character than single large scale homes. )

Retain Base Zoning Allowances (Caps):

Policy 2.1.a ...limit base development rights to those allowed today. This Policy is contradicted by the following policies:

- Policy 2.1c ...allow residential density bonuses in order to conserve open space
- Policy 4.3.b ...allow for density increases for restricted, workforce housing in targeted areas of Town

How can density bonuses be granted in the above two instances if development rights are to be limited at those allowed today? Instead of having an absolute “cap” I think it would be more beneficial to have the build out set at what is allowed today but allow the number to be flexible by +/- 5%-10%. This is important for two reasons. First, over the past 12 years I have seen more development units be given up for tax write offs than have been added using density bonuses. I have spoken to staff and this observation has been confirmed. Therefore by having a cap we actually have a number that will constantly be declining. By allowing bonuses we are more likely to stay closer to a constant build-out number. Secondly, allowing for appropriate and permissible density bonuses can be a very useful tool for the planning staff and the elected officials when dealing with either a difficult or desirable project.

**Barbara Allen**

Conflicts/Contradictions – We need to identify more areas in Town (and the Village) to accommodate the transfer of density from the county. I am not in favor of taking property rights from the county landowners and giving a windfall to owners in

Wilson, Racquet Club, etc; however, I would be in favor a creating a multiplier for the PRD and specifying that a certain portion of that multiplier can only be realized in areas designated in Town or in Teton Village as receiving zones. The logistics of this would be left to the individual landowners to figure out.

- a. We have unintentionally, but with good intentions, created a contradiction between Theme I, the Transportation Chapter and the Energy Chapter by not forcing remaining development into the denser areas. I am not in favor of density bonuses for specific end product; however, I would be in favor of upzoning some areas with the parameter that the upzone can ONLY be used if it a development right is extinguished somewhere else.
- b. 2.1.d. The last sentence of this paragraph “and encouraged to be designed provide workforce housing” is not an accurate representation of our discussion. Our discussion was to incentivize the conversion of commercial to residential. This would trigger an affordable housing requirement. We DO NOT need additional language hampering this effort by suggesting that it will “be encouraged to be workforce housing.”
- c. Ref Recommendation 174 and 175, I think we need to discuss the conflict of the chapters I referenced in point a with the possibility of identifying some receiving areas in Teton Village rather than the outlying county again ONLY if said density is transferred from another location.

## **Michael Pruett**

### Reconciliation #1

My comments are specific to density and caps on residential density in town Principle 2.1 and Policy 2.1.a. I think having a cap on residential development in town is inconsistent with any redevelopment in town and constitutes a “no growth” policy. A hard fast cap on residential development is not the solution we need – it is in direct conflict with providing housing for our workforce, local jobs, and supporting local businesses. It is in direct conflict with Theme 3 Town is Heart. For example under the current plan we would not be able to find any high density areas to meet the community’s goals of rental housing and workforce housing within the caps. This is inconsistent with the Theme 3, 4, and 5 and will stagnate our town. I propose that Principle 2.1 and Policy 2.1.a be revised to allow residential growth above the caps in specific areas (targeted growth areas) and for defined community benefit as follows:

- Workforce housing
- Market rate housing
- Apartments
- Etc.

### Reconciliation #2

My comments are specific to caps on nonresidential density in town Principle 2.2 and Policy 2.2.a. I think having a cap on nonresidential development in town is inconsistent with redevelopment in town and constitutes a “no growth” policy. A hard fast cap on nonresidential development is not the solution we need – it is in

direct conflict with providing redevelopment (theme 3), providing local jobs (Theme 5), new lodging (theme 3) and supporting local businesses (theme 5). For example without the ability to discuss the appropriate nonresidential allowances in the Lodging Overlay we may not be able to implement the future vision for downtown in Principle 3.2 and Policies 3.2.b & d. This is inconsistent with the theme 3 and will stagnate our town. I propose that Principle 2.2 and Policy 2.2.a be revised to allow nonresidential growth above the caps in specific areas (defined in FLUP) and for defined community benefit as follows:

- Redevelopment to implement vision for downtown “lights on”
- Lodging
- Local jobs and businesses
- Etc.

### **Mark Newcomb**

The fundamental contradiction in the current draft is between Theme’s 1 and 2. Theme 1 states that for ideological, ecological and economic reasons wildlife will be protected and afforded as much opportunity to thrive as possible, cumulative impacts will be monitored and mitigated, and “large contiguous open spaces” will be conserved. There is little that is unclear about this Theme. It sets a high standard that poses challenges for the other seven themes in the plan. Never the less, it is clear this is desired by the community and should remain a preeminent theme going forward.

Insightful public comment has noted that the best way to successfully carry out the principles of Theme 1 while allowing for their common enjoyment by residents and visitors alike is to “rent” our community’s natural resources (here we can consider open space to be a proxy for natural resources), not occupy it. Logically this entails either not allowing any new development (unrealistic) or arranging new development near existing areas of density already impacted by humans, close to public transportation and services, and outside of scenic vistas.

Theme 2 primarily contradicts Theme 1 by precluding such land use planning other than by moving as much new development as possible from the county to the town. While conceptually ideal, reality may prove that Theme 2 as written motivates a dispersed type of ranchette development that contradicts core principles of Theme 1 as well as contradicting parts of Themes 4,5,6 and 7.

The reasons lie in how large property owners may interpret their development alternatives as stated in the current draft. “Why is this Theme Addressed?” in Theme 2 states that “increased density and intensity of development” threatens the character of existing neighborhoods in both the town and county and is undesirable. However 35-acre ranchettes are “inconsistent” with Theme 1 and also undesirable. But to avoid 35 acre ranchettes some form of density “bonus” must be allowed. Principle 2.1.a states that such density increases will not be permitted without “defined community benefit” (first and foremost in the way of open space/wildlife habitat if we are to abide by Theme 1, only secondarily for workforce housing). Fair enough. 2.1.c goes on to allow for PRD’s in areas outside of wildlife habitat *and* “adjacent to existing development”. However inserted between 2.1.a and 2.1.c is 2.1.b that states

that no such development will occur in nodes, despite the fact that nodes are largely outside of vital wildlife habitat and are adjacent to existing development. Furthermore much of the open space that is outside of nodes but still “next to existing development” has seen development proposals in the past, proposals that ignited no small amount of debate.

Policies 2.1.d, 2.1.e and 2.1.g provide guidance in how to handle dense development where proposed as an alternative to 35 acre ranchettes: move it into town. However the mechanisms proposed, to my knowledge, have not been evaluated as to their efficacy or viability. I don't think we know whether the logistical hurdles can be surmounted or whether there would even be any economic incentive to transfer development. Such transfers are at best uncertain.

Thus development under Theme 2 will occur only in town and/or in areas that have already seen contentious development proposals, or it will progress as 35 acre ranchettes. To force development into areas where contentious debate has already occurred is undesirable. And developing 35 acre ranchettes is undesirable as well as being counter to Theme 1. However without a clear mechanism and obvious economic incentive for transferring county development rights into town, such options seem hard to avoid. The fundamental flaw is that mechanisms for density increases are allowed but only in impractical ways, illogical places, or in a manner that defeats the goals of Theme 1.

How about removing the possibility for density increases altogether? That would resolve the issue of where density increases should go, but it would certainly result in 1 in 35 as being the primary development tool, which again contradicts the communities desire to not develop in 35 acre ranchettes as well as contradicting much of Theme 1. Furthermore it contradicts Theme's 4 and 8 by leading to the potential construction of over 3500 dwellings of the most energy and employee intensive type. Per dwelling unit and per person energy consumption would rise. The need for subsidized employee housing would continue unabated.

Furthermore, if the subsidized housing required by ranchette style development were required to be placed on site, it would potentially lead to clusters of five, ten, possibly more units dispersed around the valley, again contradicting much of Theme 1 and some of Theme 2. Such development would also have a “bar bell” effect on the community by creating a class of service industry and maintenance workers living in subsidized housing along side a class of much wealthier large home owners. The middle class may be left with few housing options other than those that exist today, an amount that will comprise an ever smaller percentage of the overall housing mix, all of which is in contradiction to Theme 4.

To reiterate, the most important contradiction is that Theme 2 contradicts the core of Theme 1 by likely dispersing development throughout the remaining large open tracts of space and wildlife habitat.

Above all, the contradictions in Theme 2 may ultimately render this plan ineffective in meeting the preeminent goals of Theme 1 by actually encouraging ranchettes and dispersing development. Side effects would include a heavier reliance on subsidized housing, potentially dispersed clusters of workforce

housing, and/or the increased likelihood of dense development in areas where battles over development have already been fought. Throughout history and throughout the world, when open space was considered valuable, buildings were clustered and building size was minimized. I believe this plan can do better towards both strategies without additive growth.

### **Theme 3 – Uphold Jackson as “Heart of the Region”**

#### **Paul Dunker**

Policy 3.2.c: Protect the image and function of Town Square: Last sentence: “Pedestrian only areas around the town square should be considered including the feasibility of closing certain streets to vehicular traffic.” Contradicts Rec# 222: ”Identify pedestrian only areas around the town square including enhancement of pedestrian amenities and closing streets to vehicular traffic” Our recommendation was to identify pedestrian only areas, including closing streets to vehicular traffic not just consider their feasibility.

#### **Barbara Allen**

- 1) I believe there needs to be reconciliation between the caps placed in Town and our goals in 1, 8, 6 & 4.
- 2) Still think that 3.2.b “sales tax collection within the Town must be maintained and expanded” is in conflict with Policy 2.6.c “Do not make land use decision for revenue purposes.” I do not think we should be discussing the expansion of taxes in a land use plan.

#### **Michael Pruett**

My comments are specific to the Town of Jackson. I do not feel the growth caps achieve the goals we set for our community. I feel that the Town is the place the community agreed to meet many of our goals including housing, redevelopment, Town is Heart, vitality, character...etc. The community and we have agreed that we need to be “smart” about growth in town, that this is the right place for it because of :

- Smart growth concepts
- Existing infrastructure in the town
- Walk and bike to work
- Vitality in the town
- Supports local businesses
- Supports the tourism business which in turn benefits the community
- Consistent in maintaining and preserving community character
- And more

#### **Mark Newcomb**

As for Themes 3 and 4, the potential available housing supply in town will fall well short of the demand generated by this plan even if very little or no development is transferred from the county. Also the density asked for of town may be unpopular

and resisted by a large enough segment of the community to render this goal unattainable. And the conversion of existing non-residential to residential mentioned in 3.4.a is untested (i.e. the relative levels of commercial rents to owners equivalent rents that would drive such a conversion have not been examined), and the amount of housing conversion will create remains uncertain. Given the above, Theme 3 may well contradict Themes 1 and 2 by placing an impossible burden on town and forcing dispersed pockets of workforce housing back into the county. If workforce housing is forced out of the county due to contradictions in Principle 2.1, an increasing number of employees will seek homes outside of the community, contradicting Principle 2.5.

#### **Theme 4 – Meet Our Community’s Housing Needs**

##### **Paul Dunker**

- 1) Theme [4] Workforce Housing definition: Seriously, you can’t call it “workforce housing regardless of employment.” Omit the words “or employment” and add a sentence including retirees as part of the historical workforce.
- 2) I agree with the Conservation Alliance’s 5/28 comments regarding this Theme as they relate to Affordable Housing (which is one component of Workforce Housing.) More specific explanation of our Affordable Housing program needs to be included. Why it exists, what it’s goals are, how they’re being achieved, what needs to be reevaluated & update in this plan. Specifically, new ideas are included?

##### **Tony Wall**

- 1) pg. 54 The third housing issue “Catching Up to improve on existing situation” is in direct conflict with the goal of 65% and the acknowledgement that we are currently in excess of that number. There is no justification given for “catching up” - “Maintaining our current levels” should be the title of this bullet point. In the indicators section the goal should be changed accordingly from “Increase” to “maintain”. The language on pg. 55 “the community’s goal is to increase the percentage of the workforce living locally” is also in conflict with the fact that we are currently in excess of our goal
- 2) 4.2 (pg. 58) “developers .....will be required to mitigate a portion of their impacts” is in direct contradiction to the achievement of our goal of housing 65% of our workforce
- 3) the goal in Theme 4 Indicator #1 to “increase” the % of the workforce housed locally from today’s number should change to “maintain” if we are currently above the established threshold
- 4) the goal in Theme 4 Indicator #7 should be changed to “maintain” for the same reason
- 5) The definition of Workforce Housing (Theme 4) is even more vague than in the original draft – there was considerable PC discussion and Public Comment about creating a NARROWER definition – not a BROADER one. By not defining WFH

more narrowly we would be undermining the opportunity to achieve the 4 goals set forth on pg. 54

**Barbara Allen**

- 1) I do not think it generally reflects our discussion
- 2) I think definitions on page 55 need to be removed
- 3) Ref rec 263 – I do not see where this was incorporated into the chapter. The bullet point where this is footnoted does not pertain to the intent of this vote
- 4) Generational Continuity: Phrase “Community members that grew up here have a greater appreciation for the shared values of the community and its history.” I do not believe this was in the last version and would like it taken out of this one. I’m fine with “play an important role” or something of that ilk.
- 5) Problem 1: Statistical info at beginning of chapter discussing median income etc is no longer accurate
- 6) I do not think Rec 272 is accurately reflected in the text
- 7) Policy 4.1.e is very vague and I’m not sure it addresses the discussion
- 8) Ref Policy 4.2.c – This is a repeat of policy 2.1.d and does not accurately reflect our votes in rec. 34, 35 and 36. We did not incentivize the conversion of non-residential to residential with any stipulation as to the “encouragement of workforce housing.”
- 9) Principal 4.3 – this rewrite does not reference any recommendations nor does it accurately reflect what we reviewed in the previous version. It does not reference the rental housing issue that redevelopment impacts nor does specify what the word “incentive” means.
- 10) The concept of the “middle class” was a frequent conversation in this chapter, but not addressed in this chapter. Text needs to be added that recognizes that deed restricted housing raising the end price of the final product and prices out any “middle class” housing that may have existed without a deed restriction. Language should be added regarding potential size constraints to help create “urban” housing that is more efficient and that is more affordable based on the unit size, not based on a deed restriction

Indicators – I do not recall or read a recommendation where we agreed upon 65%?

**Theme 5 – Provide for a Diverse and Balanced Economy**

**Paul Dunker**

I support the inclusion of the Jackson Hole Chamber of Commerce recommendations.

**Barbara Allen**

I still think that this is a superfluous chapter, but will bow to being outvoted in every vote on this one. ☺

## **Mark Newcomb**

Theme 5 is broadly contradicted by Theme 2 due to the potential stifling effects of Theme 2's contradictions and associated uncertainty. As stated in Theme 1 the health of the county's natural resources is critical in preserving the visitor service segment of the economy. If development in the county is comprised largely of ranchettes, it may impact the visitor experience. Furthermore if price incentives do happen to drive the conversion of non-residential in town to residential, it may suppress entrepreneurialism (other than in the long term rental market) and impact economic vitality. It may also become more difficult to accomplish the goals of self reliance and diversity as stated in Theme 5.3.

## **Theme 6 – Develop a Multi-Modal Transportation Strategy**

### **Paul Dunker**

Policy 6.1: The term “year around mode shift” should be “year round.”

Strategy 6.7: Establish a Regional Transportation Authority: I support the concept, as well as joining the Linx Co-op, but they're two separate entities. The Linx Co-op is a regional transportation network, a Regional Transportation Authority is a policy making body charged with identifying and funding projects and initiatives.

### **Mark Newcomb**

I find no glaring contradictions in Theme 6. However there is a critical lack of emphasis on human safety. The current development pattern has resulted in a large west bank population while our hospital is on the east bank. If a major incident (an explosion perhaps, or a fire at the urban/wildlands interface) were to occur simultaneously with an accident on the Snake River Bridge or at a similar constriction elsewhere in the county, we may lack adequate alternatives for rerouting emergency vehicles in a way that will effectively handle people needing emergency hospital care. Perhaps local fire and EMS have already planned for such contingencies and have viable plans in place. If not, the issue should be considered and taken into account when making decisions about transportation planning.

## **Theme 7 – Provide Aulait Community Facilities, Services and Infrastructure**

## **Theme 8 – Climate Sustainability and Energy Conservation**

### **Barbara Allen**

Policy 8.2.b – This is in conflict with language in Theme III about stable neighborhoods as well as with zoning in certain areas. While I am in favor of the concept, it needs to be modified to make this policy appropriate.

Policy 8.2.c is inconsistent with Theme II and with the decision to cap growth. This needs to be reconciled

**Ben Read**

My other concern or hope is that we embrace as directly as possible the idea that sustainability practices should be applied to land use planning and that we acknowledge (and manage) as a community the direct and excessive bearing that prosperity has on energy usage.

**Paul Duncker**

“Energy costs are also greatly impacted by the energy demand generated by development patterns. Sprawling development patterns increase infrastructure, service delivery and transportation costs for residents. Further, by reducing energy consumption the community reduces its reliance on foreign non-renewable energy sources. Thereby increasing our energy security position and creating benefit to our national security.” (This is precisely the justification for a Nodal Development pattern rather than a sprawling development pattern.)

**Mark Newcomb**

Theme 8 can do more to emphasize that building size, whether residential or commercial, is one of the most critical factors in energy consumption and should be limited or “energy taxed” on a sliding scale (bigger place, bigger tax). Furthermore it should be noted that reducing building size can play a beneficial role in meeting the goals of all other themes, especially Themes 1 and 2.

**Appendix I – Future Growth and Buildout****Tony Wall**

The appendix should contain both ACTUAL and EFFECTIVE population numbers for 2000, 2010, and at build-out