

Public Comment Entered April 7, 2011 to April 15, 2011

Date	Name	Comment
4/14/2011	Van Gelder, Bill Interested Public	<p>I have always considered myself a moderate and felt like the comprehensive plan was heading in the right direction. I have looked upon groups such as Save Historic Jackson Hole and Friends of South Park as in the fringe, pushing a very specific agenda.</p> <p>After watching the public discussion for the past two weeks, since what I view was a complete turn around from the direction the comprehensive plan was heading, I find myself agreeing with those groups more and more.</p> <p>The final straw was a 1/2 page ad in the paper yesterday telling me I was wrong, probably paid with my tax dollars. As are the people telling me I am wrong.</p> <p>The plan needs to cap growth, the plan needs to protect what makes Jackson special, wild life and scenic resources, the plan needs to implement a plan to move forward and protect Jackson for generations to come.</p> <p>In my opinion the changes you have made to the plan do not, and need to be reversed.</p>
4/14/2011	Hawks, Molly Interested Public	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Please do not reinstate the nodes in Wilson or the village road.</p>
4/13/2011	Jannotta, Ned Interested Public	<p>I am writing to express my concern that you have veered toward a more development oriented comprehensive plan, despite the overwhelming public support for a "limited" development plan that places wildlife and the preserving open spaces as the primary concern. The Valley simply cannot accommodate the number of residents that your plan envisions without fundamentally altering to the negative our community. I urge you to heed the voice of the broader community, not the limited number of those in development/construction, and create a more conservative plan as it relates to the future of our Valley.</p>

Date	Name	Comment
4/13/2011	Walles, Mackenzie Interested Public	<p>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?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The people of Wilson want our quality of life preserved. Your voting public would like you to listen!</p>
4/13/2011	Spence, Kent Interested Public	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The Wilson area has critical wetlands, Moose Habitat, and migration corridor that should never be considered for dense development.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Thanks for considering my vote on this matter.</p>

Date	Name	Comment
4/13/2011	Wakeman, Polly Interested Public	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>To reinstate the development Nodes allowing for more than double today's buildout, with no limits to growth is shortsighted and negligent.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 lose.</p> <p>Please use your position to make this place one you will be proud to have helped preserve.</p>
4/12/2011	Falcey, Missy Interested Public	<p>It is difficult for me to express my profound disappointment in your recent decision with regard to the Comp Plan. Your vital stewardship of this valley has been abrogated. Your response to your resident constituency, not commercial constituency, has been ignored.</p> <p>Jackson Hole is unparalleled and we have the opportunity to ensure that it remains unique. Your decision has embraced commonality.</p> <p>Please reconsider your decision and reinstate mandated limits on growth in order to protect our character and our precious wildlife. I endorse limiting growth to the development allowances already established.</p>
4/12/2011	Fennessey, Kelli Interested Public	<p>Please consider adding affordable houses. We have many small units available already. Most people have families etc. When planning the 10-Year Workforce Housing Action Plan please consider building homes with garages and yards. Not apartments and condo.</p>
4/12/2011	Klene, Richard Interested Public	<p>Clearly our electeds have ignored the wishes of the majority of county residents and gone with a hugely pro-development plan that panders to the wishes of folks who want the county to grow, for the purpose of enriching themselves and their business partners. The slogan now is "Grow, Baby, Grow." The lack of constraints on growth, and of serious consideration of its impacts will certainly lead to increased traffic, more animal vehicle collisions, and reductions in the quality of air, water and life in the Valley.</p> <p>Many of the characteristics that brought residents here are already gone, along with a lot of old-time and not-so-old time homeowners. Certainly they will be replaced by wealthy folks looking for a second or third residence, but the values and long-term commitment to the character of the place will be even more drastically and permanently altered.</p> <p>Our "one of a kind" town will be increasingly like another crowded theme park for those who like to visit places that aren't too unlike the rest of the country.</p>

Date	Name	Comment
4/12/2011	Schwender, Craig Interested Public	<p>When the comp plan draft was first released we were astonished that our tax dollars were being wasted on planners who did not understand or appreciate the unique nature of the valley we call home. At that time, with the growth proposed and the high density in sensitive areas, I said we should fire these sad, short-sighted, Colorado imports.</p> <p>With the town meetings they claimed "we listened to your comments", but all the evidence is to the contrary. Those planners have earned dismissal. Send them back to their rocky mountain home.</p> <p>More disappointing is the vote of the elected officials. The cynics said early on that the process was designed to wear down the voters until everyone lost interest. The cynics were right. Our elected officials have shown little regard for the wishes of the community and the need for only the most limited and necessary growth.</p> <p>Clearly it is time for a new county commission. The next election will indeed be interesting.</p> <p>Respectfully (but just barely),</p>
4/12/2011	Womack, Ray Interested Public	<p>Please do all you can to support affordable housing in this valley. My wife Meg and I live in Melody Ranch, and the affordable housing upgrades the place a lot, bringing in young families and children that make it a real neighborhood.</p>
4/12/2011	Denny, Chris Interested Public	<p>I'm writing to you as a long-time Jackson resident, local business owner, and concerned citizen, regarding the open hole/vacant lot on the corner of W. Gill and N. Glenwood.</p> <p>Our offices are located immediately adjacent to this property and I have to ask - what in the world is going on over there? A quick survey of the property today shows the entire side of the safety fence has fallen into the 'hole' (on the east side where they've eliminated the sidewalk) and the parking situation on Gill is equally a disaster, due to the barriers taking up part of the east bound lane, essentially turning a two lane road into one lane without any notice or signage. I sit here most everyday day, seeing discouraged pedestrians and drivers not understanding the flow of traffic. It's really a bad scene over here and there really should be no parking allowed on the south side of W. Gill.</p> <p>What's the deal with this property? Hopefully the town is making some money leveraging serious fines against this developer - its just the biggest eyesore for our historic downtown.</p> <p>Regardless, I just wanted to bring to your attention that the fence and barricades need immediate attention. As for the rest of it, hopefully the developer will be filling the hole in this summer and planting grass to cover up the mess they've left behind.</p> <p>I'd appreciate a status of some sort, since this is not only effecting our ability to do business in this neighborhood, it's also a unsightly stain on our beautiful downtown business sector.</p> <p>Thanks for your consideration.</p>

Date	Name	Comment
4/11/2011	O'Brien, Paul F. Interested Public	<p>Listening to the JIM discussions on the comp plan, I'm impressed with the seriousness with which our elected officials are discussing issues and tackling important policy questions. And rightly so. They have taken on the public trust and the duty to work in the public interest. However, I was disappointed by the unrealistic discussion in the March 25 meeting on caps or limits to growth. You could have been listening to a meeting in Anytown, USA where the big planning worry is making sure the buildings look nice. But Jackson is not Anytown. Teton County is one of the few accessible, high mountain habitats and recreation areas on the planet. Its uniqueness will grow in the decades ahead as global warming takes its toll. At the same time, the global population, now 7 billion, will be 9 billion within a generation, and global GDP, now \$60 trillion, will double every 15 years or so. Sure we are now suffering through the aftermath of a financial crisis, but the future is clear: There will be powerful demands to visit, exploit, and buy a piece of Teton County. Any planning caps or limits we choose will be tested like Japan's sea walls in last month's tsunami. If the Plan seeks to control growth through a sequence of short-run checkpoints it will be overwhelmed by the pressure of global demand.</p> <p>The logic of starting the Plan with a robust cap or build-out limit is that this acknowledges that the significant existing development rights in Teton County are a uniquely valuable resource. Limits help to build a culture of husbanding that resource, and making sure that it is used wisely. Limits require tough decisions that recognize trade-offs. Some may call a build-out limit a "scare tactic" approach to planning but it is not. It is simply an honest recognition that this Comprehensive Plan has to take account of the long-term global forces we face. Anything less would be a refusal to accept reality.</p> <p>Commissioners Ellis and Vogelheim have supported development caps as well as mechanisms to monitor and enforce them. I hope they persevere in those efforts and that their fellow elected officials join them.</p>
4/11/2011	Acri, Armond Save Historic JH	<p>I have attended almost all of the public meetings on the Comp Plan and many of the meetings of the Stakeholders Advisory Group. (STAG) After a desire to protect our wildlife the most common desire I heard was for predictability. It seems many of our citizens believe we would benefit from a Comp Plan that meets this desire, but many of our electeds maintain that we need flexibility not predictability. Why is that? Are the two mutually exclusive?</p> <p>At the simplest level, people want to know what kind of building can be built next to them. How big will it be or how many units will it have? How high will it be? Can it be located to block my views or my sunlight? Business owners have the same questions and also wonder if the building will affect their parking, and access for their customers. Taken to the next level, if we know what can be built on individual lots, we can understand what our community will look like in the future when those lots are built out. This helps us plan for our future.</p> <p>Why do some of our elected officials want to hide what our future will look like? One of the biggest faults of our current Land Development Regulations are the discretionary tools like the PMUD and the PUD-AH that allow our elected official to "horse trade" extra development rights for what they perceive to be public benefit. These alphabet soup projects are almost always controversial and benefit no one except a few lawyers. They have resulted in hotly debated public meetings, tied up planning staff and elected officials, and resulted in several lawsuits.</p> <p>That kind of flexibility doesn't benefit the community. Buyers pay a higher price expecting to get extra development rights. They then have to pay a high cost to have their team present a complicated plan to the electeds. This increases the cost of development which increases the cost of real estate in both the Town and the County, and prices locals out of the market. Let's go back to building smaller buildings that can built by our local trades people, not large projects that require large out of state corporations. We do not like to shout, but so far it seems only Ben Ellis and Paul Vogelheim have heard our request for predictability.</p>

Date	Name	Comment
4/11/2011	Ewing, Patty Interested Public	<p>I'm confused! After over three years of well attended meetings, and hundreds and hundreds of public comments, in the fall of 2008 JHN&G printed the following ad: "The Comprehensive Plan Will Be Responding to Public Comment. What you (the public) 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 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 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."</p> <p>Compare this to the ad (Also paid for by the joint Town/County Comprehensive Plan) in the March 30, 2011 JHN&G. "Meeting Summary for March 24 & 25". The ad reflects discussions from the elected official that essentially reverse the direction of the Comprehensive Plan. This isn't an argument about no development or no growth. Consider the following growth is already entitled and/or approved for future development: Commercial: Town - Already built commercial: 4,576,840 sq. ft.; allowable NEW commercial: 3,436,798 sq. ft. County - Already built commercial: 3,476,829 sq. ft.; County allowable NEW commercial: 3,179,295 sq. ft. And, current Empty Commercial Space is now estimated 40% rate of occupancy. Residential: Town/County current built dwelling units, 9,644; Town/County allowable new dwelling units: 10,000 And now we hear that this is not enough and you want to not limit yourselves to this already doubling of everything as a reasonable constraint to plan within. Simply put, during the last three plus years, public comment has consistently asked for: Predictability, not flexibility; Community Character definition which is clear (not urbanization of Jackson Hole); Cost of growth: infrastructure, roads, sewer, water, traffic, schools, and social services. I am confused. I'm frustrated! I'm beginning to believe that public comment, however well-reasoned, well-researched and well-written has no impact. I'm beginning to believe that it doesn't matter what the issue is, public comment does little to change what the electeds want to do. The Comprehensive Plan will be so complex and unintelligible to the average reader that it will provide cover for any action the electeds want to take. And, this will be the most expensive Comprehensive Plan in the country!</p>
4/10/2011	Huff, Mercedes Interested Public	<p>I will keep this short, as I have been on record many times with this same concern. Why are you trying to develop this valley with such detrimental numbers, developments and nodes? It has been very clear from the public input that they don't want to see that.</p> <p>When the rewrite of this plan was undertaken, it was supposed to be a few points of clarification. I was told that Wilson needed a new plan because every time someone wanted to build something it took a variance. So what? That at least gave us a baseline to ask for a variance. The other concern was that it took too much of staff's time. I can't think of anything that could be more time consuming, for staff, officials and the public, than these last three years of intense meetings and desperate outcries to STOP this rampant obsession for build out.</p> <p>I believed that the public had been heard when nodes went away from the plan. Why the reversal? We can still protect wildlife and open space without these massive nodes which will be abused and ruin the character of our valley. Once again, I will say that not everyone has an entitlement to live in Jackson Hole. We can't produce housing for everyone. There have to be caps or we will become like so many other resort areas --- nothing special. After working in the real estate profession here for over 30 years, and having tried hard to participate in a meaningful way to have people understand the intrinsic value of lack of development, I truly believe that less is more. Everyone's values will be better protected by not overrunning us with more and more growth. In fact, what you're proposing will actually harm property values across the board!</p> <p>I'm very disappointed in the direction you are heading after your last meeting. PLEASE rethink that position and listen to what has been put in front of you for the past few years by your electorate.</p>
4/10/2011	Poole, Carol Interested Public	<p>To preserve our highest community values of wildlife, open spaces and small town character – I will not support any plan which more than doubles residential and commercial development.</p> <p>I demand that the plan is predictable and that starts with setting a reasonable – and achievable – end-state of growth that is equal to, or less than, the current doubling they have now thrown out as a reasonable constraint.</p> <p>I demand the nodes only be established if we work to constrain growth to no more than double what we have – and any development potential moved to nodes is achieved by transferring or purchasing of existing rights - thus permanently extinguishing them to achieve permanent open space in important rural areas – that includes the bulk of South Park.</p> <p>I demand that the monitoring of ongoing human impacts on wildlife and natural resources is a critical policy for managing growth and should be reinstated in the plan.</p>

Date	Name	Comment
4/9/2011	Jern, Sherri Interested Public	<p>I feel that I have been slapped in the face. Four years of attending countless meetings, writing letters, talking with officials, presenting not just opinions but also facts and in one fell swoop, you have wiped out the hard work that the people who live and work here have done. I will not stoop to restate my opinions, obviously they have been ignored. Simply put, growth does not equal quality of life for anyone in Teton County. (or elsewhere in the USA, obviously) We have something special in Teton County....but it looks that we are headed to be "everywhere" land. I am so disappointed in your actions. Leland Christensen attended so many of those meeting with the planning commissioners.....where were you? Nodes, who supported nodes? Certainly not the people living in those areas, only developers. Guest houses? Do you really think we should double the density of a lot from single family to dual...and also, how many "rich" people now use their guest houses for caretakers.....very, very few. Most locals do not want to turn into indentured slaves, which is what most caretaking positions are.</p> <p>You can't state a top number for growth? It would upset the population too much? What are we? Children who do not know what is good for ourselves and our families? We can't handle the truth? Or are we not smart enough to know how we want to live?</p> <p>Four of my employees live in Idaho and have worked for me over 4 years each. Two own houses there, two rent. None would prefer to live on this side of the pass. They love working here but would not choose to live here. They feel that their quality of life is better where they are. (three of them make the drive at 5 am in order to work for me)</p> <p>Good transportation would eliminate a great deal of employee issues without promoting a more than double index for growth in Teton County Wyoming.</p>
4/9/2011	Wemple, Robert Interested Public	<p>I agree with Brooke Bullinger and others who question why Comisioners reversed direction on the buildout number and nodes. If there was a good reason why public sentiment was ignored, then I haven't seen it. Maybe in the next meeting the Comisioners could reinstate the previous concepts or at least more clearly explain the drastic change. Thank you for listeningthis time.</p>

Date	Name	Comment
4/8/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	<p>Dear electeds – I do believe each of you has the preservation of both our natural resources, and our community and its economy, at the center of your beliefs. I also know that trying to both simplify - but at the same time highlight - direct changes in course that did occur on March 25 via an email alert – had its risks. Believe me it was not what I wanted to do – but I felt that a significant course change had indeed occurred. I was not alone in that view. I admit it also felt a little like “nailing Jell-O to the wall”. That does not mean I doubt your core values – but you need to understand as a collective body it did at least defer - and also seriously call into question – whether you will work within the existing extensive entitlements or not.</p> <p>You have all seen my alert – as I made that transparent to you. I do not feel we really are that far apart – but both “Smart Growth” and the continued dependence on growth is still a core philosophical divide. Instead of what you may see as another “email blast” from me to anyone – please read and consider my following thoughts:</p> <p>Is "Smart Growth" the Ultimate Oxymoron?</p> <p>“Smart growth” is an urban planning and transportation theory that concentrates growth in compact walkable urban centers to avoid sprawl. Smart growth is at the core of the debate in the Comp Plan as its principles portend to achieve the development of vibrant, healthy communities.</p> <p>Premise: Sustainable, unending population growth in a valley (or planet) with finite resources and land area is an oxymoron; no possibility of such "Smart Growth" exists.</p> <p>Argument: Merely concentrating humans and their built environment cannot compensate for the fact that ever-increasing residents and visitors ultimately require ever-increasing resources, infrastructure and energy inputs. The view that high-density human settlement protects our wildlife, public lands, agricultural/ranch lands or open space, in the long run, is illusory: all are increasingly stressed by the demands of burgeoning residents and visitors in "high-density" areas. Long-term solutions require policies that stabilize population and create permanent open space.</p> <p>Logically, Smart Growth alone will not create or maintain sustainable communities. When in-fill projects and high-density development reaches capacity, sprawl will resume unless population stabilizes and open space has been permanently preserved. Smart Growth masquerades as the ethically more responsible choice, while ignoring the reality that more people use and over-use natural resources and public lands, whether they are physically located inside or outside the higher density area. Ultimately, it only slows the pace of sprawl and obscures real, workable solutions offered by population stabilization combined with permanent open space preservation.</p> <p>Comp Plan Realities: We have 30 to 40 years – or more - of growth already entitled according to Appendix I. That provides ample time to adjust ongoing, permitted growth to create a sustainable, stable population within existing parameters to achieve community goals. It makes no sense to allow additive growth when we are not even close to buildout. Now is the time to recognize real limits and put appropriate tools in place so we don't reach capacity with community needs unmet. We need to acknowledge that the Comp Plan is a de facto cap on the number of buildings and the mix of development. This indirectly controls population. Until you address the community mandate to work within the extensive existing entitlements, you will find little support for the process and our community will lose faith in its own government. The prospect that we collectively can achieve workforce housing and fiscal balance within a viable and stable economy – while maintaining our wildlife, open space, natural resources and small town rural character – will continue to recede.</p> <p>As an individual trained in free market capitalism who also has two degrees in ecology and environmental studies – I know communities develop more sustainably when they create jobs, income and savings by doing more with what they have. This is especially true with workforce housing and governmental income. True Smart communities recognize constraints and determine a desired population. Their economy develops, the environment stays healthy and the valley remains a place people want to live and others want to visit. This is better – not always and certainly not forever – bigger.</p> <p>Possible Solutions:</p> <p>Growth Management – what many of us want</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •In the Themes and Principals section - commit to work within the extensive existing overall base residential and commercial zoning and entitlements collectively within – and between (shifting) - the Town and County to achieve community goals. Status: postponed till after the character district discussions. •State that we desire a viable community of no more than 40,000 residents – and an economy that is not dependant on population growth. Status: collectively you did not accept this approach. •Add a statement that both the pattern of growth - AND our resident and effective (includes visitors in our hotels and campgrounds) population has on-site AND off-site impacts on wildlife, natural resources and community character. Status: this has been partially addressed - but not directly. <p>OOOnly by addressing both our population (via buildout) AND our pattern of growth - can the community be assured of achieving its greatest community values of wildlife, open space and community character. Status: this has been deferred until after the character district discussions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •“Adaptive management” approaches should be considered – to measure achievement of our goals on reinvestment and revitalization, workforce housing ratios, wildlife and natural resource impacts, transportation systems, and fiscal balance of income versus expenses. Status: collectively you did not accept this approach.

Date	Name	Comment
		<p>Pattern of Growth – what many of us want</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •That the preservation of permanent open space is much preferred over temporary zoning – thus permanent open space should be the primary goal of any shifting of development rights. Status: this was addressed. •That development potential in important rural areas is thoughtfully either extinguished through the purchase of those rights – or transferred to appropriate receiving areas. Status: this was addressed. •Receiving areas should be evaluated not only on existing infrastructure – but also on the natural and scenic values on those receiving areas and potential impact to existing neighborhood character. Status: I assume this will be discussed in the upcoming meeting on Character. <p>Impacts of Growth – what many of us want</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Reinstate at the policy level that measuring cumulative impacts of human activities on wildlife and natural resources should both be collected, and also be one of the foundations that informs policy decisions on future growth. Status: the policy was removed while the indicators remained. This should be revisited. <p>Cost of Growth – what many of us want</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Growth, regardless of location or type (residential or commercial), should pay its full share of direct incremental impacts on workforce housing, infrastructure and social systems. Status: I assume this will be discussed at one of the upcoming meetings probably under Economy.
4/8/2011	Trachtenberg, Barbara Interested Public	I am extremely disappointed in my elected officials and worried about the future of my home—to me the beautiful spot in the US. The Comprehensive Plan should and must protect our neighborhoods, valley ad precious wildlife from unpredictable growth. Please listen to your community.
4/8/2011	Trachtenberg, Barbara Interested Public	Mark [Barron], Please be a voice for the community that elected you, and put limits on the Comprehensive Plan. This could be a mistake that will never be rectified.
4/7/2011	Unfried, Steve Interested Public	<p>We were shocked and dismayed to learn that our elected officials have reversed years of progress toward a reasonable comprehensive plan that would have preserved our unique wildlife and channelled future growth in the least harmful way. There is already too much potential buildout authorized; the existing limits should not have been disregarded after all the discussion thus far. Concentrating future growth where it will create the least traffic and disturbance of wildlife is essential to maintaining our community character and attractiveness to visitors, who continue to be a mainstay of our local economy, therefore reinstating excessive growth at various "nodes" around the county is counterproductive. We continue to be very concerned that the new plan will not provide enough predictability to guide its implementation over the years ahead. It needs serious benchmarks, limits and monitoring to be effective.</p> <p>We are uniquely blessed with the most intact temperate ecosystem in North America, which has been the wellspring of our community and economy for some time. Now is not the time for any further encroachment on it.</p>

Date	Name	Comment
4/7/2011	Salter, Andy Interested Public	<p>Over the past years and over the course of numerous public meetings, valley citizens and organizations have repeatedly and consistently urged you to commit to revisions to the Comprehensive Plan that will preserve the character of our community, protect the natural resources and wildlife of our valley, retain and not exceed the limits of the valley's existing development potential, and provide some certainty with regard to the scale and locations of future developments within the County. The Comprehensive Plan is perhaps the key document that articulates the community's vision for future development in the Town and County.</p> <p>While I could not attend your March 25 meeting, I was distressed to read that you have tentatively decided to remove constraints on future growth and development in our community. I strongly urge you to reconsider those tentative decisions.</p> <p>Growth within the Town and County must be managed responsibly and to do that, the revised Comprehensive Plan needs to provide clear direction for the future and provide citizens with the assurance that there are reasonable limits on future development in our community. I urge you to commit to a revised Comprehensive Plan which works within and does not expand the valley's existing development potential. I understood that one of the main reasons for revising the current Comprehensive Plan was to make it more predictable. The community has been remarkably consistent in its public comments during the revision process that any revisions to the Comprehensive Plan should limit build-out potential; protect our existing neighborhoods; preserve wildlife, wildlife corridors, and open space; and preserve the character of the Town and the valley. There is a definitive amount of existing unused development potential in the Town and County. I urge you not to increase, and instead to set reasonable limits on that development potential.</p> <p>The three prior draft revisions to the Comprehensive Plan, written by the initial consultant in 2008, the Planning Staff in 2009, and the joint work of the Town and County Planning Commissions more recently, all properly incorporated public input and mandated limits on future growth to preserve the existing character of our community. The referendum on the Downtown Redevelopment District in 2003, the Lake Research Partners survey of Teton County voters in 2007, and the University of Wyoming survey of Teton County voters in 2008 all establish that the vast majority of citizens of the Town and County find it critically important that community character be preserved.</p> <p>The wildlife and abundant natural resources in our Town and County makes ours a unique community. Impacts on those resources should be minimized by the revisions to the Comprehensive Plan. Predictability regarding land use decisions should be increased.</p> <p>The Comprehensive Plan is critically important to shape and guide development patterns that leave a legacy for generations to come. Your March 25 vote ignored community input and disregarded the input of your own consultants and professional planning staff. The "flexibility" some of you seek will remove the predictability and reasonable constraints on development that we should expect to see in the plan. The character of our community is defined by appropriately scaled developments, considerable open space, and abundant wildlife. These natural resources of our community must be preserved and protected.</p> <p>Please honor and abide by the will of the citizens who elected you and develop revisions to the Comprehensive Plan that preserve, rather than threaten, the economy, quality of life, and character of our Town and County.</p>
4/1/2011	Whissel, Fred Interested Public	<p>As you know, Rich can occasionally go off the deep end, when conversing about the comprehensive plan – but only because he is so dedicated to getting it right. In this case, having read his attached comments, I have to share his concerns. If what Rich describes is true, then you certainly may be making an unforgivable mistake, and the subsequent huge increase in allowed development will forever destroy the very thing that makes Teton County great. For what? A few tax dollars? Please be certain to fully consider both the short-term and the long-term consequences of your impending decision, and choose the course that will achieve the greatest good for the greatest number, both now and in the future.</p> <p>I have only one vote, but I have a great propensity to write letters and to draw editorial cartoons when I feel the need justifies the means. This does.</p>
3/30/2011	Thurston, Ray Interested Public	<p>How many times does the county have to do this? Seems like a big waste of time. In my area we have protected elk habitat. Now the neighbors and ranchers are complaining that the elk are damaging hay and landscaping. Can't win. Ray</p>
3/29/2011	Kochan, JP Interested Public	<p>Thanks for the update.. I am glad and relieved that conservancy is a priority!!!</p>

Date	Name	Comment
3/25/2011	Bloom, Rich Interested Public	<p>Greg – thank you for your phone call just now asking for more information on the PRD, its benefits and its limitations – basically how do we achieve permanent open space – and how does it fit with Smart Growth principals?</p> <p>As I discussed the presentation from County planning staff today only focused on how the tool has been used in direct applications through their office. Although considerable benefit has been achieved on smaller parcels – the entire story was not shared with the electeds this morning. I hope it is alright that I have copied in both Laurie - and also John Sheppard – who has been attending all the joint sessions.</p> <p>Attached are the Land Trust’s formal public comments on the April 2009 draft that reinforces our conversation we had just now – on the benefits of the PRD for achieving open space even when the use is not necessarily visible to the planning office. That is not to say the tool does not need some refinement and enhancements. Second the Trust’s comments cover the relative value of permanent open space versus temporary zoning that you and I discussed – and is a foundation of Smart Growth principals. The letter also echoes in addition why I, and the public at large, were so concerned when the draft plan was released in April 2009 – basically how were they going to redirect the existing potential – shift it or simply down zone the entire rural areas? The Trust has expressed these concerns quite well in the attached May 14, 2009 letter.</p> <p>The second attachment is from rancher Brad Mead who weighed in on the issue though a News and Guide Guest Shot - when the County, without completely understanding the implications - was considering removing the tool in its entirety – as they could not see the non-visible (outside of planning office applications) achievements as it was used. That is because - as we discussed - it is a private conversation between the land owner, the land trust, the land appraiser and the IRS. The Trust states it quite clearly – that after the PRD was adopted in 1994 – unseen to the County – some 10,000 acres came under permanent conservation easements – versus 5,000 acres in all the proceeding years. Granted some 2,400 of that 10,000 were directly seen in the planning staff PRD applications. Those other 7,600 acres were never seen by the planning staff as direct PRD applications – yet the PRD played a critical tax role in the Trust’s ability to achieve thus easements.</p> <p>With the Town as involved with the Land Trust as partners on Karnes, Flat Creek and now Snow King – I would suggest you sit down with Laurie in the next few weeks.</p> <p>Again thank you so much for the call – I just wanted to make sure you also consider talking to the true experts on how permanent conversation easements are actually achieved with willing land owners.</p> <p>Feel free to share this email and the attached public documents with other members of the Town Council and/or Mayor – as we discussed the PRD is a tool largely unfamiliar with the Town electeds. The next joint meeting will be the County’s turn, as we discussed, to understand the complexity of some of the Town tools – the main thing is that we all continue to learn through this process before making the final policy decisions.</p>
3/23/2011	Stone, Cindy Hill Interested Public	<p>I encourage each of you to remember that wildlife, habitat and open space are the priorities of this valley. Each theme of the comprehensive plan should reflect that.</p> <p>e.g.</p> <p>Because wildlife is the valleys highest priority, affordable housing will be encouraged in this manner.</p> <p>Because Wildlife and open space are Teton county’s highest priorities transportation will be dealt with in this manner.</p> <p>Thank you for your continued hard work</p>