



Community Open House & Workshop Summary

Monday, September 10, 2007 – 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
St. John's Episcopal Church, Fellowship Hall, Jackson

Format/Agenda:

1. Open house with posters and comment forms.
2. Brief presentation about Plan Analysis report, vision, and issues.
3. Short workshop focused around Plan Analysis questions and 1994 Plan vision (small group work)
4. Wrap-up – next meetings, etc.

Participation:

About 35 people attended the meeting.

Staff: Blair Leist (County), Jeff Noffsinger (Town), Ben Herman and Lesli Ellis (Clarion), Bill Collins (Collins Planning), and Carlos Hernandez (Fehr & Peers).

Meeting Summary:

The planning team presented an overview of the plan update process and the 1994 Plan Analysis report (both available on the project website: www.jacksontetonplan.com).

Vision Working Groups:

The public divided into five working groups. A summary of the working group written comments follows.

Each group provided the following general comments to the whole group:

- Vision statement is really accurate. Transportation is most critical.
- Agriculture topic does not need to be an entire chapter. Economic substance – “sustainability” should mean better not bigger and balance. Expand bullet points; they don't need major changes.
- 1994 Plan – Needs definition of “sustainability.” What is statistical basis? What can the valley support? Resident workforce is seeing widening gap. Need more and different places for people to live.
- Not too much argument in the group Great visions. But mechanisms not meeting vision statements without compromise. They are subjective. “Sustainable housing for residents”-- is free market possible?
- How can normal people have affordable housing. People are leaving.

- Plan vision is nice, but implementation has loop holes. The 1994 Plan didn't work on specifics (e.g., Now we need to tighten down definitions, buildout, character, (e.g., how many people? Get specific.)
- Implementation important!

1994 Plan Vision

The written comments were:

1. Is the 1994 Plan Vision Statement generally still relevant? If not, why?

T2 – one opinion: The visions are still appropriate; however the mechanisms in place are not meeting them without seriously compromising each other. Attempts at balance become very subjective due to lack of specific criteria, or conflicting criteria. Methods of balancing different needs.

T2 – another opinion: The visions aren't consistent with each other. Emphasizing one vision compromises another.

T3: Loopholes have bypassed the master plan. Ranching has disappeared. Transportation is still very key. We are surprised about zoning: Land development regulations not strictly enforced. Housing type for residential workers is relatively meaningless.

T4: Yes.

T5: Yes. But not agriculture. County only seems to build for wealthy people.

T7: Yes.

2. To refine the Vision Statement, what themes would your group recommend adding or taking out?

T2: Traditions and character is an evolving goal. The character of the Rocky Mountains is changing, whether we like it or not. The Architecture of Jackson has always been very eclectic. Don't over regulate design or we will become very artificial.

T3: Need very specific modeling: # people, # cars, # of houses by type. More attention to control zoning and land use regulations. Define both sides of issues.

T4: What population at build-out is sustainable? Add traffic and transportation. Remove agriculture. Revise regular and updates with a monitoring process.

T5: Drop agriculture. Benchmark sustainability. The town goals differ from the county goals. Need more open space and places for people.

T7: Public transportation--create multi-modal transportation

3. Which of the Vision Statement topics or themes are major priorities for the community to address during this plan update? Why? Would you be willing to make trade-offs to achieve goals related to this topic?

T2: Sustainable housing market for residents, preferably in a free market environment if it is still possible.

T3: Must solve the problem regionally in surrounding counties: Population cap, Where are we now, Town character, protect neighborhoods and character.

T4: Support a resident workforce, and define sustainability.

T5: Community/commodity, work/wealth, conservation, Do we actually support what we say/we do?

T7: Protect and maintain community character size, scope, events, place, work for seasonal and diverse persons.

1994 Plan Analysis Comments

Housing Needs Assessment – Bureau of labor statistics. Could be turnover of jobs. Aren't squared up with what they're looking at.

Transportation? Mechanism for tying to reasons (e.g., tourism flat, data not there).

1994 Comprehensive Plan Analysis

1. What does your group see as the accomplishments and short-comings of the 1994 Plan:

Check one for each topic ((Y) yes, (N) no, or (M) maybe:

5Y 5N 2M ***Development Location (Open space preservation, Areas suitable for development, Affordable Housing Centers, and Town Development)***

0Y 3N 1M ***Development Patterns and Community Character***

2Y 0N 1M ***Protection of Natural and Scenic Resources, Agriculture***

3Y 0N 2M ***Affordable Housing***

2Y 0N 2M ***Transportation***

0Y 3N 2M ***Balance Between Resorts and Community***

T3: Great inter-structural gains, really mixed community. Resorts have a huge impact economically

T4: Development meets some goals but not others. Need wildlife habitat protection. No agriculture. We need pathways and transit to help traffic problems.

T2: The goals from the 1994 plan were for a different circumstance. Our valley has changed so dramatically, our goals need to meet our current circumstance. I can't even compare 1994 to now, the community is so different.

2. How would your group rank these topics in order of priority for the plan update to address? (with #1 being highest priority)

	T8	T7	T5	T2	T4	T3
Development location	3	7	2	1	2	
Development patterns	4	4	1	4	3	1b
Protections of natural and scenic resources	1	6	3	3	1	1c
Affordable housing	5	2	5	2	3	3
Transportation	6	3	4	5		
Balance between resorts and community	2	4	6	6		2
Sustainability/ Energy use/ types		1				

T3: Need to work on defining community character. Crucial “the people who live here need to have more say in what is going to happen.” T3- 1- Build out cap- how many, for whom, what type? Need to really spend time in defining community character in a manual to help guide the actions of community.

T4: There is no community

T2: Affordable housing/ not all deed restricted. Need opportunity for free market

T7: Sustainability/ Energy Use/ Types

T8: Lighting restrictions, keep lights off Teton Range silhouette. Allow only near or at the base of the range. (Must involve the Park Service and, especially, the Forest Service, since they lease the land for skiing, recreational sports, etc.) Need to preserve visual esthetic views (both during the day and night).

Are you all in agreement? No

3. Keeping in mind this is an update to the 1994 Plan, what do you think are the most critical questions the update should answer in each of the following subject areas:

Check those that apply:

- Development Location (Open space preservation, Areas suitable for development, Affordable Housing Centers, and Town Development)**
- Development Patterns and Community Character**
- Protection of Natural and Scenic Resources, Agriculture**
- Affordable Housing**
- Transportation**
- Balance Between Resorts and Community**
- Other topics (please list) _____**

T2: Whatever we do, we can't lose our community. I don't know how to accomplish this but our community (people)! To me I want to continue to live here – after 30 years. It is very hard to still make it happen – my children can never do it – but a wealthy man's can. That is really too bad.

T4: Development location, protection of natural and scenic resources, affordable housing

T5: Development locations, development patterns and community character, protection of natural and scenic resources, affordable housing, transportation, balance between L.S and community

T3: Build out. Definition of character that is useful. Need tighter control of land use targets/ number of regulations. A less cumbersome development process. Historical preservation ordinance and incentives.

Help Refine the Community Vision – Comment Forms

We received four written comment forms at the meeting. Comments are:

- Support and promote a resident work force – the market will take care of high end.
- Gentleman ranching has taken over ranching as a means of making a living.
- Population growth will likely be required for economic sustenance.
- Either designate areas as “no growth” and transfer development to density nodes or allow more growth.
- Yes (the vision is still valid). Prioritize resident workforce.
- Cap buildout.
- Provide a diverse, safe mix of transportation options.
- Need to prioritize goals.
- How to integrate Latino community.
- Sustainability: What does that mean? For population/build out?
- We must acknowledge somewhere in the plan, the affect of national and international issues into the future:
 - Energy, types, costs, availability (electricity, petroleum, natural gas, etc.)
 - Terrorism
 - Wealth growth
 - Retirees: baby boomers most wealth every calls for a 40 year cycle.
- Also – Wyoming has no state income tax – a big factor for Jackson’s growth.