



## Technical Advisory Group Meeting #2 Summary

---

Thursday, January 31, 2008

4H Building, Miller Park

Time: 10:30 AM - 12:30 PM

### Agenda

---

1. Reports and updates
2. Present scenarios and results from public meeting and STAG
3. Discussion
4. Wrap-up (future events, next meeting dates, etc.)

### Attendance

---

TAG: 13 members of TAG participated, including: Rachel Markko, Doug Brimeyer, Rusty Palmer, David Kaufman, Brian Schilling, Mary Martin, Terri Gregory, Michael Wackerly, Christine Walker, Tim Young, Steve Foster, and Susan Patla. 3 guests were also present.

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

### Meeting Summary

---

#### Discussion about Scenarios and Feedback from Public Meeting

Staff provided a brief overview of the scenarios and feedback from 1/30 public event where almost 200 people participated. People will continue to have opportunities to give feedback about the scenarios via on-line questions and paper surveys.

TAG Comments were as follows:

- Don't take the results from the public meeting "to the bank," because what people say they support and what they are "willing to pay" are different. Consider adding some questions about willingness to pay (i.e., for housing and transportation).
- Will the community survey include people outside the county? (i.e., 35% of workers live outside). No, the community survey will focus on residents. The county and town will consider other methods to capture those "out of county" perspectives, such as intercept surveys, meetings with employees at the hospital, etc. The on-line survey will capture opinions of people outside the county.
- Add a question to the survey regarding home ownership (e.g., "Do you own or rent your home?")
- The TAG discussed how we can resolve some contradictions within the scenarios and better present unintended consequences.

- TAG can help the planning team highlight “unintended consequences” of choices, for example:
  - Cons of 4-story height in town:
    - Would require new fire equipment and engineering,
    - Increases human interaction and therefore potentially crime and demand for services,
    - People need space to store their “toys” – may mean more building elsewhere,
    - Increased costs of building in earthquake zone,
    - Parking is hard to enforce as the town grows higher.
  - Pros of increasing density and building heights in town:
    - reduces demand for transportation—road building,
    - increased efficiency in providing utilities and transportation,
    - preserves more land for wildlife habitat, and
    - possibly provides more workforce housing—if it doesn’t all become condos.
- One member is concerned that the undercurrent of “the American Dream” suggests that everyone should be entitled to a house in the valley. It is not possible.
- Committee members suggested we need to interrelate discussion about population growth (and buildout) with questions about what type of commercial and jobs. Ask people not only what type of housing they would like to see, but also what kind of growth overall? Do people want condos or affordable housing? The middle-class professional choices are gradually getting more segmented.
- Cull out a separate “impact” section to articulate impacts of choices. This could help provide the balance between the scenarios. (Response: We’ve been thinking big pictures. For the next level, that is where we are headed.)
- As a transient tourist community, don’t we need to include something about traffic? When it increases to require 6-7 cycles of lights, what are the impacts, e.g., on ambulance services? Incorporate that information into the plan.
- Transfer of Development Rights/Purchase of Development Rights (TDR)/(PDR) Programs – Where are they used and what is their effectiveness? The planning team provided some examples from around the country, including Boulder County, CO, Montgomery County, MD, and San Miguel County, CO (PDR program). Teton County land trusts have used PDRs successfully. For a program to work as a way to manage growth, it would have to be targeted and would need “receiving” areas. A TDR Program also needs incentives (usually at least a 1:1 ratio of sending and receiving areas). It can also be free market. The problem here (as in many places) is too much “sending area” and not enough receiving area.
- The “TDR/PDR” terminology may have been confusing in the questions. Take the acronym out and explain the concepts. Note that Teton County has a good legacy of (private) PDRs.
- Game and Fish – The scenarios present some dichotomy. Scenario D implies that it may be bad for wildlife to limit growth. Conversely, density and population growth overall will affect wildlife. This is because people use public lands, so if population increases (even if it is at higher densities), there are impacts on wildlife. The total number of people will have an affect on public lands outside the town. (e.g., houses on 1/35s with smaller footprint of population would be better for wildlife.)

- Some clarifications that would help in questions include: “town-level density”—clarify that this does not mean expansion. Define geographic boundaries of South Park – within ½ mile of high school and North of Rafter J.
- Explain the impacts of large houses—“castle” homes.
  - Cons of large houses:
    - The number of service employees per house increases exponentially to the size of the house, which creates impacts. For example, every large home adds 6 to 12 workers to the workforce, placing demands on services.
    - These houses use the “footprint of limited resources” (e.g., land, electricity, wood), making it so that workers can’t afford to live here.
    - Homes, even when unoccupied part of the time, still use services. (e.g., alarms go off.) Can we put user fees in place? Yes -- but that is only one part of the picture.
  - Explain the differences between large homes versus open spaces, and large homes versus modest homes or clustered development. The community sees smaller impacts with smaller homes.
- At the “Y”, acknowledge that housing units would not have the same type of impacts and the homes would not create as many employees. Housing would provide for workers locally.
- The planning team could create a “relative impacts guide,” with the help of TAG, to help people understand the moving parts and impacts of different choices.

Next steps:

The planning team explained that for the next round of materials, including a preferred plan, they will be working with WyDOT to do transportation modeling. Will be addressing investments and mode shift.