

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	Preservation of wildlife, wildlife corridors and scenic areas should be our #1 priority! The End.	Barbara Magin	4/29/2009 17:35
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	Page 17. I would point out that the second bullet point under 2008 polling..says that a MAJORITY of the community supports preserving wildlife over more deed restricted housing. I think this has been totally ignored. I know the answer to that is that with the nodes there will be less impact; but with this plan there are still going to be 50,000 people in this valley and that cannot help but negatively impact our wildlife.	Bland Hoke Jr.	5/15/2009 15:47
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	Preserving open space is extremely important. I could not find a clear definition of open space in the plan. I looked for this because I understand that the Melody Ranch gravel pit is classified as "open space" and recall that Shooting Star proposed about 100,000 sf of development in "open space" several years ago. To me, open space should be defined as "undisturbed land or new park land". The community wants to preserve open space and there should be more restrictions on what can be done within an open space boundary.	Bob Nigro	4/23/2009 13:11
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	I have serious concerns about what the property owners intend to do with their water rights in T40N R116W Sections 6 and 7 (abandon, transfer?). Since the Adams Ditch head gate is in the SW1/4SE1/4 of section 6, will these appropriators have access to that head gate and what about ditch maintenance issues?	Bodean Barney	5/6/2009 23:02
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	Policy 1.1.b: Monitor cumulative human impacts Data already exists that supports human impacts have had a negative effect on native species. We need to start this Policy by compiling and analyzing existing data. Policy 1.1.c: Conserve large, contiguous, and connected open spaces Yes! This is a policy that could be the most effective in sustaining our wildlife populations, scenic values and tourist based economy. Policy 1.1.g: Permeability of development design for wildlife I strongly disagree with the statement that the Town and community nodes will not be included in this. Please change this statement to include all development. For example, Flat Creek running through Town provides for a tremendous amount of fish and wildlife movement. Policy 1.2.b: Require filtration of urban runoff This policy should include onsite and off sites detention and ideally, retention (through infiltration) of stormwater. Low Impact Development practices should be implemented by new development including municipal sidewalks and other projects. Indicators Add - Percent of surface water runoff being detained and infiltrated/treated before reaching our waterbodies.	Brian Remlinger	5/8/2009 17:04
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	In the surveys taken last year, this was more than a theme-- it was a priority. When it conflicted with growth and development, this was to take "priority"-- that's what it means. The planners seem to have forgotten that, or as one said when denigrating the surveys, "we don't plan by referendum." The people will not put up with being insulted by the planners and those encouraging them. Start over and do this right, it's just too important.	C Schwender	5/11/2009 22:08

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	<p>I apologize that my previous comment pertaining to Policy 1.5.d ("Maintain dark night skies") ventured well beyond the "community-vision" objective of the Comprehensive Plan, and into the forbidden land of "regulatory means." But to do otherwise is difficult when the best antidote to light pollution is simply less light - given that even reflected light from "dark-sky" compliant fixtures can contribute significantly.</p> <p>The Comprehensive Plan's acknowledgement of "dark and starry night skies" as worth maintaining is very positive, as is the policy statement's inclusion of limiting "nonessential lighting." (a reference to the double whammy of natural-resource depletion). Missing, however, is explicit reference to qualitative attributes of outdoor lighting that clearly affect its value, without directly impacting dark skies and natural resources.</p> <p>That omission occurs because the Plan's architecture fails to include a Community Value Theme that addresses the human interface of resource stewardship and responsible growth. Therefore, I suggest adding an additional Theme and thereby broadening the Plan's conception of "public goods," as follows.</p> <p>Theme: Provide for the community's public safety and quality of life.</p> <p>Therein would be a venue for outdoor lighting as follows:</p> <p>Principle: Promote effective outdoor lighting.</p> <p>Policies: 1. Limit glare. Glare is what blinds the eye's retina as it adapts to the brightest light source, meaning one's surroundings become darker and less visible. Even worse, the effects of glare become more disabling with age, which is why the elderly often are unable to drive at night. Typically, a light that causes glare is psychologically associated with good lighting, whereas it is just the opposite-glare reduces visibility, visual comfort, and the usefulness of light.</p> <p>2. Limit light intensity. The effects of excessive illumination are similar to glare: the retina is slow to adjust to a variety of light levels and, once adjusted, greater illumination levels may be no more enabling than lesser levels. And as illumination levels increase, adjacent areas appear darker and shadows more prominent, thereby impairing public safety.</p> <p>3. Limit light trespass and light pollution. This relates to the intrusive and devaluing effects of unwanted light upon private property and common spaces, and the responsibility to avert uncontained light from spilling upwards or outward across property boundaries.</p> <p>Strategy: Amend lighting ordinances and development standards so as to achieve a timely implementation of policies.</p>	Carl Jordan	5/16/2009 17:03
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	<p>RE: Policy 1.5.d: Maintain dark night skies.</p> <p>This element is of critical importance to natural-resource protection as it impacts tourism, disturbs natural habitats and circadian rhythms, and devalues the dark sky as a source of human discovery and inspiration. The objective must be effective lighting without undue glare, trespass, or light pollution.</p> <p>Currently Jackson and Teton Cy have similar ordinances with good provisions for glare (90-degree cutoff with limited pole heights) and trespass (shielded from direct view at the perimeter). The maximum permitted illumination levels are reasonable, but should be restated in lumens/sq.ft., as incorporated in the current draft model-ordinance proposed by International Dark Sky Association and Illuminating Engineering Society; and these levels should be kept low due to substantial light reflected off winter snow-cover.</p> <p>But if the intent of Policy 1.5.d is only to maintain current ambient light levels, that is not good enough. The night sky around Jackson Hole is already light-polluted, and therefore must get darker in order to protect its values. And references to generalized national standards (e.g. IESNA) are likely to be too lenient to meet our demanding environmental objectives and winter-snow conditions.</p> <p>Therefore, further strengthening of local ordinances should include the following provisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given the substantial light-pollution impact of outdoor lighting on tourism, habitat, and the adjacent National Parks, an amortization period for noncompliant fixtures is justified (as in Victor and Ketchum), at which time all grandfathered fixtures must comply. Meanwhile, hinged, adjustable floodlights should be re-directed downward (below 30-degrees above nadir) and away from roadways, and all outdoor lighting be brought into compliance as a complement to redevelopment or change of use.</li> <li>Natural resources can be conserved and night-skies darkened by extinguishing nonresidential uses one hour after the close of business, except for demonstrated security needs.</li> <li>Signs should also be regulated by requiring downward-directed sign lighting, and internally-lit signs (except for trademarked material) should be composed with dark backgrounds.</li> <li>Given the extreme sensitivity of Jackson Hole to light pollution, I do not believe that upward (vertical) architectural lighting should be permitted, no matter how tightly it might be regulated.</li> </ol>	Carl Jordan	5/15/2009 3:29

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	<p>Principles and Policies Principle 1.1 Establishment of focal species and protecting and monitoring them is an excellent idea. Who decides on the focal species?</p> <p>You say that until these new protections are put in place crucial winter habitat for moose, deer, elk, etc. will continue to be protected. But there is crucial winter moose habitat in Wilson ( as indicated by the most recent Game and Fish evaluation ) that will not be protected if the density increase contemplated in this Plan is adopted.</p> <p>I ask that ALL winter habitat be protected until the new protections, based on updated NROs ( and expanded to include the current notable gaps ) are in place.</p> <p>Policy 1.1.b. and Policy 1.1.d.</p> <p>Here I feel that all development decisions should be based on solid science. In places where we do not yet have sufficient information, nothing should be developed. There are acknowledged notable gaps in the data that we do have. These gaps are in Wilson, Teton Village Road, Snake River area. Exactly where you have designated development nodes and sharp increases in density. Decisions on such density increases should wait till we have adequate science to guide us and assure us that we will not destroy or degrade crucial habitat.</p> <p>Policy 1.1.g.</p> <p>I feel that in all areas, INCLUDING the county nodes, development should be designed to accommodate wildlife movement and support wildlife migration.</p> <p>Principle 1.4</p> <p>You state that development in floodplains and other hazardous areas should be minimal or avoided. The Aspens and Wilson are both in 100 year floodplains. Clearly, that makes them an inappropriate place to promote such a drastic increase in density. What are you thinking?</p> <p>Policy 1.5</p> <p>Here the town and county should require compliance with dark skies policy for existing and new development rather than rely on incentivizing.</p>	Carol Wauters	5/18/2009 1:03
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	<p>1. Updating of NRO mapping should be done prior to adoption of the plan so that decisions are being made on the basis of information that is as up to date and complete as possible.</p> <p>2. Permeability of development design for wildlife: current "wildlife friendly" fencing standards as currently written are very difficult to enforce as has been shown by numerous problem fences constructed in recent years.</p> <p>When the LDR's are written to implement this goal, please consider having some permit process for construction of fencing or some way for the Town and County to know IN ADVANCE that a fence is going to be constructed so that "wildlife permeability" can be reviewed before construction. Trying to correct a problem after construction is not working well at all. Many of the new buck and rail fences that have been constructed around individual parcels are simple too high.</p> <p>The agricultural exemption is a serious problem and should be reviewed. For example: *The construction in 2008 of a very high (48"-52"+ top rail) buck and rail fence along Spring Gulch Road to replace the old and long established 36-38" wire fence has resulted in a barrier to wildlife movement.</p> <p>*A 52" fence (2007) on a 120 acre parcel in the Zenith area is causing considerable impediment to elk movement (especially for younger/old animals) during the migration in Spring and Fall.</p> <p>*A 52" fence built around a conservation easement property (Kings Highway area) is yet another impediment to the "permeability" concept.</p> <p>If this Plan is genuinely dedicated to stewardship of wildlife and all that this implies then fencing regulations must be improved AND ENFORCED. At present fencing contractors interpret the ag exemption to mean that "we can build anything we want" regardless of consequences to wildlife.</p> <p>The Town of Jackson should also consider the implications of fencing in known wildlife movement areas. Given the movement of deer across the corridor from the butte to the Karns Meadow area, the construction of the fence along the north side of the old Sagebrush motel Property on Broadway should have had to meet wildlife friendly standards.</p>	Cate Miller	5/16/2009 0:39
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	<p>While there is mention of the importance of wildlife corridors, there is no attempt to define wildlife corridors, nor is there any guidance on how important wildlife corridors would be identified. Once we make a mistake and allow development impacts in critical wildlife corridors, it will be too late. As stewardship of wildlife and natural resources is the most important theme of the community, this appears to be a critical omission.</p> <p>While there are general steps to protect wildlife, the plan does not permanently protect wildlife in any way. What are the specific litmus tests?</p> <p>Environmental commission: While the concept of an environmental commission is an admirable one, there is no mention of how the commission would be chosen by elected officials. As real estate development and tourism are key elements of our local economy, we need more specificity on the avoidance of conflicts of interest and the depth of qualifications expected for such a commission. How will the commission measure impacts? When is an impact deemed great enough for action?</p>	Cathy Kehr	5/14/2009 14:38
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	<p>How on earth could you publish this theme without a revised NRO map????? You've had the information for almost a year and there is no way you can gauge the impacts of the wildlife issues for the various districts without a revised map. This is the most inane thing that has happened with this plan. Wildlife is a driving force with this revision and not having the revised information as a part of the document is ridiculous.</p> <p>What is described as being important considerations in this theme are appropriate. Taking them seriously in the LDR's is yet to be seen.</p>	Diane Hazen	5/15/2009 14:57

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	<p>Policy 1.3.a: "requiring <u>and funding the conservation of energy...</u>"</p> <p>Policy 1.3.c: Add: The life-cycle cost associated with buildings shall be considered, including analysis of the up-front cost associated with constructing more energy efficient buildings, and the long term gains.</p> <p>Strategy 1.4 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet: "<u>provide incentives, adopt mechanisms to provide appropriate funding, ...</u>"</p> <p>Add # 9: Indicator- Energy consumption Goal- Decrease per capita energy consumption Review period-5 yr</p>	EEAB LAUT	5/19/2009 0:00
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	<p>Generally: Numerous policies are stated that require some sort of measurement and monitoring yet no current studies exist that set baselines to allow a comparison. There is not enough mention of continued agricultural uses and not just as it relates to conservation easements. Protection of this long Wyoming industry and character enhancing value of Jackson is missing except for the mention in Principle 1.6. The 1994 Plan was much more supportive of ranching, 4H use, recreational horse ranches, etc.. The Plan should remove all development incentives in the NRO but should not limit the base entitlement rights of land owners. Numerous mention of incentives are mentioned - what kind of incentives? What are the costs of incentives and who pays?</p> <p>Page 16 Photo caption should be changed to indicate: Wildlife and natural resources protection is the priority theme of the Plan.</p> <p>Page 17 box. The first paragraph should state that most members of the community believe that wildlife and natural resource protection should be the organizing theme. Bullet 2 should not mention some believe workforce housing is equally important unless a percentage is stated and better yet eliminate this sentence.</p> <p>Bullet 3 should indicate the unwillingness or low level the community is supportive of funding. This bullet is misleading based on public comment.</p> <p>Policy 1.1.a. Is worded like there are not protections in place which is not the case. 1.1.d. Is this attempting to further limit the base entitlement rights in the rural zones? This is already very restrictive.</p> <p>Policy 1.1.e. What are programmatic steps?</p> <p>Policy 1.1.g. This should not except development in the town or nodes. Agricultural use should be protected as in the 1994 Plan.</p> <p>Principle 1.4 and 1.5 make no mention of existing platted or approved development affected by new regulations.</p> <p>Strategy 1.2 last bullet should also set up approved sending areas for off sight vegetation mitigation.</p> <p>The indicator table on pg.26 shows timeframes that in most cases are too short to show any trend or come to a conclusion.</p>	Gail Jensen	5/17/2009 14:25
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	<p>I have significant concerns about the way that this plan addresses protection of wildlife. This is one of the most important places in the country and the main reason we moved here. I am very disappointed that the plan does not limit growth nor consider current wildlife migration and sensitive areas when it identified up-zone areas. Allowing for more development in these areas DOES NOT PROTECT OUR WILDLIFE. Just drive down HWY 89 any morning in the winter and you can see for yourself what development in Melody, Rafter J and the construction of a 5 lane highway has done for our wildlife. The amount of dead carcasses on the road is unbelievable. I would appreciate your consideration on this subject - the number one subject identified by our valley residence - and re-work this plan so that it gives our much deserved wildlife a needed break.</p>	Holly Balogh	5/2/2009 20:40
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	<p>With your ambitious plans for excessive growth in Teton County, you have completely ignored the public's comments about the importance of preserving wildlife and natural resources.</p>	Jill Moberg	5/15/2009 17:13
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	<p>Because of the placement of this issue, it is focused on night skies, which is excellent and a valuable part of the Plan.</p> <p>Another aspect of outdoor lighting should also be addressed in the plan -- the effect of glare and light trespass on residents and visitors. These effects do affect the ability of residents and visitors to enjoy the night skies. They also affect the ambiance of the area, and they represent a health safety issue in two respects. First, evidence is accumulating that light-at-night (LAN) suppresses melatonin production, disrupting sleep and contributing to cancer risk. Second, glare makes driving and navigating at night more difficult and can be a contributor to accidents.</p> <p>This other aspect of outdoor lighting effects should be addressed at an appropriate place in the Plan.</p>	John L Liebenthal	5/15/2009 12:40
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	<p>We need wildlife impact studies to be built in as we go along with planned development.</p>	Julie McIntyre	5/17/2009 12:27
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	<p>Sounds great.</p>	Karen Jerger	5/15/2009 2:04

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	Without stewardship of wildlife and wild spaces, Jackson Hole might as well not exist.	Kathleen Belk	5/12/2009 19:31
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	Lofty goal but should not be the first priority. It should be strongly considered with such items as #7. Quality community facilities, services and INFRASTRUCTURE are the real NEEDS of residents in your "satelite" communities. Jackson as the "Hub of The Universe" needs to recognize that it is not all that great in its attitude to those of us in the outlying areas. Jackson has all the ammenities. Recreational facilities, fire, police, schools, library, are all in place which those of us living in the County pay for but do not have the ability to access them without an hour's travel. See #6	Ken Koster	4/24/2009 15:44
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	The increased pressure on our wildlife and natural resources from development will only get worse and needs to be addressed in a more proactive way. Research by WGF and others is limited and should be a driver for what needs to be done. If there is no data in an area, either there should be an effort to obtain that information or any decisions for that area should be made with the knowledge that each remaining acre in Teton County is becoming more and more critical for habitat. To assume that no data means that everything is OK is irresponsible. There is a great need to look at cumulative impacts we are having on the land and resources. We may be beyond the tipping point for being able to maintain our wildlife. Unfortunately, the identified nodes are also wildlife habitat and the plan should address development that impacts those species. Additional species should be included in your focal group such as bears, birds of prey, pronghorn, and others as determined by WGF and other researchers. The "crucial" and "migration" corridor definitions should be refined or eliminated from the LDRs. We should declare that all wildlife use of lands in Teton County are essential to the viability of these animals.	Louise Lasley	5/14/2009 13:27
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	Page 17, 3rd bullet: "A large majority of the community agrees with establishing a funding source to acquire open space..." However, no where in the Strategies section is such a program even mentioned, much less defined; without this definition, it will not happen. Page 25, Strategy 1.1, 1st bullet: "The Environment Commission will be an appointed volunteer committee of scientists..." This is too limiting. I would argue that there are many residents who are not degreed "scientists" who have important practical knowledge of and experience in Jackson Hole that must not be ignored.	Michael Faraday	5/17/2009 14:23
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	I write to share my feedback and raise concerns about the recently released draft of the proposed update to the Town of Jackson/Teton Comprehensive Plan. The draft plan fails to properly protect Jackson's unique wildlife, open spaces, and community character. Once you have allowed growth to occur in an irresponsible manner (as proposed in this draft plan), it will not be possible to ever recreate the beauty of this valley or bring back wildlife destroyed by this proposed growth. I do not understand the reason why you have ignored what the public has asked for and diluted the clear, strong language of the 1994 Plan that supports the stewardship of the ecosystem. The public clearly stated it did not want more growth but rather appropriate limitation of growth. The public also shared through community surveys that it wanted to preserve open spaces, such as South Park, and to protect Jackson Hole's wildlife and natural resources as the number one priority. The new draft proposes significant growth that is not desired by the public and then allows for a substantial increase in the number of buildings and private developments. I cannot tell whose voices were heard and addressed. The draft plan reads as if you listened to the voice of developers rather than the rest of the public. I remain opposed to a number of aspects of the draft plan. It improperly de-emphasizes the importance of scenic resources and does not contain a mechanism to permanently protect rural open space areas. It contemplates more than doubling the number of residences and commercial space. Rather than directly address and reduce the severe shortfall in affordable workforce housing, this draft plan worsens the problem. New workers will create additional demands for affordable housing, and compound the existing shortage. In my view, the draft plan should make infill in the town the first priority before considering expansion into other nodes in the County. Please reduce the recommended overall build-out of the town and county and define maximum build-out so that only a slow sustainable rate of growth will be encouraged. I live in South Park and remain seriously concerned that the Plan proposes elimination of language from the prior Plan that called for permanent open space protections of South Park and for protecting the scenic and wildlife values in South Park. I have looked out of my window and seen red fox and moose living in and crossing this part of the valley. Eagles regularly rest on nearby trees. This area contains irreplaceable wildlife and, if you do not protect it, that wildlife will be lost forever. Please revise the comprehensive plan to accurately reflect the will of the community and its residents and fulfill your responsibility to preserve this spectacular place we live in.	Michele Gammer	5/14/2009 0:00
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	Theme 1 is ignored, and devalued in most of the development nodes as well as most of the town districts. The impacts of development which disrupts migration patterns, destroys habitat in wetland and riparian zones, diminishes open space, causes an increase in roads, traffic, congestion, pollution, need for services, infrastructure, all have a negative impact on wildlife. Also extremely important is the negative impact on the quality of life for our community. The protect wildlife theme must be placed as the number one priority!	Patty Ewing	5/18/2009 0:08

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	<p>It has been interesting reading the new Comprehensive Plan, and following the debate over it, from out here in Abu Dhabi. I've been struck by a link between the economies here and in Teton County: Both are dependent on a natural resource, and successful management of that resource is essential for good economic performance. But there also is an important difference. Once a barrel of oil is sold and shipped from here it's gone forever, and the oil supply eventually will run out. Teton County has a great advantage over this region; its natural resources can be enjoyed without depletion, and with proper care can last for, and benefit, many generations.</p> <p>That is why I am puzzled by why the Plan doesn't make a stronger effort to understand the scope and vulnerabilities of the Valley's natural capital. Preserving the natural environment is an important theme of the Plan, of course, but this is not accompanied by any serious attempt to measure the impact of development on the environmental capital of the valley, or to balance costs against benefits. That gap, in my opinion, undermines much of that the Plan wants to accomplish. You have a Plan that assumes growth will happen, and tries to channel it to where that growth will do the least damage. It takes a short-term view when it treats building homes and commercial space that will last for decades. This is not responsible stewardship of a unique, irreplaceable resource.</p> <p>The planning process made a strong effort to understand what the community wants. It did not make the same effort to take an inventory of our environment, and determine how to preserve it. That's a gap that can be fixed. The problems of our economy and financial system have just put a long moratorium on major development activity. There is no obstacle to extending the planning process to make a quantitative assessment of our natural capital, and how much development it can sustain.</p> <p>Your leadership can make a difference. Support the goals of the Plan, but instruct the planning staff to come up with real answers to hard questions: What is our environmental capital worth, in terms of jobs created and recreational benefits enjoyed? What further buildout is consistent with maintaining current environmental quality? Where do we want the population and development footprint in the Valley to be in 50 years or 100 years? There is time to ask these questions now, and if we miss this chance we may not have another one.</p>	Paul F. O'Brien	4/27/2009 0:00
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	<p>I think promoting stewardship of wildlife is paramount. Development must be limited in many respects in order to achieve this goal. I don't believe that tripling the size of Wilson and allowing for 1000 more units in South Park are in harmony with this goal, nor is overdeveloping the Town of Jackson. I like the idea of town as heart and support more development in town but not to the extent that the number of people in the valley has a negative impact on wildlife and natural resources. A much larger population in town would surely compromise the integrity of recreation areas such as Cache Creek and Snow King. The amount of allowable development must be in harmony with our environment.</p>	Robin McGee	5/12/2009 11:39
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	<p>As a private citizen of the County , I am in support of the BHAG (Big Hairy Audacious Goal) of being Carbon Neutral by 2030. Please keep that statement in the Comp Plan. Thank you!</p>	Roxanne DeVries Robinson	5/14/2009 0:00
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	<p>New regulations will protect a group of focal species, but they are not yet identified. There should be a target date for establishing the focal species. Evaluation of focal species should be done on a running 3 year average, not on a year to year basis.</p> <p>-Strongly disagree with policy 1.1g that Town development and county nodes will not be wildlife permeable. There is a need to provide safe passage for deer on West Broadway. That area needs to be developed with permeability or safe passage routes in mind. The same applies to South Park.</p> <p>-This theme promotes renewable resources and a reduction in greenhouse gases but ignores the obvious. Build less. If we build smaller buildings we have a reduced impact. A big house with LEED gold certification in the wrong location can use more energy and have a bigger impact on wildlife than a smaller house in the right location.</p> <p>-Policy 1.5.d has a goal to maintain views of vistas from public roads and parks, but does not mention from town. Citizens do not favor 4 story buildings. They block our view. We need to eliminate them. Living in town does not have to mean giving up a view.</p> <p><b>-Environmental Commission needs private citizens, not just scientists.</b> The Commission should include at least 2 citizens who are concerned about wildlife.</p> <p>-The indicators do not mention wildlife. This is very discouraging for a theme that is supposed to be about wildlife. <b>We need to define a LOS for people who value wildlife in Teton Co.</b> If I have to drive to see animals I used to see in my neighborhood, my LOS has declined.</p> <p>-Conservation easements will taper off with time, using that an indicator of success will cause failure over time.</p> <p>-Indicator 4 should be monitored yearly to avoid the temptation to make Indicator 3 look good by dumping directly into Flat Creek to reduce the sediment in storm water treatment units.</p> <p>-Indicator 5, ratio of habitat mitigation to habitat disturbance is not meaningful. Need to quantify the value of the mitigation and disturbance, not just the measure the area affected.</p> <p>-In sub-areas that have a lower priority for wildlife, it is important to recognize that there may be areas within the sub-area where wildlife should be given higher priority. The best example is deer crossing West Broadway to reach Karns Meadow. Protecting a crossing through that spot is very important to keeping Snow King and the south facing slopes above Broadway connected. These areas should be identified in the Plan</p>	Save Historic Jackson Hole	5/15/2009 10:51

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	<p>We have a lot of protected lands...but to build out the last 3% to the total extend is not in the interest of many people living in Jackson. To be a responsible Steward for Wildlife and the Yellowstone greater area we probably should have a greater vision. Just looking into the next 10 years is maybe not extensive enough...maybe a look further than 10 yrs. into the future would be more responsible....Jackson, is a "small node" and cant be another Idaho Falls, Casper, etc...We dont have to accomodate everyone who would like to live here because it is so beautiful.....I see almost on a daily basis people who have come here to Jackson for work (summer or winter) and love to kayak, bike, hike..you can do it all here...but are really not interest in Stewardship for the wildlife...it is nice to see a moose and an elk but hey..I cant slow down because of them because I have places to go and need to be there "right now"... So there more population we have here in Jackson (densed in) the more conflicts there will be between wildlife and people. So I guess even in that little 3% node we need enough space for the wildlife to migrate through....open spaces... So please consider the open spaces in town and south and north of town.....the wildlife needs them, we need them..too.</p>	Sonja Boehne	4/27/2009 14:52
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	<p>After much public comment, oral, written, and surveys conducted, it's clear that the vast majority of residents want to emphasize the protection of our valley's most precious resource: rural scenery and viable wildlife corridors as our number one objective.</p> <p>Additionally:</p> <p>Clearly articulate the entire district as containing important wildlife, connectivity, and scenic values, using language similar to that in the current (1994) comp plan.</p> <p>Delete language that states South Park will be built out from 'north to south starting at High School Road.'</p> <p>Exhaust in-fill in town before considering any expansion into new County nodes (including NW South Park) or targeted Town growth areas.</p> <p>Drastically reduce the proposed NW South Park 400-acre, 1,500-unit housing node, both in footprint and number of units, consistent with a less-growth plan.</p> <p>Clearly state that any density incentives used for the reduced NW South Park node will be derived from permanent open space protection within the district only, not from Alta or Buffalo Valley.</p> <p>The reduced NW South Park node to have a 1/8 mile pull-back from both High School and South Park Loop Roads, to respect the educational nature of HS Road and the scenic value of South Park Loop.</p> <p>The design of any development in the reduced NW South Park node to allow wildlife movement permeability.</p> <p>The design of any East-West connector road to not encourage further sprawl towards Rafter J in the future.</p> <p>The design of the reduced NW node to not add traffic volumes onto High School Road.</p> <p>No annexation of the new reduced node until it is designed and approved under County LDR criteria. No annexation as a whole, to then fall into Town design standards.</p> <p>The Tribal Trails connector between South Park Loop Road and HWY 22 not even considered until all solutions for improving the 'Y' intersection are exhausted, and assurances made that no new traffic would be diverted onto High School Road.</p>	Tom Vajda	5/17/2009 20:40
03 Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources (Theme 1)	<p>It was the character of the region that drew my husband and me here: the sheer, naked beauty of the mountains and the valley; the friendliness of the residents; the homey-ness of the town; the ubiquitous commitment of all who lived here to protecting the character of this unique region. We moved here to be a part of this community that so closely aligns with our own personal character. We live in Wilson; our home is less than ten miles from Hoback Junction.</p> <p>We understand that the development of a new Comprehensive Plan particularly addresses the issue of sustainability within our region, so that development meets the needs of the present community without compromising the ability of communities that evolve in the future to meet their own needs. It is notable that the proposed Comprehensive Plan guarantees that decisions about development extend to the preservation and protection of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. Specifically, the Plan states that, while recognizing that growth and development are necessary to meet the human needs of the community, the impact of local decisions must be understood in a regional context because of the ecological significance of our surroundings. To this end, two foremost priorities were developed that drive the focal community themes around which the Comprehensive Plan was formulated: 1) promotion of wildlife and natural resources stewardship, and 2) responsible management of growth.</p> <p>In terms of the first priority, the Plan seeks to maintain viable populations of all native species and to preserve the natural, scenic, and agricultural resources that define Teton County's character. There's that term "character" again. In the chapter detailing this first community theme, the Plan once again addresses the need for updated mapping before any decisions about development or community change can be made. Many residents of Teton County are seriously concerned about the disruption of wildlife migration corridors, should any regional development plan be adopted before mapping is updated. Community residents apparently agreed with the limitation of development and population growth to county nodes, the "Y", and downtown Jackson. In no part of the Comprehensive Plan or its appendices is it recorded that community residents agreed where those county nodes would be located.</p> <p>As new, but passionately involved members of the Wilson and Jackson/Teton County communities we wish to express our hope that planners, administrators, and elected officials read closely the Comprehensive Plan before adopting it as the absolute paradigm for future development in this region. The Plan is a work of art and its intricate detail is staggering.</p> <p>Unfortunately, it appears that a number of the Plan's expectations have not yet been met: updated mapping of wildlife habitats and migration corridors; updated zoning maps and amended base development right regulations; coordination between Jackson/Teton County planners and WYDOT; determination of congruence between stated plans and local character. Surging forward to adopt this Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan without careful consideration of these and other issues significant to the residents of the varied parts of this community can only be detrimental to all concerned in the long run.</p>	Vicki L. Rosenberg	5/11/2009 23:12