

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.11 District 11: Wilson	I don't think the planned Wilson node reflects what the locals have been saying. The plan includes too much growth. Our wonderful wildlife natural resource is not being adequately protected. And on and on. Keep it simple. Keep it small.	A, A. Zvegintzov	5/1/2009 10:00
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>I own the 5 acres between Hardeman's Barn and Fish Creek. My house is virtually on the creek and is built up so I have an incredible view up and down the creek and across the meadows. I see swans and geese and ducks and teal, eagles osprey and countless song birds. There's a herd of 15-20 elk that move from just upstream of me all the way down the creek. Moose rub against my house at night and feed on the willow and in the creek - and get killed on the highway. This spring there are actually two fox families raising their families around the Hardeman buildings; about 13 kits. Some of them will perish on the highway also. Otters are making a comeback and so are beavers. I have endless wonderful wild life stories seen right from my kitchen window. But the creek is already being degraded by the unnaturally high water that continues so much of the year; the baetis hatch is nearly gone and the caddis hatch is sparse.</p> <p>The amount of growth proposed by the plan can only speed and increase the degradation of the whole area. Our natural treasures need more protection - as our Wilson community keeps telling you- than is proposed in the plan. Please be more sensitive to what the community is saying.</p>	A, A. Zvegintzov	5/10/2009 21:30
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>This is a plan for the destruction of Wilson, and for Jackson Hole. Why did you hold all the public meetings if the wishes of the community were going to be absolutely disregarded? What a sham of a public process. I attended several of the meetings, and the residents of Wilson were very clear that we do not want our community destroyed by making it a focus for high-density development. The planners assured us that we had made our wishes clear and they understood that we do not want increased density in Wilson. I am horrified by what this new "plan" proposes for Wilson and for the rest of Jackson Hole.</p> <p>How many jobs does Wilson provide? The vast majority of people living in Wilson have to commute elsewhere to work. That won't change by adding hundreds of new units. What we will have is hundreds more cars on the road every day as the new residents commute to work.</p> <p>You also can't make a case that Wilson has little value as wildlife habitat and therefore is suitable for intensive human development. I have moose in my yard every winter, coyotes and foxes roaming around, trumpeter swans and geese and ducks on Fish Creek, elk in my yard this past winter, river otters using Fish Creek, and many other species of mammals and birds in all seasons. How many of them will persist with the intensity of development you are proposing?</p> <p>I am also dismayed at the lack of detail and vagueness of the "Plan". How is anyone supposed to be able to tell what's actually proposed? We need much more concrete detail in order to comment intelligently. Just saying things like "duplexes, triplexes, and four-plexes are appropriate" tells us nothing--where will they be? What areas will be upzoned? What amount of "worker housing" will entitle a landowner to upzoning? Which areas will be off-limits to increased density in order to protect wildlife?</p> <p>We need more time, we need more detail and less fluff. I, like many people I've talked to, am appalled by this pseudo-plan.</p>	Ann Harvey	5/15/2009 17:14
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>The current vision for Wilson as laid out in the Comprehensive Plan is unsustainable, unrealistic, and will prove devastating to any kind of life of value (or at all) in this magic valley. Please realize that there has to be a way to REPLACE SPRAWL with high-density nodes or the net effect of condensed living is worse than what we have now. During the next phase of planetary adjustment to resources, we need to be radical leaders in how to live WITH a landscape Planning for conventional growth is not a way to do this. Smart decisions limiting car traffic, using local resources (and less of them), changing our habits to accommodate wild animals and paying attention to our health and education needs as a community are ways that we can improve this place and our lives. If we want to accommodate 3-4 times more people in Wilson, then we must house them in square footage that has already been constructed, and create sensible commerce around existing infrastructure.</p> <p>The proposed density increase lies within the highest priority grizzly bear conflict zone. With the radical die-off of whitebark pine and the de-listing of the grizzly, it is highly possible that there will be no grizzly bears left in Yellowstone/Teton in the next few years, DUE TO CONFLICTS WITH HUMANS. Increasing density will increase conflicts, and create unmanageable stress levels for the bears.</p> <p>This is a time when we need to look very carefully at what we have left and what we want to do about it.</p> <p>Please LISTEN TO THIS COMMUNITY.</p>	Beth McIntosh	5/17/2009 0:00

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>I have been reading the Comp Plan and would like you to consider some of the following things.</p> <p>1) Separate Wilson Meeting: As Wilson has been slated as one of the key "nodes" I think that it is very important that Wilson have its own meeting for a presentation and discussion of the plan IN THE TOWN OF WILSON. The Elementary School would be a good place. It would be great to have the meeting as soon as possible so Wilson residents would have time to respond before the plan goes into effect.</p> <p>(2) WILDLIFE PROTECTION SOUTH OF HIGHWAY 22, WILSON VILLAGE: I am very concerned with the proposed high density zoning that borders my immediate north boundary up to Hwy 22 and Wilson Village. High density development, as proposed, would potentially provide for hundreds of new housing units with impacts from humans, pets, cars, lighting, pollution and noise. These impacts could have serious negative consequences on the quality and health of the wildlife habitat and populations on my land.</p> <p>The Waldron Property that abuts my western boundary is also slated for high density development. That development would seriously effect the ability for moose to migrate from the Wilson bench eastward onto my land and their habitat area. The Waldron land is in crucial Moose Winter habit as defined by WY Game and Fish and deserves protection.</p> <p>As you know, Tom and I put conservation easements on our 38 acre property thru The Jackson Hole Land Trust because of its very important and unique year round wildlife habitat, especially for moose and Elk. Our land includes wetlands, willows, spring creeks, riparian zones, and extensive Fish Creek frontage (including a large oxbow). It is designated prime Crucial Winter Moose Habitat as mapped by Game and Fish. The last couple of years we have had twin moose born here. We also have deer, eagles, osprey, foxes, trumpeter swans, otters, cutthroat trout and an occasional bear. A small Elk herd winters here and last winter we even had two mountain lion cubs.</p> <p>Hank, I would love to show you this land so you can understand and appreciate its unique wildlife value. Would it be possible for you to come over some time soon for a short walkabout? I can't tell you how much I appreciate what you do and are doing for our community and valley!- It's a tough job!!</p>	Birdie Rossetter	4/23/2009 0:00
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>I always thought that I lived in the Village of Wilson. Do I now have to refer to it as the Node of Wilson or Wilson Node?</p> <p>I live on 38 acres 2/10 of a mile south of Wilson with both Fish Creek and Spring Creek running thru it. The first thing Tom and I did when when we bought the property 20 years ago was to put a Conservation Easement on it.</p> <p>Almost every wild animal (including baby cougars last winter) and wild bird in this Valley either live on our Property or migrate thru it. Moose twins have been born on our land almost every year. Two years ago Moose twins were born on the Waldron Property.</p> <p>The proposed Comprehensive plan for high density development of lands south of Wilson-land immediately adjacent to my property, would seriously impact moose habitat and migration. Moose move back and forth from the Wilson bench to my land. They feed on my willows. They calve in the oxbow of Fish Creek which is also my land.</p> <p>I am sure other people will speak about the nightmare of having 100s of cars trying to get onto Rt. 22 at the base of a steep mountain pass.</p> <p>Several years ago Tom and I were having a conversation with Luna Leopold (Aldo's son) about rivers. In his wonderful deep voice he said "The best thing you can do for a river is "Leave it alone."</p> <p>The best thing you can do for Wilson is "LEAVE IT ALONE</p>	Birdie Rossetter	4/26/2009 0:00
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>Is anyone listening?</p> <p>How many more meetings do we have to attend? How many more letters do we have to write? How many more emails do we have to send? Wilson does not like or want the Comp Plan as written.</p> <p>Eighty or more houses plus at least eighty dogs plus one hundred and 50 or more cars on the pasture land on South Fall Creek Road in Wilson equals Night Light Pollution, Noise Pollution and NO Wildlife.</p> <p>As to the redevelopment of downtown Wilson.- We already have a Hardware store, Catering service, 2 Restaurants, a Bagel shop, a Bank, a Ski and Bike shop, a Barber shop, a Post Office, a Medical facility, an Elementary school, a Community Center and Hungry Jack's for everything else.</p> <p>People will always drive to the ski area parking lot, the golf course, the Snake River, Teton Park and Jackson no matter how many so called amenities are added to Wilson. Bus service is not an adequate option when you have jobs, errands appointments etc. both North and South of the Y.</p> <p>Do we really want Wilson to become "Every Town USA" ?</p>	Birdie Rossetter	5/15/2009 0:00

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>The ceiling number of units currently proposed for the Aspens and downtown Wilson is far in excess of what these areas can absorb. The Wilson discussions since 2001 have been heavily weighed toward minimal increase in residential and commercial capacity. The latest Wilson Mixed Use numbers for residential were a +98 units and now we're looking at 500+! Regardless of the fact Wilson has already absorbed a lopsided (high) percentage of workforce housing, I know it's the wrong geographic location in our valley to put more density. Downtown Wilson is split in 1/2 by a major 2 lane road and WYDOT does not have current plans to improve and/or widen this stretch of hwy 22. They do not have it on their calendar. I know the density (population increase) won't happen over night or even next year, but I know it's the wrong decision to deem this high number a maximum cap. Other than major traffic to and from Teton Valley, Wilson has little traffic and impact, and that's why the wildlife frequent the area. There's NFS access and lots of water and this won't change. The wildlife will suffer with more congestion over the years and this wildlife concern is the community's #1 concern. Human Needs are also important and should be on an equal basis with wildlife, but Wilson is not the smart location for massive additional population. The character of the street-scape is vital to those who live and use Wilson as their 'home' and this should not change b/c special interest groups feel this geographic location needs to have a higher percentage of workforce housing.</p> <p>For those who know me, I'm an advocate of workforce housing, but Wilson proper is not the right place. The Aspens, west side of Hwy 390, would appear to be more appropriate, but still not the best choice. Additional workforce housing belongs near major grocery stores, the bulk of employment and four lane highways - Keep Town as Heart b/c this makes the retailer's businesses prosper. Packing in housing b/c a fifteen year old plan defined Wilson as a 'node' is ridiculous. Please listen to those who live and breath her now.</p>	Bomber Bryan	5/15/2009 16:24
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>Wilson is NOT a "node" that should have additional subsidized housing and 100,000 squ ft of commercial space.....there are plenty of houses available right now.....there is plenty of commercial space available....walking town....where Hwy 22give me a break....We voted you into office and we can vote you out....just remember you work for the tax payer and from the looks of it from the attendance at Wilson Elementary last week.....NO ONE SINGLE PERSON was in favor of this proposal. It is appalling that this meeting was not on the public record....shame shame shame</p>	Brian Phillips	5/15/2009 0:00
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>RE: Waldron Property and Wilson Mixed Use Boundary</p> <p>The 15 acre Waldron Property and the properties located south on Fall Creek Road do not belong within the Wilson Mixed Use Boundary. The Planners inclusion of this piece within the boundary is arbitrary and is not consistent with public comment received in the Mixed Use Village Planning process or the current Comprehensive plan update. During the Wilson Mixed Use Village Planning process the citizens of Wilson made it abundantly clear that Wilson should only grow to the size currently allowed under today's zoning. Please reference Planner's notes from the October 4, 2007 Open House "All were opposed to additional density on the Waldron property." Throughout the Mixed Use Planning process the Waldron Property was shown in yellow or "single family low". Myself and many other citizens were upset when between open houses the 15 acre property changed from Yellow NC-SF which is the current zoning to MU-R or Mixed Use Residential. We were concerned that by including the Waldron Property within in the boundary would increase the likelihood that property could be slated for High Density Development. Repeatedly Alex Norton claimed that this was not the case. We realized our fears were well justified when the Comprehensive Plan Revision was released allowing for High Density Development on the Waldron Property. Furthermore the maps provided to the residents of Teton County by the planning staff during the during the Comprehensive Plan Update showed "South on Fall Creek Road" as a distinct area and the "Town of Wilson" as another. The demarcation point was Highway 22. The feedback that the residents of Teton County provided for "South on Fall Creek Road" was to preserve the rural character and not to allow any additional density. This only makes sense as the lots that are located south on Fall Creek Road are larger and adjacent to large conservation properties including the Rosseter property and the Fish Creek Ranch.</p> <p>The planners only justification for the inclusion of the Waldron property being located within the boundary was "walkability," while ignoring the many reasons why this special property is not the appropriate place to have high density housing. The Waldron Property is considered Critical Moose Habitat by Fish & Game. It is vital wildlife corridor for a host of animals and is adjacent to hundreds of acres under conservation easement. The property primarily consists of pristine wetlands which according to the Wilson Charette/Mixed Use Village meetings were to be preserved and enhanced. The views as you enter Wilson and look south down Fall Creek road are spectacular. The views are just one of the many special aspects of the "character" of Wilson. The citizens of Teton County have stated that wildlife is their number one priority. The possibility of high density housing on the Waldron Property flies in the face of the expressed vision of the citizens of Wilson and Teton County. Please remove the Waldron property from the boundary and extend the same protections that are provided in the plan for all the properties located south on Fall Creek Road.</p>	Brooke Walles	5/15/2009 17:29
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>Are you aware that no meeting has been scheduled for Wilson or the West Bank until May 5th at the Village? That leaves only 10 days left in the comment period. How could they not have a meeting scheduled in the areas that will be the most negatively impacted by the plan? Thus far the planners have ignored and disregarded the feedback provided by the citizens of Wilson and the citizens of Teton County during the mixed use village meetings/comp plan revision update. This is yet another example of the planners trying to shape the feedback and response to the plan. Their job is not to sell us their vision but to come up with a plan that enacts the vision of the citizens of Teton County. Please have them schedule a meeting at the Wilson school as soon as possible so that the citizens of Wilson will have a chance to be informed and comment on the plan before the deadline. Thanks for your attention to this matter.</p>	Brooke Walles	4/23/2009 0:00
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>I think the Wilson expansion is inevitable and a great idea. I am excited to hopefully purchase a home there one day. I have lived in the Jackson Hole area for 9 years off and on and have desired to own a home in the Wilson area. I am also a member of Cornerstone Church that meets at Wilson Elementary School and hope to make Wilson my permanent community. This new plan would do just that - it would make Wilson a more united and self-sufficient community that doesn't have to rely on driving into the town of Jackson constantly. Thanks for all you are doing!</p>	Bryan Chassard	5/8/2009 15:11

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.11 District 11: Wilson	The density for the region you have labeled 'single family mixed use" is too high. The entire town of Wilson is a wildlife corridor. Scale it down or our wildlife will suffer. Keep the density at current levels south of highway 22.	Carol Poole	4/24/2009 9:28
10.11 District 11: Wilson	The comprehensive plan for 10.11 District 11: Wilson, does not represent the cultural beliefs of the residents of Wilson. The plan states the increase in housing and commercial building will reduce the need for Wilson residents to take trips to Jackson, thus reducing traffic. This statement is false and cannot possibly hold true. The majority of Wilson residents work in Jackson and many use the Stillson parking lot to reduce traffic. Increasing housing by almost 3 times will only increase traffic, period! And ten years from now a new comprehensive plan will need to be created to try and figure out how to decrease traffic by expanding highway 22. Growth is not in the best interest of Wilson residents, we live in Wilson because we wish to get away from the chaos. I have lived in Wilson for over 25 years, born and raised and to be honest, I avoid Jackson like the plague and I do not need to go to Jackson because Wilson has a grocery store, a hardware store, post office, coffee shop, gear store, doctors, and two restaurants and a bar, plus all the close wonderful restaurants in the Aspens and the Village. So the statement that increasing housing to reduce traffic and trips to Jackson is absolutely ludicrous and a statement that is attempting to justify building MORE AND MORE AND MORE. Please stop.	Christina	5/6/2009 17:02
10.11 District 11: Wilson	I realize the commercial zoning has been on the Hwy 22 corridor for awhile (I've been in town 19 years and it's been the same I believe). I understand and respect that any landowner has the right to maximize their property's potential, especially commercial, within the bounds of the law. I do wonder what other services a town like Wilson requires though. We have a gas station, P.O., awesome general store, hardware store, bar, bank, welding shop, Dr's offices, contractor, bike/ ski shop. To me the town is extremely viable and already meets your requirements allowing residents to avoid trips to town. For years, I've been able to NEVER cross the Snake to fulfill daily needs and then some. In fact, there have been months where I never had to leave "the Loop" (except to see friends) in order to be completely sufficient in today's world. I think a satellite Sheriff's office is just plain dumb. Enough said. It also seems from the orange area on the map that most of the property for future home development is currently held in private hands. I could be way off-base on this. So, in some ways, the future of Wilson's development potential lies in the hands of current owners not giving in to an upzone of their property and early retirement if they sold out. Our 2+ acres on the loop can be taken out of your calculations. Thanks	Clint Day	5/7/2009 16:26
10.11 District 11: Wilson	Your plan in Wilson is out of control. You should rethink the number of houses you want to approve and cut it to zero. No growth in Wilson, and I don't even live there!	David Pfeifer	5/14/2009 20:10
10.11 District 11: Wilson	I am very opposed to the plan for both the Aspens and Wilson. My primary reason is that both of the "pods" on the Westbank are home to year round wildlife. Of course our biggest wildlife population concern in this valley is the decrease numbers of moose. This is not due to predation in this part of Jackson Hole, but due to human development and loss of habitat. Are you all familiar with Dr. Joel Berger's extensive study of our valley's moose population? Teton Village Road is has the highest moose mortality rate in Jackson Hole according to his study. Those of us who live along 390 and 22 are sick of seeing the moose carcasses along the side of those roads. And increase in traffic that has been profound and detrimental. I do see some good ideas and positive aspects to the proposed plan, but the overall number of humans proposed in these two nodes is excessive and the resulting stress on the highways and further degradation of the wildlife habitat is unacceptable. I also own property in Teton Village and vehemently opposed the scale of development that was approved there. Further development on highway 390 in light of what has already been approved is ludicrous. I don't support the high amount of growth set forward on the westbank in this plan draft. I believe we need to grow, modestly, first by redeveloping areas near elementary, middle, high schools as well as jobs in and near the existing "Heart of Jackson Hole". Just looking at the Gregory Lane region, many of those lots could be smartly redeveloped (and using green techniques) where children and adults can easily bus, walk and ride to their destinations. I fully support exploring the 'Hostel' housing idea for our many seasonal employees and would like to see the planners address this low cost alternative immediately. Thank you for your time. I expect to see large changes made to this first proposal. I believe this valley was never meant to house 'everyone' that might want to live here and this plan does not address smart, slow growth or our precious resources.	Deborah Webb, DDS	5/15/2009 19:20
10.11 District 11: Wilson	Please reconsider the plan adding over 500 homes to the Wilson area the town can not take that increase. HWY22 crossing will not be safe, school will not be able to handle the increase #'s, character of the town will be changed for ever and wildlife impact will be too large. Thank you,	Doug Doyle	5/15/2009 12:47

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>Increasing housing in Wilson will only increase traffic on Hwy 22 to and from Jackson. As stated in the plan (increasing housing in Wilson will decrease the need to drive into town for errands etc.) where do these numbers come from?? I would like to see a valid assessment.</p> <p>If my assumption is correct, a large portion of workers live in the town of Jackson, not Wilson, therefore wouldn't it be a better option towards creating workforce housing where a majority of residents work? This would be a more sustainable option. Not built below one of the most dangerous mountain passes in the U.S. Can anyone say "Tommy's Truck Stop" again??</p> <p>And more importantly, why has the largest proportion of workforce housing been developed in Wilson? Tripling or even doubling housing in Wilson will only destroy the character and sustainability of the town. Places like Hungry Jacks or Westside Groceries will not be able to keep up with the demand. Will a new post office need to be created to supply mailboxes to new residents? Will a new school need to be built?? Where? How? What is the plan for an increase in traffic on Hwy 22??</p> <p>I believe in "no growth" We should work with what we have. I would saw half of all the condos in the Aspens are empty during the year. There are places for people to live here in Jackson. I think the solution would be to place a Cap on rental fees etc. to make it affordable. Building more is not the answer.</p>	Elise	5/10/2009 10:03
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>I attended the meeting at the Wilson School on May 7th. There was obvious emotion and opposition to the proposed plan. The plan, in my opinion does not focus enough on the impact the increased traffic will have on these "nodes" but especially on Wilson. I feel that the three identified "Nodes" on the westbank are unfaily matched. Teton Village was solely developed to support the resort. The Aspens was developed for residential housing. Wilson is not and never has been a "development". Wilson is a town with a grocery store, bar, restaurant, park, community center & school. It is also the only "node" with a highway that splits the town in half. Increased traffic on Hwy22 would only divide our town in half even more and destroy the already threatened wildlife population.</p> <p>I have three children we live down Fish Creek rd. We ride our bikes to Hungry Jacks everyday in the summer and it is already scary enough to ride my kids down Main St. & West St. The thought of potentially doubling the amount of vehicle traffic on those, already narrow, roads is frightening. My children are unable to cross Hwy22 by themselves because it is too dangerous. It would be a shame to prevent them from even riding to school because it would be too dangerous.</p> <p>I am not opposed to growth. I want my children to be raised in a community that provides for them. However; the current proposed plan is not smart growth. I would strongly suggest that the commissioners treat Wilson very differently than the rest of the proposed "Nodes" because it is not at all a fair comparison.</p> <p>Thanks for your consideration of this matter,</p>	Elizabeth Doyle	5/9/2009 14:28
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>My comments on the Proposed Comp Plan for Teton County/Jackson regarding development in Wilson are:</p> <p>We, as residents of Wilson/Westbank are being pushed and cajoled into something that a "developer" wants when he/she wants to maximize the density. Ninety plus new units in Wilson is TOO MUCH for the VILLAGE of Wilson.</p> <p>Too much commercial is also included in the plan. The existing commercial seems to be very adequate. Adding a cleaners and/or a pharmacy will not keep people from going to Jackson. Most people will be working in Jackson anyway and will make at least five round trips a week. Increased traffic trying to get on Route 22, (in either direction) is not very smart. It's dangerous, particularly right at the bottom of Teton Pass. There is currently un-rented office space in Wilson as well as bank and/ or retail space.</p> <p>Regarding residential development - an additional 90 units is TOO MUCH. We cherish the wildlife and 90 new dogs will eliminate the wildlife. The habitat will be diminished by more houses. I feel that 20 to 30 residential units might be acceptable. A good design with open space would still allow for some habitat and feeling of being in the country instead of in a city.</p> <p>The development is slated for a dangerous place with regard to entering the highway at the bottom of the Pass. I thought it was known as "Tommy's Truck Stop" for a reason. I believe that the back of the property contains a lot of wetlands.</p> <p>The bottom line is the proposed plan provides for too much density. Please consider keeping wildlife and reducing, not increasing traffic. Please remember this is the VILLAGE of Wilson, not a NODE.</p>	Ellen Linn	5/15/2009 0:00
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>I would like to comment briefly on the proposed Wilson expansion. Overall, I think the plan is very well thought out and a benefit for Wilson and west bank residents. My wife and I have lived on the west bank off and on over the past 8 years and have grown to love the area. One of the difficult things, especially during the summer, is making the trip into town for shopping and errands. In our opinion, Wilson and the west bank could use such a commercial expansion as you propose. Yes, we, like many residents love the quiet and peaceful aspect of the west bank. Growth and change can be scary, as I'm sure many have indicated to you. However, its contradictory for us to totally oppose growth, especially responsible growth as your plan proposes. We all contribute to the population here and therefore need to embrace responsible growth. Though many will likely fear this plan, I am confident that, if and when it is executed according to your responsible measures, residents will be surprised how well it works and subsequently embrace it. Growth and change are inevitable. They are a normal and positive part of life and community.</p> <p>One question I have for the planning committee is this: Does or will the committee include a lot-designation for the possibility of a future church in Wilson? This would add diversity and a positive community aspect to such growth for Wilson.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read this. We heartily support the plan to responsibly add the several hundred home sites and commercial property as you propose. Thank you for all your hard work. Keep up the good work.</p>	Eric Davis	5/8/2009 16:15

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.11 District 11: Wilson	i've been a resident of Wilson for about 10 years. i feel strongly that the planned/zoned growth for Wilson should be much less than what the plan looks like. I recognize there are many interests at work here but believe the vision of a majority people is not consistent with the plan. As planners/public servants i feel you're accomodating developers and people who 'have yet to move to Wilson' with this plan. That is not your constituency and come election time I expect to work hard to make sure my representation better reflects what i and what i believe the community actually wants. please don't increase the potential density in Wilson anywhere near the degree as is proposed right now. Thanks for your hard work.	Ethan Steinberg	5/15/2009 15:54
10.11 District 11: Wilson	I really don't want to see 500 more houses in Wilson. It is too much growth too fast. There is not the job growth in Jackson Hole to support a doubling or tripling of the number of houses in Wilson. Not to mention that it will significantly impact the small town feel of Wilson. Please slow down with this planned growth business.	Gregg Dean	5/15/2009 13:47
10.11 District 11: Wilson	I am writing to voice my opinion on the planned development of Wilson, WY. As a long time resident of Jackson (30 plus years) I am opposed to the high density planned for the town of Wilson. It will negatively affect many aspects of the small town. Wildlife will suffer, traffic will be too much for it as is and would need further development of reads and highways, which again, I oppose. DO NOT CHANGE WILSON TO A HIGHER DENSITY AREA.	Hernando Pardo	5/7/2009 0:00
10.11 District 11: Wilson	It seems peculiar, if not suspicious, to invite public input on the creation of a comprehensive plan, set up community-agreed upon objectives, and then propose a plan that turns its back on them. What happened to the number one goal of protecting wildlife? What happened to the commitment to manage growth responsibly? What happened to the desire to preserve our open spaces and rural character? Nothing better illustrates the apparent disregard for community desires than the proposals for Wilson. There is no way that Wilson could support the 520 new homes the plan proposes without ruinous effect on wildlife, rural character and infrastructure. Obviously we can't hope to limit our population to that on Hungry Jack's nostalgic sign, but certainly we can de better than what is currently proposed. We urge you to take another hard look at the plan as it stands now, before we destroy the very aspects of the Valley that we all cherish.	Huntley and Joan Baldwin	5/17/2009 0:00
10.11 District 11: Wilson	As a Wilson resident I am very concerned with the large development densities being planned for this node. I attended multiple meetings last year with concerned citizens and I do not see where the planners incorporated any of our feedback and viewpoints into this new plan. This plan looks like or is even worse than the Option B that everyone was so against from the start of this process. Were these meetings just an exercise in futility? A necessary hurdle towards getting what our county planners envision rather than what actual residents envision? I feel wronged that our voice was not listened too. Wilson has already gone through a massive amount of new development in the last ten years with Wilson Meadows, HHR, and Stilson. Let's think smart growth. Giving bonus development densities only begets more growth and creates more systemic housing problems. If the goal is to create more affordable housing than make sure that any density bonuses are zoned as "affordable housing" and not as standard residential development. Any new marketable lots/buildings created in such a desirable area like Wilson will not be affordable to the working class. The affordable housing problem is due to commerical developers not having to provide enough affordable housing. Why does the comp plan have to allow our community to double in the next twenty five years? Quality of life and protection of wildlife soley comes from keeping our population at a sustainable thresh hold. The first goal in this plan should be a census on what maximum population numbers we can sustain without damaging our values.	Jarad	5/15/2009 17:19
10.11 District 11: Wilson	This is not a must do project in Wilson, there is no need for this many homes. This is just developers being developers. There are no jobs or businesses or buildings to put a business in Wilson and it will not change any time soon. The jobs are at the ski hill or in town so built there when it is necessary, we have enough traffic from Victor and Driggs every morning. This town has very low density and that is the attraction. This project is not needed in Jackson at this time, maybe once things turn around and then a project in the town of Jackson makes more sense.	Jeff Rambo	5/11/2009 0:00

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.11 District 11: Wilson	Thank you for all the hard work you have done to complete the Comp Plan for the County. I am sure it is difficult to distill everything you hear into one clear, concise and strategic plan. I am afraid perhaps, you didn't clearly hear the residents of Wilson, Wyoming when they shared their concern for low/lowgrowth and protection of the wildlife. The ideas you have proposed are directly contrary to the voices of Wilson residents. We are in a wildlife migration pattern and we love it. Everyday we see moose, elk, fox, deer wandering through our backyards. They come down the hill above Fall Creek Road, cross the road and head toward the Snake River. The retaining walls on Fall Creek have already forced them into a narrow path. Adding homes to the Waldron property would end the pattern. Adding home to the Waldron property will also endanger human beings. Visibility is terrible around the curve for the houses that already exist there. To add additional traffic would be extremely dangerous. Just the thought of children walking along the road to Nora's or Hungry Jack's is terrifying. We can't handle more traffic on Fall Creek. And speaking of traffic, have you notice we don't have a traffic light in Wilson and we like it that way. If you really plan to sextuple the population, you will have to add in a myriad of traffic mitigation features that we certainly don't want. Can you please try to listen just a little harder, read just a little more carefully and really understand how we Wilson residents feel. Our quality of life and that of the wildlife that we care for is in your hands. Please be kind to all of us.	Jill Baldauf	5/15/2009 0:00
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>We wish to express our observations on the proposed plan for Wilson.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although protection of wildlife is expressed as the number one consideration for the county, it is only number five for Wilson. Wildlife populations in Wilson are already challenged. Moose populations in Teton County are down over 50% from ten years ago, attributed to loss of habitat. Are we willing to forsake these precious resources for yet to be identified new residents. • Growth and workforce housing are the driving elements of the plan, when Wilson already a higher percentage of subsidized affordable housing and homes for "workforce" residents than any other sector in Teton County. • And, it's hard to say who is the real beneficiary of <i>subsidized</i> affordable housing. Is it the occupant? Is it their employer who can continue to pay a less than adequate amount for employees to afford home ownership? Is it not contributing to otherwise un-sustainable commercial development? What is the real benefit to the community? • Recent re-development of West Street has been sited as a model for this plan. Yet few "workforce" residents could afford the resultant new homes, all exceeding \$1,500,000 in value. This re-development has resulted in property tax increases in our case of over 60% and even higher for others. Continued development of this kind could well drive current working residents to leave their homes in Wilson, no longer being able to afford increased costs of living. • While stating future development will be designed to protect Fish Creek, simply enforcing the current 50 foot set back will go a long way in achieving this goal without any changes or unclear plans. • There is not sufficient infrastructure to accommodate such dramatic growth in Wilson. Not the schools, roads, sewer capacity, water resources or commercial development. Why are planners so willing to forsake our present rural character for, future unknown residents? Wilson more than doubled its size with the development of Wilson Meadows just over a decade ago. <p>Wilson and Jackson have always been very special parts of the west, created by rugged individuals. If this plan is so beneficial for all of us tripling Wilson's current population, why stop there. Maybe ten or twenty times would better serve the needs of our future unknown populations. It is apparently not for long time residents to say, having consistently expressed our views of slow, low density growth.</p>	John and Pamela Mortensen	5/13/2009 0:00
10.11 District 11: Wilson	Thank you all for the presentation in Wilson. I now understand how you've reached your numbers. The numbers for Wilson are staggering to me. The conflict with the wildlife vision is the main stumbling block for me, combine that with the teton pass factor, traffic and doggies etc., I can't support the numbers the plan proposes. One thing that wasn't discussed at the meeting is Wilson's close proximity to some of the most important scenic easements. The Ordway Fish Creek Ranch, the Rossetter easment, the Wilson Wetland Trail and both Hardeman meadows. I worked on four of these projects with the JH Land Trust and realize how incompatible the proposed density is. I was amazed to find out that the current zoning allows for 120 new units. That number also seems too high to me. Thanks to you all for the opportunity to comment.	John Becker	5/11/2009 10:14
10.11 District 11: Wilson	Wilson teems with wildlife. Further development will be very harmful to migration and nesting/breeding.	Julie McIntyre	5/17/2009 12:24

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>Wilson, precariously situated at the base of Teton Pass, is not only presently strained with it's own local traffic but also with the traffic traveling to and from Idaho. To increase the residential units and extensive commercial space in Wilson so greatly is not responsible management, will be a hazard, and should not be recommended by the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>Living in Wilson, I drive, daily, on Highway #22, passing the Stagecoach, Fall Creek Road, West Street, Hungry Jacks & the Post Office, Nora's Fish Creek Inn, Ida Ward Lane, and Second Street.</p> <p>Between the Stagecoach, going east to Second Street there are 8 or more access roads or driveways onto Highway #22.</p> <p>Fall Creek Road on the south is the only access for all the residents off Fall Creek Road to Highway #22. West Street and Second Street are the two primary access roads for the residents from the north to Highway #22, from the town of Wilson and from along Fish Creek Road.</p> <p>Having a vision in the Comprehensive Plan of the possibility of increasing by up to 520 new residential units within a quarter mile of the existing commercial core is excessive and would be a danger, particularly to the area between Fall Creek Road and Second Street. Presently the traffic is often a problem. There are many cars and trucks, as well as pedestrians, bike riders, and even some horseback riders. The vision for additional residential and commercial units should be far less than presently proposed in the effort to honor the stated "Priority: Manage Growth Responsibility".</p> <p>I agree with the statement that "While Wilson is designated as a node to accommodate some community needs, such as housing, the Town of Jackson should remain the lodging, retail, professional, and civic center of the region." Because Jackson is intended to remain the "center" of the region, I believe that Jackson should have more of the commercial and residential units that are now envisioned for Wilson.</p>	Julie T. Obering	5/15/2009 8:20
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>Having attended the County Neighborhood meeting in Wilson on May 7th, it sounded as though the majority there were in agreement with with Theme One of the Community Vision which states: Promote Stewardship of Wildlife and Natural Resources. However at the meeting people seemed betrayed by the Plan's prioritization for Wilson of 1: Responsible Growth and 2; Workforce Housing, with 5; Wildlife and Natural Resources much lower on the priority list. Is this really the priority for Wilson given the input people gave in the pre-draft comment period?</p> <p>The people in attendance seemed further horrified at the suggested build-out numbers, allowing up to 520 new homes in this node. Basing build-out numbers on the density of West Street and allowing that density on all areas of the single family mixed type areas on the map for Wilson seems too dense. The recent economic downturn will likely diminish the growth rate, and therefore I would suggest a re-evaluation of build out numbers be contemplated. A diminished build-out number would perhaps accommodate people's wish to protect wildlife and natural resource, while still allowing the increases in density currently permitted under the existing zoning regulations.</p> <p>In general Wilson residents are not opposed to some growth, but fear that density allowances will damage the character of the town.. Specifically, classification of the properties south of Highway 22 and east of Fall Creek Road for town-level densities, allowing up to 9 units per acre of single family mixed type development seems inappropriate. Given the wildlife corridor there from hillside to Fish Creek and surrounding wetlands, it would be better to transition from town to rural and conservation lands with much lower density there.</p> <p>Thank you for all the work you have put in on the draft comp. plan, and for the opportunity to have input at this stage.</p>	Karen W. Hobbins	5/11/2009 12:53
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>I strongly disagree with the direction of the proposed comp. plan. I have lived in Wilson for 19 years and previously lived in California. To see the result of rampant growth which destroys a place, one only needs to go to Southern California. Our assets her are the open spaces, wildlife and clean air.</p> <p>Read the guest shot in last weeks paper by Kristine&Paul O'Brien and then re-read it. Protecting our "environmental capital" is the only way to ensure that Jackson doesn't become just another ruined destination. Where is it written that everyone who wants to live here, should live here? Why do we need a total build-out? Let's rethink the idea of living within our means- what our environment can sustain.</p>	Kathy	5/13/2009 14:29

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>I was born in Teton County. I was fortunate enough to be of a family that arrived in the mid 50's and purchased over 300 acres in Wilson, not without looking from Astoria to Grand Teton National Park. I feel very strongly about this entire county, but due to the growth along with the popularity, I must choose an area that effects me most and that I have the energy to try to save. Teton County is my back yard, and I am getting exhausted and very frustrated. I have spent countless hours, and sent several comments to this planning commission, and I am speechless, I can hardly comment anymore, no one is listening. This is for many of us our second large battle against high density.</p> <p>I remember when the construction trades, real-estate agents and very large land owners were very in favor of the 94 plan. IS IT STILL ALL ABOUT THE DOLLAR?. I also distinctly and sadly remember the Hardeman expansion. We environmentalists after a long battle said, ok you want to put in 70 units ok, we don't like it, but ok, and than the county came back with 96, and the other 12 or whatever in Schwabacker property. My numbers are off, but the point is that the powers that be seem to want the biggest and most. Not everyone can live in Teton County and preserve what we barely have left.</p> <p>I never envisioned that you would come back to us with 100 times the density for the entire county. You can not fill this valley Butte to Butte. The 3 to 5% of vacant land is irreplaceable. I have never seen the elk migration march right up and down fish creek, due to no other avenues and stay as they have the past 3 years.. I live in the Wilson Node. The area that you want to add 520 units lies in direct conflict with migration of just about every wild animal that this area is famous for. Not to mention the disgusting amount of commercial space YOU THINK WE NEED. For the past two weeks, I have had every day, and I am not exaggerating moose, elk, bald eagles, osprey, fox's, deer, sand hill cranes, and coyotes IN MY BACK YARD. These animals pass thru my yard, which is at the south end of Ward Lane bordering the Rossiter property. These animals/birds do not abide by the fence or the road, they travel this area going in every direction to and from the Snake River, Fish Creek, Fall Creek. Please, Please</p> <p>Reconsider, update, and complete the NRO's for all of Teton County, prior to signing this ludicrous amount of density. You are the very group of people that we have all taken the time to voice our concerns for the past two plus years, why have you given us a plan that is so far removed from so many comments opposed to so much density and outrageous commercial space.</p> <p>DON'T BE REMEMBERED AS THE STAFF THAT PLACED THE DEATH NAIL IN TETON COUNTY. YOU HAVE GREAT POWER TO DO SO MUCH BETTER. PLEASE, PLEASE LISTEN TO THE CITIZENS OF THIS INCREDIBLE VALLEY.</p>	Kathy Harrington	5/17/2009 0:00
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>Please listen to the citizens who attended the Draft Comp Plan Presentaton in Wilson on 5/07/09. The citizens desire no change to the already outstanding character which exists in Wilson. We are at a tipping point, where additional population and their associated impacts will adversely affect wildlife and scenery. Consider the fact that Hwy 22 runs through the center of Wilson, which is a dangerous mountain pass.</p> <p>Focus on making the community better for the citizens who live here. Where did all the results from the past charettes go. Density neutral was the consensus. This "node" is a beautiful place, and like many others in this community, I fear that the "density bonuses" and "afordable housing" are more important than the wildlife who has resided here longer than us.</p> <p>There is too much focus on balancing wildlife with growth. Soon enough, there wont be any wildlife, and we will be like any other western resort town.</p> <p>It is time where the County officials actually listen to the citizens that pay the taxes that make their paychecks. Manage growth so it is acceptable to the citizens of Wilson, meaning growth neutral. Work with WYDOT to improve Hwy 22 running through Wilson.</p> <p>Dont get caught up in the self perpetuating philosophy that we need to continue to grow to fuel the affordable housing programs. Wilson is a special place which can not sustain any more development without sacraficing the real character of this community.</p>	Ken Rizzotti	5/7/2009 22:34
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>I am in full support of the proposed growth plan in Wilson. I have always felt Wilson to be too exclusive & under utilized as an area for the future growth of Jackson. If development is executed with intention & a focus on maintaining the strong sense of community that exists in Wilson I strongly agree with the proposed growth projection. Thank You.</p>	Kristin Nice	5/10/2009 21:08
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>"While Wilson is designated as a node to accommodate some community needs such as housing, the Town of Jackson should remain the lodging, retail, professional, and civic center of the region." comp plan</p> <p>Again, you are zoning for growth in areas that do not have adequate infrastructure to accommodate density. There is no mention of impact on the school system (already at maximum), just mention of more parks. What about more grocery stores? Places to eat? This will just be another population pimple that feeds off the Town, which means additional traffic.</p> <p>Too much density!</p> <p>Limit Growth across the board. That is what the community is saying.</p>	Liza Hoke	5/15/2009 17:50
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>I am writing to request that a County Neighborhood meeting be scheduled immediately in the Town of Wilson. The citizens of Wilson should have the opportunity to meet with the planning staff and hopefully planning commissioners and County Commissioners to discuss the new draft of the Comp. Plan. I am requesting that a meeting be scheduled at the Wilson school. The planning department has completely ignored the feedback they received during the many meetings held in Wilson regarding density and the "Mixed Use Village" concept. Just because it now has a different name, "county node" does not change the feelings of the citizens of Wilson. I request that this meeting be schedule before the end of April so that the citizens of Wilson have time to actually provide feedback before this short comment period expires.</p>	Mackenzie Walles	4/23/2009 0:00

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>I am writing as a resident of Wilson to tell you how disappointed I am with the Draft of the Comprehensive Plan revision. I have lived in Teton County, WY since October of 2000 and have been a resident of Wilson since January of 2007. We purchased a home in Wilson so that we could be a part of the character that makes Wilson such a special place to live. We wanted to live in an area of the County where we would be close to town, but far enough away so that we would be close to the wildlife that makes our valley so special. We became very involved in the Mixed Use Village planning process once we moved to Wilson. We joined with our neighbors to help shape what the future of Wilson. After countless hours of meetings, emails and phone calls, the planners provided Wilson residents with two options to be presented to the Planning Commission. Option A (density neutral) and Option B (increased density zoning.) Wilson chose Option A. We obviously made the wrong choice in the eyes of the Planning staff, because this was never presented to the Planning Commission. Option B was an increase of 98 units and now the planning staff is trying to increase our density by up to 400 additional units. Why did no one listen to Wilson? Why did we spend so much time planning in Wilson to have all of that work for nothing? How did we go from them recommending an additional 98 units to an additional 520? What happened to wildlife and preservation of wetlands being the #1 priority????</p> <p>As was stated by the great majority of attendees of the Wilson Mixed use village meetings, the Waldron 15 acre property in Wilson should be removed from the boundary that the Planners dreamed up. The Waldron property is NOT an appropriate place for increased density. The property is currently deeded for up to 5 residences and that is how it should remain. The Waldron property is a migration corridor for the wildlife that is so important in Wilson. It is adjacent to the Rossetter land which is adjacent to Fish Creek Ranch. Our property is adjacent to the Waldron property and we have wildlife viewings multiple times each week. The property seems to have a resident immature moose who lost his mother and twin brother due to traffic on our highways. The Waldron property is South on Fall Creek Road and should be put in the same zoning category as the rest of the properties South on Fall Creek.</p> <p>My husband and I attended all of the Comprehensive Plan meetings. It is very clear that our community said that protecting wildlife was the number one priority. It was not my intent nor do I believe it was the intent of the majority in attendance, that in order to protect wildlife in the county that the plan would cram high density in the places that most of us live! The Node concept is flawed!!! I think that the node concept should be removed entirely from the plan. Wilson is not a pedestrian friendly town, it is at the base a steep mountain pass! The plan does not take into account the infrastructure and services that will be necessary for all of the additional people it is planning for. Where will all of the children go to school? The Wilson elementary is already close to capacity. More vehicle trips will be created into town. We do not have an Albertsons and never will!</p> <p>I realize that the plan is planning for the future, but I do not believe that the planners planned for the future that the residents of Teton County envision. These are only a few of the issues I have with the draft plan and will continue to comment throughout this process. I hope that the Planning Commissioners will listen to the residents of our community and help create a plan that does reflect our vision.</p>	Mackenzie Walles	5/15/2009 15:59
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>I have been reviewing the Comprehensive Plan with particular regards to Wilson as that has been my hometown for the last 33 years. I have learned that the property of most interest for development is the Waldron property located at the corner of Teton Pass and Fall Creek Road. I have major concerns if development is to occur on this property.</p> <p>I have seen many accidents involving semi trucks coming off Teton Pass in the years that I have lived just off the Pass road. One truck in particular hit a shed on the Waldron property (known as Tommy's Truck Stop for many years after the accident and the newly constructed building is Bill and Tom's New Truck Stop). God forbid that any person, least of all a child should be struck by a run-away truck while crossing Highway 22 to get to the Wilson School which is located on the north side of the road.</p> <p>There are hundreds of cars that use Teton Pass Road on a daily basis. I have waited at the head of my road for many minutes to get onto Teton Pass during the busy rush hour early in the morning and have worried about being rear-ended coming home at night and turning off of Teton Pass because of the traffic. In my opinion, putting dense development at the base of a very steep mountain pass road is a very poor idea and does not show responsible planning. Will there be a traffic light at the base of the pass so that those people living in that high-density area could get out of that development? Can you imagine how far up the pass cars would be backed up if that were the case? Putting more traffic onto a currently highly used road would only compound the problem.</p> <p>Another major concern of mine is for the wildlife that uses the Waldron property and adjacent properties to access Fish Creek. We have many moose on our land, especially during the winter. One very distinctive moose, plagued by ticks and mostly hairless from scratching himself, used that corridor this winter. He spent many afternoons in our yard, but then I would see him the next day down on the Waldron land. In the winter the animal tracks are numerous and obvious as the animals go from the bench above the Fall Creek Road down to the valley below.</p> <p>I would appreciate your consideration of my concerns as a local who has witnessed the activities and environment of this area over the last few decades!</p>	Marva Duke	4/27/2009 0:00
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>I look forward to Wilson being better connected to Jackson with pathways and public transportation. Wilson is a node and always has been. I support that concept. Concentrating new development is good for shared transportation, good for wildlife and will improve diversity in Wilson.</p>	Marylee White	5/12/2009 18:48

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>Our family lives in Wilson, inside the single family area of "District 11". Our primary concern with this plan is that the Mixed Use Orientation will allow dense redevelopment of the commercial core of our town, destroying the character of this small town gem. We absolutely oppose 3 story structures in the core and are much more comfortable with the scale of the PS Bagel/ Wilson Backcountry building.</p> <p>Please take into consideration the character issue. It cannot be recreated and even in the long term our county does not need an abundance of 2 and 3 story condo projects. Finally there seems to be an argument that adding rooftops will lead to more retail which will reduce traffic. I fundamentally disagree. More people=more traffic.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of residents!</p>	Peter French	5/14/2009 9:49
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>Planning is almost always a good thing. And the current version of our comp plan revision is a lovely piece of work, written in a very literary way with lots of nice graphics. The long hours and hard work on this project are greatly appreciated.</p> <p>However, it is not only off the mark, it is full of contradictions as well.</p> <p>In seeking to provide answers, what it primarily does is raise more questions. A big one that comes to mind is: what happens after the much-touted "Build-out limit" is reached? Does everything come to a creeching halt? I don't think so. That's not human nature. So 'buildout' is just a conceptual smokescreen.</p> <p>And what really is a "Node?" When you describe Wilson as a designated 'node' of the future, you are not only giving today's Wilson the kiss of death, you are contradicting the concept when you say it will be used for housing development only, thereby maintaining 'town as heart' (i.e. keep the retail business in Jackson). In other words, you want Wilson to become a Bedroom community, with triple or quadruple the population! Shame on you, planners!</p> <p>A comprehensive plan should get specific about recommended new platting for public spaces like parks and pedestrian areas, and new layouts for community-oriented street and transportation systems. This one does not. And why do we NOT see the phrase 'Community Character' peppered throughout the document? Well, apparently it is because the planners in their infinite wisdom decided that Community Character could not be given a precise, black and white definition, so they would just leave it out! Go figure!</p> <p>The authors show a further lack of connection with this community when they say that the existing Wilson services, school and small businesses need "increased viability and sustainability" (their words.) Ridiculous! Every service and business in Wilson is the very Definition of Sustainability! And in fact, they are pretty much running at desired capacity most of the time. The big exception, of course, is that brand new two-story office building which sits empty on highway 22, but we tried to tell the developer it was not needed before it even got built. And now your plan talks about putting more "offices" in Wilson.</p> <p>I have one specific request: please take Wilson off of the list of "Nodes." Wilson can grow slowly, in its own "Rural" way. And maybe we can do without your "daytime vibrancy" – whatever that means.</p>	Peter Pilafian	5/13/2009 0:00
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>Please REMOVE Wilson from the list of "Nodes."</p> <p>The level and density of growth that you are describing is completely inappropriate, and would be the Kiss of Death for Wilson as we know it.</p> <p>Your 'Plan' seeks to turn Wilson into a bedroom community to support Jackson businesses, and to supply convenient workforce housing for other employers all around the county.</p> <p>Your plan for Wilson is inappropriate and unacceptable, and ignores the wishes of local residents.</p> <p>To the extent within which Wilson might possibly be called a Node, it is entirely built out now, and does not need any significant additional density. You do not even realistically (or imaginatively) address the problem of Highway 22, around which the whole Wilson question revolves. As you know, the charrette cross-section was a serious compromise, and has already been violated by WYDOT.</p> <p>Nobody is in favor of your Wilson plan, except those that stand to profit from it, or those that don't live here.</p> <p>Wilson should be changed to 'Rural' designation. Wildlife, ranchlands, scenic vistas, riparian lands - this is the character of Wilson.</p> <p>Please -- remove Wilson from the list of 'Nodes' before this plan is submitted to the county.</p> <p>Do it Now!</p>	Peter Pilafian	5/15/2009 11:24

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>We strongly urge you to scale back your density plans for Wilson. With the proposed density in the new plan, the character of Wilson will drastically change. Fragmenting Jackson Hole's population further by increasing the density of Wilson instead of within the city of Jackson, where it should be, is irresponsible planning - and certainly not "green".</p> <p>There is no reason other than to satisfy the greed of developers, to increase density in Wilson - and particularly NOT down Fall Creek road. What has happened to the vision to be a green community - to concentrate population around diverse commercial centers, reduce driving distances to community services and offer alternative transportation to the car? Increasing population density in Wilson only creates more long distance traffic; less efficient traveling for shopping and everyday life. Schools and other infrastructure will be impacted enormously necessitating further development.</p> <p>Teton County today does not offer adequately paying jobs to support a mortgage for many. Density with lower income housing in the mix, does not ultimately relieve the issue. Two years ago Teton County had too many jobs and not enough employees. This year we have too many employees and not enough jobs.</p> <p>Past and present residents of Wilson moved to Wilson for its unique and SMALL town character. At the very least IMPROVE Wilson's walk ability and community character. Do not screw it up. Uphold the design that the residents of Wilson spent hours compiling in the public charrettes. It does not resemble your proposal.</p> <p>You have an opportunity to preserve a wonderful community and area for wildlife. Please do it.</p>	Randy Roberts and Ellen Fales	5/15/2009 0:00
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>I'm concerned with the future size of Wilson, and obviously you guys are as well. Great presentation by the way! My question is: why did you start the design process for the plan on the hypothetical minimum allowable numbers per lot (is this right?) vs. starting off with the cap of 120 more from the old plan? Who is pushing for these big numbers? We aren't pushing for this much growth so who is?</p> <p>I understand everyone should have the right to build on their property, but didn't the old plan take that into account? What's wrong with the old building cap?</p>	Rick Hunt	5/15/2009 13:18
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>Tripling development in Wilson does not seem feasible given the current nature of the region and lack of public transportation to the area. I think tripling the size would have a very negative impact on the character and wildlife in the area.</p>	Robin McGee	5/12/2009 11:25
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>For the past 1 1/2 years, many locals have been participating in what the Planning Dept. called the "People's Plan." We spent countless hours attending meetings and readjusting our time to be in the valley for what we considered to be critical decision times. We were lead to believe that our input was forming the new Comp Plan. Now that the plan has been revealed, it is not what anybody asked for at all. The new Teton County Comprehensive Plan is a huge disappointment with tragic consequences.</p> <p>My comments will be directed to Wilson and the Waldron property.</p> <p>Too much growth Wilson - Not a "walkable" community Waldron property - "South on Fall Creek" boundary Moose habitat being ignored</p> <p>In October 2007, the people clearly chose "Option A" with neutral density. Teton County's published handout called <i>Mixed Use Village Sub-Area Plan WILSON DENSITY</i> stated "Based on the public input received at the October 4, 2007 Open House, the vast majority of Wilson residents support Option A (density neutral) and are opposed to Option B (increased density)."</p> <p>Wilson has already doubled in size in the past decade with the addition of the Wilson Meadows sub-division. Most importantly, Wilson is not an appropriate place for high-density housing. Wilson is not the cute little isolated mountain town that the County tries to portray it to be! It is a town that was built at the base of a steep mountain pass, 10% grade, which serves as a major commuter highway for multiple communities in Idaho going to and from Jackson and Teton Village. WYDOT considers it to be one of the busiest and most dangerous highways in all of Wyoming. Traffic count figures for July and August 2008 average around 12,500 cars per day traveling through Wilson. Yet the County seems to believe that this is a great place for high-density housing! To propose a significant increase in high-density housing immediately at the base of this dangerous run-out is not only irresponsible but grossly negligent.</p> <p>The Waldron property should remain in the "South on Fall Creek" boundary which is rural in character. Alex Norton, on April 20, 2009, explained that high-density was going to be put where high-density already exists. This is not true for "South on Fall Creek" and the Waldron property, which has been platted for five parcels on 15 acres for decades. In addition, Teton County's <i>"Comments from Wilson Mixed Use Village Sub-Area Plan Meeting--10/4/2007"</i> states on the 3rd bullet point "Waldron Property - ALL were opposed to seeing increased density there."</p> <p>Critical moose habitat is being ignored. The Waldron property provides substantial wetlands for moose habitat and provides the necessary wildlife corridor to the Rossetter Land Trust and the Snake River. Please refer to the article in the Jackson Hole News & Guide dated March 25, 2009 - "Moose on the decline in Jackson Hole area." In conclusion, to propose high-density at the Waldron parcel, with deadly access at the base of Teton Pass, is not responsible planning.</p>	Sally Stevens	4/27/2009 0:00
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>The proposed hi potential density for Wilson is 2.4x what is currently allowed and is 4x what is currently built. It would make Wilson significantly more dense than what the Town of Jackson is now and would be within the proposed density ranges for Town</p> <p>Increasing the vibrancy of Wilson will not reduce traffic. It is in conflict with the Town as Heart and will change the character of Wilson. People chose to live There for its limited retail.</p>	Save Historic Jackson Hole	5/15/2009 14:59

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>I would like the following comments regarding the new proposed comprehensive plan made official. It is against my better judgement wasting more of our time concerning uncontrolled development in Wilson, Wyoming. The county never listens anyway proof from the latest comprehensive plan that is completely contradictory against what the people living in Wilson stated they wanted to see for our community 6 months ago at a work shop meeting.</p> <p>This new plan could triple the size of Wilson! When is it going to end? Wilson grew at a rate of tenfold with the Hardeman development, doubled again with the old school house development and is currently being hit with more development. Enough is enough!</p> <p>Forget the discussions of road safety, wildlife, and community character. Those comments have always fallen on deaf ears. I have lived in Wilson for over 30 years and paid property taxes helping to support government officials. It is past time the county respects our wishes for controlled development regardless for thier wishes for continued affordable housing. Especially when this so called affordable housing invites developers into the project and the county offers them density bonuses as well. Those of us living here for so long need to also be considered into the equation. We have paid to live here and our opinion must be sreiously considered.</p> <p>I was at that town meeting and I heard 95% of the comments opposed to continued mass development and this is exactly what the new comprehensive plan calls for; 500 homes??? Give me a break, 100 homes is too much in downtown Wilson. Have you driven through town lately? Tried to cross highway 22 with all the speeding traffic? Mass development belongs south of Jackson where we have the infrastructure to support it. Wilson has already been hit with too much density and taken more than it's fair share.</p> <p>Few of us in Wilson want this plan and will fight to keep controlled development. One day I can only hope the county listens to the peoples voice and reconsiders the monetary side versus the human side and shows more respect to the long term citizens of this valley.</p>	Scott Harmon	5/15/2009 0:00
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>Our family became members of the Wilson community following the last Comprehensive Plan, and while we certainly had some notion of what we were joining, it has turned out to be so much more than any of us expected. We are in awe and humbled by what we have become a part of, and a few of the many lessons we have learned in the process (and this includes our 14 and 10 year old children) are (1) respect for the physical, wildlife and human elements of the entire community, (2) recognition of our role as temporary inhabitants and in that role stewards for generations to come, and (3) acknowledgment of the vast reservoirs of wisdom that we can tap into by listening to both the vocal and more silent members (including our local wildlife) of the community.</p> <p>As background, we chose our location for many reasons - including the unique mix of connectedness and openness. We are a quarter mile from the commercial district on Hwy 22 and yet the orientation of our modest home on a little over an acre is toward Munger Mountain, with wide vistas provided by the adjacent combined 80 acres of conservation easement property. We take advantage of the proximity to walk or bike to the commercial district for much of our shopping and in so doing we have the privilege of sharing part of the commute with moose, fox and elk who either inhabit portions of our and adjacent lots, or who use them as part of their migratory pattern. It is just this ability to (1) connect to both the town of Wilson and the wildlife whose land we have taken over, at the same time as the ability to (2) immerse ourselves in the openness of physical beauty of all that touches and surrounds Wilson that inspires the strength of the emotional tie to the community that we love and imparts those life lessons.</p> <p>While on one level as a recent member of the Wilson community I applaud the overall vision and themes and their county-wide priority, at the same time I am deeply concerned about how that vision and those themes have been applied to Wilson. Moreover, my concern is even greater due to the apparent lack of adherence to my lesson # 3 - this effort does not evidence the willingness to listen to the voices previously communicated based on the earlier proposals for Wilson. I strongly urge that the application of the plan to Wilson more closely reflect both the priorities of stewardship of wildlife and responsible growth management without abandoning the effort to include Wilson as one of the county nodes for further development. Allowing for housing growth in areas such as the area bounded by Fall Creek Road, Highway 22 and Fish Creek based on the single family mixed use zoning ignores the impact on wildlife that is a significant element of that part of town.</p> <p>From my perspective the plan is doomed if it is not at least more internally consistent in prioritizing the themes. How can one be "contextually-sensitive" in addressing development without taking into context the adverse impact on the wildlife that such a change to that area would cause? While I did not participate in the earlier town meetings addressing the proposals for mixed use development in Wilson, I understood that similar views were effectively communicated. Also, it appears that my reaction and approach is consistent with the survey results. Thank you for the opportunity to comment and I will provide more detailed suggestions in a future communication.</p>	Steve Grossman	5/15/2009 17:18
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>In light of the current economic situation it seems to me that it would make much more sense to concentrate as much growth as possible to the greater Jackson area and the Teton Village area. This would eliminate the need for many of the services that will probably need to be added to the so called node areas,ie schools,transportation,law enforcement,fire safety etc.Since the plan seems flexible as conditions improve other areas could be added.</p>	Steven Epstein	5/8/2009 15:43
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>Density as proposed is far to high. Limit any growth to wilson workforce only. Do not increase commuter traffic by promoting people who work in other areas to live in Wilson. This plan is not about its stated goals, appears to be a rubber stamp for unpresidented growth that is not benefit to anyone but developers. Waldron property off Fall creek rd should recieve highest protection as wildlife corridor not as increased housing. Animals coming off pass are forced into narrow hillside area by fall creek retaining walls and a high fenced pasture at base of Heck of a Hill. This corridor is used daily by multiple animal species. Property provides key link to Rossitter open space, Fish creek waterway and protected Hardeman lands beyond. Plan must address current highway 22 traffic and speeding issues before any other growth priority. Include all comment recieved at recent Wilson charettes in planning documents. Listen to community before planners and developers.</p>	Steven Poole	5/13/2009 17:22

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>As a resident of Wilson, I have seen many changes with the development of the area. Everytime a large area of land is dug up(SRA for an example)the animals of the area are misplaced. Once the ground was broken at SRA the coyotes moved south and started dining on many of the wilson residents pets since their prey moved upward on the mountains. A friend down the street came outside due to a ruckus by her door to find several coyotes ripping apart her small dog. Moose that frequented our street are found dead on the highway as their habitat continues to be consumed and many more vehicles are travelling on Teton Village Road. Travel surveys for Teton Village show almost a hundred vehicles entering the Village per half hour during the various seasons throughout the day and thats just entering not departing. Enough is enough, a ten percent growth each year will compound these problems with the New comprehensive plan. Less is more. Ten percent more people, ten percent more cars, ten percent more wildlife becoming carnege to selfish people rushing to their destination. How many more moose or other animals have to die on the Village road before anyone cares about the traffic. In the last three days I have seen three moose crossing Teton Village Road during the day between 11am and 3pm.</p> <p>It currently takes almost ten minutes for me to get out onto the Village road from my street due to the present traffic flow.</p> <p>How can ten percent growth each year sustain what we already have, once it is gone its gone. The current comprehensive plan screams sustainability for realestate companies and construction companies not wildlife or community.</p>	T.Roman	5/15/2009 19:16
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>Sounds like the Jackson Hole Community is speaking out against your growth plan. Are you listening? Kristne & Paul O'Brien say it best in their "Guest Shot" article in the weekly JHN&G (May6), bottom line is sustainable--continued with minimal long-term effect on the environment.</p> <p>The key word is "minimal", not massive.</p> <p>Please don't ruin the community we love with this plan. Please don't ruin Wilson. I do not like this plan.</p>	Teresa Miller	5/7/2009 11:44
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>For the past 1 1/2 years, many locals have been participating in what the Planning Dept. called the "People's Plan." We spent countless hours attending meetings and readjusting our time to be in the valley for what we considered to be critical decision times. We were lead to believe that our input was forming the new Comp Plan. Now that the plan has been revealed, it is not what anybody asked for at all. The new Teton County Comprehensive Plan is a huge disappointment with tragic consequences.</p> <p>Comments will be directed to Wilson and the Waldron property.</p> <p>Too much growth Wilson - Not a "walkable" community Waldron property - "South on Fall Creek" boundary Moose habitat being ignored</p> <p>In October 2007, the people clearly chose "Option A" with neutral density. Teton County's published hand-out called Mixed Use Village Sub-Area Plan WILSON DENSITY stated "Based on the public input received at the October 4, 2007 Open House, the vast majority of Wilson residents support Option A (density neutral) and are opposed to Option B (increased density)."</p> <p>Wilson has already doubled in size in the past decade with the addition of the Wilson Meadows sub-division. Most importantly, Wilson is not an appropriate place for high-density housing. Wilson is not the cute little isolated mountain town that the County tries to portray it to be! It is a town that was built at the base of a steep mountain pass, 10% grade, which serves as a major commuter highway for multiple communities in Idaho going to and from Jackson and Teton Village. WYDOT considers it to be one of the busiest and most dangerous highways in all of Wyoming. Traffic count figures for July and August 2008 average around 12,500 cars per day traveling through Wilson. Yet the County seems to believe that this is a great place for high-density housing! To propose a significant increase in high-density housing immediately at the base of this dangerous run-out is not only irresponsible but grossly negligent. In addition there has already been two affordable housing projects built with the additional project at the old Wilson School underway.</p> <p>The Waldron property should remain in the "South on Fall Creek" boundary which is rural in character. Alex Norton, on April 20, 2009, explained that high-density was going to be put where high-density already exists. This is not true for "South on Fall Creek" and the Waldron property, which has been platted for five parcels on 15 acres for decades. In addition, Teton County's "Comments from Wilson Mixed Use Village Sub-Area Plan Meeting--10/4/2007" states on the 3rd bullet point "Waldron Property - ALL were opposed to seeing increased density there."</p> <p>Critical moose habitat is being ignored. The Waldron property provides substantial wetlands for moose habitat and provides the necessary wildlife corridor to the Rossetter Land Trust and the Snake River. Please refer to the article in the Jackson Hole News & Guide dated March 25, 2009 - "Moose on the decline in Jackson Hole area."</p> <p>In conclusion, to propose high-density at the Waldron parcel, with deadly access at the base of Teton Pass, is not responsible planning.</p>	Theresa Dowling Phillips	5/9/2009 11:54
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>In regard to the Wilson Plan, I cannot support the housing density and feel the numbers are too high. I'm also concerned about wildlife conflict that high density housing may create, coupled with high traffic converging at the bottom of Teton Pass. Thank you,</p>	Theresa Zellmer	5/11/2009 10:28

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
10.11 District 11: Wilson	<p>I am submitting a full comment on the Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan in this District 11 (Wilson) section of the Feedback portion of this website. I am also submitting portions of my comment in other sections. It does not appear that any comments have been submitted as yet, which I find worrisome. My husband and I attended the community meeting on May 6, 2009 at the Wilson School. It would be extremely disappointing if the important questions raised and the many impassioned comments made at that meeting were not appropriately recorded.</p> <p>Although new Jackson-area residents, we've been coming to the region for winter vacations for more than 25 years. In fact, my first glimpse of the Rockies was looking at the Tetons as my plane landed in Jackson Hole in 1982. Every time we returned to the region, the build-up was shocking. Two years ago, we finally decided to buy, fearing that we would never be able to find a permanent home here if we waited any longer. Fate was with us when we made that decision, since my husband found a position here and we were able to move much sooner than expected.</p> <p>It was the character of the region that drew us here: the sheer, naked beauty of the mountains and the valley; the friendliness of the residents; the hominess 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 are concerned about the inclusion of Wilson as one of the nodes slated for expansion by the Comprehensive Plan. According to the Plan, Wilson already has mixed-use facilities that have locally oriented non-residential uses, which provide local residents with basic services. The Plan states that the intensity of any development would be higher in town where the locally oriented uses serve the entire community and limit dependence on trips into town. In terms of building form and orientation, further development would include two- and three-storey buildings located fronting the street with mixed uses that provide for morning-through-evening vibrancy and where pedestrian corridors could be utilized while accommodating automobile transport. The Plan calls for the development of mixed-type residences that include single family, duplex, triplex, and fourplex construction, along with limited retail facilities in appropriate locations. According to the Plan, the building form and orientation of such structures will be compatible with neighborhood character. We respectfully ask where tri- and fourplex housing is compatible with the character of Wilson, or where additional retail facilities would be appropriate? Even though the Plan states that single family mixed development is only appropriate to provide workforce housing, we are puzzled as to where such structures would fit in with Wilson as it has evolved over the past 150 years.</p> <p>According to the Plan's discussion of managing growth responsibly in District 11 (Wilson), the Wilson node comprises an area within ~1/4 mile of the Wilson commercial core that is deemed appropriate for town-level densities. The buildout calculations call for increasing nonresidential existing floor area from 51,000 to as much as 171,000 or greater. Buildout numbers also call for increasing residential development from 170 dwelling units to as many as 520 dwelling units, which would increase residential density from 0.94 to as much 3.08. Essentially, the Plan suggests that Wilson expand at least three-fold. How can such expansion possibly preserve the character of Wilson?</p> <p>The Comprehensive Plan states that "the priority in Wilson is the provision of housing opportunities to benefit the community." Is this meant to benefit the Wilson community or the Jackson/Teton County community? Expansion of Wilson to provide for the housing needs of the broader community would exploit the educational, commercial, sewer, emergency, recreational, and transportation services of the immediate community. While it would appear on paper that the vibrancy and sustainability of Wilson would be enhanced, a three-fold residential expansion would certainly strain existing services beyond the breaking point. Furthermore, the Plan states that "all development in Wilson should be designed to protect riparian corridors." Any expansion within ~1/4 mile of the Wilson commercial core would involve riparian habitats.</p>	Vicki L. Rosenberg	5/11/2009 23:06

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
<p>10.11 District 11: Wilson</p>	<p>In the Introduction to the Comprehensive Plan we read about the community vision adopted in 1994 and confirmed in 2008. We agree with every one of the points made: protection of scenic vistas and wildlife habitat for generations to come; maintenance and enhancement of environmental quality; promotion of and support for a diverse social and economic population, including provisions for a resident work force; preservation of the traditions and character of the Rocky Mountain West and Wyoming; and assurance that development on private lands in Teton County was compatible with surrounding public land values and uses. We also understood that the community recognized that a new plan should map areas appropriate for certain land uses in order to give landowners, developers, neighbors, and elected officials a measure of predictability regarding land use decisions and actions, so that priorities of and relationship between community values would be addressed. We particularly appreciate that measurable indicators would be developed with any new plan that would hold everyone involved accountable for the cumulative impacts of decisions made.</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>The second priority of the Plan details how growth in this region will be managed responsibly. We agree with the Plan's statement that future development, including redevelopment and infill, must occur in a measured, deliberate, and predictable way so it does not detract from the existing natural environment and community character. While the Plan does not define the carrying capacity of the region, it does describe a 10 Future Land Use Plan that will direct decisions related to growth in this community. In fact, those who developed the Comprehensive Plan have provided excellent maps and other visuals that depict how the Plan's themes, principles, and policies will be implemented in both the areas appropriate for conservation and those appropriate for development in such a way that community-wide priorities will be honored.</p>	<p>Vicki L. Rosenberg (cont.)</p>	

Topic	Comment	Author	Date
<p>10.11 District 11: Wilson</p>	<p>We are impressed with the detailed breadth and depth of the Comprehensive Plan. Certainly, the developers of the Plan have exercised due diligence in bringing to the community such a well-structured design for growth, development, and conservation within the region. Of grave concern to us, however, is that the Plan states that this design will be used to inform future zoning and land development. We understand that community members called for buildout projections and some means of gauging the process of growth. The Plan reports that the community supports more population in the Town of Jackson in order to preserve the agricultural and natural resources in the county. It also states that "a large majority of the community agrees to limit development in rural parts of Teton County while allowing more development and population growth in certain county nodes such as Aspen/Pines, Teton Village, Wilson, South Park, and Hoback." Nowhere in the plan does it explain how or why these areas were selected for expansion. Time and again, spokespersons for the Comprehensive Plan have emphasized that the Plan is only a plan, and does not define zoning maps or land development regulations. Yet, a strategy referred to repeatedly within the chapters of the Plan states that zoning maps and base development right regulations should be updated and amended to be consistent with the 10 Future Land Use Plan. The 10 Future Land Use Plan, or "FLUP," is an integral part of the Comprehensive Plan. The plans for residential and unit developments, for affordable housing developments, and for mixed use developments appear to already be in place under the guise of "just a plan."</p> <p>If adopted, will the Comprehensive Plan adhere to its stated principle that new development regulations will protect existing character and promote sustainability? Will it truly consider "how well a proposed development fits' into the setting in which it is to be located ?" When it states that "incentives that promote desired conservation and development are also needed" does it mean that administrators of the Plan will pay off residents within county nodes and the Town of Jackson to expand housing and local convenience commercial? The Plan also states that annexations will be used for town expansion, and that criteria will be adopted to guide such seizure appropriately.</p> <p>We wholly support the promotion of the Town of Jackson as the "heart" of the region. From a sustainable perspective, it is certainly desirable for at least 65% of the Town's workforce to reside in the immediate vicinity. The vast majority of workers are unable to afford a home valued at \$2 million, the current average. Perhaps employers should, indeed, take on a larger responsibility for housing their workers. Perhaps it will be necessary to develop multi-family housing. We agree with the majority of community members that the need for local workforce housing conflicts with other community values such as preservation of wildlife habitat and natural resources, reductions in traffic, and preferred development patterns. We believe that that provision of deed restricted workforce housing should take priority over additional commercial or resort development make room for the workforce before developing businesses that require more workers. This would uphold Theme 5, which calls for the community to remain a community first, and a resort second; to maintain a vibrant economy while preserving wildlife, natural resources, and community character. As the Plan reports, the community expressed concern that growth primarily oriented to serving visitors, has little community benefit and may compromise community character.</p> <p>Theme 6 of the Comprehensive Plan addresses the transportation issue in Teton County, stating that ideally, any strategy adopted would reduce resident and visitor reliance on single-occupancy vehicles while still allowing safe, efficient, and economic travel. Repeatedly, the notion of bicycle and transit use in the Town of Jackson and in and between county nodes is suggested as a means to alleviate local traffic. We certainly agree that mass transit is desirable, but dependence on bicycle use anywhere outside of the Town itself is unrealistic. More importantly, we believe that Teton County planners should develop a working relationship with WYDOT to increase the viability of alternate modes of transportation within the Town of Jackson as well as in/among other county locales, not simply investigating internodal transit.</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. 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>	<p>Vicki L. Rosenberg (cont.)</p>	