

Appendix B

Public Input

Public Comment Opportunities and Notices



Initial Announcements

- 1/5/16 Livingston Enterprise article
- 1/27/16 Livingston Enterprise article
- 1/28/16 Livingston Enterprise article
- 1/31/16 Bozeman Daily Chronicle article

Growth Policy Website

Established in March 2016 and updated throughout the project to provide an information clearing-house and to accept public comments. <http://www.parkcounty.org/Government-Departments/Planning/GROWTH-POLICY-UPDATE/>

Stakeholder Interviews to Identify Key Issues

May 2016

Open Houses and Public Workshops to Vet Key Issues and Review Goals and Objectives

Meetings held between 4pm - 6pm

- 6/7/16 Cooke City - Cooke Community Center
- 6/9/16 Gardiner - Gardiner Community Center
- 6/14/16 Paradise Valley - Emigrant Hall
- 6/15/16 Shields Valley - Wilsall Senior Center
- 6/16/16 Livingston - Shane Center

Advertising for meetings

- 5/23/16 News release distributed
- 5/23/16 Shields Valley, Gardiner, Cooke City newsletter paid notices
- 6/1/16 Email blast advertising meeting asking public to share information
- 6/1/16 Livingston Enterprise article
- 6/1 /16 Posters distributed to businesses in all communities
- 6/1/16 Postcards distributed to all communities first week
- 6/1/16 Facebook post advertising meetings
- 6/2/16 Livingston Enterprise Guest Editorial
- 6/3/16 Livingston Enterprise article
- 6/6/16 Week of - Livingston Enterprise Op-ed Peter Fox

-
- 6/6/16 Week of Livingston Enterprise story
 - 6/7/16 Facebook post advertising meetings
 - 6/16/16 Facebook post advertising meetings

Online Questionnaire to Seek Guidance on Approaches to Land Use and Development

- 8/9/16 Press Release sent to list serv
- 8/9/16 Press Release sent to Gardiner, Livingston and Cooke City Chambers of Commerce and Park County Library.
- 8/10/16 Press release sent to Livingston Enterprise
- 8/12/16 Distribution of paper copies of questionnaire to Val's Café in Wilsall, Glenn's Market in Clyde Park, Park County Library in Livingston, Cooke City Chamber of Commerce and Gardiner Chamber of Commerce.
- 8/15/16 Link to questionnaire posted to Park County website homepage events section
- 8/15/16 Facebook post to encourage residents to participate
- 8/22/22 News story in Livingston Enterprise
- 8/27/16 Peter Fox Op-ed

Planning and Development Board Public Hearing and Meetings to Consider Public

Comments

- 11/17/16 Public hearing
- 12/15/16 Meeting to consider comments
- 12/22/16 Meeting to consider comments

Advertising for hearing / meetings

- 10/12/16 News release on sent to Park County Community Journal, Cooke City Newsletter, Gardiner Chamber Newsletter, Shields Valley Newsletter, Livingston Area Chamber, Livingston Enterprise
- 10/13/16 Facebook advertisement on Public Hearing
- 10/14/16 Public Hearing legal notice published in Enterprise
- 10/31/16 Public Hearing legal notice published in Enterprise
- 11/9/16 Public Hearing legal notice published in Enterprise
- 11/10/16 Facebook advertisement on Public Hearing

Key Stakeholder Interviews

Below is a record of the public input collected and considered in the drafting of the growth policy.

Park County Growth Policy Update – Interview Response Form

Purpose: The purpose of the Park County Growth Policy stakeholder interview process is to identify the key issues that need to be addressed as part of the update. These are the topics that are most important to Park County residents and business owners. As the Growth Policy update addresses only areas within the county, we ask that respondents limit their responses to issues pertaining to Park County.

Date: 6/28/2016

Interviewee: DAVID DE RUY

Affiliation(s): ATTORNEY, OWNS RANCH LAND, MINING & TIMBER INTEREST, LIFE LONG RESIDENT & INCOME PROPERTY IN LIVINGSTON

| Question | Response |
|---|---|
| <p>1. From your perspective what do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years?</p> | <p>ZONING BALANCE BETWEEN ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES AND SUSTAINING AGRICULTURE BASE AND CORE INDUSTRIES, INCLUDING TIMBER & MINING</p> |
| <p>2. In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues?</p> | <p>GROWTH POLICY & CLEAR STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES</p> |

Park County Growth Policy Update – Interview Response Form

| Question | Response |
|--|--|
| <p>3. Which agencies, organizations, and/or individuals are best suited to address these issues?</p> | <p>9</p> |
| <p>4. If nothing is done to address these issues, what do you see as the likely outcome?</p> | <p>A COMMUNITY DEPENDANT ON TOURISM, LOW PAYING JOBS</p> |
| <p>5. What additional issues/topics do you think the Park County Growth Policy should address?</p> | |

Park County Growth Policy Update – Interview Response Form

Purpose: The purpose of the Park County Growth Policy stakeholder interview process is to identify the key issues that need to be addressed as part of the update. These are the topics that are most important to Park County residents and business owners. As the Growth Policy update addresses only areas within the county, we ask that respondents limit their responses to issues pertaining to Park County.

Date: 25 May, 2016

Interviewee: Alex Sienkiewicz

Affiliation(s): Community Member/Partner

| Question | Response |
|---|--|
| <p>1. From your perspective what do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years?</p> | <p>Pressing issues include those that may be categorized as 1) Social 2) Environmental 3) and Economic. Of course there is significant overlap and interplay between these categories and improvement in one area often leads to improvement in another. For example, healthy fisheries and streambed access to public lands and waters fosters local business opportunities, quality of life, real estate markets, and public health and welfare, and connecting youth with the outdoors. All of these categories and the well-being of a "culture of community"...</p> <p>A big question for Livingston and Park County is that relating to what the future holds for us. What is our community vision? Are we as a community going to take the long route of siting growth, development, and land use to happen haphazardly and without foresight (the pay more later approach); or roll up our sleeves and develop a vision of private land use, public parks and open spaces, and zoning that creates a deliberate and sustainable community-focused future (the pay less now approach)... Unfortunately, the existence of challenging politics continues this question. While community and future-oriented citizens tend to support reasonable planning, zoning, and community measures, there are those who oppose such measures as they see their "freedom" to do whatever they like and use their land however they see fit as paramount in matters of community well-being. At the same time, these opponents of community planning often fail to admit that private actions almost always have a large effect on communities and public values... For example values levels of governmental siting private businesses in ecologically sensitive and nearby the banks of the Yellowstone River negatively affects private landowners downstream, fisheries and ecological values, aesthetics and public recreation opportunities (associated with the stream access law). What do we need to see as a community? Thinking schools? World class outdoor amenities and strong public access trails? A thriving and vibrant local and regional economy? A physically and emotionally healthy population of community members? These are not rhetorical questions. If we as a community support such a vision, we need to work hard, persistently, and consistently to these ends. This starts in creating law, policy, and regulation to prevent countervailing forces from precluding the community vision before it can be achieved...</p> |
| <p>2. In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues?</p> | <p>As far as planning for growth and development—have a strict growth policy, that prevents politics from overriding it... develop an urban growth boundary like the city of Portland, OR. Plan for open space and trails connecting open spaces and public lands. Make the county, bike-able, walkable, and sustainable. Initiate open space bonds and look to connect local, state, and federal public lands. Develop and support standing community boards that partner with government agencies and support the long term vision for the community. Incorporate business and educational institutions into such community endeavors... and give the community and its institutions ownership in the positive changes...</p> |

Park County Growth Policy Update – Interview Response Form

| Question | Response |
|--|---|
| <p>3. Which agencies, organizations, and/or individuals are best suited to address these issues?</p> | <p>City and county leaders and institutions (We should ask ourselves whether the city should move to a mayor-city council system for more accountability...?). We should emphasize to wealthy part timers and large land holders that it would behoove them to give back to the communities from which they draw such great benefits in a far bigger and more meaningful way. In turn, try to wrap some of these folks into the regular course of business and community...</p> |
| <p>4. If nothing is done to address these issues, what do you see as the likely outcome?</p> | <p>Amplification of current socio-economic and environmental problems. Inability of local governments to manage educational institutions, environmental problems, sprawl, poverty, drug and alcohol abuse, depression, etc...</p> <p>While Bozeman is no Panacea, that city is progressive in its efforts to plan ahead and be forward thinkers to the extent powerful forces to the contrary can be overcome. Those who think "wind" will prevent that kind of growth and sprawl from coming to Livingston are misguided.</p> |
| <p>5. What additional issues/topics do you think the Park County Growth Policy should address?</p> | <p>Connecting All socio-economic strata and all manner of citizens to open spaces.</p> <p>Making Livingston bike-able, walkable, and sustainable.</p> <p>Setting strict zoning regulations and urban boundaries that reflect a well-considered and deliberate vision of the future.</p> <p>Hold public and private entities accountable for their obligations...When private individuals or entities reap a positive benefit or gain, they should be encouraged to give back (large landowners, water users, businesses)... We should all pay taxes and put our money where our mouths are...</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| Name | Andrea Peacock |
| Affiliation | Elk River Books, Emigrant resident |
| What do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years? | The county needs mechanisms by which it can guide desired growth and control for undesirable effects of chaotic growth. |
| In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues? | A plan that outlines desired and valued uses, and allows the county to place restrictions on activities that degrade or impinge on these desired and valued uses. |
| If nothing is done to address these issues what do you see as the likely outcome? | Uncontrolled growth that degrades agricultural, recreational and aesthetic values; water and air quality problems; insufficient infrastructure to accommodate increased population. |

Park County Growth Policy Update – Interview Response Form

Purpose: The purpose of the Park County Growth Policy stakeholder interview process is to identify the key issues that need to be addressed as part of the update. These are the topics that are most important to Park County residents and business owners. As the Growth Policy update addresses only areas within the county, we ask that respondents limit their responses to issues pertaining to Park County.

Date: 5/6/16

Interviewee: Bob Ebinger

Affiliation(s): Livingston BID, Former City Commissioner

| Question | Response |
|---|---|
| <p>1. From your perspective what do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years?</p> | <p>A need for better interface/relationship between the City and County.</p> <p>Making sure the Wildland Urban Interface is correctly done.</p> <p>Respecting natural environment and wildlife while developing lands.</p> <p>Planning for and balancing the usage of water between agriculture and development.</p> |
| <p>2. In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues?</p> | <p>Education that can help lead to bottom-up solutions, however idealistic this may sound. This can help prevent fear and animosity from the public surrounding change.</p> <p>It is hard to address some issues because the mentality is "It's always been done this way."</p> <p>Through the creation of coalitions including elected officials.</p> <p>Increasing public awareness to the fact that problems won't just disappear and we need to focus on solutions.</p> |

Park County Growth Policy Update – Interview Response Form

| Question | Response |
|---|--|
| <p>3. Which agencies, organizations, and/or individuals are best suited to address these issues?</p> | <p>Planning Boards made up of people with a mixture of different interests that represent policies.</p> <p>Community Government as long as it represents a wide swath of opinions.</p> <p>The Park County Environmental Council, Energy organizations, stock growers and any other group as long as everyone realizes that people are there to come to a solution, not just spit out there mission statements.</p> |
| <p>4. If nothing is done to address these issues, what do you see as the likely outcome?</p> | <p>We will become Gallatin Valley or worse, Belgrade.</p> <p>Misuse in downtown Livingston, there is currently a need for infill in Livingston and in existing communities within the County.</p> |
| <p>5. What additional issues/topics do you think the Park County Growth Policy should address?</p> | <p>The County Commission needs to represent the entire County.</p> <p>The Growth Policy should include a focus on the relationship between the City and the County because Livingston is in Park County.</p> <p>The Former Zoning Donut</p> <p>Light Pollution</p> |

Park County Growth Policy Update – Interview Response Form

Purpose: The purpose of the Park County Growth Policy stakeholder interview process is to identify the key issues that need to be addressed as part of the update. These are the topics that are most important to Park County residents and business owners. As the Growth Policy update addresses only areas within the county, we ask that respondents limit their responses to issues pertaining to Park County.

Date: 05-11-2016

Interviewee: Bob Smith

Affiliation(s): Cooke City Silver Gate resident

| Question | Response |
|--|--|
| <p>1. From your perspective what do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years?</p> | <p>In Cooke City, Forest Service is trying to shut down public lands and put in wilderness.</p> |
| <p>2. In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues?</p> | <p>Commissioners need to sit down with town and FS to work things out and get things done.</p> |

Park County Growth Policy Update – Interview Response Form

| Question | Response |
|--|--|
| <p>3. Which agencies, organizations, and/or individuals are best suited to address these issues?</p> | <p>FS, commissioners, legislature, National Park Service, Town of Cooke and Silver Gate. Need a leader like a/ all commissioners</p> |
| <p>4. If nothing is done to address these issues, what do you see as the likely outcome?</p> | <p>Wilderness, Cooke City Silvergate won't be there anymore. No recreation left.</p> |
| <p>5. What additional issues/topics do you think the Park County Growth Policy should address?</p> | <p>Look at growth through paradise valley area. be prepared for growth, infrastructure, roads, subdivision regs including</p> |

Park County Growth Policy Update – Interview Response Form

Purpose: The purpose of the Park County Growth Policy stakeholder interview process is to identify the key issues that need to be addressed as part of the update. These are the topics that are most important to Park County residents and business owners. As the Growth Policy update addresses only areas within the county, we ask that respondents limit their responses to issues pertaining to Park County.

Date: May 16, 2016

Interviewee: Donna Rowland

Affiliation(s): CP, CC, SG Chamber of Commerce and Community Council, Mt. Republic Chapel of Peace

| Question | Response |
|--|---|
| <p>1. From your perspective what do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years?</p> | <p>Housing for year round residents and seasonal workers.</p> <p>Each community in Park County has different infrastructure issues that will is and or will effect the economic value. i.e. septic/sewer, water, internet service, fire protection, emergency services, to name a few.</p> <p>School systems especially in smaller communities need to be kept up with technology. Insure quality is being taught. Better communication with state and county officials.</p> <p>The items listed above are very important to retain a population to have people available to run the non profit organizations and districts established.</p> |
| <p>2. In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues?</p> | <p>Some of the problems are a catch 22. You have to fix this before we can get that.</p> <p>Having some resolution for septic in Cooke City (or some solution outside of the main street area) to be able to build housing. It would have to be a decision of the community with zoning as to what type of housing.</p> <p>Communication and more involvement with Park County Superintendent for the school board and teacher(s).</p> <p>So many issues and topics have been discussed and have been accomplished from the 2005 Growth Policy. Continue strong with the conversations with the communities and finding resolutions. Target dates and/or review dates are a great way for the community to see any type of success building more trust.</p> |

Park County Growth Policy Update – Interview Response Form

| Question | Response |
|---|---|
| <p>3. Which agencies, organizations, and/or individuals are best suited to address these issues?</p> | <p>Colter Pass, Cooke City and Silver Gate relies on our Park County departments for guidance and help.</p> <p>State agencies.</p> |
| <p>4. If nothing is done to address these issues, what do you see as the likely outcome?</p> | <p>The issues with the water in both Silver Gate and Cooke City and septic in Cooke City need to be addressed now. Without resolutions established within a year or so the infrastructure will fail. We don't want to see businesses closed nor do we want to have a failure in water that would drive people away from visiting or businesses not able to serve their visitors. Lack to owners or visitors effects the economy of this area.</p> <p>Infrastructure not taken care of will not allow us to serve the many YNP park visitors. Looks poorly on all of us.</p> <p>Good schools keep and bring in young people, otherwise they are leaving the area.</p> <p>Internet outside of Cooke City, is hurting the businesses since visitors are demanding the service. The businesses are not able to keep up with the expected demand in applications to run their business.</p> <p>Internet also could expand some type of technology business for people that want to study and or work here.</p> |
| <p>5. What additional issues/topics do you think the Park County Growth Policy should address?</p> | <p>The same comments written in the previous 2005 growth policy report continue and have not been resolved. Though I do see better and more communication between Park County and are communities.</p> <p>We need some type of a task force plan to address the many different topics that the community of the Cooke City area. Target or review dates will build trust, communication and success.</p> <p>All over Park County communities are experiencing the same issues. Important to use all resources to help people that live and work here.</p> |

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Name | Alice Hartman |
| Affiliation | Mayor of Clyde Park, MT |
| What do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paving Bracket Creek Road into Clyde Park • Keeping green box site • Increasing land use conflicts in Clyde Park • Clyde Park prepare for oil and gas | |
| In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City has contact with sheriff for Clyde park – works very well • County is very helpful at helping with maintenance of roads • Good coordination between the two | |
| If nothing is done to address these issues what do you see as the likely outcome? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased conflicts (especially if oil and gas is developed) | |
| What additional issues/topics do you think the Park County Growth Policy should address? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subdivision rules for Clyde Park? • Address how land use is changing • Clyde park has its own growth policy | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | Chuck Donovan |
| Affiliation | Rural Fire/private land owner/developer |
| What do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property Rights, especially for landowners • Maximize delivery of services to encourage growth around Livingston • Different needs for different parts of the County – Wilsall to Gardner • Management of fuels on private lands – grasses and timber • Coordination between City (Livingston) and County | |
| In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People generally don't want to see zoning • Fire departments need training and help getting volunteers • Expedite subdivision process in the area around Livingston • Mater plan for roads • Road design standards • People have got to reach compromise | |
| If nothing is done to address these issues what do you see as the likely outcome? | |
| | |
| What additional issues/topics do you think the Park County Growth Policy should address? | |
| | |

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Name | Ed Schilling |
| Affiliation | Former County CoCo |
| What do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economy relies on agriculture and tourism. How do we address agriculture and tourism and how do they coexist? Not all people want growth but we need growth. • Parts of the transportation network is substandard. • Which way will Livingston grow? • Maintenance of subdivisions after they are built? • What do we do with garbage? Currently situation is not ideal. | |
| In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can we finance infrastructure for growth around Livingston? • Who is going to pay for services? • Citizens initiated zoning. • Prepare for oil and gas by setting baseline for groundwater | |
| If nothing is done to address these issues what do you see as the likely outcome? | |
| | |
| What additional issues/topics do you think the Park County Growth Policy should address? | |
| | |

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| Name | Frank O’Conner |
| Affiliation | PB Member, Business Owner |
| What do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation – Roads not up to code • Junk ordinance (is there one? Or is it not enforced) • Garbage disposal – find ways to make it more sustainable • Coordination with city • Bicycle/Multi-use Trails – trails are economic drivers | |
| In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new roads need to meet standards without exceptions • RSID’s could be used to maintain roads • More recycling • Telecommunications – how do we get high-speed internet to rural areas? | |
| If nothing is done to address these issues what do you see as the likely outcome? | |
| | |
| What additional issues/topics do you think the Park County Growth Policy should address? | |
| | |

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| Name | Heather Jurvankainen |
| Affiliation | Director of Public Health |
| What do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The connection between poverty and mental health and drug abuse and mental health • Housing, especially in Gardner, and increasingly in Livingston. High cost of housing is displacing people with mental health issues to remote areas where they do not have access to services • In Gardner, there is no housing for seasonally and temporary employee's • There is a lack of services for people with mental health issues in Gardner • Increased housing costs will hurt the ageing population | |
| In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bringing people out of poverty will help people with mental health issues • Part time clinic in Gardner • Shuttle services from Gardner to services in Livingston • Outreach in Gardner • Workforce housing • Housing for people with mental health issues | |
| If nothing is done to address these issues what do you see as the likely outcome? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Situation will worsen and costs will rise for county residents | |
| What additional issues/topics do you think the Park County Growth Policy should address? | |
| | |

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| Name | Jackie Robbins |
| Affiliation | Former County Planner |
| What do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gardner and Cooke City water and sewer systems • Wildland fire • Public health and safety of bison expansion • Glut of available lots • People don't know county is liable for approving bad subdivisions | |
| In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tourism tax for public infrastructure in Gardner and Cooke City • Controlling noxious weeds on vacant subdivision lots • Limiting density in fire prone areas | |
| If nothing is done to address these issues what do you see as the likely outcome? | |
| | |
| What additional issues/topics do you think the Park County Growth Policy should address? | |
| | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Name | Mike Dailey |
| Affiliation | PB Member – retired property appraiser |
| What do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation of larger Agricultural holdings • Water use and minimum shares of irrigations • Proper covenants in subdivisions • Fixing inadequate roads in some areas • Prevent non-appropriate uses such as tire pits, junk yards and negative impacts to property values | |
| In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support conservation easements where beneficial –Commissioners • Provide limits for water shares – water boards and judges • Assist problem areas and offer help with RSID’s – planning boards • Enable public hearings for all non-appropriate uses – zoning boards • Educate land owners about loss of value from poor planning | |
| If nothing is done to address these issues what do you see as the likely outcome? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of family farms and the folks that have them. • The loss of community. “Help thy neighbor” | |
| What additional issues/topics do you think the Park County Growth Policy should address? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction crews working in park need a place to live in Gardner (man camps) • Establishing a water quality baseline in shields valley (oil and gas) | |

| | |
|---|------------------------|
| Name | Tara Depuy |
| Affiliation | Former County Attorney |
| What do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use conflicts are going to be a big issue – mining in Paradise Valley, stip commercial development • Lack of process giving people a say in land use • Housing is needed in Gardner • Doughnut area around Livingston | |
| In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zoning needs to be on the table as a tool • Need good paying jobs • Improved coordination between city and county • Workforce housing in Gardner | |
| If nothing is done to address these issues what do you see as the likely outcome? | |
| | |
| What additional issues/topics do you think the Park County Growth Policy should address? | |
| | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Name | Jacqueline Isaly |
| Affiliation | Park County Resident |
| What do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years? | Sprawl. Sub-Divisions with poorly designed/poorly constructed homes that all look alike and could be in any town across the US. Vehicle Congestion. Too many people and too many vehicles for the capacity of the roads. |
| In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues? | Resist the impulse to allow for such sprawl, the traffic comes from moving away from small town country living. Don't forget why people move here in the first place. Focus more on keeping destinations centrally located with walkable/bikable access. |
| If nothing is done to address these issues what do you see as the likely outcome? | Livingston and Park County will lose its charm and be no different than any other run of the mill suburbia town. |
| What additional issues/topics do you think the Park County Growth Policy should address? | ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION |

Park County Growth Policy Update – Interview Response Form

Purposes: The purpose of the Park County Growth Policy stakeholder interview process is to identify the key issues that need to be addressed as part of the update. These are the topics that are most important to Park County residents and business owners. As the Growth Policy update addresses only areas within the county, we ask that respondents limit their responses to issues pertaining to Park County.

Date: 5/18/16

Interviewee: Katie Weaver

Affiliation(s): Extension Agent - Economic and Community Development

| Question | Response |
|---|--|
| <p>1. From your perspective what do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continued pressure on our community infrastructure and the mediocre condition that it is in and especially as tourism numbers continue to grow. - Resort tax districts (Gardiner and Cooke City) are only for set amount of time so Cooke City will eventually lose this type of funding and should start thinking of long-term infrastructure as part of the projects that the taxes pay for. - Ex-urban growth/low-density growth issues as related to infrastructure and lack of planning. - Demographic changes are happening and pressure is occurring from people moving over from Bozeman; this pressure will continue from numerous directions unless there is another crash (which is unlikely). How do you maintain current landscapes with increased pressures? - Lack of diversified economies – tourism is great asset but also one of greatest challenges – it is the highest employment sector but offers the lowest wages. - The area experiences generational poverty – how do we address economies with low-wage, low-skilled workforces, people living in poverty, no benefits, behavioral health issues (especially in that demographic), etc. - Workforce training should be considered in the area to ensure opportunities for youth for their future in college, careers, entrepreneurship, etc. - Lack of collaboration between the county and city and need for more seamless transitions from within the city to the edge of the city and into county. |
| <p>2. In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County need take a more active role in intermunicipal committees – some is happening now but there could be more. • We need to keep our resources in the county and have people in our county managing our resources (economic development, public health, etc.) – other partners can be of the table from other committees or counties, but the lead should be taken by Park County leadership. • Should be bringing together groups of people that can assist and help with strategic planning and utilizing respected and trusted persons for engagement and leadership for addressing these issues. <i>Quarter</i> – is a great example of what can happen. Cooke City and infrastructure issues is a great example of what needs to be addressed as far as a focus for strategic planning. • Concentration of housing funds and community fund funds and maybe rethinking <i>Altogether</i> Housing conservation. There are opportunities to communicate and work with actual developers so we don't get into situations comparable to Biggrade. There are opportunities in hiring in experts (i.e. <i>Harwood</i>, <i>HRDC</i>) that can do the back of projects that <i>Livingston</i> would be proud of. We should also make sure strategies are aware of the facts that are available through state resources. • Continue to explore and understand what funding mechanisms are in place (can Cooke City have another resort tax since this law expires). (Considering how resort taxes are spent (especially with traffic around at time and funding). • Encouraging funding mechanisms and standards to have human capacity to carry out the work in the best way possible. • Utility for state water fee. • Building relationships with other workforce groups across the region and quickly learn and deploy <i>Livingston</i> based people. • Collaboration between city and county boards have been happening and should continue to happen – needs for at least one city/county member should be filled on city and county boards. (Living based membership is important as well. Board looking for all board members could be encouraged/expected with lay down structure and then focus the theme of collaboration through that meeting. Need facilitation of city/county meetings with listed members at agenda items per jurisdiction. |

Park County Growth Policy Update – Interview Response Form

| Question | Response |
|--|---|
| <p>3. Which agencies, organizations, and/or individuals are best suited to address these issues?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reemphasized that whoever is taking lead must be a local agency, organization or person. - Depending on the issue, a team of governmental, organizational and community leaders should collaborate for effective and efficient strategic planning. - Infrastructure issues should be led by the county. - Some influence by MSU Extension agents could be utilized as unbiased facilitators. - Chambers and councils in smaller unincorporated communities should be utilized. |
| <p>4. If nothing is done to address these issues, what do you see as the likely outcome?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continued growth patterns already exhibited with no strategic investment or deployment of energy resources capital. - When you look at other communities this size, we have relatively good growth – and need to make it so everyone can live and work here. - If we don't manage our open space and where people live (looking at valley in last fifteen years), you will see the same residential development; Shields and Paradise Valley will continue to be cut up more. - County already has had some impacts on natural resources (ie - fisheries) because of pressure of tourism. Also wildlife corridors have been reduced (through housing, fencing, etc.). - If smaller communities can't fix infrastructure, they will be less intact (a good example of this type of situation is the community of Big Sky). |
| <p>5. What additional issues/topics do you think the Park County Growth Policy should address?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transportation - especially non-motorized or non-single driver transportation - Clear strategic direction from City and County. - Poverty. |

Key Issues

- Water supply is a pressing issue
 - There are times when the Yellowstone and Shields rivers do not have legally available water – not quite closed basins though
 - Ground water permitting is challenging though there are not many applications coming in.
- Difficult to mitigate outflows from wells. Not much on the ground enforcement.
- Ponds are an issue
- With Land Use conversions (flood to sprinkler/pivot irrigation) late season flows are lower. While sprinklers and pivots are more efficient they result in less ground water recharge than flood irrigation.

Outcome of limited water supply in future

- Constraints on economic and population growth
- Existing water supplies will diminish.

How to Address

- Water resource planning.
 - Identify desired future conditions which are to be maintained. E.g. aquifer levels, stream flows, floodplains, etc.
- Promote smart development
- Implement water resource studies

Other Items Noted

- Predicted effects of climate change
 - Timing of rain and snow is the main issue both of which will impact late season flows.
- Ditch leakage is a significant contributor to groundwater recharge
- Park County irrigators prefer sprinklers/pivots as they are more efficient and conserve water. In actuality they may actually consume more water as there is less ground water recharge.
- Idaho incentivizes irrigators to stay in flood irrigation. There is no way to get people to convert back to flood from sprinkler/pivot.
- Correction in existing growth policy
 - NPS compact create Yellowstone groundwater area – *also set limits on surface water in tributaries and water adjacent to Yellowstone National Park*

| | |
|--|--|
| Name | Linda Worobec |
| Affiliation | Church Universal and Triumphant |
| What do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years? | growth in tourism |
| In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues? | prepare for infrastructure with roads and facilities along Hwy 89 and Gardiner |
| If nothing is done to address these issues what do you see as the likely outcome? | haphazard growth with increased traffic and expensive housing like Big Sky |
| What additional issues/topics do you think the Park County Growth Policy should address? | wildlife management without impacting private property owners' rights |

| | |
|--|--|
| Name | Maria Teresa Moras |
| Affiliation | employee at The Summit Lighthouse |
| What do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years? | danger of wild fires |
| In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues? | cutting down dead trees, minimizing the danger by cleaning the dead trees in the soil that are fuel ready to burn, do the good forest management |
| If nothing is done to address these issues what do you see as the likely outcome? | fires during the summer, but hopefully not |

| | |
|--|---|
| Name | Marshall K. Haley |
| Affiliation | Summit Lighthouse employee; Gardiner resident |
| What do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years? | 1) Road quality maintenance. 2) Warning newcomers and tourists of dangers from highway animal presence. 3) Perhaps major growth in Paradise Valley as Bozeman/Gallatin County fills up and gets 'too expensive'? |
| In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues? | 1) Our county road department does a good job, but it's a big county with many dirt roads in 'the valley'! 2) Maybe more signs along Highway 89 -- especially at each end, warning of that danger, and maybe posting number of accidents (and deaths?) caused by animals the previous year? 3) Early anticipation of growth and widen roads before it's 'too late' (always one of a government's greatest challenges, I know), especially Highway 89. |
| If nothing is done to address these issues what do you see as the likely outcome? | 1) & 2) No outcomes different from current ones ... whatever those are ...? 3) Perhaps increased accidents on Highway 89 due to over-crowding two lanes. |
| What additional issues/topics do you think the Park County Growth Policy should address? | ? |

Park County Growth Policy Update – Interview Response Form

Purpose: The purpose of the Park County Growth Policy stakeholder interview process is to identify the key issues that need to be addressed as part of the update. These are the topics that are most important to Park County residents and business owners. As the Growth Policy update addresses only areas within the county, we ask that respondents limit their responses to issues pertaining to Park County.

Date: 5-21-16
 Interviewee: O'Hair Ranch Co. Jerry O'Hair Pres.
 Affiliation(s): Rancher

| Question | Response |
|---|---|
| <p>1. From your perspective what do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years?</p> | <p>Job Opportunities for People - Growth of Business for a Tax Base See Growth is being discouraged by the present policy and the planning Board Property Rights are controlled</p> |
| <p>2. In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues?</p> | <p>Promotion of Growth instead of always putting down ideas and regulations that make starting something new impossible Too many regulations under control of Burecrats less Government regulation</p> |

Park County Growth Policy Update – Interview Response Form

| Question | Response |
|--|---|
| <p>3. Which agencies, organizations, and/or individuals are best suited to address these issues?</p> | <p>Growth Policy - County Com. Planning Board</p> |
| <p>4. If nothing is done to address these issues, what do you see as the likely outcome?</p> | <p>Park County will continue to be a low income per capita in Montana Young people will leave for a brighter future. Nothing is available except for low paying service jobs</p> |
| <p>5. What additional issues/topics do you think the Park County Growth Policy should address?</p> | <p>Land owners are not considered by the planning Board - Board should be made up of more forward thinking people instead of how we can contain or stop growth.</p> |

Biggest Concerns

- Being able to accommodate construction
- Lack of regulation in county – no building codes
- Vacation rentals
 - Popping up all over. People are turning anything they can into a vacation rental
 - Leading to shrinkage of year round population
 - Drives up demand and prices for both for sale and rental housing. Houses get snatched up fast, often before they hit the market. Many full time residents are moving to Emigrant.
 - No means of regulating vacation rentals
 - Gardiner has commercial and residential tap fees but vacation rentals generally pay residential.
- Lack of water storage. If there is a problem with water supply it is an immediate problem and must be addressed. No room or time to catch up.
- Waste water treatment residuals are high in arsenic from waste coming from Yellowstone
 - There is a sewer line that runs from Gardiner to Mammoth that has an inflow and infiltration problem (ground water infiltrating pipe). High arsenic groundwater in Yellowstone is leaking into the pipe and making its way to the Gardiner wastewater treatment plant. As a result Gardiner cannot use the residuals (bio-solids) as a soil amendment, or disperse, and must haul residuals to landfill in Logan.
 - Gardiner has an arsenic treatment plant for water but not for wastewater. The effluent levels from wastewater treatment plant has arsenic levels in the range of 150-200 ppb. *For drinking water EPA set arsenic standard at 10 ppb.*
 - NPA says that it is at least two years out from when they can address the problem.
 - Gardiner has plans to remove and replace pond liners and remove wastewater treatment residuals but this project is on hold until the NPS deals with the arsenic problem.

Other Items Noted

- There has been a lot of new construction post-recession. The recession did not really impact Gardiner to a great extent.
 - 1 big new hotel
 - People are converting old stone houses to boutique hotels.
- Summer water usage is in high demand and they are having difficulty keeping up with demand. Wastewater treatment plant has to kick into high gear in summer. Winter is dead.
- Gardiner's wastewater treatment system
 - There is a lift station on the south side of the river which pumps water to north side of the river where it is then gravity fed to sewer pond – aerated lagoons

Park County Growth Policy Update – Interview Response Form

Purpose: The purpose of the Park County Growth Policy stakeholder interview process is to identify the key issues that need to be addressed as part of the update. These are the topics that are most important to Park County residents and business owners. As the Growth Policy update addresses only areas within the county, we ask that respondents limit their responses to issues pertaining to Park County.

Date: 5/11/16

Interviewee: Dr. Scott Coleman

Affiliation(s): Livingston HealthCare

| Question | Response |
|---|---|
| <p>1. From your perspective what do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Housing in the County is in crisis mode. Cited example of trying to hire – can't seem to hire middle wage, non-physician professionals that want to be in Montana and especially Livingston area, because the difference between cost of living and cost of housing is too much. - Felt there should be a thoughtful plan to clean up trailer parks with suggested future housing policy to eventually replace the trailer parks with low-cost housing units. - Many traffic issues especially within Livingston. - Discussed zoning through growth with bike lanes and trails for interconnectivity with thoughtful creation of commuting alternatives without such heavy reliance on vehicle use. - Natural wildlife corridors should be a necessity in the County especially as growth continues. - Donut area issues which creates resentment among city residents because tax burden is increased. - Would like to see aggressive and unified effort to push for resort tax with legislative change to population size related to resort tax requirements. |
| <p>2. In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need better and more frequent meetings (questioned if any meetings now occur) between City, County, school district and Livingston HealthCare officials – perhaps quarterly meetings – to share current and future project information. This might help reduce duplication of projects and maintenance (one example is parks and trails). - Need to build trust among City and County officials and other major leadership parts of our local government. - Need to improve on shared commitment to community – the biggest barrier is city/county relationship. |

Park County Growth Policy Update – Interview Response Form

| Question | Response |
|---|---|
| <p>3. Which agencies, organizations, and/or individuals are best suited to address these issues?</p> | <p>- City, County, Livingston HealthCare, school districts</p> |
| <p>4. If nothing is done to address these issues, what do you see as the likely outcome?</p> | |
| <p>5. What additional issues/topics do you think the Park County Growth Policy should address?</p> | <p>Block all fast food chains especially in downtown area.</p> |

Park County Growth Policy Update – Interview Response Form

Purpose: The purpose of the Park County Growth Policy stakeholder interview process is to identify the key issues that need to be addressed as part of the update. These are the topics that are most important to Park County residents and business owners. As the Growth Policy update addresses only areas within the county, we ask that respondents limit their responses to issues pertaining to Park County.

Date: 5/12/16

Interviewee: Sky Anderson

Affiliation(s): Hayhook Ranch/Shields Valley Rancher

| Question | Response |
|---|---|
| <p>1. From your perspective what do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerned that as county continues to grow, encroachment instances and violation of private property rights will also increase, especially as people move further into rural parts of the county. More population further creates more desire for more access and he has seen lack of regard/respect for private property rights. - State land rules need to be more understood as the county grows as there are many citizens and/or visitors that do not understand the rules or simply disregard the rules. - Budgetary issues are also an issue as more traffic has been moving up and down county rural roads – feels there is a need to increase maintenance of county roads. This would mean that before new projects (especially those that are recreational in nature) are considered, the necessities of road maintenance should be addressed. - The population of the north end of Park County is becoming more retired and second home buyers – Shields Valley Schools have lost 200 kids since 1998. - Discussion of anti-decay ordinances – and respectfulness of others and other personal properties. - Questioned that if all is good right now and population growth is nearly stagnant, why is there a major need for additions/changes to a growth policy? |
| <p>2. In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Possible introduction of state sales tax and elimination of either a property tax or income tax. - Resort tax discussion for the City of Livingston – meaning change in population requirements which would need to be approved through legislative act. |

Park County Growth Policy Update – Interview Response Form

| Question | Response |
|---|--|
| <p>3. Which agencies, organizations, and/or individuals are best suited to address these issues?</p> | <p>- Park County</p> |
| <p>4. If nothing is done to address these issues, what do you see as the likely outcome?</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>5. What additional issues/topics do you think the Park County Growth Policy should address?</p> | <p>- Litter issues – all county roads and highways – more emphasis or rewards to community groups to clean the roads and get more recognition. Incentivized programs to do more road cleanup.</p> |

Park County Growth Policy Update – Interview Response Form

Purpose: The purpose of the Park County Growth Policy stakeholder interview process is to identify the key issues that need to be addressed as part of the update. These are the topics that are most important to Park County residents and business owners. As the Growth Policy update addresses only areas within the county, we ask that respondents limit their responses to issues pertaining to Park County.

Date: 5/12/16
 Interviewee: Shiell Anderson
 Affiliation(s): Hayhook Ranch/Shields Valley Rancher

| Question | Response |
|---|--|
| <p>1. From your perspective what do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some states have "Right To Farm" legislation which protects existing farm and agricultural practices which should be supported such as burning stubble, animal feedlots, etc. People that move into Park County sometimes feel that some of these activities should not occur but they should remember that they are moving into a community that has been utilizing certain (and effective practices) for many generations. - Should be consideration of more clustered housing in rural areas instead of spreading housing units out over 5 to 20-acre lots that some people don't have the means to manage. - Public convenience should not trump private property rights. - Expressed that there is spillover from Bozeman area and the draw is rural nature and open spaces. - Proposed bike paths are not necessary as there are many recreational opportunities already available to visitors. - Adding new trails will not improve tourist traffic and money is not well spent especially since there are many acres of recreational areas within the County that people can take advantage of. - Discussion of potential for development credit idea (this was analyzed in this area back in the 90s). - SH would like to avoid what happened in the Billerica (south from Minnesota) – perhaps some type of zoning. |
| <p>2. In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues?</p> | <p>Not sure if we need to change the status quo; if everything stays the same – do we need to grow and do we need more economic development?</p> <p>Consideration for new state sales tax while utilizing the existing property and income taxes that is beneficial with the addition of a sales tax.</p> <p>Rural sprawl may be best managed with use of development credits which ultimately helps property values to increase.</p> |

Park County Growth Policy Update – Interview Response Form

| Question | Response |
|--|---|
| <p>3. Which agencies, organizations, and/or individuals are best suited to address these issues?</p> | <p>- Park County with some assistance, where appropriate, from some federal and state agencies.</p> |
| <p>4. If nothing is done to address these issues, what do you see as the likely outcome?</p> | <p>NA</p> |
| <p>5. What additional issues/topics do you think the Park County Growth Policy should address?</p> | <p>NA</p> |

Interview with Kerri Strashheim, DNRC Water Resources

Key Issues

- Livestock wildlife conflict
 - Bison coming out of Park resulting in brucellosis in livestock
 - There is a designated surveillance area (DSA) around Yellowstone. Requires a livestock management plan with the MT Dept. of Livestock. All ranchers in the DSA are subject to higher requirements for minimizing exposure to brucellosis. Livestock must be tested increasing labor and costs for ranchers. The state pays for a vet to come out and do the test and analyze results but it is still a big burden to bring livestock in to perform the tests. Also with each legislative session there is the threat that the state will cut funding for this program.
 - Cows and calves coming from the Yellowstone DSA receive less money at market even if they have tested negative. As a result there is a smaller market and smaller pot of buyers for livestock coming from this area.
 - Tracy wonders whether all of the above will make it less profitable and more labor intensive to continue ranching in the Yellowstone DSA and may result in ranches being sold off in the future.
- Bison coming out the Park have also become a public safety issue in Gardiner and Paradise Valley.
 - When Bison leave the Park they become the responsibility of the MT Dept. of Livestock.
 - Most often the sheriff is called to deal with problems with Bison. Park County needs to come up with money to deal with this issue as these duties are above what is normally required of the sheriff.
 - The County has gone above and beyond their duties to address bison issues. They have been working with the Interagency Bison Management group and have been running in the a brick wall.
- Land Fragmentation (*subdivision*)
 - People love Park County for the wide open spaces and rural lifestyle. Continued subdividing disrupts this.
 - Continued subdividing also disrupts migration corridors and wildlife habitat and can result in more human-wildlife conflicts.
- Water use and Water Conservation
 - Water will become more scarce in the future
 - There are techniques to conserve water being employed within existing rights
 - The number of pivots have increased exponentially in the last 15 years. Some irrigators use wheel and hand lines. Flood irrigation is the least common type of irrigation.
 - While flood irrigation results in more groundwater recharge it also leaches more nutrients from the soil forcing irrigators to use more fertilizer and other soil amendments.
 - There are no water conflicts in Park County like in Gallatin. Less concentrated urban growth results in the lower occurrence of conflict.
 - Late summer irrigators start to run out of water, but it is dependent on the year.
 - The number of water users and irrigators has remained steady over the years.
 - Water users are pretty consciences of their water use

Trends

- Big ranches have remained intact. Tracy knew of three ranches in the Shields Valley that were consolidated into one but the ranch remains in operation.
- Shields and Paradise Valleys are primarily hay and cow production. There are a few small grain operations in the

Shields Valley.

- There has not been a lot of conversion from agriculture to residential.

| | |
|--|--|
| Name | Wendy Riley |
| Affiliation | Emigrant resident |
| What do you see as the most pressing issues facing Park County now and in the next 5, 10, 20 years? | Development - both residential and commercial (small- & large-scale) |
| In your opinion what are the best ways to address these issues? | Sensible land use planning, aka zoning |
| If nothing is done to address these issues what do you see as the likely outcome? | Blight and destruction of our most beautiful areas such as Paradise Valley |

Open House / Workshop Comments

Key Issue: Government Coordination

Park County does not exist in a vacuum. There are a variety of forms of government from school boards and fire districts to federal and state agencies, all involved in providing services and impacting the County's population and surroundings. The County Commission only has jurisdiction over a portion of what occurs in Park County, but where they don't have jurisdiction, it is likely another entity does. Non-governmental entities such as health care providers and community groups also play a critical role in providing services and contributing to Park County's high quality of life. Coordination with other government agencies and non-governmental partners is critical to provide efficient and effective services to residents and visitors.

Goal: Plan for and encourage development in the area around Livingston

Objective: Complete a joint planning exercise with the City of Livingston to develop a shared vision for the unincorporated area around Livingston

Objective: Update the existing interlocal agreement between the City of Livingston and Park County to outline steps each jurisdiction should take to meet the shared planning vision

Objective: Complete an infrastructure plan and adopt development standards that under state law allow for the expedited review of subdivisions in the unincorporated area around Livingston

Goal: Partner with state and federal agencies to reduce human-wildlife conflicts

Objective: Develop and implement a shared strategy with wildlife management agencies and community organizations to educate the public on living with wildlife

Objective: Identify critical wildlife corridors for development, infrastructure and conservation planning

Goal: Support efforts of fire managers to manage fuels on public and private lands

Objective: Implement the tasks in the 2014 Community Wildfire Protection Plan

Objective: Increase support for rural fire districts

Goal: Become active partners in management of federal lands

Objective: Establish Cooperative Agency status with the United States Forest Service and National Parks Service

Goal: Encourage efforts of non-governmental partners to address community needs

Objective: Facilitate and provide support to community groups

Place green stickers next to statements you like or agree with, red stickers next to statements you dislike or disagree with.
Use sticky-notes to make comments and place them on the poster.

Key Issue: Water Availability and Quality

Water is a basic necessity of life and is critical for the growth and development of the County. As growth and development occurs, the County needs to understand the dynamics of this crucial resource and be prepared to make decisions on how to manage it to protect existing users, and provide for additional ones. In order to do this, the County needs to establish a foundation for future decision making.

Goal: Be prepared to make decisions on how to manage water resources

Objective: Establish baseline water quality information for the major watersheds in Park County

Key Issue: Housing

The cost of housing in Park County is on the rise. Is the cost of housing out pacing wages? **What does affordable housing mean for the workforce or low income households? How do housing prices impact elderly residents, or people with special needs?** Looking west, the cost of housing in Gallatin County is skyrocketing. Will it impact Park County? Park County needs to gain a better understanding of its housing needs, and lay the foundation to address affordability.

Goal: Provide for affordable, low income and workforce housing

Objective: Prepare a housing plan for all of Park County that identifies affordable housing needs, targets and identifies possible funding sources, and pinpoints implementation partners

Objective: Assist with implementing the strategies in the Gardner Area Housing Action Plan

Objective: Actively support and pursue grant funding to provide affordable housing to people with special needs and the elderly

Objective: Evaluate the impact of vacation rentals on housing availability

Place green stickers next to statements you like or agree with, red stickers next to statements you dislike or disagree with.

Use sticky-notes to make comments and place them on the poster.

Key Issue: Infrastructure

(1 of 2)

Infrastructure connects people to places. Without it, there are no businesses, no trade and no jobs. The County is a provider of infrastructure, and what we think of critical infrastructure is evolving. The County needs to ensure the infrastructure that enables commerce for today and for tomorrow is safe, effective and efficient.

Goal: Increase availability of broadband Internet

Objective: Partner with educational providers, health care providers, the City of Livingston and the business community to provide information and recommendations in order to make informed decisions about investing in broadband infrastructure and expanding its use

Goal: Create a system of interconnected trails

Objective: Prioritize and implement the recommendations in the Park County Active Transportation Plan

Objective: Continue partnerships with the City of Livingston to develop Active Transportation facilities in and around the City

Objective: Identify stable, long-term funding sources for trail planning, design, construction, and maintenance

Goal: Provide for a safe and efficient County road network

Objective: Update the subdivision regulations to ensure new subdivisions pay a proportional share of their impact when upgrading County roads to meet County standards

Objective: Establish a baseline for the condition of County roads, and monitor their condition over time

Objective: Prioritize the use of Rural Special Improvement Districts to upgrade substandard County roads in areas that are already developed

Objective: Continue to secure federal funding sources to upgrade County roads that provide access to recreation areas on federal lands

Key Issue: Infrastructure

(2 of 2)

Infrastructure connects people to places. Without it, there are no businesses, no trade and no jobs. The County is a provider of infrastructure, and what we think of critical infrastructure is evolving. The County needs to ensure the infrastructure that enables commerce for today and for tomorrow is safe, effective and efficient.

Goal: Support water and sewer districts in and around community centers

Objective: Coordinate with the Gardiner Water and Sewer District to update water and sewer facilities

Objective: Evaluate and support the development of public water and wastewater systems in community centers in order to accommodate new growth and existing development

Goal: Collect, treat and dispose of solid waste as part of an effective and efficient waste management system

Objective: Maintain a data base on the use of solid waste

Objective: Continue partnerships with the City Livingston to manage solid waste

Objective: Continue efforts to support and explore new options for recycling

Place green stickers next to statements you like or agree with, red stickers next to statements you dislike or disagree with.
Use sticky-notes to make comments and place them on the poster.

Key Issue: Growth and Development

Over the life of this Growth Policy Update, growth and development in Park County is certain to occur. Growth and development is positive, and will help to diversify and strengthen the County's economy. However, as growth and development occurs, conflicts will arise. The County Commissioners, County staff, and citizens need to be aware of changes in land use with both the positive and the negative impacts, and have the foundation ready to react in an acceptable manner.

Goal: Protect private property rights

Objective: When making decisions regarding land use, uphold provisions of the US Constitution and the Constitution of the State of Montana that protect private property rights

Goal: Take an active role in the land use and development process

Objective: Recognize the relationship between enhanced revenues generated by new growth, and the long term liabilities for maintaining infrastructure and providing services

Objective: Identify the current mechanisms for addressing land use conflicts, and evaluate options for improvement

Objective: Develop tools that will allow the County to respond to and address evolving land use issues

Objective: Continue with and expand upon community outreach efforts that inform citizens of planning activities, while keeping planners aware of pressing issues

Objective: Identify areas of critical agricultural importance, and implement mechanisms in these areas that enable agricultural land owners to continue operations

Goal: Diversify Park County's economy

Objective: Provide resources and support to economic development agencies operating in Park County

Growth Policy Update Public Meeting (Workshop Posters)-
Cooke City 6.7.16

Key Issues

Water and Wastewater

Housing

Services (Garbage, internet, phone)

Community Capacity

Outreach Education

Opportunities

Prioritize Community Goals

Education and Outreach

Know our Challenges (be prepared to address them)

Next Steps

Planners

Develop Actions

Check Back with Community

Community

Continue/Expand Conversation

July 8th Meeting

Check Back with Planners

Gardiner 6.9.16 meeting Poster Comments

Key Issue: Intergovernmental Coordination

Park County does not exist in a vacuum. There are a variety of forms of government from school boards and fire districts to federal and state agencies, all involved in providing services and impacting the County's population and surroundings. The County Commission only has jurisdiction over a portion of what occurs in Park County, but where they don't have jurisdiction, it is likely another entity does. Non-governmental entities such as health care providers and community groups also play a critical role in providing services and contributing to Park County's high quality of life. Coordination with other government agencies and non-governmental partners is critical to provide efficient and effective services to residents and visitors.

Goal: Plan for and encourage development in the area around Livingston

Objective: Complete a joint planning exercise with the City of Livingston to develop a shared vision for the unincorporated area around Livingston (1 like)

Objective: Update the existing interlocal agreement between the City of Livingston and Park County to outline steps each jurisdiction should take to meet the shared planning vision (1 like)

Objective: Complete an infrastructure plan and adopt development standards that under state law allow for the expedited review of subdivisions in the unincorporated area around Livingston (1 like)

Goal: Partner with state and federal agencies to reduce human-wildlife conflicts

Objective: Develop and implement a shared strategy with wildlife management agencies and community organiza-

tions to educate the public on living with wildlife (3 likes) (1 dislike)

Objective: Identify critical wildlife corridors for development, infrastructure and conservation planning (4 likes)

Goal: Support efforts of fire managers to manage fuels on public and private lands

Objective: Implement the tasks in the 2014 Community Wildfire Protection Plan (1 like)

Objective: Increase support for rural fire districts (2 likes)
Goal: Become active partners in management of federal lands (1 like)

Objective: Establish Cooperative Agency status with the United States Forest Service and National Parks Service (1 dislike)

Goal: Encourage efforts of non-governmental partners to address community needs (1 like)

Objective: Facilitate and provide support to community groups (1 like)

Key Issue: Water Availability and Water Quality

Water is a basic necessity of life and is critical for the growth and development of the County. As growth and development occurs, the County needs to understand the dynamics of this crucial resource and be prepared to make decisions on how to manage it to protect existing users, and provide for additional ones. In order to do this, the County needs to establish a foundation for future decision making.

Goal: Be prepared to make decisions on how to manage water resources

Objective: Conduct a water resource study that analyzes sources, long term availability, potential conflicts, and recommendations for management

Objective: Establish baseline water quality information for the major watersheds in Park County (5 likes)

Key Issue: Infrastructure

Infrastructure connects people to places. Without it, there are no businesses, no trade and no jobs. The County is a provider of infrastructure, and what we think of critical infrastructure is evolving. The County needs to ensure the infrastructure that enables commerce for today and for tomorrow is safe, effective and efficient.

Goal: Increase availability of broadband internet

Objective: Partner with educational providers, health care providers, the City of Livingston and the business community to provide information and recommendations in order to make informed decisions about investing in broadband infrastructure and expanding its use (4 likes)

Goal: Create a system of interconnected trails

Objective: Prioritize and implement the recommendations in the Park County Active Transportation Plan (2 likes)

Objective: Continue partnerships with the City of Livingston to develop Active Transportation facilities in and

around the City (1 like)

Objective: Identify stable, long-term funding sources for trail planning, design, construction, and maintenance (2 likes)

Goal: Provide for a safe and efficient County road network

Objective: Update the subdivision regulations to ensure new subdivisions pay a proportional share of their impact when upgrading County roads to meet County standards (1 like)

Objective: Establish a baseline for the condition of County roads, and monitor their condition over time (1 like)

Objective: Prioritize the use of Rural Special Improvement Districts to upgrade substandard County roads in areas that are already developed (1 like)

Objective: Continue to secure federal funding sources to upgrade County roads that provide access to recreation areas on federal lands (4 likes)

Goal: Support water and sewer districts in and around community centers (2 likes)

Objective: Coordinate with the Gardiner Water and Sewer District to update water and sewer facilities (2 likes)

Objective: Evaluate and support the development of public water and wastewater systems in community centers in order to accommodate new growth and existing development (3 likes)

Goal: Collect, treat and dispose of solid waste as part of an effective and efficient waste management system

Objective: Maintain a data base on the use of solid waste (2 likes) (1 dislike)

Objective: Continue partnerships with the City Livingston to manage solid waste (1 like)

Objective: Continue efforts to support and explore new options for recycling (4 likes)

Key Issue: Housing

The cost of housing in Park County is on the rise. Is the cost of housing outpacing wages? What does affordable housing mean for the workforce or low income households? How do housing prices impact elderly residents, or people with special needs? Looking west, the cost of housing in Gallatin County is skyrocketing. Will it impact Park County? Park County needs to gain a better understanding of its housing needs, and lay the foundation to address affordability.

Goal: Provide for affordable, low income and workforce housing

Objective: Prepare a housing plan for all of Park County that identifies affordable housing needs, targets and identifies possible funding sources, and pinpoints implementation partners (4 likes)

Objective: Assist with implementing the strategies in the Gardner Area Housing Action Plan (3 likes)

Objective: Actively support and pursue grant funding to

provide affordable housing to people with special needs and the elderly (2 likes)

Objectives: Evaluate the impact of vacation rentals on housing availability (2 likes)

Key Issue: Growth and Development

Over the life of this Growth Policy Update, growth and development in Park County is certain to occur. Growth and development is positive, and will help to diversify and strengthen the County's economy. However, as growth and development occurs, conflicts will arise. The County Commissioners, County staff, and citizens need to be aware of changes in land use with both the positive and the negative impacts, and have the foundation ready to react in an acceptable manner.

Goal: Protect private property rights (1 like)

Objective: When making decisions regarding land use, uphold provisions of the US Constitution and the Constitution of the State of Montana that protect private property rights (1 like) (1 dislike)

Goal: Take an active role in the land use and development process (1 like)

Objective: Recognize the relationship between enhanced revenues generated by new growth, and the long term liabilities for maintaining infrastructure and providing services

Objective: Identify the current mechanisms for addressing land use conflicts, and evaluate options for improvement (1 like)

Objective: Develop tools that will allow the County to respond to and address evolving land use issues (1 like)

Objective: Continue with and expand upon community outreach efforts that inform citizens of planning activities, while keeping planners aware of pressing issues (2 likes)

Objective: Identify areas of critical agricultural importance,

Emigrant 6.14.16 meeting Poster Results

Key Issue: Intergovernmental Coordination

Park County does not exist in a vacuum. There are a variety of forms of government from school boards and fire districts to federal and state agencies, all involved in providing services and impacting the County's population and surroundings. The County Commission only has jurisdiction over a portion of what occurs in Park County, but where they don't have jurisdiction, it is likely another entity does. Non-governmental entities such as health care providers and community groups also play a critical role in providing services and contributing to Park County's high quality of life. Coordination with other government agencies and non-governmental partners is critical to provide efficient and effective services to residents and visitors.

Goal: Plan for and encourage development in the area around Livingston

Objective: Complete a joint planning exercise with the City of Livingston to develop a shared vision for the unincorporated

and Chapter 10 of Livingston (5 likes)
Objective: Update the existing inter-agency agreements between the City of Livingston and Park Co. (11 likes)
Objective: Each jurisdiction should take steps to meet the shared planning vision (4 likes)
Objective: Complete an infrastructure plan and adopt development standards that under state law allow for the expedited review of subdivisions in the unincorporated area around Livingston (12 dislikes)

Goal: Partner with state and federal agencies to reduce human-wildlife conflicts

Objective: Develop and implement a shared strategy with wildlife management agencies and community organizations to educate the public on living with wildlife (13 likes)
Objective: Identify critical wildlife corridors for development, infrastructure and conservation planning (10 likes)

Goal: Support efforts of fire managers to manage fuels on public and private lands

Objective: Implement the tasks in the 2014 Community Wildfire Protection Plan (2 likes)
Objective: Increase support for rural fire districts (7 likes)

Goal: Become active partners in management of federal lands

Objective: Establish Cooperative Agency status with the United States Forest Service and National Parks Service (11 likes)

Goal: Encourage efforts of non-governmental partners to address community needs

Objective: Facilitate and provide support to community groups (4 likes)

Key Issue: Water Availability and Water Quality (8 likes)

Water is a basic necessity of life and is critical for the growth and development of the County. As growth and development occurs, the County needs to understand the dynamics of this crucial resource and be prepared to make decisions on how to manage it to protect existing users, and provide for additional ones. In order to do this, the County needs to establish a foundation for future decision making.

Goal: Be prepared to make decisions on how to manage water resources

Objective: Conduct a water resource study that analyzes sources, long term availability, potential conflicts, and recommendations for management
Objective: Establish baseline water quality information for the major watersheds in Park County (17 likes)

Key Issue: Infrastructure

Infrastructure connects people to places. Without it, there are no businesses, no trade and no jobs. The County is a provider of infrastructure, and what we think of critical infrastructure is evolving. The County needs to ensure the infrastructure that enables commerce for today and for

tomorrow is safe, effective and efficient.

Goal: Increase availability of broadband internet (1 like)

Objective: Partner with educational providers, health care providers, the City of Livingston and the business community to provide information and recommendations in order to make informed decisions about investing in broadband infrastructure and expanding its use

Goal: Create a system of interconnected trails

Objective: Prioritize and implement the recommendations in the Park County Active Transportation Plan (2 likes)

Objective: Continue partnerships with the City of Livingston to develop Active Transportation facilities in and around the City (3 likes)

Objective: Identify stable, long-term funding sources for trail planning, design, construction, and maintenance (9 likes) (1 dislike)

Goal: Provide for a safe and efficient County road network

Objective: Update the subdivision regulations to ensure new subdivisions pay a proportional share of their impact when upgrading County roads to meet County standards (4 likes)

Objective: Establish a baseline for the condition of County roads, and monitor their condition over time (6 likes)

Objective: Prioritize the use of Rural Special Improvement Districts to upgrade substandard County roads in areas that are already developed (2 likes)

Objective: Continue to secure federal funding sources to upgrade County roads that provide access to recreation areas on federal lands (7 likes) (1 dislike)

Goal: Support water and sewer districts in and around community centers

Objective: Coordinate with the Gardiner Water and Sewer District to update water and sewer facilities (3 likes)

Objective: Evaluate and support the development of public water and wastewater systems in community centers in order to accommodate new growth and existing development (1 like)

Goal: Collect, treat and dispose of solid waste as part of an effective and efficient waste management system

Objective: Maintain a data base on the use of solid waste (3 likes)

Objective: Continue partnerships with the City Livingston to manage solid waste (7 likes)

Objective: Continue efforts to support and explore new options for recycling (14 likes)

Key Issue: Housing

The cost of housing in Park County is on the rise. Is the cost of housing outpacing wages? What does affordable housing mean for the workforce or low income households? How do housing prices impact elderly residents, or

people with special needs? Looking west, the cost of housing in Gallatin County is skyrocketing. Will it impact Park County? Park County needs to gain a better understanding of its housing needs, and lay the foundation to address affordability.

Goal: Provide for affordable, low income and workforce housing

Objective: Prepare a housing plan for all of Park County that identifies affordable housing needs, targets and identifies possible funding sources, and pinpoints implementation partners (7 likes)

Objective: Assist with implementing the strategies in the Gardner Area Housing Action Plan (2 likes)

Objective: Actively support and pursue grant funding to provide affordable housing to people with special needs and the elderly (6 likes)

Objectives: Evaluate the impact of vacation rentals on housing availability (6 likes) (2 dislikes)

Key Issue: Growth and Development

Over the life of this Growth Policy Update, growth and development in Park County is certain to occur. Growth and development is positive, and will help to diversify and strengthen the County's economy. However, as growth and development occurs, conflicts will arise. The County Commissioners, County staff, and citizens need to be aware of changes in land use with both the positive and the negative impacts, and have the foundation ready to react in an acceptable manner.

Goal: Protect private property rights

Objective: When making decisions regarding land use, uphold provisions of the US Constitution and the Constitution of the State of Montana that protect private property rights (7 likes) (4 dislikes)

Goal: Take an active role in the land use and development process

Objective: Recognize the relationship between enhanced revenues generated by new growth, and the long term liabilities for maintaining infrastructure and providing services (2 likes)

Objective: Identify the current mechanisms for addressing land use conflicts, and evaluate options for improvement (7 likes)

Objective: Develop tools that will allow the County to respond to and address evolving land use issues (9 likes)

Objective: Continue with and expand upon community outreach efforts that inform citizens of planning activities, while keeping planners aware of pressing issues (5 likes)

Objective: Identify areas of critical agricultural importance, and implement mechanisms in these areas that enable agricultural land owners to continue operations (7 likes)

Goal: Diversify Park County's economy

Objective: Provide resources and support to economic development agencies operating in Park County (2 likes)

Growth Policy Update Public Meeting (Workshop Posters)- Emigrant 6.14.16

Priorities

Protect Natural Resources
Balances in Property Rights
Keep Property Appealing
Roads
Highway Safety
Water Quality
Recreation Use of River
Zoning
Refuse & Recycle

Barriers

Lack of Zoning
Conflicting Visions
Lack of Public Participation
Lack of Funding
Lack of Regulation

Opportunities

Tax (Fuel, Property)
Speed Limit
Additional Traffic Laws
Economic Development
Recreation for Citizens
1st National Park and Paradise Model
Eyesore Protection
Citizen-Initiated Zoning
Brand Livingston and Park County as Entrance to the Park

Wilsall 6.15.16 meeting Poster Results

Key Issue: Intergovernmental Coordination

Park County does not exist in a vacuum. There are a variety of forms of government from school boards and fire districts to federal and state agencies, all involved in providing services and impacting the County's population and surroundings. The County Commission only has jurisdiction over a portion of what occurs in Park County, but where they don't have jurisdiction, it is likely another entity does. Non-governmental entities such as health care providers and community groups also play a critical role in providing services and contributing to Park County's high quality of life. Coordination with other government agencies and non-governmental partners is critical to provide efficient and effective services to residents and visitors.

Goal: Plan for and encourage development in the area around Livingston (1 like)

Objective: Complete a joint planning exercise with the City of Livingston to develop a shared vision for the unincorporated area around Livingston (1 like)

Objective: Update the existing interlocal agreement between the City of Livingston and Park County to outline steps each jurisdiction should take to meet the shared

planning vision (1 like)

Objective: Complete an infrastructure plan and adopt development standards that under state law allow for the expedited review of subdivisions in the unincorporated area around Livingston

Goal: Partner with state and federal agencies to reduce human-wildlife conflicts (1 like)

Objective: Develop and implement a shared strategy with wildlife management agencies and community organizations to educate the public on living with wildlife (3 likes)

Objective: Identify critical wildlife corridors for development, infrastructure and conservation planning (1 like)

Goal: Support efforts of fire managers to manage fuels on public and private lands

Objective: Implement the tasks in the 2014 Community Wildfire Protection Plan

Objective: Increase support for rural fire districts (3 likes)

Goal: Become active partners in management of federal lands (2 likes)

Objective: Establish Cooperative Agency status with the United States Forest Service and National Parks Service (1 like)

Goal: Encourage efforts of non-governmental partners to address community needs (1 like)

Objective: Facilitate and provide support to community groups (2 likes)

Key Issue: Water Availability and Water Quality

Water is a basic necessity of life and is critical for the growth and development of the County. As growth and development occurs, the County needs to understand the dynamics of this crucial resource and be prepared to make decisions on how to manage it to protect existing users, and provide for additional ones. In order to do this, the County needs to establish a foundation for future decision making.

Goal: Be prepared to make decisions on how to manage water resources

Objective: Conduct a water resource study that analyzes sources, long term availability, potential conflicts, and recommendations for management

Objective: Establish baseline water quality information for the major watersheds in Park County (4 likes)

Key Issue: Infrastructure

Infrastructure connects people to places. Without it, there are no businesses, no trade and no jobs. The County is a provider of infrastructure, and what we think of critical infrastructure is evolving. The County needs to ensure the infrastructure that enables commerce for today and for tomorrow is safe, effective and efficient.

Goal: Increase availability of broadband internet (4 likes)

Objective: Partner with educational providers, health care

providers, the City of Livingston and the business community to provide information and recommendations in order to make informed decisions about investing in broadband infrastructure and expanding its use

Goal: Create a system of interconnected trails

Objective: Prioritize and implement the recommendations in the Park County Active Transportation Plan

Objective: Continue partnerships with the City of Livingston to develop Active Transportation facilities in and around the City

Objective: Identify stable, long-term funding sources for trail planning, design, construction, and maintenance

Goal: Provide for a safe and efficient County road network (1 like)

Objective: Update the subdivision regulations to ensure new subdivisions pay a proportional share of their impact when upgrading County roads to meet County standards (2 likes)

Objective: Establish a baseline for the condition of County roads, and monitor their condition over time (3 likes)

Objective: Prioritize the use of Rural Special Improvement Districts to upgrade substandard County roads in areas that are already developed (2 likes)

Objective: Continue to secure federal funding sources to upgrade County roads that provide access to recreation areas on federal lands (2 likes)

Goal: Support water and sewer districts in and around community centers

Objective: Coordinate with the Gardiner Water and Sewer District to update water and sewer facilities (2 likes)

Objective: Evaluate and support the development of public water and wastewater systems in community centers in order to accommodate new growth and existing development (2 likes)

Goal: Collect, treat and dispose of solid waste as part of an effective and efficient waste management system (2 likes)

Objective: Maintain a data base on the use of solid waste (1 like)

Objective: Continue partnerships with the City Livingston to manage solid waste (3 likes)

Objective: Continue efforts to support and explore new options for recycling (3 likes)

Key Issue: Housing (1/2 like)

The cost of housing in Park County is on the rise. Is the cost of housing outpacing wages? What does affordable housing mean for the workforce or low income households? How do housing prices impact elderly residents, or people with special needs? Looking west, the cost of housing in Gallatin County is skyrocketing. Will it impact Park County? Park County needs to gain a better understanding of its housing needs, and lay the foundation to address affordability.

Goal: Provide for affordable, low income and work-force housing

Objective: Prepare a housing plan for all of Park County that identifies affordable housing needs, targets and identifies possible funding sources, and pinpoints implementation partners (2 likes)

Objective: Assist with implementing the strategies in the Gardner Area Housing Action Plan (1 like)

Objective: Actively support and pursue grant funding to provide affordable housing to people with special needs and the elderly (3 likes)

Objectives: Evaluate the impact of vacation rentals on housing availability (2 likes)

Key Issue: Growth and Development

Over the life of this Growth Policy Update, growth and development in Park County is certain to occur. Growth and development is positive, and will help to diversify and strengthen the County's economy. However, as growth and development occurs, conflicts will arise. The County Commissioners, County staff, and citizens need to be aware of changes in land use with both the positive and the negative impacts, and have the foundation ready to react in an acceptable manner.

Goal: Protect private property rights (5 likes)

Objective: When making decisions regarding land use, uphold provisions of the US Constitution and the Constitution of the State of Montana that protect private property rights

Goal: Take an active role in the land use and development process (2 likes)

Objective: Recognize the relationship between enhanced revenues generated by new growth, and the long term liabilities for maintaining infrastructure and providing services (2 likes)

Objective: Identify the current mechanisms for addressing land use conflicts, and evaluate options for improvement (1 like)

Objective: Develop tools that will allow the County to respond to and address evolving land use issues (2 likes)

Objective: Continue with and expand upon community outreach efforts that inform citizens of planning activities,

Livingston 6.15.16 meeting Poster Results**Key Issue: Intergovernmental Coordination**

Park County does not exist in a vacuum. There are a variety of forms of government from school boards and fire districts to federal and state agencies, all involved in providing services and impacting the County's population and surroundings. The County Commission only has jurisdiction over a portion of what occurs in Park County, but where they don't have jurisdiction, it is likely another entity does. Non-governmental entities such as health care providers and community groups also play a critical role in providing services and contributing to Park County's high quality of

life. Coordination with other government agencies and non-governmental partners is critical to provide efficient and effective services to residents and visitors.

Goal: Plan for and encourage development in the area around Livingston

Objective: Complete a joint planning exercise with the City of Livingston to develop a shared vision for the unincorporated area around Livingston (12 likes) (1 dislike)

Objective: Update the existing interlocal agreement between the City of Livingston and Park County to outline steps each jurisdiction should take to meet the shared planning vision (6 likes)

Objective: Complete an infrastructure plan and adopt development standards that under state law allow for the expedited review of subdivisions in the unincorporated area around Livingston (7 likes) (4 dislikes)

Goal: Partner with state and federal agencies to reduce human-wildlife conflicts

Objective: Develop and implement a shared strategy with wildlife management agencies and community organizations to educate the public on living with wildlife (2 likes) (1 dislike)

Objective: Identify critical wildlife corridors for development, infrastructure and conservation planning (4 likes) (1 dislike)

Goal: Support efforts of fire managers to manage fuels on public and private lands

Objective: Implement the tasks in the 2014 Community Wildfire Protection Plan (2 likes)

Objective: Increase support for rural fire districts (2 likes)

Goal: Become active partners in management of federal lands

Objective: Establish Cooperative Agency status with the United States Forest Service and National Parks Service (5 likes)

Goal: Encourage efforts of non-governmental partners to address community needs

Objective: Facilitate and provide support to community groups (5 likes)

Key Issue: Water Availability and Water Quality

Water is a basic necessity of life and is critical for the growth and development of the County. As growth and development occurs, the County needs to understand the dynamics of this crucial resource and be prepared to make decisions on how to manage it to protect existing users, and provide for additional ones. In order to do this, the County needs to establish a foundation for future decision making.

Goal: Be prepared to make decisions on how to manage water resources

Objective: Conduct a water resource study that analyzes sources, long term availability, potential conflicts, and rec-

which creates a plan to manage one of pressing issues (1 like)

Objective: Establish a base of critical agency information for, and the main website for, Park County (1 dislike) (1 dislike)

agricultural landowners to continue operations (3 likes)

Goal: Diversify Park County's economy (2 likes)

Infrastructure connects people to places. Without it, there

are no businesses, no trade and no jobs. The County is a

development agencies operating in Park County

critical infrastructure is evolving. The County needs to ensure the infrastructure that enables commerce for today and for tomorrow is safe, effective and efficient.

Goal: Increase availability of broadband internet

Objective: Partner with educational providers, health care providers, the City of Livingston and the business community to provide information and recommendations in order to make informed decisions about investing in broadband infrastructure and expanding its use (10 likes)

Goal: Create a system of interconnected trails (2 likes)

Objective: Prioritize and implement the recommendations in the Park County Active Transportation Plan (3 likes)

Objective: Continue partnerships with the City of Livingston to develop Active Transportation facilities in and around the City (9 likes)

Objective: Identify stable, long-term funding sources for trail planning, design, construction, and maintenance (11 likes) (7 dislikes)

Goal: Provide for a safe and efficient County road network

Objective: Update the subdivision regulations to ensure new subdivisions pay a proportional share of their impact when upgrading County roads to meet County standards (9 likes)

Objective: Establish a baseline for the condition of County roads, and monitor their condition over time (6 likes)

Objective: Prioritize the use of Rural Special Improvement Districts to upgrade substandard County roads in areas that are already developed (1 like) (3 dislikes)

Objective: Continue to secure federal funding sources to upgrade County roads that provide access to recreation areas on federal lands (9 likes) (1 dislike)

Goal: Support water and sewer districts in and around community centers

Objective: Coordinate with the Gardiner Water and Sewer District to update water and sewer facilities (3 likes) (1 dislike)

Objective: Evaluate and support the development of public water and wastewater systems in community centers in order to accommodate new growth and existing development (8 likes) (1 dislike)

Goal: Collect, treat and dispose of solid waste as part of an effective and efficient waste management system

Objective: Maintain a data base on the use of solid waste

(8 like)

Objective: Continue partnerships with the City Livingston to manage solid waste (11 likes)

Objective: Continue efforts to support and explore new options for recycling (12 likes)

Key Issue: Housing

The cost of housing in Park County is on the rise. Is the cost of housing outpacing wages? What does affordable housing mean for the workforce or low income households? How do housing prices impact elderly residents, or people with special needs? Looking west, the cost of housing in Gallatin County is skyrocketing. Will it impact Park County? Park County needs to gain a better of understanding of its housing needs, and lay the foundation to address affordability.

Goal: Provide for affordable, low income and workforce housing

Objective: Prepare a housing plan for all of Park County that identifies affordable housing needs, targets and identifies possible funding sources, and pinpoints implementation partners (13 likes)

Objective: Assist with implementing the strategies in the Gardner Area Housing Action Plan (1 like)

Objective: Actively support and pursue grant funding to provide affordable housing to people with special needs and the elderly (8 likes)

Objectives: Evaluate the impact of vacation rentals on housing availability (6 likes) (2 dislikes)

Key Issue: Growth and Development

Over the life of this Growth Policy Update, growth and development in Park County is certain to occur. Growth and development is positive, and will help to diversify and strengthen the County's economy. However, as growth and development occurs, conflicts will arise. The County Commissioners, County staff, and citizens need to be aware of changes in land use with both the positive and the negative impacts, and have the foundation ready to react in an acceptable manner.

Goal: Protect private property rights

Objective: When making decisions regarding land use, uphold provisions of the US Constitution and the Constitution of the State of Montana that protect private property rights (9 likes)

Goal: Take an active role in the land use and development process (2 likes)

Objective: Recognize the relationship between enhanced revenues generated by new growth, and the long term liabilities for maintaining infrastructure and providing services (9 likes)

Objective: Identify the current mechanisms for addressing land use conflicts, and evaluate options for improvement (8 like)

Objective: Develop tools that will allow the County to re-

spond to and address evolving land use issues (3 likes)

Objective: Continue with and expand upon community outreach efforts that inform citizens of planning activities, while keeping planners aware of pressing issues (8 like)

Objective: Identify areas of critical agricultural importance,

Livingston Meeting – Workshop

6.16.16

Priorities

1. Econ development
 2. Maintain natural environment
 3. Affordable housing
 4. Plan roads and utilities
 5. Housing development – master plan affordable
- Housing
6. Maintain property rights
 7. Cherish county...
 8. Grid of city county land uses
 9. What we want to be when we grow up
 10. Growth and development – infrastructure demands, etc.
 11. Ensuring new development on existing infrastructure
 12. Reducing development in hazardous places
 13. Zoning for land use
 14. Infrastructure to attract tourists and businesses
 15. Effective government that listens, think broadly, and act
 16. Infrastructure – capacity
 17. Housing – capacity
 18. Communication all levels of government
 19. What is the identify of Park County – growth, sustainability
 20. Protect natural resources
 21. Public access to public lands
 22. Steer growth of private residences
 23. Land use – zoning is absolutely necessary
 24. Water – management
 25. Control development of agriculture lands
 26. Commercial/industrial land use regulations
 27. Non county road improvements
 28. Wild life accommodation within the county
 29. Initiate county zoning plan to protect private property rights
 30. Weed control – enforcement
 31. Economic development – per capita income
 32. Land use
 33. Access to public lands, trails, and rivers
 34. Concentrated development, no sprawl
 35. Coordination with city planning, admin, public works – proximity to Livingston
 36. Diversify economic base
 37. Housing – affordable and work force
 38. Protecting tourism industry – sustainability

39. Protecting agriculture
40. Protecting Yellowstone ecosystem – mines and asphalt plant
41. Existing and future roads and corridors – planning, growth
42. Quality schools
43. Quality emergency services
44. Public access to public lands and water
45. Trail connectivity
46. Planning for new growth
47. Water use and availability

Barriers

1. Private property attitudes – protection
2. Mistrust of government
3. Fear of change
4. Funding
5. Human challenges – fear of change, history, turf, egos, personalities, fixed mindsets
6. Paranoia – U.N. agenda 21
7. Lack of communication
8. Money
9. Fear of government control
10. Attitude toward change
11. Money
12. People who oppose all government activity
13. People who don't want to pay for public improvements
14. Prioritizing resource allocation in a resource short environment
15. "we've always done it this way"
16. Money
17. Hard focus on outcomes – no vision of outcomes to gain support
18. "Mish mash" growth
19. Good ole boy / new boy ideas
20. Lack of vision
21. No incentive of smart growth
22. No incentive to not sell land
23. Low participation
24. Diverse population –
25. Funding
26. Community perception of planning
27. Engaging all sectors of community
28. Outdated federal mining laws
29. Wealthy land owners who block public access
30. Sprawl in rural areas
31. Tax base too small
32. Lack of city county cooperation
33. Lack of economic development progress
34. Development sprawl needs control
35. Too many restrictions on new business devel-

and implement mechanisms in these areas that enable agricultural land owners to continue operations (8 likes)

Goal: Diversify Park County's economy

Objective: Provide resources and support to economic development agencies operating in Park County (4 likes) (2 dislikes)

- 36. Costs need control
- 37. Preconceived Ideas
- 38. Past history laissez faire
- 39. Budget constraints
- 40. Lack of coordination and joint planning city county growth issues
- 41. Opposition to land use regulations
- 42. Rapid growth that would only accelerate – everyone wants piece of paradise

Ways to address fear of planning

- Bottom up type processes
- Mitigate assumptions – education, public outreach
- highlighting fiscal issues without planning

Budgetary issues

- lack of communication
- timing
- unrealistic/too big
- PILT reliance
- Lack of public support

Opportunities

1. People care about better community
2. One of a kind resources – Yellowstone National Park
3. Growth is coming, now is the time
4. Small town sense of community
5. Most people share the same values
6. Land use – growth and development threats inspire land use planning
7. Incredible natural beauty proximity to Yellowstone National Park
8. Highway and airport infrastructure
9. Growing public awareness to protect paradise
10. World class travel destination
11. Excellent residential location
12. Encourage high density growth – ag credit system (limits on residences, farmers were given credits, developers had to buy before development could occur)
13. Attract clean business, what we are where we are
14. Still small enough to get community involvement
15. Let new businesses in
16. Cooperation between city and county
17. Natural resources can bring in jobs money people
18. A blank slate – no countywide/overarching

regulation, can create our own model

19. Small community
20. Have strong sense of pride and values
21. City and county improved infrastructure
22. Private money is bringing in more tourists
23. More effective techniques are educating and involving the public
24. Growing awareness for the need for planning
25. Willingness of the gov't to address the opposition of gov't
26. Recent development and Connectivity of trails
27. Gardiner efforts – resort tax, gateway project, housing (a lot to learn from it)
28. New, younger, engaged business ownership
29. New hospital
30. Investment in downtown building (Urban Renewal Agency funding)
31. Capitalize on tourism with backup from clean industry
32. Get our ducks in a row
33. Run our city and county responsibly – role model
34. Create parking for residents and guests – in communities
35. Changing demographics, progressive thinking
36. Increasing understanding for the need for open space limiting sprawl and development
37. Increasing sensitivity for the need to protect the environment
38. Identify the Livingston river front as a driver of economic activity (Mailed In) (1 total)
39. Desire of the a large portion of the populace to achieve a better quality of life, earnings
40. Desire of the large portion of the populace to protect existing quality of life, small community life style and environment
41. Wind farm

and fire districts to federal and state agencies, all involved in providing services and impacting the County's population and surroundings. The County Commission only has jurisdiction over a portion of what occurs in Park County, but where they don't have jurisdiction, it is likely another entity does. Non-governmental entities such as health care providers and community groups also play a critical role in providing services and contributing to Park County's high quality of life. Coordination with other government agencies and non-governmental partners is critical to provide efficient and effective services to residents and visitors.

Goal: Plan for and encourage development in the area around Livingston (1 like)

Objective: Complete a joint planning exercise with the City of Livingston to develop a shared vision for the unincorporated

rated area around Livingston (1 like)

Objective: Update the existing interlocal agreement between the City of Livingston and Park County to outline steps each jurisdiction should take to meet the shared planning vision (1 like)

Objective: Complete an infrastructure plan and adopt development standards that under state law allow for the expedited review of subdivisions in the unincorporated area around Livingston (1 like)

Goal: Partner with state and federal agencies to reduce human-wildlife conflicts (1 like)

Objective: Develop and implement a shared strategy with wildlife management agencies and community organizations to educate the public on living with wildlife (1 like)

Objective: Identify critical wildlife corridors for development, infrastructure and conservation planning (1 like)

Goal: Support efforts of fire managers to manage fuels on public and private lands (1 like)

Objective: Implement the tasks in the 2014 Community Wildfire Protection Plan

Objective: Increase support for rural fire districts (1 like)

Goal: Become active partners in management of federal lands

Objective: Establish Cooperative Agency status with the United States Forest Service and National Parks Service (1 dislike)

Goal: Encourage efforts of non-governmental partners to address community needs (1 like)

Objective: Facilitate and provide support to community groups (1 like)

Objective: Develop tools that will allow the County to respond to and address evolving land use issues (1 like) (1 dislike)

Objective: Continue with and expand upon community outreach efforts that inform citizens of planning activities, while keeping planners aware of pressing issues (1 like)

Objective: Identify areas of critical agricultural importance, and implement mechanisms in these areas that enable agricultural land owners to continue operations (1 like)

Goal: Diversify Park County's economy (1 like)

Objective: Provide resources and support to economic development agencies operating in Park County (1 like)

Key Issue: Water Availability and Water Quality (1 like)

Water is a basic necessity of life and is critical for the growth and development of the County. As growth and development occurs, the County needs to understand the dynamics of this crucial resource and be prepared to make decisions on how to manage it to protect existing users, and provide for additional ones. In order to do this, the County needs to establish a foundation for future decision making.

Goal: Be prepared to make decisions on how to manage water resources (1 like)

Objective: Conduct a water resource study that analyzes

sources, long term availability, potential conflicts, and recommendations for management (no choice available on worksheet)

Objective: Establish baseline water quality information for the major watersheds in Park County (no choice available on worksheet)

Key Issue: Infrastructure (1 like)

Infrastructure connects people to places. Without it, there are no businesses, no trade and no jobs. The County is a provider of infrastructure, and what we think of critical infrastructure is evolving. The County needs to ensure the infrastructure that enables commerce for today and for tomorrow is safe, effective and efficient.

Goal: Increase availability of broadband internet (1 dislike)

Objective: Partner with educational providers, health care providers, the City of Livingston and the business community to provide information and recommendations in order to make informed decisions about investing in broadband infrastructure and expanding its use (1 dislike)

Goal: Create a system of interconnected trails (1 like)

Objective: Prioritize and implement the recommendations in the Park County Active Transportation Plan

Objective: Continue partnerships with the City of Livingston to develop Active Transportation facilities in and around the City (1 like)

Objective: Identify stable, long-term funding sources for trail planning, design, construction, and maintenance (1 like)

Goal: Provide for a safe and efficient County road network (1 like)

Objective: Update the subdivision regulations to ensure new subdivisions pay a proportional share of their impact when upgrading County roads to meet County standards (1 like)

Objective: Establish a baseline for the condition of County roads, and monitor their condition over time (1 like)

Objective: Prioritize the use of Rural Special Improvement Districts to upgrade substandard County roads in areas that are already developed (1 like)

Objective: Continue to secure federal funding sources to upgrade County roads that provide access to recreation areas on federal lands (1 like)

Goal: Support water and sewer districts in and around community centers (1 like)

Objective: Coordinate with the Gardiner Water and Sewer District to update water and sewer facilities (1 like)

Objective: Evaluate and support the development of public water and wastewater systems in community centers in order to accommodate new growth and existing development (1 like)

Goal: Collect, treat and dispose of solid waste as part of an effective and efficient waste management system (1 like)

Objective: Maintain a data base on the use of solid waste

Objective: Continue partnerships with the City of Livingston to manage solid waste (1 like)

Objective: Continue efforts to support and explore new options for recycling (1 like)

Key Issue: Housing (1 like)

The cost of housing in Park County is on the rise. Is the cost of housing outpacing wages? What does affordable housing mean for the workforce or low income households? How do housing prices impact elderly residents, or people with special needs? Looking west, the cost of housing in Gallatin County is skyrocketing. Will it impact Park County? Park County needs to gain a better understanding of its housing needs, and lay the foundation to address affordability.

Goal: Provide for affordable, low income and workforce housing (1 like)

Objective: Prepare a housing plan for all of Park County that identifies affordable housing needs, targets and identifies possible funding sources, and pinpoints implementation partners (1 like)

Objective: Assist with implementing the strategies in the Gardner Area Housing Action Plan

Objective: Actively support and pursue grant funding to provide affordable housing to people with special needs and the elderly (1 like)

Objectives: Evaluate the impact of vacation rentals on housing availability (1 dislike)

Key Issue: Growth and Development (1 like)

Over the life of this Growth Policy Update, growth and development in Park County is certain to occur. Growth and development is positive, and will help to diversify and strengthen the County's economy. However, as growth and development occurs, conflicts will arise. The County Commissioners, County staff, and citizens need to be aware of changes in land use with both the positive and the negative impacts, and have the foundation ready to react in an acceptable manner.

Goal: Protect private property rights (1 like)

Objective: When making decisions regarding land use, uphold provisions of the US Constitution and the Constitution of the State of Montana that protect private property rights (1 like)

Goal: Take an active role in the land use and development process (1 like)

Objective: Recognize the relationship between enhanced revenues generated by new growth, and the long term liabilities for maintaining infrastructure and providing services (1 like)

Objective: Identify the current mechanisms for addressing land use conflicts, and evaluate options for improvement growth and existing development (1 like)

Written Comment Collected from all Open House Meetings

| Meeting Location | Key Issue | Goals | Objective | Comment |
|------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Emigrant | Growth and Development | Protect private property rights | When making decisions regarding land use, uphold provisions of the US Constitution and the Constitution of the State of Montana that protect private property rights | I agree with private property rights but it needs limits. What I've seen so far here in Montana, people are more concerned with individual private property rights instead of the overall good for everyone. |
| Emigrant | Water Availability and Quality | Be Prepared to make decisions on how to manage water resources | Establish baseline water quality information for the major watersheds in Park County | They need to pay attention to riparian habitat. In particular, the Yellowstone river not only supplies clean water but is a major recreational resource. If it gets overbuilt it will lose its quality to the point people won't use it. Thus affecting our tourism economy. |
| Emigrant | Growth and Development | Take an active role in the land use and development process | | Stricter regulations on bill boards. No mining or industrial development in the county. Ok with commercial development, more specifically cater to tourism. I think the procedure and regulations for subdivision are ok at the moment. |
| Emigrant | Growth and Development | Protect private property rights | When making decisions regarding land use, uphold provisions of the US Constitution and the Constitution of the State of Montana that protect private property rights | I think the way the objective is written, it sounds inflammatory. I want the current objective to split into more discrete objectives, more specifically related to private property rights issues. |
| Emigrant | Growth and Development | Protect private property rights | When making decisions regarding land use, uphold provisions of the US Constitution and the Constitution of the State of Montana that protect private property rights | I think Moser's property is a violation of some regulation if not at least highway encroachment. If it is not in violation of any regulation, those regulations need to be created and enforced. |

| | | | | |
|------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Emigrant | Growth and Development | Protect private property rights | When making decisions regarding land use, uphold provisions of the US Constitution and the Constitution of the State of Montana that protect private property rights | I don't want to see individual property rights at the exclusion of natural resources and the environment. To the point where it detracts from the beauty of paradise valley. Better balancing of individual property rights and community interests. |
| Emigrant | Housing | Provide for affordable low income and workforce housing | | I think a lot more analysis needs to be done in regards to the growth of Bozeman and Gallatin County and its impacts on Park County. The development in Livingston and the I90 corridor needs to be planned to receive additional people. |
| Wilsall | Infrastructure | Collect and treat and dispose of solid waste as part of an effective and efficient waste management system | Continue partnerships with the City Livingston to manage solid waste | Before they got rid of the Livingston incinerator they should have let all the Park County citizens decide on it. |
| Livingston | Water Availability and Quality | Be Prepared to make decisions on how to manage water resources | Establish baseline water quality information for the major watersheds in Park County | Baseline water quality for the Wilsall and Clyde Park area has already been done. For the northern conservation district/watershed group, Alan Johnstone was the chairman at that time, Darrel Shehen is the current chairman. Jackie Nelson was the contact for the southern conservation district/watershed group. |
| Livingston | Water Availability and Quality | Be Prepared to make decisions on how to manage water resources | Establish baseline water quality information for the major watersheds in Park County | The state is already doing these things. It's duplicity for county to get involved with that. |
| Livingston | Infrastructure | Support water and sewer districts in and around community centers | | Cooke city should be included in the water/sewer infrastructure planning. |

| | | | | |
|------------|-------------------------|--|---|--|
| Livingston | Infrastructure | Provide for a safe and efficient County Road network | Prioritize the use of Rural Special Improvement Districts to upgrade substandard County roads in areas that are already developed | Non-county roads have a long history of deteriorating especially when the community and traffic is growing. Unfortunately most of these communities do not have the resources to fix the roads on their own. Whether you like gov't support or not an RID is the only way to realistically finance significant road improvements and maintenance in these areas. |
| | Government Coordination | Support efforts of fire managers to manage fuels on public and private lands | Implement the tasks in the 2014 Community Wildfire Protection Plan | Would need to refresh understanding of this plan |
| | Government Coordination | Become active partners in management of federal lands | Establish Cooperative Agency status with the United States Forest Service and National Parks Service | Currently I feel that the FWP and NPS are doing a good job with federal lands, not sure that Park County jumping in would be a good thing. Let them do what they are good at, experience matters in this case and FWP and NPS have it. |
| | Growth and Development | Take an active role in the land use and development process | Develop tools that will allow the County to respond to and address evolving land use issues | Revisit the tools currently in place and see if we are using them fully. |
| | Infrastructure | Increase availability of broadband internet | Partner with educational providers, health care providers, the City of Livingston and the business community to provide information and recommendations in order to make informed decisions about investing in broadband infrastructure and expanding its use | AS broadband providers are limited in this area due to license agreements between the providers, time spent on this should not be priority at this point. |
| | Infrastructure | Create a system of interconnected trails | Prioritize and implement the recommendations in the Park County Active Transportation Plan | How current is the recommendation on this plan, if not within last 5 yrs than no |

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--|---|---|
| | Infrastructure | Provide for a safe and efficient County Road network | Prioritize the use of Rural Special Improvement Districts to upgrade substandard County roads in areas that are already developed | Since you haven't gotten one to work yet, continue trying |
| | Infrastructure | Collect and treat and dispose of solid waste as part of an effective and efficient waste management system | Maintain a data base on the use of solid waste | To do what with? |
| | Infrastructure | Collect and treat and dispose of solid waste as part of an effective and efficient waste management system | Continue partnerships with the City Livingston to manage solid waste | Revisit this to ensure it is financially beneficial |
| | Housing | | | This is becoming a necessary priority for all! |
| | Housing | Provide for affordable low income and workforce housing | Assist with implementing the strategies in the Gardner Area Housing Action Plan | Unfamiliar with this plan |
| | Housing | Provide for affordable low income and workforce housing | Evaluate the impact of vacation rentals on housing availability | Not a priority, we are a tourist town and vacation rentals bring in dollars to a multitude of areas |
| | Government Coordination | Plan for and encourage development in the area around Livingston | Update the existing interlocal agreement between the City of Livingston and Park County to outline steps each jurisdiction should take to meet the shared planning vision | That's great but what about joint planning/ interlocal agreements with Gardiner through the Greater Gardiner Community Council? |

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--|---|---|
| | Government Coordination | Plan for and encourage development in the area around Livingston | Update the existing interlocal agreement between the City of Livingston and Park County to outline steps each jurisdiction should take to meet the shared planning vision | Park County, Livingston, Gardiner are three different places and should be treated as such. Shields Valley also being its own. |
| | Government Coordination | Partner with state and federal agencies to reduce human and wildlife conflicts | Develop and implement a shared strategy with wildlife management agencies and community organizations to educate the public on living with wildlife | The wildlife issue is too much for more than general statements on a Growth Policy. We already have multiple government agencies and private groups involved. Should be separate from Growth Policy. |
| | Government Coordination | Support efforts of fire managers to manage fuels on public and private lands | Implement the tasks in the 2014 Community Wildfire Protection Plan | Yes- If there's already a plan it should be implemented. |
| | Infrastructure | Increase availability of broadband internet | Partner with educational providers, health care providers, the City of Livingston and the business community to provide information and recommendations in order to make informed decisions about investing in broadband infrastructure and expanding its use | Should be City/Community funded not via County funded. Agree internet should be widely available but each community should decide how and to what extent funded. |
| | Infrastructure | Create a system of interconnected trails | Prioritize and implement the recommendations in the Park County Active Transportation Plan | Hard to agree or disagree as I'm not familiar with what is in the plan. If plan was developed on proven needs/wants of community I support. Should not raise costs significantly through Park County. |
| | Infrastructure | Create a system of interconnected trails | Continue partnerships with the City of Livingston to develop Active Transportation facilities in and around the City | Please include discussion of public transportation (i.e. bus from Livingston to Gardiner for both locals and tourists; Livingston to Bozeman). Also develop rails to trails from Gardiner through the valley to Livingston. |

| | | | | |
|--|----------------|---|--|--|
| | Infrastructure | Create a system of interconnected trails | Identify stable, long-term funding sources for trail planning, design, construction, and maintenance | Would support transportation system for getting folks from Bozeman or Airport through Livingston and to the Park. Should be majority financially supported by users. |
| | Infrastructure | Provide for a safe and efficient County Road network | Update the subdivision regulations to ensure new subdivisions pay a proportional share of their impact when upgrading County roads to meet County standards | We are, I assume, just talking roads here. |
| | Infrastructure | Provide for a safe and efficient County Road network | Establish a baseline for the condition of County roads, and monitor their condition over time | Little used roads might be de-commissioned or reduced to maintain the road standard should be based on numbers and use. Different baselines for different roads. |
| | Infrastructure | Provide for a safe and efficient County Road network | Prioritize the use of Rural Special Improvement Districts to upgrade substandard County roads in areas that are already developed | Property tax the first source and improvement district second. |
| | Infrastructure | Provide for a safe and efficient County Road network | Continue to secure federal funding sources to upgrade County roads that provide access to recreation areas on federal lands | Remember the Jardine Road condition, it provides access to so many public trails to public lands. |
| | Infrastructure | Support water and sewer districts in and around community centers | Coordinate with the Gardiner Water and Sewer District to update water and sewer facilities | Only if resort taxes are used heavily since heavy uses are primarily from tourism. We'll need upgrades yes, but pay for it with resort tax. |
| | Infrastructure | Support water and sewer districts in and around community centers | Evaluate and support the development of public water and wastewater systems in community centers in order to accommodate new growth and existing development | Again, use resort tax heavily. |

| | | | | |
|--|------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Infrastructure | Collect and treat and dispose of solid waste as part of an effective and efficient waste management system | Maintain a data base on the use of solid waste | Will this database be used to expand recycling options? Then yes, sounds great. |
| | Housing | | | ...and not just affordable housing, but we need any housing! There is a lack of residential housing in general in Gardiner. |
| | Housing | Provide for affordable low income and workforce housing | Prepare a housing plan for all of Park County that identifies affordable housing needs, targets and identifies possible funding sources, and pinpoints implementation partners | Consider zoning changes or building permit guidelines that allow small (very) parcels the ability to build a their own “tiny house” property or parcels. Low-cost option for many. Should allow for homeowner construction on permanent foundations. |
| | Housing | Provide for affordable low income and workforce housing | Assist with implementing the strategies in the Gardner Area Housing Action Plan | Am against a “west Yellowstone” solution of building into the forest, land trades, etc. Would like to see dense housing with open space in between. Rodeo grounds, bottom of basin planning. Just say no to sprawl in Gardiner/Park County. |
| | Housing | Provide for affordable low income and workforce housing | Assist with implementing the strategies in the Gardner Area Housing Action Plan | Gardiner has no way to go bit up or down the valley. We need this managed but not to the point it becomes unaffordable. The ones in need are the lower end of the wage scale. |
| | Growth and Development | | | Growth and Development is inevitable. Can be positive or negative. |
| | Growth and Development | | | Inevitable |
| | Growth and Development | Protect private property rights | | Reword to state protect property rights and values. This recognizes that what one does on his private property impacts his neighbors. |

| | | | | |
|----------|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Growth and Development | Protect private property rights | When making decisions regarding land use, uphold provisions of the US Constitution and the Constitution of the State of Montana that protect private property rights | Property rights should be protected through proper/vetted public input into zoning districts to protect residents, businesses & rural property. |
| | Growth and Development | Take an active role in the land use and development process | | Who should do this? |
| | Growth and Development | Take an active role in the land use and development process | Recognize the relationship between enhanced revenues generated by new growth, and the long term liabilities for maintaining infrastructure and providing services | Resort taxes should not be used as replacement funds for projects such as roads/ sewer/ water/ etc. projects but could help supplement if requests far exceed standards. |
| | Growth and Development | Take an active role in the land use and development process | Identify the current mechanisms for addressing land use conflicts, and evaluate options for improvement | Should not be so rigid that it becomes divided. Each side in issues need wiggle room. |
| | Growth and Development | Take an active role in the land use and development process | Develop tools that will allow the County to respond to and address evolving land use issues | The tricky part, finding a balance. |
| | Growth and Development | | | ADD GOAL: Ensure that future growth and development enhances environmental values (2 likes) |
| Emigrant | Government Coordination | Support efforts of fire managers to manage fuels on public and private lands | Implement the tasks in the 2014 Community Wildfire Protection Plan | Don't know what this is |
| Emigrant | Government Coordination | Become active partners in management of federal lands | Establish Cooperative Agency status with the United States Forest Service and National Parks Service | HB 510 helps with this |

| | | | | |
|------------|--------------------------------|--|--|---|
| Emigrant | Water Availability and Quality | Be Prepared to make decisions on how to manage water resources | Establish baseline water quality information for the major watersheds in Park County | This needs to be done for all issues relevant to water. |
| Emigrant | Housing | | | Gallatin County already impacts the County. |
| Livingston | Government Coordination | Plan for and encourage development in the area around Livingston | | Yes |
| | Government Coordination | Plan for and encourage development in the area around Livingston | | No |
| | Government Coordination | Plan for and encourage development in the area around Livingston | | Too broad. What kind of development? |
| | Government Coordination | Plan for and encourage development in the area around Livingston | Update the existing interlocal agreement between the City of Livingston and Park County to outline steps each jurisdiction should take to meet the shared planning vision | ?? |
| | Government Coordination | Plan for and encourage development in the area around Livingston | Complete an infrastructure plan and adopt development standards that under state law allow for the expedited review of subdivisions in the unincorporated area around Livingston | Concern- expedition can lead to poor review process, greed motivated. |

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Government Coordination | Plan for and encourage development in the area around Livingston | Complete an infrastructure plan and adopt development standards that under state law allow for the expedited review of subdivisions in the unincorporated area around Livingston | thorough [note: this was suggested in repleace of the work “expidited”] |
| | Government Coordination | Plan for and encourage development in the area around Livingston | Complete an infrastructure plan and adopt development standards that under state law allow for the expedited review of subdivisions in the unincorporated area around Livingston | No!! subdivisions should be carefully scrutinized , limits sprawl.! |
| | Government Coordination | Support efforts of fire managers to manage fuels on public and private lands | Implement the tasks in the 2014 Community Wildre Protection Plan | ? |
| | Growth and Development | Diversify Park Countys Economy | Provide resources and support to economic development agencies operating in Park County | Depends, we have a unique community don’t want it to become “anywhere” USA. See Gardiner branding/research results |
| | Infrastructure | Increase availability of broadband internet | | Money |
| | Infrastructure | Create a system of interconnected trails | Prioritize and implement the recommendations in the Park County Active Transportation Plan | ? |
| | Infrastructure | Collect and treat and dispose of solid waste as part of an effective and efficient waste management system | Maintain a data base on the use of solid waste | Money |

| | | | | |
|--|------------------------|---|--|---|
| | Housing | Provide for affordable low income and workforce housing | Assist with implementing the strategies in the Gardner Area Housing Action Plan | ? |
| | Growth and Development | Protect private property rights | | Depends, what if one person's development rights negatively impact everyone else? |
| | Growth and Development | Protect private property rights | When making decisions regarding land use, uphold provisions of the US Constitution and the Constitution of the State of Montana that protect private property rights | Need to understand what there are! |

Livingston The growth policy needs to be enforceable. The county should consider county wide zoning. If we could always trust our neighbors to do the right thing then we wouldn't need county wide zoning. The economic report that was done in 2016, reflects Park County's strong economic numbers based on recreation, tourism, ranching, etc. If we muck that up, with asphalt plants, tire dumps, polluted rivers, we'll have nothing.

Livingston None of the key issues or goals mention weed management.

Livingston I want to see connections between transportation planning and land use planning as a goal. More specifically, I want these two topics related to affect parts of the growth policy in regards to growth and development. The inter-relationship of a lot of these goals are deeply interconnected, whether these connections are identified as smart growth, the connection of these issues and goals should be included as a goal itself. For these goals to work they need to be coordinated and not only be identified as separate topics.

Livingston I am disappointed with the lack of presence and involvement of emergency service personnel at the open house.


Questionnaire Results

Park County Growth Policy Update Questionnaire

SurveyMonkey

Q1 On a scale from 1 (strongly opposed) to 5 (strongly in favor), please rate the following County levels of involvement towards land use planning.

Answered: 183 Skipped: 0



| | Strongly opposed | Somewhat opposed | Neither opposed or in favor | Somewhat in favor | Strongly in favor | Total | Weighted Average |
|--|------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|------------------|
| Alternative One: Passive Approach. The Growth Policy will not spell out a specific strategy for addressing land use change over the long term. Instead, it will call for addressing land use issues when they arise on a case-by-case basis. | 57.87% 103 | 16.85% 30 | 5.06% 9 | 8.99% 16 | 11.24% 20 | 178 | 1.99 |
| Alternative Two: Neighborhood / Community Approach. The Growth Policy will call for the County Planners to assist communities in developing local solutions to land use change and development issues. | 10.56% 19 | 10.00% 18 | 14.44% 26 | 30.56% 55 | 34.44% 62 | 180 | 3.68 |
| Alternative Three: County Comprehensive Approach. The Growth Policy will call for County staff/ commission to proactively evaluate development and land use change challenges and work with the public to address these issues in a phased approach. | 14.92% 27 | 7.18% 13 | 5.52% 10 | 15.47% 28 | 56.91% 103 | 181 | 3.92 |

Q2 In the boxes provided below, please explain your thoughts, clarify your ratings, make suggestions or ask questions about the three alternatives:

Answered: 131 Skipped: 52

| Answer Choices | Responses | |
|--|-----------|-----|
| Alternative One: Passive Approach | 78.63% | 103 |
| Alternative Two: Neighborhood / Community Based Approach | 78.63% | 103 |
| Alternative Three: County Comprehensive Approach | 90.08% | 118 |

| # | Alternative One: Passive Approach | Date |
|----|--|--------------------|
| 1 | A comprehensive approach is efficient, economical, and would provide a more sustainable solution to addressing land use issues | 8/25/2016 2:50 PM |
| 2 | Sounds like it would take forever and be exhausting for everyone involved. | 8/23/2016 9:53 PM |
| 3 | Yes, County should only be involved where there is significant impact to wildlife and ecology. | 8/23/2016 9:03 PM |
| 4 | Private land is private. Govt has no business regulating private land outside the city limits | 8/23/2016 4:09 PM |
| 5 | a passive approach is not an option | 8/23/2016 2:05 PM |
| 6 | too reactive. Need a comprehensive plan to avoid last minute reactive responses to ideas individuals and businesses come up with. | 8/23/2016 10:44 AM |
| 7 | If we don't plan for growth it will come anyways and we will get taken advantage of and lose control over how our county looks and is developed and we will lose our 'edge' over other places that have been or are being wrecked by development. | 8/23/2016 9:17 AM |
| 8 | not sustainable model | 8/23/2016 9:09 AM |
| 9 | This seems to be how Gallatin County runs its show and it has required a lot of reactive measures to growth which are often expensive and incomplete. | 8/23/2016 8:04 AM |
| 10 | You don't make massive mistakes with this approach. | 8/23/2016 7:42 AM |
| 11 | This is a foolish and short sighted way of approaching inevitable growth that will impact the area. We need a plan that addresses the entire picture. | 8/23/2016 7:08 AM |
| 12 | Nothing will ever get done. | 8/22/2016 10:20 PM |
| 13 | We need proactive planning | 8/22/2016 10:01 PM |
| 14 | case by case basis does not address future goals or assure that Park county is a place that its current residents continue to enjoy and feel proud of | 8/22/2016 9:39 PM |
| 15 | Somewhat opposed because, communities like Gardiner do not have elected officials representing the people or common man; without a long term county strategy this may result in lop-sided results and obstinate friction with big government or big business special interest groups that invites county mediation. This approach has the most chance of success when a community has a well developed sense of ordered liberty. | 8/22/2016 9:15 PM |
| 16 | Waiting for issues to come up is what we have been doing all along. It has not worked. It just leads to confusion, controversy and animosity. We need to have a standard to go by. | 8/22/2016 8:56 PM |
| 17 | We are living that scheme now with drastic needs. | 8/22/2016 8:41 PM |
| 18 | We can react on a case by case basis such as a large pig feedlot. | 8/22/2016 7:50 PM |
| 19 | Not practical. The county must get involved with land use planning and must enforce any rules or zoning in effect. | 8/22/2016 6:34 PM |
| 20 | A hodge podge of vacation rentals, industrial uses of unsuitable lands, and developers of subdivisions that do not keep in mind natural wildlife corridors, ranchers or waterways would spring up. It's easier to guide than to react when situations occur. | 8/22/2016 6:20 PM |

Park County Growth Policy Update Questionnaire

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|----|--|--------------------|
| 21 | Other than public/ environmental safety, the government needs to stay away from private property | 8/22/2016 6:17 PM |
| 22 | I am not in favor, as times are changing | 8/22/2016 6:06 PM |
| 23 | What does it mean, "the Growth Policy will call for addressing land use issues" when they arise, HOW will they be "addressed"? | 8/22/2016 5:24 PM |
| 24 | This is not fair to community members or to potential new businesses. We cannot wait and react to problems. This pits neighbors against neighbors and is a passive approach. Our community deserves thoughtful decision making informed by community involvement that guides and shapes our future in a way that builds a strong local economy and protects our quality of life and resources. | 8/22/2016 5:19 PM |
| 25 | We need direction, it would be too hard to consistent with decisions. | 8/22/2016 4:10 PM |
| 26 | status quo, which is not working | 8/22/2016 3:01 PM |
| 27 | non consistent approach based on reaction not advance planning | 8/22/2016 1:43 PM |
| 28 | this is sticking your head in the sand and hoping growth doesn't happen. Recipe to look like shit in a few years. | 8/22/2016 1:24 PM |
| 29 | no vision. too large opportunity for money and political influence | 8/22/2016 1:22 PM |
| 30 | horrible. We are sick of having to defend against moronic proposals such as tire dumps or asphalt plants. | 8/22/2016 1:19 PM |
| 31 | Not doing enough | 8/22/2016 12:47 PM |
| 32 | too passive and allows for things to slip between the cracks...we need a vision and direction | 8/22/2016 12:42 PM |
| 33 | nobody wins. short term selfish outcomes create another kalispell or hamilton with urban sprawl, no wildlife, invasive species and the loss of paradise | 8/22/2016 12:41 PM |
| 34 | We face serious threats—like mining outside of YNP. We need to be proactive in prohibiting harmful activities. We mobilize too late, take too little action, and it allows outside interests to sometimes win. | 8/22/2016 12:36 PM |
| 35 | Anything is better than the 'nothing' we have today. Passive means you will fight one issue every time and there will be many times that no plan will constitute grounds for irresponsible decisions based on old precedents. | 8/22/2016 12:22 PM |
| 36 | This approach is driving us nuts and is costly. We need some predictability about what we can expect for development and where. | 8/22/2016 11:55 AM |
| 37 | Park County MUST BE be visionary with regard to land use planning. In the absence of Park County's participation and leadership, we will continue to see undesirable sprawl and degradation throughout the county. Most progressive and desirable communities throughout the nation have strong land-use planning emphasis and have moved toward density while preserving their natural resource assets. Park County should provide leadership to ensure our communities grow in ways that are beneficial rather than destructive. | 8/22/2016 11:51 AM |
| 38 | Too lax given the changing landscape of Park County | 8/22/2016 11:46 AM |
| 39 | Way too piecemeal. Has the tendency to lack consistency through time. | 8/22/2016 11:21 AM |
| 40 | As issues of land use arise, they should be decided by the community, not a county | 8/22/2016 11:19 AM |
| 41 | We desperately need a short-and-long term strategy for land use planning in Park County! | 8/21/2016 1:08 PM |
| 42 | Unplanned, sporadic development will hurt the area. | 8/21/2016 10:15 AM |
| 43 | This is not acceptable. Change is going to occur and we need to be ready for it. | 8/20/2016 7:54 PM |
| 44 | Just solve problems when they come up. Land owner rights should trump bureaucratic decisions even when the decisions are well intentioned. | 8/20/2016 3:04 PM |
| 45 | Passive approaches tend to result in chaotic trends. | 8/19/2016 11:44 PM |
| 46 | Zoning cannot be put in place retroactively and this approach will not protect the assets of the county. | 8/19/2016 9:15 PM |
| 47 | Less government regulation is preferred | 8/19/2016 6:43 PM |
| 48 | There is too much at stake to take a passive approach | 8/19/2016 5:04 PM |
| 49 | This is just reactionary and it feels like the county is in the best place to be a part of solving these issues. | 8/19/2016 4:26 PM |
| 50 | Allows freedom for specific situations | 8/19/2016 3:39 PM |
| 51 | Reaction to a bad situation only creates a worse and more costly situation. | 8/19/2016 11:34 AM |
| 52 | This short-sighted approach puts the county and communities in a precarious position. We must be proactive to ensure needs are met now and into the future. | 8/19/2016 9:20 AM |

Park County Growth Policy Update Questionnaire

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 53 | Doesn't provide for smart growth and preserving unique amenities of Park County | 8/18/2016 5:58 PM |
| 54 | My passive, we mean reactive. Should have could have would have... Before we know it this will be Gallatin County. | 8/17/2016 2:34 PM |
| 55 | No planning means the county is unprepared for situations that will arise in the future. | 8/17/2016 12:20 PM |
| 56 | This approach is too reactive, we need to be proactive to do the best planning we can. | 8/17/2016 11:53 AM |
| 57 | Planning on a case-by-case basis puts the county at a significant disadvantage and exposes them to countless legal challenges by anyone who doesn't like the decision. Clarity and certainty are important! | 8/17/2016 10:41 AM |
| 58 | I think that Park County will experience significant growth due to overflow from Gallatin County. This is an opportunity to poise Livingston to build great economic stability, and the way to do that well is to manage and plan. I don't believe a passive approach will allow Park County to capitalize upon the economic opportunity that will be available to them in the next few years. | 8/17/2016 10:24 AM |
| 59 | The problems are going to continue to grow and Park County doesn't have the staff or money to deal with each issue separately | 8/17/2016 9:07 AM |
| 60 | I believe we need to plan future land use for sustainability | 8/16/2016 6:19 PM |
| 61 | It will be one fire drill after another | 8/16/2016 4:07 PM |
| 62 | Not active enough | 8/16/2016 11:48 AM |
| 63 | This is 19th Century approach. Reasonable limitations must be placed upon the right of a property owner to use his property as he pleases for the common good. Zoning is, and has been recognized by the Montana legislature as, an integral part of public planning, which takes the long view. The use of land is a granted right, but the land itself remains long after individuals who have exercised such rights have passed away. Rural zoning contemplates not only benefits in the present, but also seeks to conserve our resources for future generations. | 8/16/2016 11:31 AM |
| 64 | passive approach | 8/16/2016 9:58 AM |
| 65 | County officials should focus on heading off problems, not reacting to them as they arise. Be proactive, not reactive. | 8/16/2016 9:15 AM |
| 66 | Not feasible; its really no change from now | 8/16/2016 6:39 AM |
| 67 | Instead of inventing possible problems (that do not exist) address actual issues that do arise, when they arise as time passes. What seems important today is not at all necessarily what is important tomorrow. No sense wasting time, money and manpower on non-issues. | 8/15/2016 8:43 PM |
| 68 | This is our current approach, which does not seem to be working. Some sort of zoning needs to be implemented so that the community doesn't have to fight every development (mines, gravel and asphalt plants) as a separate campaign. | 8/15/2016 8:24 PM |
| 69 | We need a more long range plan for the city/county and this is too nearsighted for that. | 8/15/2016 2:50 PM |
| 70 | Seems development will rapidly stress infrastructure (think Rexburg and Bozeman). Also potential for or allegations of favoritism/nepotism/abuse/whatever when some development is approved and others not | 8/15/2016 2:26 PM |
| 71 | Seems like an excuse to do nothing | 8/15/2016 11:05 AM |
| 72 | This approach will allow those few with the finical resources to dictate what happens for all of us | 8/14/2016 5:33 PM |
| 73 | Need county wide policy | 8/13/2016 9:50 AM |
| 74 | This approach feels like the direction of the Growth Policy could change dramatically depending on who is in office. This worries me. | 8/12/2016 1:18 PM |
| 75 | We need to be more proactive so we're not constantly caught in reactive mode. | 8/12/2016 9:29 AM |
| 76 | That opens the door to unregulated situations that might include mining, over development, higher taxes, drilling, lack of infrastructure | 8/11/2016 5:03 PM |
| 77 | Addressing land use issues on a case by case basis is guaranteed to result in doing nothing, since problems will only be identified after the fact, say when a facility is spewing toxins into the air or the Yellowstone river, at which time it is impossible to stop the problem. Because the southern half of Park County, Livingston south, is a world famous tourist area, suburban sprawl and heavy duty manufacturing must be evaluated before they happen. Anything else is closing the barn door after the horses have run off. | 8/11/2016 2:47 PM |
| 78 | I support propert rights and liberty. | 8/11/2016 10:47 AM |

Park County Growth Policy Update Questionnaire

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|-----|---|--------------------|
| 79 | Park County is a primary tourist destination and many of the folks who bought properties there in the past decade or so did under the assumption the area would remain relatively unspoiled. The 'typical' Montanan attitude of "it's my property and I'll do whatever I want with it" CAN'T be the guiding principle in this context. One very bad apple will spoil the entire bunch and the county can't allow for this to happen. There have to be very clear guidelines that are addressed upfront and NOT on a case by case basis which often fails because problems aren't caught until the train has left the station. | 8/11/2016 8:01 AM |
| 80 | case-by-case allows for flexibility and understanding the possible uniqueness of each situation, which I appreciate. But could it also leave easy loopholes for misuse? | 8/10/2016 7:30 PM |
| 81 | Don't meddle | 8/10/2016 4:10 PM |
| 82 | This Re-active approach has not worked. IE: Gold mining, tire dumps, gravel pits etc. | 8/10/2016 4:08 PM |
| 83 | Simply put, being proactive is better than being reactive. | 8/10/2016 1:35 PM |
| 84 | Waiting passively and addressing issues one at a time will produce a suboptimal result. Only looking at the county, or at a minimum, regions of the county as a whole can good overall planning be achieved. There are many issues and interests to be balanced out in this process, this cannot be thoughtfully addressed without considering larger environmental blocks. | 8/10/2016 1:25 PM |
| 85 | Citizenst do not know how to go about developing their own plans. we just know what we don't want. we don't want unlimited, rampant development, especially along the yellowstone river. with more assault to it it will become an endangered, polluted river. | 8/10/2016 1:00 PM |
| 86 | I suggest pro-active planning is better than reactive | 8/10/2016 12:19 PM |
| 87 | vague and doesn't allow long term solutions for home owners. | 8/10/2016 11:49 AM |
| 88 | Potentially disastrous. When problems arise it may be too late to address them effectively | 8/10/2016 11:25 AM |
| 89 | Most people live in the county because they do not want restrictions | 8/10/2016 11:15 AM |
| 90 | Too little too late to prevent disastrous land uses | 8/10/2016 10:25 AM |
| 91 | Seems like a 'we don't care approach' | 8/10/2016 9:06 AM |
| 92 | Might work but is a reactive approach | 8/10/2016 8:28 AM |
| 93 | a passive approach leads to poor land use and will not lead the County in a positive plan going forward, instead it will be a jumble of mismatched last minute ideas | 8/10/2016 8:05 AM |
| 94 | That's what we've been doing, which means "not" doing, and it hasn't worked | 8/10/2016 7:52 AM |
| 95 | How does this affect the proposed asphalt plant near Emigrant | 8/10/2016 7:24 AM |
| 96 | It is essentially no planning for big issues that might arise that could significantly impact the community. | 8/10/2016 7:07 AM |
| 97 | This is clearly an unproductive option. It's clear we need certain protections and guidelines for the county. | 8/10/2016 6:29 AM |
| 98 | Case by case issues sounds good but I think things will never progress if every matter has to be reviewed and worked out. | 8/10/2016 3:53 AM |
| 99 | The growth policy should have more teeth. | 8/9/2016 9:56 PM |
| 100 | Ambitious | 8/9/2016 6:48 PM |
| 101 | I feel like there should be more thought put into planning. This approach seems too haphazard, which would lead to a poorly planned community. | 8/9/2016 6:32 PM |
| 102 | This seems like the current model and it has done little to meet the public's needs. | 8/9/2016 4:36 PM |
| 103 | encourage infrastructure development by the use of travel corridors/ corridors | 8/8/2016 8:03 AM |
| # | Alternative Two: Neighborhood / Community Based Approach | Date |
| 1 | While local input is very important, a comprehensive approach that considers then entire county is preferred | 8/25/2016 2:50 PM |
| 2 | I appreciate community involvement, if the community has the information it needs to be make informed decisions. I like the people having advocacy and the ability to change direction based on current circumstances that we may not be able to foresee now. But we need advice from experts. | 8/23/2016 9:53 PM |
| 3 | better than a comprehensive approach | 8/23/2016 9:03 PM |
| 4 | County planners may assist; not direct or mandate. Only suggest | 8/23/2016 4:09 PM |
| 5 | The neighborhood should be as important, if not more so, than a single commissioner's opinion | 8/23/2016 2:05 PM |

Park County Growth Policy Update Questionnaire

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 6 | By splitting up the county into small segments it will be easier for unattractive destructive uses to appear. | 8/23/2016 10:44 AM |
| 7 | Sounds good, but not sure if it is enough. | 8/23/2016 10:20 AM |
| 8 | As long as the county spells out 'sideboards' for how these plans are to be laid out it's not a bad approach in some areas that step forward but it should not take the place of planning throughout the county. | 8/23/2016 9:17 AM |
| 9 | better than alt 1, however too subjective, and may not have best interest of future generations in mind | 8/23/2016 9:09 AM |
| 10 | Community members understand their needs best. | 8/23/2016 7:42 AM |
| 11 | This would be helpful in combination with #3. | 8/23/2016 7:08 AM |
| 12 | This will create a fractured land use program that will likely end up pleasing the few and creating conflicts overall. | 8/22/2016 10:20 PM |
| 13 | A citizen-based approach is unnecessarily resource intensive and insufficiently comprehensive | 8/22/2016 10:01 PM |
| 14 | Those who live there must be address and their needs given priority. | 8/22/2016 9:39 PM |
| 15 | Somewhat in favor because this approach seems to have the best probability for the reliable use of the principle of "subsidiarity" and balance providing prudent guidelines satisfying both the county and the local communities. The interests of the common man, not just those of the big government or big business special interest groups, can then have a chance to rise to the surface. | 8/22/2016 9:15 PM |
| 16 | Incrementalism in different neighborhoods seem to also leads to confusion and lack of clear standards. We could have blight in one area and a nice environment in others. | 8/22/2016 8:56 PM |
| 17 | This is better but not enough. | 8/22/2016 8:41 PM |
| 18 | Let's not let the activists run roughshod over the silent majority | 8/22/2016 7:50 PM |
| 19 | Park County currently has several citizen-initiated zoning districts. They work well when the rules are enforced by the county. They do not work at all when the county planning department fails to enforce violation of zoning district rules. | 8/22/2016 6:34 PM |
| 20 | This makes sense - a group of ranchers will have different priorities than a small close knit community. | 8/22/2016 6:20 PM |
| 21 | I am in favor of either of these but favor County comprehensive approach | 8/22/2016 6:06 PM |
| 22 | Is there such a position as a Park County Planner? | 8/22/2016 5:24 PM |
| 23 | I support this approach, but I still believe that we need comprehensive community planning that will guide decision making. | 8/22/2016 5:19 PM |
| 24 | It is always a good idea to get the stake holders on board and have input to the solutions | 8/22/2016 4:10 PM |
| 25 | better than status quo | 8/22/2016 3:01 PM |
| 26 | Again, reactive inconsistent growth approach creates hap hazzard patchwork of rules/regulations | 8/22/2016 1:43 PM |
| 27 | Bottom up solutions usually have the best staying power but sometimes lack teeth. It also means some communities won't embrace planning at all. | 8/22/2016 1:24 PM |
| 28 | too narrow for special interests | 8/22/2016 1:22 PM |
| 29 | am mixed on this idea | 8/22/2016 1:19 PM |
| 30 | Neighborhoods should have a say over whether they want additional development. | 8/22/2016 12:55 PM |
| 31 | Better than nothing. | 8/22/2016 12:47 PM |
| 32 | commissioners working together in the direction the voters want to proceed | 8/22/2016 12:42 PM |
| 33 | long term sustainability, values, landscape and community | 8/22/2016 12:41 PM |
| 34 | Good to have the community involved, needs to be done sooner rather than later. | 8/22/2016 12:36 PM |
| 35 | What constitutes a neighborhood? I have an Emigrant address. I live 15 miles from Emigrant. I live 15 miles from Gardiner. | 8/22/2016 12:22 PM |
| 36 | This approach will not be effective against large-scale extractor operations such as hardrock mining and does not offer a comprehensive strategy for dealing with all types of industrial extractive industry in Paradise Valley. | 8/22/2016 11:55 AM |
| 37 | While our neighborhoods should have a strong say in how they want to utilize their lands, I do not believe they have capacity to fully envision, design, and implement plans in a vacuum. On the other hand, Park County has staff (or SHOULD have staff) that are knowledgeable in land-use planning and ways to meet planning objectives. Communities such as Gardiner are unincorporated with no real governance to guide the communities destiny. County oversight would go a long way to prevent communities from doing more harm than good with regard to land use. | 8/22/2016 11:51 AM |

Park County Growth Policy Update Questionnaire

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|----|--|--------------------|
| 38 | Better than nothing | 8/22/2016 11:46 AM |
| 39 | Has the potential for significant variance leading to difference in utilization of county services. | 8/22/2016 11:21 AM |
| 40 | Development of lands need to be community decisions | 8/22/2016 11:19 AM |
| 41 | Each community/neighborhood has specific needs, and the growth policy should be drafted to accommodate these. | 8/21/2016 1:08 PM |
| 42 | Community cohesion and input is necessary. | 8/21/2016 10:15 AM |
| 43 | I like the idea of having the community based approach but realize that this can be tricky. As I understand it this approach requires a large majority and that majority will carry the vote. | 8/20/2016 7:54 PM |
| 44 | Better than comprehensive. | 8/20/2016 3:04 PM |
| 45 | This is my preferred approach and is most local. | 8/19/2016 11:44 PM |
| 46 | This offers some benefits for neighborhoods but would create an odd patchwork within the county. | 8/19/2016 9:15 PM |
| 47 | Good to have neighborhood input | 8/19/2016 5:04 PM |
| 48 | This approach allows the county to assist those involved in their area with the appropriate solution without a one-size-fits-all approach. It ensures that stakeholders have a say but get the help of the county. | 8/19/2016 4:26 PM |
| 49 | A reasonable alternative | 8/19/2016 3:39 PM |
| 50 | Having guidelines to assist communities and individuals is practical. | 8/19/2016 11:34 AM |
| 51 | This approach is the most appropriate. Working with citizens and communities ensures that the solutions are appropriate. | 8/19/2016 9:20 AM |
| 52 | I live in Gardiner and our needs are different from those in other park county communities. I would like our leaders to work with us, to use their expertise to help us make a better decision . But ultimately, people of Gardiner should have the most say | 8/18/2016 7:02 AM |
| 53 | Working with community members and constantly soliciting feedback is a great idea, however, I believe somebody has to take the bull by the horn's so to speak | 8/17/2016 2:34 PM |
| 54 | Because Park Co is diverse, each community needs to be assessed individually. | 8/17/2016 12:20 PM |
| 55 | This approach is better, but would be paired best with an overarching plan that takes into account the big picture of growth and development in our county. | 8/17/2016 11:53 AM |
| 56 | The county should adopt a comprehensive approach based on neighborhood input. | 8/17/2016 10:41 AM |
| 57 | This makes one area pristine and another and industrial waste ground | 8/17/2016 9:07 AM |
| 58 | It would benefit park county residents to know exactly what the process will be for this neighborhood/community based approach. Will there be consistency with how stakeholders (i.e. the community) will be handled or facilitated? | 8/17/2016 9:03 AM |
| 59 | I believe that Alternatives 2 and 3 need to be combined | 8/16/2016 6:19 PM |
| 60 | Communities should have significant input in determining what they want | 8/16/2016 4:07 PM |
| 61 | I like this solution better as people that actually work and live in a community are better at making decisions that would affect them better than someone whom is not involved | 8/16/2016 4:06 PM |
| 62 | more work in getting the varied opinions and slower! | 8/16/2016 11:48 AM |
| 63 | Zoning is an important tool that plays a large role in determining how Park County will look in the future. Piecemeal approach is inconsistent with long term goals and has a different representable voting standard that favors large landholders not the entire population. | 8/16/2016 11:31 AM |
| 64 | passive approach | 8/16/2016 9:58 AM |
| 65 | Neighbors working together to find solutions is the best path, though often difficult. | 8/16/2016 9:15 AM |
| 66 | Change in the approach, but nit too invasive. | 8/16/2016 6:39 AM |
| 67 | Same as above. Land use can be very divisive so there is no reason to pit neighbors against each other unnecessarily over hypothetical situations that don't exist. | 8/15/2016 8:43 PM |
| 68 | Better than the current motto, but complicated and will create lots of contention among neighbors. | 8/15/2016 8:24 PM |
| 69 | I think in some cases this approach could work, but again I believe in a wider scope/longer range plan | 8/15/2016 2:50 PM |
| 70 | Similar enough to alternative three to | 8/15/2016 2:26 PM |

Park County Growth Policy Update Questionnaire

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 71 | Lets county officials off of the hook. no political consequences | 8/15/2016 11:05 AM |
| 72 | This will still need a lot of driving by the county planners | 8/14/2016 5:33 PM |
| 73 | I like the idea of everyone working as a team to come up with strategies and solutions. This way the local community feels part of the solution, which is really important as decisions will impact them directly. | 8/12/2016 1:18 PM |
| 74 | County help is key for communities. We have limited capacity, expertise, and resources at the community level. | 8/12/2016 9:29 AM |
| 75 | I like this best since the community and neighbors are the decision makers. It is an automatic checks and balance approach so that a governing body that does not live in the area can not decide what's best for the locals. | 8/11/2016 5:03 PM |
| 76 | Developing local solutions sounds good and there's value in having local control. However, many of the smaller towns in Park County and especially the rural areas don't have the people or the clout or the finances to stand up to a large (or even modest sized) corporation or land development company. Because there's a limited amount of land available for private use in Park County, major changes anywhere in the county will effect all residents. Pollution either via runoff from heavily developed housing areas or from industrial sites will degrade the Yellowstone river and reduce the tourist/fishing dollars coming into the county whether it runs directly into the Yellowstone or into the Shields river and then into the Yellowstone. | 8/11/2016 2:47 PM |
| 77 | However, one persons choices do affect others. | 8/11/2016 10:47 AM |
| 78 | While I'm not opposed to this very localized view, it won't work. Localities don't have the clout the county does—especially unincorporated areas, which cover most of the still-undeveloped areas of the county. There would be no way for local communities that establish their guidelines entirely independently to enforce those—enforcement would still have to come from the county via zoning guidelines. Also, with this approach the county will be abdication its primary responsibility which is to consider the welfare of the county overall. What one neighboring jurisdiction may or may not do will impinge greatly on other neighbors and this approach does not allow for negotiated/coordinated planning so that all communities share in the duty to think ahead and consider their neighbors. | 8/11/2016 8:01 AM |
| 79 | Community approach seems ideal to me, considering the "vote" of the majority. I think it is hugely important to not put the current community aside during growth. Squashing the old community to make room for whoever wants to come in is not growth. | 8/10/2016 7:30 PM |
| 80 | Help when asked | 8/10/2016 4:10 PM |
| 81 | Another re-active approach that does not address the broader issues of the Paradise Valley and Park County. | 8/10/2016 4:08 PM |
| 82 | I believe that local people are far better suited to guide thier own communities | 8/10/2016 1:35 PM |
| 83 | I think the best is a combination of alternative 1 and 2. A comprehensive approach that incorporates regions/neighborhoods offers the best opportunity for balanced land use. | 8/10/2016 1:25 PM |
| 84 | there needs to be community input given lots of statements to choose from that are very clear. more people need to show up to comment and make statements. more public gatherings would allow more to show up and converse. teh June meeting in emigrant was mostly a failure as not enough people camd and not enough time was offered. | 8/10/2016 1:00 PM |
| 85 | All communities and Planning need to work together | 8/10/2016 12:19 PM |
| 86 | doesnt really say who will be making those decisions | 8/10/2016 11:49 AM |
| 87 | I see merit in a combination of both this approach and Alt 3 approach. Not in favor of giving ALL the power to County staff | 8/10/2016 11:25 AM |
| 88 | Neighbors telling neigh's what can be done. Could be problematic. | 8/10/2016 11:15 AM |
| 89 | Same thought | 8/10/2016 10:25 AM |
| 90 | Better than Alternative Two, but too much burden on local, grass-root efforts that aren't as effective as the County | 8/10/2016 9:06 AM |
| 91 | Best, Includes localized participation | 8/10/2016 8:28 AM |
| 92 | Can work favorable if we still look at an overall master plan of where the county wants development to go in the future | 8/10/2016 8:05 AM |
| 93 | Alternative 3 is really the best plan, but # 2 may be the most palatable for most residents | 8/10/2016 7:52 AM |
| 94 | How does this affect the proposed asphalt plant near Emigrant | 8/10/2016 7:24 AM |
| 95 | While this is an option, it's also less productive and could lead to confusion where land use would vary by neighborhood, and could be difficult for the County to enforce. | 8/10/2016 6:29 AM |
| 96 | Seems ok. | 8/10/2016 3:53 AM |
| 97 | See above | 8/9/2016 9:56 PM |

Park County Growth Policy Update Questionnaire

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|-----|---|--------------------|
| 98 | The county's involvement in land use policy in (distant) Silvergate-Cooke City is virtually invisible. The neighborhood community could use more help and attention | 8/9/2016 9:19 PM |
| 99 | Park county has no idea of Cooke city needs. | 8/9/2016 6:48 PM |
| 100 | This is better than #1, but it still doesn't provide a blue print for the future. And it could lead to misunderstandings and the potential for randomness on why this gets approved, but not that. It's still a recipe for confusion and irritation long term. | 8/9/2016 6:32 PM |
| 101 | County growth should be more county citizen spearheaded than city | 8/9/2016 5:48 PM |
| 102 | Seems like a step in the right direction but relying on the county planners could introduce biased solutions depending on who the county planners are. | 8/9/2016 4:36 PM |
| 103 | do not try to give Hatfields control over McCoy's property | 8/8/2016 8:03 AM |
| # | Alternative Three: County Comprehensive Approach | Date |
| 1 | A pro-active approach is always the smarter way to go, rather than waiting for something bad to happen first before addressing this issue. This involves thinking! | 8/27/2016 10:33 AM |
| 2 | MT | 8/25/2016 3:13 PM |
| 3 | Again, a comprehensive approach where the county develops a long term plan is the only efficient, cost effective, sustainable solution | 8/25/2016 2:50 PM |
| 4 | Time to get your head out of the sand | 8/25/2016 11:42 AM |
| 5 | Montana | 8/25/2016 8:39 AM |
| 6 | I think we need a thorough understanding of the issues we will/may face before we can begin to consider choices. I worry studies or scenarios would become outdated, if land use was not approached a bit iteratively. | 8/23/2016 9:53 PM |
| 7 | to much nitpicking is unwanted | 8/23/2016 9:03 PM |
| 8 | Gov't job is to protect the people, not dictate private land use. NIMBY Park County! | 8/23/2016 4:09 PM |
| 9 | There has to be a strong leadership by elected officials who must represent and answer to the majority of the landowners wishes. | 8/23/2016 2:05 PM |
| 10 | Comprehensive planning with ample opportunity for input from citizens and local communities is the best approach to take I think. | 8/23/2016 11:13 AM |
| 11 | We need to work proactively to keep this place attractive, clean and healthy | 8/23/2016 10:44 AM |
| 12 | The more oversight the better. We have to start thinking that we are a community rather than a bunch of individuals that are islands unto themselves. | 8/23/2016 10:20 AM |
| 13 | This is good approach but possibly combine with #2- obviously controversial but the time has come for the county to address growth before growth addresses us. | 8/23/2016 9:17 AM |
| 14 | best way to outline goals for growth in the county, as it will outline specific issues and how they will be addressed by the county. also, residents need to know the regulations and policies to make informed decisions about changes to land use. this is the most clear way of communicating the policy between county and residents | 8/23/2016 9:09 AM |
| 15 | While this takes longer, it will greatly benefit Park County in the future because it could avoid a sprawling, urban eyesore. | 8/23/2016 8:04 AM |
| 16 | No one looks at the big picture. They only see the small area where they live. Leadership is all about looking at the big picture! | 8/23/2016 7:42 AM |
| 17 | This is the only sane and responsible way to address growth in this area that will affect the entire population, environment, economy. | 8/23/2016 7:08 AM |
| 18 | Because of our continued permanent population growth, coupled with the extreme levels of annual tourists visitation, I feel it is imperative to proactively address county development as a whole. It is critical that we plan and prepare for infrastructure which can provide for the public while still maintaining conservation of our environment. | 8/23/2016 4:36 AM |
| 19 | Although this may appear unpopular at first it is most likely the only way any real issues related to growth and development will be addressed. | 8/22/2016 10:20 PM |
| 20 | Evaluating development and land use changes should be the job of government. This is the information brought to Alternative Two. Alternative Two and Three are not mutually exclusive | 8/22/2016 9:39 PM |

Park County Growth Policy Update Questionnaire

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 21 | Somewhat opposed because this approach seems to run counter to the principle of "subsidiarity" and representation of the interests and rights of the common man. This big government approach usually reflects the amount of "ordered liberty" within our communities, businesses, or governing organizations. The less "ordered liberty" represented or achieved, the more government is needed. This would be unfortunate. | 8/22/2016 9:15 PM |
| 22 | Plans need to be in place soon before we ruin our beautiful home. | 8/22/2016 9:04 PM |
| 23 | Let's take care of the entire county and have guidelines to go by. We need to protect the economic, cultural, historical, and environmental resources of the entire county. Let's be good neighbors to each other. | 8/22/2016 8:56 PM |
| 24 | Needs very much to be a comprehensive plan to preserve what is here and not even think about asphalt plants, and tire dumps, etc. Still not enough nor fast enough. | 8/22/2016 8:41 PM |
| 25 | We all know planners will have ideas at odds with the public. | 8/22/2016 7:50 PM |
| 26 | THEoretically, desirable, but won't fly in Park County currently. | 8/22/2016 6:34 PM |
| 27 | MONTANA | 8/22/2016 6:27 PM |
| 28 | I actually think a general comprehensive policy that allows for community direction would be the best plan. A combination of 2 and 3. | 8/22/2016 6:20 PM |
| 29 | Is Park County Staff/Commission different than Park County Planner? If so, why a different entity? Also, what is meant by a "phased approach"? Many residents in Park County are opposed to development growth that would negatively affect the natural environment in Park County. | 8/22/2016 5:24 PM |
| 30 | The community deserves an active and engaged commission that responds to local issues in a fair, consistent manner. Not a reactive commission that only responds when angry people show up. | 8/22/2016 5:19 PM |
| 31 | Long term planning is also good as long as the goals are clearly expressed and the leadership follows the plan | 8/22/2016 4:10 PM |
| 32 | Ideal, but may lead to more opposition | 8/22/2016 3:01 PM |
| 33 | We need advance planning for controlled development | 8/22/2016 1:43 PM |
| 34 | This is ideal and what most of the country has but it may be running before we walk. Shame to see MT as one of the few states with no counties with countywide zoning. | 8/22/2016 1:24 PM |
| 35 | organized and more inclusive | 8/22/2016 1:22 PM |
| 36 | we need proactive, thoughtful planning. | 8/22/2016 1:19 PM |
| 37 | the county needs residential, retail and industrial zones. So a comprehensive approach is necessary for balance. | 8/22/2016 12:55 PM |
| 38 | There needs to be a proactive approach to the changes that are coming. | 8/22/2016 12:47 PM |
| 39 | county take the lead and do heavy lifting in front of public's approval and cooperation | 8/22/2016 12:42 PM |
| 40 | long term sustainability, values, landscape and community | 8/22/2016 12:41 PM |
| 41 | we don't want mining, or asphalt plants, or more guys like the one near Chico rd in Pray with giant junkpiles that seem to catch fire once or twice a year | 8/22/2016 12:38 PM |
| 42 | Having a comprehensive approach, IF it is done with the support of locals, would send a clear message that we value our lands, watersheds, etc. and might pre-empt people from considering harmful activities. | 8/22/2016 12:36 PM |
| 43 | Really the only choice, but comprehensive can be restricted to certain activities and certain zones. What might not be appropriate for an activity in one place could be acceptable in another. I think some form of zone parameters could be made that could be grounds for amending a comprehensive plan. Take Gold mining a hot button issue. If someone wanted a gold mine in the far north of the county and all the neighbors within x# of miles were not opposed then a county ban on gold mining could be lifted and the mine approves. Certainly HWY 89 in Paradise Valley (and Shields if they choose) should be exempt from commercial activities except in specific zones...ie Emigrant, Gardiner maybe a few other spots where the commerce is in keeping with the nature of the valley. | 8/22/2016 12:22 PM |
| 44 | MT | 8/22/2016 12:10 PM |
| 45 | This is the only approach that makes sense. | 8/22/2016 11:55 AM |
| 46 | There is too much at risk to keep moving forward without Park County's total involvement in comprehensive planning. The County is on the verge of losing its most valuable assets to sprawl in the Paradise Valley. Small communities are in-filling in ways that are degrading neighborhoods and they need guidance and leadership to promote livability. I believe it is the County's responsibility to guide a comprehensive county-wide approach to land-use planning. | 8/22/2016 11:51 AM |
| 47 | This is the approach used by most counties in the west that are undergoing land use changes (rural to development) | 8/22/2016 11:46 AM |

Park County Growth Policy Update Questionnaire

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 48 | Consistency, Longer-term mentality. | 8/22/2016 11:21 AM |
| 49 | Assistance may be needed, but that should be up to the community to ask for it if needed | 8/22/2016 11:19 AM |
| 50 | I do not see why there couldn't be a combination of alternative 2 and 3. We need the County's leadership on a county-wide basis, and assistance for a specific community land use issues | 8/21/2016 1:08 PM |
| 51 | Only if the city/county listens to the neighborhood concerns. | 8/21/2016 10:15 AM |
| 52 | MONTANA | 8/21/2016 8:40 AM |
| 53 | I am looking for the approach that will prevent mining, the gravel pit, and commercial development that threatens the environment. | 8/21/2016 7:56 AM |
| 54 | I would like it if the county would take a proactive stance, but that does not seem to be the case. | 8/20/2016 7:54 PM |
| 55 | MONTANA | 8/20/2016 1:14 PM |
| 56 | With this approach a checkerboard development would be minimized and you would no have a tire dump next to lovely homes or asphalt plants next to historic homes | 8/20/2016 7:18 AM |
| 57 | Alaska | 8/19/2016 11:44 PM |
| 58 | Only one that makes sense IF a few simple rules are followed: 1.) No special 'outs' provided for 'buddy' deals if politically connected, 2.) Keep the concept simple - Apply the 'Reasonable Person Test'. Does this land use negatively affect nearby property values, or the appeal of the areas (i.e. Paradise Valley), average person that represents its primary economic driver (i.e. tourists) | 8/19/2016 9:26 PM |
| 59 | While this would be the most difficult to develop it should be the ultimate goal. This would insure seamless transitions between different types of land use and provide clarity for landowners, buyers and sellers. | 8/19/2016 9:15 PM |
| 60 | By far the best -- bring everyone into the mix to help plan our future | 8/19/2016 5:04 PM |
| 61 | This smacks of larger government where a few people's idea of how the county should be get to implement policy controlling everyone. | 8/19/2016 4:26 PM |
| 62 | Too controlling | 8/19/2016 3:39 PM |
| 63 | I believe in a whole approach in planning for our county. | 8/19/2016 11:45 AM |
| 64 | Somehow, leave the door open just a crack so you can step up the planning process if it appears that something is awry. | 8/19/2016 11:34 AM |
| 65 | This is a good approach if county staff can be unbiased and not pushing their own personal agenda. I haven't seen evidence that this is possible but perhaps with new staff it could be achieved. | 8/19/2016 9:20 AM |
| 66 | someone has to take the bull by the horn's so to speak. | 8/17/2016 2:34 PM |
| 67 | After assessing various issues in the different communities, a comprehensive approach can be adopted that will work for the whole county. | 8/17/2016 12:20 PM |
| 68 | This approach has the greatest potential to protect our long term quality of life as well as provides an opportunity to work with local governments to learn their needs and plans. | 8/17/2016 11:53 AM |
| 69 | The county should adopt a comprehensive approach based on neighborhood input. | 8/17/2016 10:41 AM |
| 70 | This makes land use equal over the whole county. | 8/17/2016 9:07 AM |
| 71 | There has to be some oversight | 8/16/2016 4:07 PM |
| 72 | It's good to have a plan well ahead of the coming pressure | 8/16/2016 11:48 AM |
| 73 | A Comprehensive Plan needs to be developed to respond to the widely accepted principle that the myriad of future land use decisions affecting the county's lands should be made in a coordinated and responsible manner. The Plans philosophy should reflect commonly held ideas that [1] Growth should be channeled to municipalities; [2] Agricultural lands should be protected; and [3] Preservation of our environmental and natural resources should be a high priority in making land use decisions. | 8/16/2016 11:31 AM |
| 74 | passive approach | 8/16/2016 9:58 AM |
| 75 | Some parts of the county should be encouraged to remain in agriculture. Others are appropriate for industrial or residential development. The county's trained staff, overseen by the commission and the planning board, can probably make the best decisions. However, resistance is likely to be strong. | 8/16/2016 9:15 AM |
| 76 | Probably far too complex to accomplish | 8/16/2016 6:39 AM |

Park County Growth Policy Update Questionnaire

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 77 | The County is too diverse in use and thinking for a one size fits all approach. Businesses and economies are totally different from one end of the County to the other. | 8/15/2016 8:43 PM |
| 78 | Holistic, better approach. It doesn't have to be overly restrictive, but can at least arm property owners with tools to protect their property values and rights. | 8/15/2016 8:24 PM |
| 79 | This, in my mind, would create a more balanced plan with all parts of infrastructure and zoning taken into consideration. | 8/15/2016 2:50 PM |
| 80 | Growth can come too fast with no local preparation except quick and insufficient response. We can see this in the Gallatin. Park may have a window of opportunity where issues can be weighed and addressed – wild fire hazard, water availability, cost of road care and plowing, habitat concerns, etc. People too often respond after the fact, and are surprised by the need for plowing which they have to pay for; the presence of wildlife eating their gardens and bear and lions in their yards, etc. There is always ALWAYS public resistance to government interference, but it is irresponsible not to give comprehensive planning our best shot. | 8/15/2016 2:49 PM |
| 81 | It's the only way to wisely match growth with infrastructure. | 8/15/2016 2:26 PM |
| 82 | The only way to effectively approach the issues. | 8/15/2016 11:05 AM |
| 83 | This should have a large component of citizen input. | 8/14/2016 5:33 PM |
| 84 | Need county wide policy | 8/13/2016 9:50 AM |
| 85 | I like this approach as well. Proactive is so much better than reactive! The fact that this approach will work with the public as well is smart. It's important that one person or commission does not have all the power in making growth policy decisions. | 8/12/2016 1:18 PM |
| 86 | While the county is quite diverse, a comprehensive approach stands the best chance of assessing current conditions, identifying problems and opportunities, and working to address those problems and embrace opportunity. | 8/12/2016 9:29 AM |
| 87 | No, see above comments. I am not a fan of a board or planners making decisions. Too many personal agendas may be passed without public comment or votes | 8/11/2016 5:03 PM |
| 88 | I strongly favor this approach as the county has enough clout to stand up to the commercial interests and insure that development proceeds in ways that work well both for county residents, the tourists and their supporting industries, and commercial operations. Implementing zoning now can easily avoid many of the growing pains that are routinely seen in Gallatin County. Setting up planning now, before it's too late, makes it possible to come up with plans that will work well for the different areas and interests in the county. | 8/11/2016 2:47 PM |
| 89 | I do not like big brother government. | 8/11/2016 10:47 AM |
| 90 | I'm totally in favor of this approach. The county has to assume its leadership responsibilities. This doesn't mean that localities shouldn't participate—they absolutely must—but the county has to be the 'orchestra leader' in this and work to provide a coordinated, well-integrated solution that respects the welfare and interests of the county as whole and accommodates the differing priorities of localities as well as possible. | 8/11/2016 8:01 AM |
| 91 | "evaluating development and... addressing these issues..." doesn't sound as proactive as Alternative Two. Maybe it's just the wording? Allowing the communities voices to count and coming up with proactive, balanced, sensible solutions is what I would love to see. | 8/10/2016 7:30 PM |
| 92 | Pro-active. Put in place a plan that spells out what can be done, where it can be done and how it can be done. Lets avoid the death by a thousand cuts. The county needs to take a more active role in helping the county deal with demographic changes and the challenge of dealing with laws made in 1872, people wanting the highest and best use of the property to be a dump, gravel pit, or something more devastating with no regard for one neighbors. | 8/10/2016 4:08 PM |
| 93 | This seems like the most logical approach. We should be proactively dealing with these issues, not putting out fires as we go along. | 8/10/2016 2:49 PM |
| 94 | This can work and may have an advantage of coordination over the greater county area. However our communities are spread out enough and our population is small enough that such coordination is most likely not necessary. | 8/10/2016 1:35 PM |
| 95 | see just above | 8/10/2016 1:25 PM |

Park County Growth Policy Update Questionnaire

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|-----|--|--------------------|
| 96 | we count on the city/county planners to develop the legal enforceable language that protects the resources and property values. we need a trail along south hwy 89 for safe passage of non-vehicular travel. we need language that does not allow an industrial development such as a gravel/asphalt plant to operate in a residential neighborhood. no pig farms etc in a residential neighborhood. limit or allow no further development along the river corridors. should building with septic be allowed, make absolutely sure there is a waaaay back setback for them. do not allow two houses just adjacent to each other, maintain a setback. there should be language requiring no rusty metal sliding down a ranch's hill into the river; no ded cars or old farm machinery sitting out in plain sight. small developments such as glastonbury should be encompassed into county regulations. ther should be development of the proposed non-vehicular trail along south highway 89 to allow safe travel from yellowstone park to livingston. there should be involvement with the historical society to place informational plaques along the river corridors telling of the valued history. there should be coordination with the state to develop improved boat access sites, such as mile 26 which is dangerous.. we need to enhance the experience of our visitors that ranching is our history, and lews & clark mapped this and that today we want to share that and make it easy for visitors to learn our valued characteristics, such as buffalo jumps. | 8/10/2016 1:00 PM |
| 97 | Have a plan and work the plan long term and short term | 8/10/2016 12:19 PM |
| 98 | heavy potential for heated arguments that may be based on personal bias/land holdings rather than what is best for economy. | 8/10/2016 11:49 AM |
| 99 | See Alternative two comment | 8/10/2016 11:25 AM |
| 100 | Most people live in the county because they do not want restrictions | 8/10/2016 11:15 AM |
| 101 | Same principle in reverse | 8/10/2016 10:25 AM |
| 102 | Growth and land use needs to be PLANNED, not reacted to! | 8/10/2016 9:07 AM |
| 103 | Best Approach! So, we don't have to keep fighting the same battles over and over again - here, there, everywhere. | 8/10/2016 9:06 AM |
| 104 | Worst. Bureaucratic top down approach | 8/10/2016 8:28 AM |
| 105 | a Master Plan is the best option to ensure that the community grows in a positive way that ensure development with real goals, real use planned in without the mismatched jumble that poor planning can result in | 8/10/2016 8:05 AM |
| 106 | This is what it is really going to take to protect the county's quality of life. | 8/10/2016 7:52 AM |
| 107 | How does this affect the proposed asphalt plant near Emigrant | 8/10/2016 7:24 AM |
| 108 | We need an overall, holistic approach to preserving the character of Park County. While growth may be different in different areas, if we don't have an overall view we will end up with a hodge podge of development. | 8/10/2016 7:13 AM |
| 109 | What is the done side for being prepared? | 8/10/2016 7:07 AM |
| 110 | This is the most desirable option. We need to be visionary about how we want our county to look in advance of the increased population growth and development we will see. We also need to preserve the character and beauty of our county, and select locations for large-scale commercial development with forethought. | 8/10/2016 6:29 AM |
| 111 | Seems like the best plan. The Livingston area as a whole lacks any leadership. Any policy where being proactive is an option should be the approach. Making sure the right hand knows what the left hand is doing. | 8/10/2016 3:53 AM |
| 112 | See above | 8/9/2016 9:56 PM |
| 113 | Park County needs to be proactive in regards to land use planning. Commissioners who are not willing to be proactive should step aside. | 8/9/2016 9:38 PM |
| 114 | Too much regulation by bureaucrats. | 8/9/2016 6:48 PM |
| 115 | This approach provides a blue print for the future, spelling out a vision for growth over time. It lets people know what will get approved and why. | 8/9/2016 6:32 PM |
| 116 | Staff always need to be involved | 8/9/2016 5:48 PM |
| 117 | Land use is extremely important to Park County citizens being such, it should be addressed and evaluated by elected officials in conjunction with Park County staff. | 8/9/2016 4:36 PM |
| 118 | re adopted the 1998 comprehensive plan | 8/8/2016 8:03 AM |

Q3 If you have additional ideas or thoughts on how the county should address the land use topic or other issues in the growth policy, please discuss them here:

Answered: 81 Skipped: 102

| # | Responses | Date |
|----|--|--------------------|
| 1 | Integrated trail systems in Livingston (like they have in Bozeman), pro-actively approaching land owners (especially those along the river) for conservation easements so that there's more public access to take a long walk along the river. | 8/27/2016 10:33 AM |
| 2 | Please make open space, vibrant communities, vibrant economies, clean air, water, and land, priorities for quality of life for all Park Co residents. | 8/25/2016 2:50 PM |
| 3 | Minimum lot size outside of the City | 8/25/2016 11:42 AM |
| 4 | I think we should have something similar to a mission statement for our land use that we measure decisions against. We should be supplied with the studies and information that we need to understand the big picture when we have decisions to make. We as a community should be able to adjust as needed. A combination of one and two. | 8/23/2016 9:53 PM |
| 5 | Don't interfere with private property unless it has a substantial impact on other peoples property, health and safety. | 8/23/2016 9:03 PM |
| 6 | Comprehensive planning is essential and would include regional variables | 8/23/2016 5:36 PM |
| 7 | No asphalt plants, no gravel pits, no mining without landowners majority vote allowing such activities. No threat to landowners health, environment, air, water quality permitted. Control over land use that may benefit one but harms many, cannot be tolerated. Noise, traffic and other similar issues must be addressed with every issue across the board. | 8/23/2016 2:05 PM |
| 8 | We need a long term comprehensive plan to keep this place one of the finest cleanest counties to live in. | 8/23/2016 10:44 AM |
| 9 | We are the Yellowstone ecosystem and should not think we need to supply the world with gold and silver and steaks and gravel. | 8/23/2016 10:20 AM |
| 10 | Park county's 'edge' over the rest of the country is our abundant wildlife populations, open spaces and free flowing rivers. If we look over the pass at Gallatin county, we are seeing our future. If the county does not take proactive steps now to plan for that growth then we will lose what makes Park Co a great place to live. | 8/23/2016 9:17 AM |
| 11 | Preserve the character of the area...the history and the architecture. Don't let short term greed ruin things. Buildings are not just for the person who builds them. They can last for generations and they effect the environment of many, many people for years and years. Most people can't see into the future when they break ground and start constructing something. | 8/23/2016 7:42 AM |
| 12 | Water usage and housing are of concern. The over usage of Hwy 89 is dangerous and appalling. Turning and passing lanes should be phased into the highway. | 8/23/2016 4:36 AM |
| 13 | People oppose land use planning because they don't always understand the complexity of the issue, or they're just a stick in the mud. Providing information and outreach to foster understanding will help with the former, the latter will never change their minds, and can be dealt with accordingly. | 8/22/2016 10:20 PM |
| 14 | A citizens committee made up of each area o Park Country. On each comment is a balanced representation of the citizens of that area. These groups would have equal weight with the government. After all, government is created by people for their well-being and betterment. Not for a few to make money off of! Corruption in government is unacceptable and has become commonplace. Also, is growth necessary? No it is not. In a country half mad with development, what will pristine land be valued at? Paradise valley has that now at its value; how can it be safeguarded? | 8/22/2016 9:39 PM |
| 15 | Get specific and straight forward. Generalities and progressive rhetoric always generate a sense of miss-giving and foreboding. Put the benefit of the common man first, without compromise, and the resulting county public policy cannot go wrong. | 8/22/2016 9:15 PM |
| 16 | Comprehensive is the best alternative in my opinion. We have much to protect here. We live in an interconnected world and need to have a through detailed plan where everyone knows what to expect. | 8/22/2016 8:56 PM |

Park County Growth Policy Update Questionnaire

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|----|--|--------------------|
| 17 | We have lived here for nearly 40 years, and in all that time groups have tried to make some reasonable planning zones. These efforts were always shouted down by developers and others, isn't it time to stop riding the fence and make some real planning efforts. I once served on the planning board and it was obvious to me the planning was like a four letter word. | 8/22/2016 8:41 PM |
| 18 | Encourage the USFS to transfer non forest parcels to the State for low cost housing in the Gardiner area. Declare forest roads leading to private lands as County roads (no maintenance necessary) thus insuring access to landowners. Stand for the common people! | 8/22/2016 7:50 PM |
| 19 | Current violations at the gravel pit at 89 and I-90 (within the East Yellowstone Zoning District) should be addressed by the county planning dept. It does no good to plan or to adopt citizen-initiated zoning districts if the county planning dept. Does not enforce the rules in place. | 8/22/2016 6:34 PM |
| 20 | I have a concern about affordable housing. If vacation rentals are allowed to proliferate then housing becomes too expensive for locals. Also, mining and industrial eyesores should be regulated as there are few places in Park Co where they might be suitable without damaging our river, land or wildlife. | 8/22/2016 6:20 PM |
| 21 | We need to defend an individual's property rights, something that county officials do not seem to be concerned about. Park county is not Yellowstone National Park and private property is not owned for the enjoyment of the people | 8/22/2016 6:17 PM |
| 22 | Maintaining the highest quality of the original, natural environment (air, land, water) in Park County should be the golden rule by which All other issues are considered by the Park County Growth Policy. | 8/22/2016 5:24 PM |
| 23 | We absolutely need land-use planning mechanisms that are consistent across the county. We need better protections at the local level of natural resources because our local economy is dependent on these resources. It's our elected officials jobs to help plan for our future. Please actively engage on these issues, don't sit back and let it happen to us. What type of advice would you give your children? Plan for their future? Or wait and see? | 8/22/2016 5:19 PM |
| 24 | Directly addressing policies which | 8/22/2016 2:20 PM |
| 25 | Look to what the Bridger Canyon folks did when they developed long range development plans. Very comprehensive and preserved wildlife corridors, lot size and construction standards. | 8/22/2016 1:43 PM |
| 26 | remember why we are here - what we love about Paradise Valley and what is truly important to the present and future generations | 8/22/2016 1:22 PM |
| 27 | the conversation needs to be framed as a property rights issue. Folks operating a tire dump or an asphalt plant are taking away our property rights to clean wells, etc. And, the costs of development should not all have to be paid for by the public. Shady companies, e.g., goldmine operators, come in and promise jobs but do not have the resources to pay for clean up or mitigation and, when disaster strikes, local communities and the state or federal government (meaning tax payers) have to pay. That violates our property rights--why should we have to pay for the transgression of others? | 8/22/2016 1:19 PM |
| 28 | Main thing to keep in mind is that Tourism is our #1 revenue source in Park County. Any kind of "dirty" industry must be kept away from the beautiful natural resources that people come from around the world to experience. | 8/22/2016 12:55 PM |
| 29 | Cost of living is a big concern especially in the town of Gardiner. There is not enough housing currently available. The ones that are are too expensive. This is affecting enrollment at the school as more and more families cannot find homes (or afford them). My child has 7 kids in her 2nd grade class. Without the school the town will suffer. We are also losing the feel of the community as more and more homes are converted to vacation rentals. We have seen more crime. People don't care when they are only here for a week at a time. The County needs to address this issue throughout Park County as I have also heard concerns about vacation rentals in Livingston. | 8/22/2016 12:47 PM |
| 30 | Tourism is obviously our main source of bread and butter. Any new development should be geared towards that industry. | 8/22/2016 12:38 PM |
| 31 | We need to maintain the natural beauty and wildlife of the area. We need to realize that our value lies in tourism dollars because of wildlife (not because of ziplines or strange transportation contraptions, or mining, etc). It is important to maintain the quality of air, water, and wildlife. | 8/22/2016 12:36 PM |
| 32 | see above | 8/22/2016 12:22 PM |
| 33 | There will likely be great opposition to Option 3 given Montana's legacy in letting its neighbors do whatever they want with their land. But without comprehensive planning, the quality of life will erode rapidly in our communities. Park County may balk at the concept of looking to outsiders for ideas, but there are several communities in other states that are doing great work in developing outstanding land use policy. I recommend studying planning policies in areas like Corvallis, Oregon or Boulder, Colorado. While residents of Park County may initially be put off by these "outsider" ideas, these areas have decades of experience in planning that have produced high quality communities while maintaining land productivity. There is a lot of money in Park County and there is great demand for housing. We need to find positive land use solutions that address our housing crisis while maintaining the outstanding natural attributes of the lands in our area. | 8/22/2016 11:51 AM |

Park County Growth Policy Update Questionnaire

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 34 | Local citizen input should out weigh out of state-county opinion, on both private and public land issues, that affect citizens and businesses within the county. | 8/22/2016 11:35 AM |
| 35 | I think Gardiner needs to find a way to deal with town issues and not involve County in vital decisions that will affect this community.If assistance id needed at as a source to complete a project, then ask for help but try to resolve the matter locally first. Once they have control over decisions it will be hard to take that power back | 8/22/2016 11:19 AM |
| 36 | The County must consider all voices, not just those who "show up." There is such a huge need to have land-use planning that incorporates zoning, which I understand historically has been shelved because the County heard only those who organized and yelled the loudest and were against it. Perhaps a county-wide written survey to all land owners to elicit opinions and ideas. Notice of the survey in the local media to make sure as many as possible hear about it. If I were not a member of PCEC, I would not have received this survey, and all land-owners and interested parties should be aware that feedback is being solicited? | 8/21/2016 1:08 PM |
| 37 | Educate the public on how "zoning" works, make them aware that the zoning can be based on the needs of the community. Not a boilerplate restrictive policy. It can be crafted to benefit all members of the community in some way. | 8/20/2016 7:54 PM |
| 38 | Let local communities decide like via covenants. We don't need government telling us what we can do. Nor, what I fear will become, the californication of this place via tyranny of a minority. There is enough of that already. | 8/20/2016 3:04 PM |
| 39 | Maintaining public land use options is very important. | 8/19/2016 11:44 PM |
| 40 | Simple - Stop delaying a reasonable zoning law and communicate to the fear mongers against such a law, that it would NOT be veiled communism in order tell people where they have to plant their garden on their own property, for example. | 8/19/2016 9:26 PM |
| 41 | The county needs to take a leadership role in developing a general zoning plan in order to prevent further protracted battles over land use. | 8/19/2016 9:15 PM |
| 42 | Allow local level decisions | 8/19/2016 3:39 PM |
| 43 | United States | 8/19/2016 11:45 AM |
| 44 | Present examples of areas that have approached growth using the various approaches. Highlight the positive and negative aspects of each. Print in various local publications. Let apathy point toward comprehensive land use planning not status quo. | 8/18/2016 5:58 PM |
| 45 | Please help us preserve our open spaces and parks and trails. This is the true value that our community has. I am very interested in more public access to areas just outside of town for our community and visitors to enjoy. | 8/17/2016 2:34 PM |
| 46 | As Gallatin County continues to grow at a 4.75% rate, Park County will be absorbing the spillover. The County needs to have short-term and long-term growth plans prepared to grow sustainably and wisely. | 8/17/2016 12:20 PM |
| 47 | The county should balance the obvious fact that our county is growing with the need to protect the resources people are moving here to enjoy. Development should not occur at all costs, we need to decide carefully what we value and protect those values as well grow. | 8/17/2016 11:53 AM |
| 48 | Planning when someone enters the subdivision review stage is not planning - it's too late by that time. | 8/17/2016 10:41 AM |
| 49 | If you don't like government regulation and controls the expect to live next to gravel pits, tire dumps, shopping malls, race tracks and having Buffalo damaging your home, yard and personal safety. | 8/17/2016 9:07 AM |
| 50 | Glad this is being discussed and a comprehensive approach involving all sides seems reasonable. | 8/17/2016 9:02 AM |
| 51 | It doesn't matter if you are 5th generation MT native or arrived yesterday... it isn't 1850 any more, get a grip on it. | 8/16/2016 4:07 PM |
| 52 | Planning and prior agreement on land uses will save time and protect owners from loss due to incompatible uses and negative impacts. | 8/16/2016 11:48 AM |
| 53 | A central question that must be addressed is how to accommodate the demand for a evolving rural lifestyle without diminishing the rural setting in the process. It has become clear to a majority of the citizens of Park County that this question can only be answered through a county-wide land use policy plan. | 8/16/2016 11:31 AM |
| 54 | Nothing. There is nothing wrong with what is working now. | 8/16/2016 9:58 AM |
| 55 | No more burdensome land regulations. You continually devalue our most important land assets with your non- stop bureaucratic fiddling. | 8/15/2016 8:43 PM |
| 56 | I would like to see Park County do some work to address the needs of this growing community. We are a place with young families as well as seasonal visitors and we are lacking some basic, vital needs for both segments of the population. We have a need for better hotels, gas stations at the north end of town, and most importantly recreational facilities for year round activities (such as swimming, basketball, track etc.). | 8/15/2016 2:50 PM |

Park County Growth Policy Update Questionnaire

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|----|--|--------------------|
| 57 | You are off to a good start with an electronic survey. You will have to proceed slowly with maximum transparency and public input, and hopefully put together facts and figures showing how public expenses and inconveniences pile up without this kind of approach. | 8/15/2016 2:49 PM |
| 58 | Alternative Four: Citizen anetive zoning | 8/15/2016 2:04 PM |
| 59 | Limit billboards along highway 89 and East River Rd. Think about boat access parks along the Yellowstone river in Paradise valley. I think the county government should take a leading role in land use planning. It will take a great amount of input from land owners large and small, but without the county taking the lead nothing will change and the few who can will use the lack of regulation to take advantage of the rest of the citizens of Park Co. | 8/14/2016 5:33 PM |
| 60 | I think by now most people have expressed that this is not an area we want to see industrial growth or waste (tire dump) growth occur. | 8/12/2016 1:18 PM |
| 61 | This issue of land use is extremely timely given the recent proposal for a large Gold Mine in Emigrant Guich and the 24/7 Asphalt Plant currently proposed for Emigrant. The gold mine and the almost certain pollution of Emigrant Creek flowing into the Yellowstone river would have been a disaster for the Park County fishing industry as well as reducing tourism. The proposed Gravel pit and Asphalt plant may well have a larger negative impact, because of how often Paradise Valley is subject to temperature inversions. During such an inversion, and I've seen them last for days at a time, all of the pollutants including toxins will be trapped in the valley creating a haze that will rival the smoke that is so often seen now. How many tourists will stop and enjoy a smelly, toxic haze? | 8/11/2016 2:47 PM |
| 62 | Let those affected have a say. Keep out special interest groups and out of area opinions. | 8/11/2016 10:47 AM |
| 63 | This survey is a good start. More is needed. I'm completely in favor of zoning. We live in Emigrant and our property, which we purchased as our dream retirement home in 2007 in "Paradise," is now jeopardized by the proposed Gravel and Asphalt operation that will be under a mile away. Also, lest you or others think that this will only affect those close to the operation, consider that the valley is subject to air inversions. That means that the pollution will be held and dispersed throughout the valley during these times—it will affect the quality of life here for everyone. A recent article in the Livingston Enterprise quoted Wendy Riley as saying this is like "Whack a mole"—different proposals that keep cropping up to introduce operations that will seriously deteriorate our valley. The county government needs to face its responsibility for leading the plans for our future and to date has been far too passive. | 8/11/2016 8:01 AM |
| 64 | Any land use possibilities that negatively affect environmental quality; soil, water, airlife... should get the most regulations and the fastest action from the county. | 8/10/2016 7:30 PM |
| 65 | There should be policies and procedures that will enable the county to benefit from the natural wonders of the place while limiting the extraction operators from destroying the very environment that attracts the business and homeowners to the area. | 8/10/2016 4:08 PM |
| 66 | Protection of ALL our water should always rank above the desires of growth. Goodness knows we have loads of "space" here but our water is limited. Even with the seemingly unending flow of the Yellowstone River our water is limited and precious. | 8/10/2016 1:35 PM |
| 67 | It is time to seriously look at zoning in the Paradise Valley to prevent tire dumps, mining and gravel /asphalt pits and not allow them in this pristine valley and main corridor to the Park. | 8/10/2016 12:19 PM |
| 68 | would like to see an intelligent team put together that is dedicated to growing livingston and the surrounding areas in a healthy, steady and sustainable way. too often in livingston we have a few people fighting for their own agenda rather than several people considering positive growth with care of workers and residents in mind. perhaps a few plans could be presented to the commission with pros and cons. then offer those plans to the public (with more information, results and options rather than the lesson/lessee argument we have now). this may also relieve some pressure from officials, hrdc and regular spokespersons and give this issue some dedicated research and thought. | 8/10/2016 11:49 AM |
| 69 | Only a few instances draw attention. Work out on an individual basis. | 8/10/2016 11:15 AM |
| 70 | We need a zoning law to preclude inappropriate land use | 8/10/2016 10:25 AM |
| 71 | Paradise Valley is just that: a picturesque residential, agricultural valley that will be ruined by commercial mining, development and any other "for profit" ventures that create eyesores and will compromise our clean, sweet mountain air, quiet peaceful surroundings and fabulous views! Let's remember: this valley was once part of Yellowstone Natl Park - and we should treat it with the same respect - to maintain its current state as a natural gem within it's current agricultural, ranching and residential realm. | 8/10/2016 9:06 AM |
| 72 | Need to start discussing the "Z" word!!! | 8/10/2016 7:52 AM |
| 73 | Community Meetings for input Draft a land use ordinance for comment | 8/10/2016 6:29 AM |
| 74 | We will end up a disaster if we don't have a well planned community. | 8/9/2016 9:56 PM |
| 75 | Too much government. I've had bad experiences with my property at Silvergare with Soda butle creek eroding my property and with land use | 8/9/2016 9:40 PM |


Park County Growth Policy Update Questionnaire

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|----|--|------------------|
| 76 | Zoning should be addressed in the growth policy to set the stage for county imposed zoning. | 8/9/2016 9:38 PM |
| 77 | The current situation in Cooke-City and surroundings seems to be 'buy it and build ... whatever you want'. The cost of land is encouraging McMansions | 8/9/2016 9:19 PM |
| 78 | Maybe you could build two architectural models of future Park Counties: one model with good planning, and one without good planning. Then people would have a visual of the difference having a good growth plan in place will make. One model would have trailers next to mansions next to truck stops next to Bill Moser's trailer collection next to hotels, next to high density neighborhoods, next to ranches, etc... the other model would have nice neighborhoods, centralized commercial areas, and defined green/ag space. Maybe the stark contrast in visual form would wake people up to the benefits of long term planning... Otherwise, good luck in getting people to give up their entrenched "you ain't messing with my personal property rights" attitude. | 8/9/2016 6:32 PM |
| 79 | More public meetings in evenings | 8/9/2016 5:48 PM |
| 80 | The growth policy should have a section dedicated to developing and incorporating prioritized objectives regarding specific land use concerns and interests of the public. This would provide a framework on which a phased approach could be conducted once the growth policy has been adopted. | 8/9/2016 4:36 PM |
| 81 | encourage year round, sustainable economy that is family unit friendly | 8/8/2016 8:03 AM |

Q4 To understand how opinions vary in the different parts of Park County, please let us know the general area where you reside.

Answered: 182 Skipped: 1



| Answer Choices | Responses | Count |
|--------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Cooke City / Silver Gate | 3.30% | 6 |
| Gardiner | 9.89% | 18 |
| Paradise Valley | 34.07% | 62 |
| Livingston Area | 43.96% | 80 |
| Shields Valley | 4.95% | 9 |
| West Boulder Area | 0.00% | 0 |
| Other (please specify) | 3.85% | 7 |
| Total | | 182 |

| # | Other (please specify) | Date |
|---|--|--------------------|
| 1 | S side 1090 to Springdale | 8/23/2016 4:09 PM |
| 2 | Bozeman (but future Livingston resident) | 8/23/2016 8:04 AM |
| 3 | and Paradise valley | 8/22/2016 9:39 PM |
| 4 | Cinnabar basin | 8/22/2016 1:26 PM |
| 5 | Tom Miner Basin | 8/22/2016 12:22 PM |
| 6 | B | 8/20/2016 7:18 AM |
| 7 | Cokedale | 8/19/2016 6:43 PM |