



LUPAC MEETING #2: SUMMARY

June 22, 2022

Members of the project team held an update meeting with the Land Use Plan Advisory Committee (LUPAC) on June 22, 2022. The purposes of the meeting were summarize community input thus far, review the preliminary goals and values, discuss next steps and answer LUPAC member questions.

ATTENDEES

LUPAC Members

Name	Participation	Planning Area
Andy Quick	Absent	Cody Local
Bret Allard	Present	Sunlight
Brett Trudo	Present	Lower South Fork
Dave Hoffert	Present	Clark
Jerry Thompson	Present	Commercial/Industrial
Kathleen Jachowski	Present	Environmental
Kelly Spiering	Absent	Agriculture
Laurie Steward	Present	North Fork
Marion Morrison	Present	Cody/Powell Rural
Matt Curtis	Present	Upper South Fork
Mike Bromley	Present	Middle South Fork
Rebekah Burns	Present	Economics
Richard Lasko	Present	Sage Creek
Tiffanie May	Present	Meeteetse Local
Tracy Lafollette	Present	Upper Clark's Fork
Tye Whitlock	Present	Powell/Real Estate

Project Team

Name	Participation	Organization/Role
Lloyd Thiel	Present	Park County Commissioner
Joy Hill	Present	Director of Planning and Zoning
Kim Dillivan	Present	Planner II
Darcie White	Present	Clarion Associates
Paul Donegan	Present	Clarion Associates
Matt Prosser	Present - Virtually	EPS
Brian Clarkson	Present	T-O Engineers

DISCUSSION

- Overview of June 20 & 21 Public Meetings (Powell and Meeteetse)
 - Jerry Thompson was surprised that there were not more people present. The focus in Powell was subdivisions and ag ground. Meeteetse talked a bit about the economy and broadband that they would like to see.
 - Tiffanie May mentioned that some of the folks at Meeteetse were actually from the Southfork area. She spoke to people and advertised in advance. She is looking for ideas on how to better spread the word.
 - Tracy Lafollette said emotions were stronger as we drilled into actual ideas for the area. Powell is going to be hugely farmers and ag. Tonight's meeting in Cody should be a diverse crowd.
- LUPAC Member Feedback/Burlblings
 - Marion Morrison said she's received feedback from folks that they feel disenfranchised on the Planning and Zoning process. They have had experiences where they felt like they were not served. In her experience, Planning and Zoning have worked really hard to be fair. Not sure if it is a perception.
 - Joy Hill mentioned that people who do not participate or review really can't complain. We are giving them every opportunity to have a voice.
 - Tracy Lafollette inquired as to whether things could change from what the public is shown at the end.
 - Lloyd Thiel said our biggest concern during the proposal selection process, our focus was on public interaction – we even asked Clarion to increase their proposed volume of meeting options and they responded.
 - Kathleen Jachowski recalled the experience on the 1998 Plan, there were three meetings every 2.5 weeks for years. It was very contentious. What it did, that we don't have right now – we are at risk of the public not knowing what we are doing. The literacy level is nowhere near as high as it was in 1998. There are not as many involved ranchers here now. It makes a huge difference in how the community understands things. She doesn't think people are ignoring it, they just aren't hearing enough about it. People

don't seem to understand the impact of our land being 80% federal. A lot of the public hasn't had to deal with the federal government issues these days. A lot of people don't go to the internet. **There needs to be more radio and news announcing.**

- Kelly Spiering said he agreed. It was brutal – two years of meetings of goals and objectives. At the end a small group synthesized it all and that was it. One group didn't carry the messages through. We want to see that special interests will not take over.
- Joy Hill said one of the things that will come out of this process is an implementation plan – that is the piece that was clearly missed during the last effort.
- Marion Morrison said there is a faction that does not use the internet.
- Kathleen Jachowski mentioned Karen Budd-Falen, water resource lawyer, spoke in Meeteetse about culture and custom in NEPA. A man stood up and said “You people don't understand, we already have a plan!” From 1988 to when the renewal was started, there was already a plan (unknown until after that planner quit). In terms of the general public being in tune with what it takes to develop a plan, the have no idea.
- Darcie clarified that this process will be transparent and there will be communication throughout to involve folks.
- **Plan Framework Overview**
 - Trying to find a balance between what people want and how to go about achieving it.
 - There is a new Natural Resource Management Plan adopted by the County in 2021.
 - There is a desire for more collaboration between the County and the cities in terms of discussions around development.
 - We want to determine if we are on the right track or not.
 - Review of survey results summary.
 - Review of Plan Vision.
 - Simplify the stewardship term. The term may be misunderstood. It may take out sides. It could be covered in a glossary. It is our job to educate people about it.
 - It is short and sweet. **Like the word “our.”**
 - It would be helpful to have the boards and slides available for people to look at and discuss.
 - Consider putting the vision out in front of people on all materials and at the forefront of meetings.
 - **This statement will not resonate with the younger population** – it needs to say “how does it matter to ME.” The “Me” generation wants it to say something about “better lives” and “the future.”
 - This is not how younger folks will be engaged. They don't listen to the radio. They are on Facebook, Instagram, etc.

- Facebook is for old people. Instagram for 30yo. Instagram and TikTok are for the younger folks.
- **For the benefit of our future.**
- Review of Shared Values
 - Growth Management
 - The asterisks are helpful. It is nice to know the core values have not changed, as a whole. Most people probably don't even know what the 1998 Plan says.
 - GM-2: What is meant by alignment? That may be read as aligning with federal rules. What is a service plan? We want to
 - In the rural areas, the people are concerned about the new development and subdivisions impacting groundwater, irrigation water. Need to adopt a uniform building code. It will mean a system and more interaction with govt/staff.
 - Private Land Use
 - The economic environment can't be run by a bureaucracy. The people sustain the economic environment.
 - If we can figure out how to balance private property rights with the needs of the community, we'll be doing well.
 - Do we promote development?
 - Encourage, promote and balance are lovely words. But at the risk of ratcheting things down too tight. Consider "implement." It should support an implementation plan.
 - Focus around who owns the implementation of the plan. It will be interesting to see if we can be somewhat intentional about whose purview that falls into.
 - Infrastructure and Public Services
 - Prioritize...sounds reactive. Not proactive. Are we going to have a plan that integrates Cody, Powell, the water systems...if we are going to be able to support any type of growth, we need to be looking at how to get ahead of it and have a coordinated plan with the different organizations/players. People expect water and they may be used to punching a hole in the ground and getting water. Wells go dry seasonally bc irrigation serves many of them. We are dealing with finite resources as if they are infinite.
 - Do we really want a plan that encourages growth. People move here and it's not for growth. It's for peace. Do we want a plan that makes us use up the resources that we have. You can either plan for it or react to it when it happens.
 - It's a question of how and where you want to grow. Where is growth suitable? Communities that decide not to grow are declining. You are not going to solve your issues by not growing.

- If we don't grow a workforce, that is the problem. We have to grow the workforce to be able to survive.
- The way the current subdivision rules are written...you can check all the boxes and do everything right – makes it hard to vote against if all the “things” have been done.
- Looking to the future, we don't need to subject our land areas to heavy growth.
- Economic Development
 - Workforce and housing are issues. They have to work together to solve problems.
 - What is meant by communications? Does it include telecommunications? The cities identify areas that are suitable for cell towers.
 - There is major solar and wind development coming. We need to get out ahead of it. The developers are buying up land to get ahead of sleepy places like ours.
- Environment and Natural Resources
 - We are looking at breaking out water into its own section due to the importance of irrigation and ground waters.
 - We need to be careful about the integration of state and federal partnerships.
 - If we don't take care of the critical wildlife habitat and map out what it is, it will need to be coordinated.
 - The animals that fall closest to endangered species listing, are the ones to watch.
 - Where do invasive species (like Russian Olives) fit into this – how to manage those would be a policy under a goal.
- Agriculture
 - Need to develop the terms encourage, nurture and sustain – what is the “how” of that?
 - The problem with ranching is making it profitable.
- Housing
 - We need to discuss policy about adopting building code. The permitting would pay for the process.
 - People come here b/c they can do what they want. No rules. We are trying to promote more of the construction closer to the towns. But they are still outside the city limits. Look at the Southfork, there is a vast number of people close to town. It would be helpful to implement a code system that would put the burden on the private sector.
 - When talking about building a home that is high value, what is \$7,000 to that person?
- Government

- Upcoming meetings
 - Round 1
 - Next LUPAC: August 31st, 3pm to 5pm
 - Round 2 – First week of October
- Land Demand Analysis
 - Baseline/High Growth Forecast
 - ...
- Land Use Suitability Analysis
 - What areas are likely to experience the greatest pressure for development?
 - Where in the County are development conflicts most likely?
 - How might policy/regulatory strategies help reduce conflicts?
 - Where might we want to be more proactive towards preservation?
 - Is the latest census data available? Yes, but some are lagging in terms of the recent growth pressures. Those numbers are not necessarily capturing the rates of growth that have been occurring.
 - How will you evaluate the hydrologic capacity in terms of sustaining development? (aquifers) We will look at proximity and potential availability of the rural water network. And then we need to try to get at the suitability for water wells. Some areas may be better or worse suited (same with sewer systems).
- Overview of the Map Portal