

1 **Planning & Zoning Commission Special Meeting Minutes**

2 January 23, 2024

3  
4 This is a special meeting of the Park County Planning & Zoning Commission held at 12:00pm in  
5 the Grizzly Room of the Park County Library, 1500 Heart Mountain St, Cody, WY.

6  
7 **Commission Members Present:**

8 Duncan Bonine, Chairman  
9 Brian Peters, Vice Chairman  
10 Kimberly Brandon-Wintermote  
11 Guy Eastman  
12 Randy Mair

13  
14 **Staff Present:**

15 Joy Hill, Planning Director  
16 Kim Dillivan, Assistant Director  
17 Jenny Cramer, Planner I  
18 Erika Decker, Office Assistant III

19  
20 Chairman Bonine opened the meeting at 12:03pm.

21  
22  
23 **SPECIAL AGENDA**

24  
25 **[PUBLIC HEARING – 2024 Park County Land Use Plan](#)**

26  
27 Chairman Bonine, the hearing officer, introduced staff and commission members, reviewed the  
28 rules of a public meeting, and opened the public hearing at 12:06pm.

29  
30 Chairman Bonine asked if any Commission members or staff had any comments.

31  
32 The Planning Director, Joy Hill, explained that the current draft of the Park County Land Use  
33 Plan (2024 Land Use Plan) was released for public review on December 21, 2023.  
34 Announcement of the release was duly noticed in both the *Powell Tribune* and *Cody Enterprise*.  
35 Copies of the Plan were available in the three libraries, the Planning Department, and online.  
36 Additionally, a copy of the Plan showing marked-up changes was available online. The Director  
37 summarized the main changes.

38  
39 Chairman Bonine asked if any Commission members had questions for Staff. There were none.

40  
41 Chairman Bonine asked if there were comments from any members of the public.

- 42 • Bruce Shackleford, lives out the Southfork Road. He irrigates, farms, and likes to see  
43 wildlife. He supports seeing all of the wildlife overlay put on the maps for informational  
44 purposes. People don't understand that the primary migration corridors do not and would  
45 not exist without the other areas. While not used as frequently, the issue is connectivity.  
46 You are not protecting anything if you just use a part of that whole system. Like blood  
47 vessels, you don't just protect the main arteries and veins, you protect the capillaries as  
48 well. Same with streams, canals, and tributaries they collectively make up what flows  
49 into the main channel. It is important to keep our people educated. This is nothing to be  
50 afraid of. It's not regulation. It is for informational purposes only. He would like very much  
51 to educate the people. As far as lifting the acreage criteria for lot sizes. Please think  
52 about the one-acre minimums so we don't pay paradise to put up a parking lot forever.  
53 He thanked the commission for their work.
- 54

## Planning & Zoning Commission Special Meeting Minutes

January 23, 2024

- 55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77
- Mary McKinney, asked to speak on behalf of herself and her neighbors. She said she is not affiliated with any group or entity. She represents herself as a rural Park County landowner. She is disappointed in the Board of County Commissioners and the Planning and Zoning Commission, allowing this revision to move forward. She felt the first draft was a more fair representation of what the public wanted. The public said wildlife and public access were important. The plan is a guide for development. Keeping just high use big game area does not protect the movement. This is important for our migratory herds of mule deer in particular. Mule deer are dedicated to their corridors, getting to and from their critical habitat. She addressed the population being down from 400,000 in 2017 to around 250,000 today. This should be concerning to all. Disease, drought, severe winters, and development are impacting the animals. The overlays in the first draft are critical to their survival. We care about their existence and survival. It doesn't mean development shouldn't occur; only that we should consider wildlife when it does occur. As for the proposal for lot sizes down to one acre, are she and others expected to give up their rights? Open space was important to county residents. Small lot sizes would inhibit/reduce open space. Our landscapes would be permanently altered. Drive down the road and see the impacts from development (already occurred). Is it possible to put a dollar figure on the resources like clean air and clean water? How do you balance that with the development? What is included in the plan addresses wildlife balance with development. She implores you to revert back to the original draft. She feels if we move forward with the current draft we will fail future generations of people and animals. Wildlife cannot advocate for themselves; we must advocate for them.
  - Sharon Rosen said her concern is taking the land and subdividing it the way that you are and watching the property taxes go up. She agrees with the others. Guidelines start and then they become regulations. The people don't have a say when the regulations start and then it snowballs. We see our property taxes as they are, going up. She is in between two agricultural areas where they have grass pastureland, between a 30-acre and 60-acre parcel. She has animals crossing over property lines and fences down from deer. She expects it. She doesn't expect her property taxes to go from \$1,700 to \$5,200 in two years because people want to build.
  - Abby Scott, member of the public, said she appreciates the time to listen to her comments. She is a lifelong resident of Park County and has a career in conservation. She shared some experience with a fellowship she had at the Western Governors Association. She worked with Governor Matt Mead on the Endangered Species Act and species conservation policy. She traveled around the West and met with local communities, many like ours. She had the opportunity to see what worked for local governance and what didn't. The two things that consistently appeared in success stories were strong local government and stakeholder input. They did this by relying on quality and complete data sets. She supports including the entire big game overlay in the plan. By providing adequate context and the full data set, you are setting yourselves and your future counterparts up to make the most informed decisions that reflect the values of our community.
  - Alex Aguirre, Powell resident, said the wildlife makes Wyoming appealing to people. Especially with our mule deer numbers down by about 40%. It would be wise that Park County takes the lead to include the medium and low use areas for the wildlife.
  - Dave McMillin has been going to the public meetings for the last two years regarding the plan. He feels strongly that the revised plan is the best thing that he could have hoped
- 100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105

## Planning & Zoning Commission Special Meeting Minutes

January 23, 2024

- 106 for in the last two years. He's remained quiet to listen to the people. He sees completely  
107 different people at each meeting. He knows there is a large segment of the population  
108 that is interested in this plan. He supports the revisions and would like to see this plan  
109 approved by the Board and get to the next step (regulation amendments).  
110
- 111 • Kelly Spiering has worked through the plan for the past two years. It represents where  
112 we are in Park County. To say there is not use in the light and medium use areas, isn't  
113 true. The fact is people should know that there will be animals moving through their  
114 yards. To say we are going to change the plan to show nothing is there, doesn't benefit  
115 anyone. Quoted support of wind and solar power. He's never heard anyone say they  
116 support those.  
117
  - 118 • Philip Cambell said he was involved with Land Use 40 years ago. It has grown a lot  
119 since then. He is more for owner land rights and personal freedom. Government doesn't  
120 give that to us, it takes it away. He is against anything that does more. It's already too  
121 much. Part of the code of the west is, know when enough is enough. Some things can't  
122 be fixed for everybody. There is no right answer here, all the way. The last thing we  
123 need to do is expand government, bigger land use planning, bigger budget, more taxes,  
124 less personal freedoms. He is all about personal property rights and government is trying  
125 to take them away more and more and more. It is time to support individual freedom and  
126 private land rights. Private rights for people.  
127
  - 128 • Kyle Pasewark, Clark resident, he attended a meeting of about 100 people a while back  
129 in front of Miss Hill and no one said anything other than keep the land use the same as it  
130 was in the last plan. The Commissioners, he doesn't think they are listening to the  
131 unanimous voice of the Clark area residents and the people here today. The changes  
132 have only helped land developers and their lobby. They don't help the public as a whole  
133 and is simply not what was in the Clark community meeting. The new Land Use Plan is  
134 becoming a land grab plan. It is important for wildlife and agriculture. Wildlife was high in  
135 priority to Clark and the whole community. The low and medium use remains crucial. We  
136 should not make the changes under the guise of private property. He bought his property  
137 under the guise of easements. His neighbors have to use his road to get to their  
138 property. It is disingenuous to say that it's restricting his rights to have him do what he  
139 already agreed to do as a condition for buying the property in the first place. It wasn't a  
140 restriction of his rights; it was a condition. It is also why he thinks there is a presumption  
141 in favor of the prior plan because that is what we all agreed to before. Unless there is a  
142 clear reason to change the plan, and none of his neighbors thought there was. The  
143 Commissioners are taking the value of land away from us and giving it to developers.  
144 The Commissioners are obligated to protect all property and all of the public. We are all  
145 obligated to protect and promote God's creation.  
146
  - 147 • Nick Patrick, South Fork resident. A few years ago, he sat on the Board and he knows  
148 how difficult it can be. What is black and white is that we live in one of the last temperate  
149 intact ecosystems in the world. We have a responsibility to take care of it, part of taking  
150 care of it includes a comprehensive, thoughtful land use plan that comes with the big  
151 game overlay and 20-acre lot minimums restored. We need to address the values that  
152 the people hold dear, the wildlife and the open lands.  
153
  - 154 • Ed Higbie said he looks at this as we can continue to make changes, nothing is going to  
155 be perfect. We should move forward. He is concerned as we spend government money  
156 to continue to make adjustments, there will be adjustments forever. He is concerned with

## Planning & Zoning Commission Special Meeting Minutes

January 23, 2024

157 the agricultural overlay. There is some agriculture that is productive, and some is less  
158 productive. It is not clear to him how you are going to control the overlays without  
159 specifics as to how they will be accepted or rejected (development proposals). Either get  
160 in there and go or get off the pot.  
161

162 • Tiffanie May, Wyoming born and raised. She was part of the LUPAC to represent  
163 Meeteetse. There were several publicly advertised meetings in multiple locations,  
164 multiple times, public opinion was openly shared – all well attended. She felt that the  
165 resourceful comments made by the communities should be taken into account. She  
166 represents the Meeteetse area. As a resident and landowner, she feels it is important to  
167 maintain our open spaces, wildlife, and farmlands. It (the land) is a resource that draws  
168 people here. They (people) are generally trying to get out away and see the wildlife and  
169 the open space, enjoy the fresh air and the mountains. It could be taken away if we don't  
170 uphold some restrictions that protect the wildlife migration corridors, protect the water  
171 and the public use. It's not all about making money off of the resources. The view is why  
172 people like to be here.  
173

174 • Sue Consolo-Murphy, North Fork landowner, she has lived here about 20 years and she  
175 has served on the NRMP steering committee. She echoes what others have said. We  
176 have an excellent Game and Fish Department. We have faith in their expertise. She  
177 favors the original draft with increased wildlife protection/use overlay coverage. It  
178 reminds us of the importance of wildlife. She is proud of the wildlife migration work that  
179 has been done. It is a special thing that Wyoming has that needs to be protected. She  
180 spent a lot of her recent adult life in Jackson Hole, and she is concerned about changing  
181 the ag overlay. There is a lot of concern about overdevelopment and research that  
182 shows splitting up parcels from 20 acres down to one acre really degrades the wildlife  
183 areas.  
184

185 • Brian Clarkson echoes the comments already heard in support of the big game overlay.  
186 Based on the Land Use Plan and the amount of community outreach, the community is  
187 obviously interested. Some of you (commission members) may not have been aware of  
188 the numbers or came in late in the game. He is a North Fork resident. In the North Fork  
189 planning area, 76% of the residents that participated wanted a proactive approach to  
190 wildlife. In Park County as a whole, 50.8% are in favor of a proactive approach, 20.7 %  
191 are interested in a moderate approach. Most wanted a big game overlay in some  
192 capacity. You agreed, months ago, when you originally approved the Land Use Plan with  
193 the big game overlay. He once defended the integrity of the commission, now he  
194 questions it. The commission should be voting in favor of what the community wants,  
195 now you are going against it. The commission owes the public an explanation of how  
196 you can approve the plan with the big game overlay and then get bullied into rejecting  
197 the previous decision. This should go back to the original draft that you already voted on  
198 and approved.  
199

200 • Kelly Jensen, lives in Cody. She grew up ranching in Park County between Meeteetse  
201 and Burlington, her family is still there. She married into another ranching family in the  
202 Meeteetse area. She values ag land like you can't believe, along with the incredible  
203 wildlife herds. We live in a special place where people wish they could live. She works  
204 from home and is in meetings with people all over the country and world and they are in  
205 awe of where she lives. Based on what she read in the plan, it's the values stated in the  
206 planning process by the majority of people involved. We have an opportunity and an  
207 obligation to acknowledge the love for ag lands and big game. Forever is a very long

## Planning & Zoning Commission Special Meeting Minutes

January 23, 2024

- 208 time. If we don't do our best today, we are looking at what happens tomorrow because  
209 we didn't do our best today. She wants to see original ag lot sizes and entire big game  
210 overlay as it was originally submitted and approved. People value this place.  
211
- 212 • Marshall Dominick has been a resident of NW Wyoming for most of his 79 years. He is  
213 not an expert, but he thinks experience counts. He farms a property to the east of town,  
214 Beacon Hill, and has managed the land for some 30 years. He has another place north  
215 of town on Cottonwood Creek. He has irrigated and farmed that land for 25 years.. He  
216 sees a lot of change going on, change is difficult. In the instance of this plan that you  
217 have worked on so hard and so long, I think you have done a great job with compromise.  
218 The 20-acre minimum is a compromise. He would like to see a 40-acre minimum. The  
219 compromise appeases all sides of the equation in the community. As to property rights,  
220 he believes the process, which has taken now going on 2 years, has given people who  
221 are concerned about their property rights, an opportunity to go ahead and submit a  
222 subdivision proposition while the laws and land use is as it is. A further suggestion, if that  
223 is the primary reason for minimizing the 20-acre compromise, you could put a so-called  
224 grace period into that issue of the 20-acre issue. He is in favor of the wildlife overlay as  
225 has been stated multiple times.  
226
  - 227 • Jim Summers said this is not an easy job trying to keep everybody happy. It has been  
228 stated far more eloquently, but he firmly believes the initial plan should be seriously  
229 considered before you change it. It seems to be the primary interest of the County and  
230 it's why we all live here. Do you really want to lose that?  
231
  - 232 • Emily Reed was born and raised here in Cody. She went to UW and has built her career  
233 in Park County. She has the privilege to be part of work relating to migrating ungulates.  
234 She is speaking as a community member with insight from her experience. Whether you  
235 are a person who is seeing the wildlife for the first time or a resident who sees them all  
236 the time, something special happens. She encourages the inclusion of all parts of the big  
237 game overlay. As a younger person, she is thinking about the next generation of  
238 residents. She also comes from deep agricultural roots, her family farms here, she thinks  
239 they did a good job compromising with the 20-acre lot minimums, she would rather see  
240 40-acre lots. To think of one-acre lots and water issues is concerning to her.  
241
  - 242 • Anne Young, she lives on Sage Creek with a small ranch. She would like you to please  
243 go back to the original draft. She was on two previous land use planning sessions in the  
244 70s and the 90s. It was extremely hard work. She regrets that you have turned the clock  
245 back and taken out the wildlife overlays because she feels it is important. Owning a  
246 ranch, part of her land is close to critical mule deer habitat. It is also low use for  
247 antelope, but there are all kinds of animals. It is ridiculous to say that that would hurt my  
248 private property rights. It doesn't threaten her that she could be in a wildlife area. It is an  
249 enhancement and an opportunity to get grants. This morning the Absaroka fencing  
250 initiative is on her property helping her with wildlife-friendly fencing. People who aren't  
251 from here, don't really know how to take care of their land, but the wildlife overlay may  
252 give them direction on how to manage their land. Please put those wildlife overlays back  
253 into your plan.  
254
  - 255 • Chuck Walker said this conversation about acreage minimums is ultimately about  
256 conserving open space, wildlife, and productive ag land. He would like to share a quote  
257 from Aldo Leopold, one of our best-known early conservationists, "Conservation will  
258 ultimately boil down to rewarding the private landowner who conserves the public interest".

## Planning & Zoning Commission Special Meeting Minutes

January 23, 2024

259 The purpose of conservation easements by land trusts are accomplished through grants,  
260 the majority of which come from the NRCS. They give great weight to protecting wildlife.  
261 By not reducing the size of the big game overlay, you give private landowners the  
262 opportunity to qualify for conservation easements which will benefit future generations. It  
263 is effectively a deed restriction linked to the land, not the current owner. He would like to  
264 see the entire big game overlay, representing contiguous habitat, left intact with the clear  
265 understanding that additional requirements or restrictions will not be imposed on  
266 landowners within the overlay. More conservation easements will help protect our open  
267 space, wildlife habitat and productive ag land. Conservation easements are voluntary  
268 transactions between private landowners and private land trusts. There is no involvement  
269 of nor downside to the public, only gain. Please maximize this public benefit.  
270

271 • Alexandra Kirk agrees with almost everyone who has spoken so far. Particularly to go  
272 back to the first Land Use Plan and echoing the wildlife (importance). She also is not in  
273 favor of going from 40-acre lots to 20-acre lots or, even worse, one-acre lots. She is also  
274 concerned about water. Right now, we've had an abundance of water, but a few years  
275 ago there was a real concern about how low our reservoir was. Maybe we are missing  
276 that a bit here in the second (adoption of) the land use plan. Allowing for so much  
277 development, she is not sure we can count on our water facilitating that on a permanent  
278 basis.  
279

280 • Bob Savala said it looks like the general consensus is to go back to the original overlay  
281 plan. He bought 60 acres out in Clark, his dream as a Wyoming boy. Next to him is private  
282 land that got bought up by a guy from Texas who advertised it as subdivisions. There is  
283 nothing out there but rocks and no water. That person tried to put a gate across a public  
284 fishing access. People approached him and said you won't get along with others if that is  
285 the way you proclaim yourself. He said I didn't come here to make friends; I came here to  
286 make money. That is one of the things we need to worry about. In the meantime, across  
287 the street, a guy put up an expensive gate and the name of the ranch/owner was Xinos.  
288 He thought the Chinese were coming. He's a large construction owner from the state of  
289 New York. He spoke with him, and the man said he is sick and tired of people and he is  
290 selling it all and coming to Clark to put all his money in Clark and Cody. He bought the  
291 Conoco station in Cody, and he is putting his money into this area. He wants to be able to  
292 sit on his porch and not see anyone. He has 700 acres. He nearly hugged him. He did buy  
293 that land last July. Some of the people coming in are here might just be what we want. We  
294 are digging ourselves into a deeper hole. We need to go back to the wildlife overlay and  
295 protecting things.  
296

297 • Doug Wachob retired from UW and moved to Cody. He is a trustee of the Nature  
298 Conservancy. He is glad for the opportunity to revisit the plan. The NC has long worked  
299 beside our partners in industry, ag, agencies to find solutions that benefit people and the  
300 working lands. The presence of wildlife is highly valued by the people of Park County. It  
301 has aesthetic value and economic value. Please consider reincluding the entire big game  
302 overlay in the plan. Knowing where the low, medium, and high use can help people know  
303 how to exercise their private rights. Inclusion will help prioritize where funds can be applied  
304 to greatest effect on private land. Include these layers for future decisions. It will allow  
305 future decisions to be made with full access to the data. Consider the overlay not as a top-  
306 down regulatory imposition on landowners but as an information tool that gives them  
307 information on how to best exercise their private property rights.  
308

## Planning & Zoning Commission Special Meeting Minutes

January 23, 2024

- 309
- 310
- 311
- 312
- 313
- 314
- 315
- 316
- 317
- 318
- 319
- 320
- 321
- 322
- 323
- 324
- 325
- 326
- 327
- 328
- 329
- 330
- 331
- 332
- 333
- 334
- 335
- 336
- 337
- 338
- 339
- 340
- 341
- 342
- 343
- 344
- 345
- 346
- 347
- 348
- 349
- 350
- 351
- 352
- 353
- 354
- 355
- 356
- 357
- 358
- 359
- Meg Summers 45+ year resident of Park County, 40 years on the South Fork and then moved to town. She submitted written comments during different opportunities. She supports the messages of others. Wildlife overlay is vital to the community. All of the corridors, not just the main ones, are vital and need to be reinstated. You have to get it right now. The next plan will be 10, 15, 20 years from now. You have to get this right now. It will be too late if you don't.
  - Mary Rumsey said let's get back to the plan that Team Joy Hill set out that the people in the community came together and said we need 20 acres in the ag overlay. We need 35 acres in the big game overlay. She lived in Meeteetse the last 26 years. We have one acre and a septic. We do not have the water resources to support any type of nonsense like that. The county does not have the resources to build the infrastructure to support that from police, roads and bridges. Our wildlife generates over a billion dollars a year from watchers making up half and hunters and fishermen making up the other half. Don't screw this up for us, please. It is like a gift. It's free and it's so important. Put the ag overlay back. We do irrigate and so do our neighbors; this is so important. You have so much power in your hands. Get it right for us and future generations. We don't want to live in some mess, and you don't have the resources to support the mess that could come of existing subdivisions and zoning that is on the books. Please get it right.
  - Terry Gardenhire, Clark resident, said it appears that changes are being proposed to the plan that cater to special interest groups rather than the public majority. That is wrong. You need to be listening to the public.
  - John McGee is a 77-year resident of Park County. His father was born east of Meeteetse along the Greybull River. You can't imagine the changes his father saw, let alone what he's seen. He favors going back to the original plan. We can't tolerate a lot more change. The world is changing too fast, and we don't have to keep up with it.
  - Josh Metten, Cody homeowner and Wyoming Field Manager for Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, there is a lot of community support for including the big game overlay and agricultural zoning is pretty widespread. We guarantee Americans quality places to hunt and fish. Most people know that Cody has quality places to hunt and fish, because of our abundant wildlife resources. Including the Big Game Overlay in the plan helps us prioritize and gives people a sense of pride. Offers grant funding for different things. As for the ag overlay, for someone who enjoys the Shoshone River, floating the river, fishing the river, hunting the river, one thing he has noticed is that there is a lot of water coming off of the ag lands that are irrigated along the river. That water is hydrating landscape and providing habitat for pheasants, waterfowl, and other game. That is a resource that is there because we have intact ag lands. We are proud of these lands and our agricultural heritage. Please include the ag overlay. We don't need to be the next Bozeman or Front Range. If we don't put land use planning in, that's where we are headed.
  - Donna Becker lives in Powell. She said it sounds like there are two groups were are dealing with – people moving in and current farmers. People moving in have the choice to agree with the stipulations and can buy property. Farmers don't have that option. Fencing will have an impact to animals. What they would put up might be different than what they would put up thinking about the animals. If they need to sell a small chunk of land so they can operate, they need to be able to do that. They may sell the land to a neighbor or a family member or whatever they want to do. We want to help the farmers, and all the things that we end up doing actually make things worse for our farmers. The Land Use

## Planning & Zoning Commission Special Meeting Minutes

January 23, 2024

- 360 Plan deals with private property. I doubt there are many people here who want someone  
361 to tell them what to do with their own property. There is no such push for increasing  
362 restrictions on public land. There is a lot of work that could be done on public lands first  
363 for example recreational impacts to wildlife on public lands are overlooked and ignored,  
364 but now private landowners are asked to limit themselves. She favors the second draft.  
365
- 366 • Rebekah Burns from Powell Economic Partnership/Chamber, she was also a LUPAC  
367 member (economic representative). She represents 58% of the people who live/work here.  
368 She also sits on the Open Lands Committee, though she is not advocating for them. She  
369 is the County's partner. She is here to work together. Not an adversary. She has been  
370 working hard to get the ag study completed. Sadly, it was not done in time to get into the  
371 Land Use Plan. The Land Use Plan says \$85 million is ag revenue for the county, that's  
372 incorrect. It is \$186 million currently, that number comes from the ag census. We know  
373 farmers don't report their numbers correctly. The actual economic value is way higher for  
374 that reason. Do you feel like if you take out the 20-acre lot size minimum, do you know  
375 that industry well enough to come up with proper zoning for it? I am your partner in this, I  
376 know this ag study inside and out, we can find answers for you. The big game overlay –  
377 on the map online, there designates an elk migration corridor. This is a document that  
378 says how we plan for the future. The people she represents want you to look to the future  
379 to represent all of their views which have been shared.  
380
  - 381 • Jenny DeSarro was born in this county and grew up riding the bus from the South Fork to  
382 town. While her years may not be as seasoned as others, she has noticed change. Along  
383 with that change, we have the gift of the evolution of science and the knowledge and tools  
384 at our disposal. Please go back to the previous version (of the plan) with all levels of big  
385 game use (low, medium, high). This tells the whole story. This is just a guidance tool. The  
386 more information people have, the better decisions can be made going forward. That is  
387 the intention of this land use plan. We need to bring as much information to the public to  
388 help them make decisions going forward. Then that information gets brought into the next  
389 phases which are regulations and zoning. The ag layer, again it's the information. Her  
390 family owns property in Clark, ag property and it is of value to keep it as big as possible.  
391 It helps hold water. It creates habitat. It fosters the whole system. We are the eastern  
392 flank of Yellowstone National Park. We also have the Shoshone National Forest. We are  
393 the stewards of this entryway/gateway to a national heritage. What we do with our planning  
394 is significantly important for this generation and all future generations.  
395
  - 396 • Laura Bell is in favor of retaining the original big game and ag overlays. She has been a  
397 resident of northwest Wyoming for nearly 50 years. She loves where she lives. As a Park  
398 County resident, she is grateful for the landowners, farmers and ranchers that provide us  
399 with open space and wildlife habitat. Ranching and farming are hard work with a narrow  
400 margin. The ones we have need help to stay afloat. There is money available to help  
401 landowners who provide habitat for the public's wildlife. There is private money, state  
402 money, federal money for fence modification, for water development, for weed treatment,  
403 funding for habitat leases and conservation easements. It can be enough to make a  
404 difference. It can help one generation be able to pass their land down to the next  
405 generation. The property needs to be designated in some way as locally significant.  
406 Please keep the original big game overlay and ag overlay. They have no teeth, there are  
407 no regulations attached, but it can open the door for financial support for the landowners,  
408 farmers and ranchers who are providing habitat for wildlife.  
409



## Planning & Zoning Commission Special Meeting Minutes

January 23, 2024

- 410
- 411
- 412
- 413
- 414
- 415
- 416
- 417
- 418
- 419
- 420
- 421
- 422
- 423
- 424
- 425
- 426
- 427
- 428
- Adam George is born and raised in Park County and has lived here most of his life. He lives between Cody and Powell and his living is 100% production agriculture. There is a part of him that can agree with everyone. The one constant in life is change and we don't like that constant. I hate seeing good ag land cut up and put into homes. A lot of the ground he has farmed is now homes. He supports personal property rights, within reason, if there are water and sewer resources to support it, as much as he hates seeing it. Around where he lives, there are a lot of small lots. Some of those small or medium lots have become a nice home and yard with the rest of the lot becoming barren wasteland, it becomes a weed patch. People should be able to do what they want with their land, and he doesn't want to see 20-acre minimum lots. People should be able to do what they want to with their land. There also needs to be a means to retain large farms. If we allow people to subdivide the ground around them, please protect the farmers if they want to expand their farms or build facilities. If you build in an agricultural area that's fine but, farmers should be protected as well. If people want to maintain large open spaces, there is a private mechanism to do that through conservation easements. I hate to restrict it. I see the fragmentation of parcels to allow for large parcels to maintain open space. We do have a housing problem here. He knows he couldn't afford to buy a home if he wasn't already here. He doesn't know how you get more homes if you don't provide land to build them. We need a balance of both.
- 429
- Marion Morrison is a taxpayer in Park County. She is halfway between Cody and Powell. She is in agreement with Jenny DeSarro, Laura Bell, Nick Patrick, Marshall Dominick, Brian Clarkson, Tiffanie May, Rebekah Burns. She was previously a member of the LUPAC and when she talked to her neighbors and friends, many said the commissioners will never listen to what I have to say. She pushed them to know the importance of participating. We did have people come out and participate. And now, to have things turned around after we had that participation. It's inappropriate, to give more weight to people who didn't participate and abandon what was done initially, makes a liar out of her. We had a 2-year process. Those disagreeing now are getting more weight to their words than those who participated initially. This is not Bob or Joe's Plan. It is the people's plan and needs to serve them. The people spoke during that process. We can't sustain the small lots. She has had to drill a new well and she has 4 neighbors who have had to drill new wells. We do not have the water capacity to subdivide to the process that would be allowed. She would like to go back to what we worked so hard for in the initial plan.
- 443
- Connie King said her husband and her have 40 acres in Clark. Her concern is to reinstate the wildlife overlays for better protection. Her acreage is excellent winter range for big game. Her concern is that her land is not included on the overlays. She looks at the overlays as being a minimum for protecting important areas. She has lived in many places, and there are very important corridors right now, there are all sorts of wildlife that use these precious habitats that are not even included in these overlays. It is a minimum to go back to what was originally proposed. Because she has lived in this state for 50 years and spent so much time in the outdoors. It is shocking to see how much things have changed in a 50-year span. She wants us to think in the terms of 30-50 years out from now, what will we have left to protect, to enjoy. Many that have come from out of state have shared their opinions as newcomers that we have such vast, wide-open space. 20-35-acre plots would be considered ranches in Colorado. We don't want to look like Colorado. With people coming in from out-of-state who are used to more dense areas, their perspective is different from those of us have watched land be divided and become less valuable for wildlife.
- 459

## Planning & Zoning Commission Special Meeting Minutes

January 23, 2024

- 460
- 461
- 462
- 463
- 464
- 465
- 466
- 467
- 468
- 469
- 470
- 471
- 472
- 473
- 474
- 475
- 476
- 477
- 478
- Margaret Lohman has written a letter and is one of the voices of the people of the actual working ranch people up the North Fork. She speaks for her working brother who has a 100-acre field with elk in it. He is that person that goes to work and then goes home and works hard to take care of this field. People love to stop and look at the elk. Her brother is close to retirement and can't keep up with all of this anymore. This idea that him supplying this field and feeding the elk is free. And that the greater good has some right to it. It's not free. He puts a lot of work into feeding the elk. At some point, he gives up trying to fight all of this because the greater good is always going to win out. You have the greater good that is romantic about everything, of course they are, everybody loves it. It's not free. The other group is the group that can afford it – they want to keep it going too because they love the elk, and they can afford it. There is another gentleman who has 675-acres up the North Fork who said it is stealing their life away from them fighting this. All she sees with the big game overlay is growth of government, and it doesn't make a difference whether the elk are going stay or go. There are huge amounts of public land and that is where the elk, the deer and the mountain sheep live. Then they come into the fields because people supply food for them. Putting a big game overlay in is not going to make a difference. All this is just growing government. She appreciates what the commission does. People that have something to lose are people like her brother, that's who is losing.
  - Hap Ridgway said the migration stuff has been well covered. The idea that so many people worked for so long on this earlier and feel dismissed now is a real danger going ahead. I don't know how you do a land use plan again and expect to get great participation. Honor those people who wrote all those letters and had all the sessions and did all the surveys. Honor them.

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

Chairman Bonine thanked the members of the public who came and participated and have been involved in the process. He added that he has received between 15-20 written comments, some of those same people spoke today. He said that the Commission is charged with certifying the Land Use Plan to go forward to the Board of County Commissioners. When certification is reached, the plan will go forward. It will go back out for public comment. There will be an additional 45 days of public comment after which the Board of County Commissioners will hold a public hearing. This is the second time around for certification. The next step after certification, with or without recommended changes, will be the plan going out for that extra comment period and public hearing. The Board of County Commissioners will either vote to approve in part or deny. They can't add to it – then the process would begin again. This public hearing is not the end. It is just for this Commission.

497

498

499

The Planning director explained the noticing requirements for a public hearing and informed the public on where to access information related to the Park County Land Use Plan .

500

501

502

503

504

505

Kathleen Jachowski asked about the authority to add something to the plan. She asked if they have the authority to add the overlay back in. Chairman Bonine said the Planning & Zoning Commission has the ability to change, amend or add to the plan. Once certified, and going before the Board, if the Board wishes to add anything, it would have to come back to the Planning & Zoning Commission.

506

507

508

509

510

Jim Sommers asked what led to the change in the big game overlay from the first meeting to this meeting. He wants to know how that change came about, same with the ag overlay. He wants to know about the process that brought on that change. He wants to know if there was another meeting he missed. Commissioner Bonine responded that they don't currently have a big game overlay in the current regulations or land use plan. It is his understanding that the

## Planning & Zoning Commission Special Meeting Minutes

January 23, 2024

511 County Commissioners had requested some mechanism by which the public could be educated  
512 about the existence of big game, where they are at, how they impact properties. He recalls  
513 discussion and questions about the use of the word education within the Land Use Plan and  
514 perhaps it was not the appropriate venue for an educational tool. One of the concerns about the  
515 big game overlays is that we can all get together and say it's a great thing and put the overlay in  
516 place, and another commission could come in behind us and say we have this overlay here and  
517 why isn't it being used and turn it into a mechanism to restrict private property rights to impose  
518 regulation. For himself, he is a private property rights guy, his opinion. It was his understanding  
519 from the discussion that came out of the Board's public hearing and the work sessions the  
520 Commission had with the Board, it seemed that we generally did not wish for any of those  
521 overlays to have an opportunity to become additional regulation. The intention was, by taking  
522 away a large percentage of the overlays, the discussion was we would look at the high-density  
523 areas because those are the areas that wildlife was most likely to be impacted and that overlay  
524 would remain in place and could remain as a talking point with people who are wishing to  
525 develop or build houses, to talk to them about the existence of potential wildlife on their  
526 property.

527  
528 Commissioner Peters agreed and said the issue was mass support of education for that tool,  
529 but we couldn't get it to the place where it was just education. That is how we reverted back to  
530 where we are at now. Commissioner Bonine said it could be changed as part of this discussion.

531  
532 Jim Sommers said it seems to him that once you fragment the overlay, you have no regulation  
533 on wildlife protection. If somebody is going to develop that subdivision, you can talk to him about  
534 the wildlife but, he doesn't care. That doesn't do anything. Commissioner Bonine said in current  
535 regulations, there is nothing that would allow us to deny a development based on a property's  
536 inclusion in any overlay.

537  
538 Planning Director, Joy Hill, clarified the definition and purpose of an overlay. She also explained  
539 that the Land Use Plan is guidance not regulation. There is no way to give everyone exactly  
540 what they want, we are going to try to reflect the primary key values of what was heard from the  
541 majority moving forward. She urged the public to continue to participate when the regulation  
542 amendment process occurs.

543  
544 Abby Scott takes issue with the comment about concern in the way that future commissions  
545 might use the big game overlay data. Those future Commissioners will be democratically  
546 elected by the citizens of Park County. It's not up to this commission to restrict the information  
547 that might be available to them.

548  
549 Sue Lyke is a simple person who is confused about a lot of this, and she would like help. She  
550 wants to know where she can educate herself on these overlays, where can she look at it.  
551 Commissioner Bonine said the draft of the Land Use Plan has the overlays spelled out in  
552 description and attached in the back are maps that show the overlays and where they are at  
553 along with the impacted areas. The Planning Director stated that there is information available  
554 online but also the Planning Department Staff are available to walk you through the Land Use  
555 Plan language.

556  
557 Brian Clarkson asked what changed. The Commission previously approved the plan. Chairman  
558 Bonine said there was a public hearing in front of the Board of County Commissioners at which  
559 the Board decided not to approve the plan as previously certified, based upon public input at  
560 that public hearing. Between what they heard at their hearing and where all the discussion was  
561 at prior we had work sessions to try and come to a resolution. There were concessions made

## Planning & Zoning Commission Special Meeting Minutes

January 23, 2024

562 and in a manner of speaking negotiation occurred. When the previous draft was not adopted,  
563 the process defines that the plan comes back to the Planning & Zoning Commission. Brian said  
564 that he wondered if Chairman Bonine's personal opinion is the same today as it was on the day  
565 the first draft was certified. Brian asked, as chair of the commission and in his role as a  
566 commission member at the time of original certification, did his opinion change. Chairman  
567 Bonine said that his opinion did not change but as a matter of concession he was not 100% in  
568 agreement with the plan when it was certified, but he knew we weren't going to make everyone  
569 happy, himself included. What we certified is not what it would be if he were to write it, but that  
570 is largely irrelevant to the discussion. But no, his opinion hasn't changed, but the previously  
571 certified plan didn't necessarily match his personal opinion.

572  
573 Kelly Spiering said he thinks we all understand that our perception is not everyone's reality. At  
574 the last hearing, he sensed the fear that education was going to be used against people in the  
575 big game overlay by future elected officials. If we limit education because we are worried about  
576 what it's going to do in the future, you're not doing what the Land Use Plan is designed to do.  
577 The Land Use Plan basically said here's where we are, what are we going to do with it. I agree  
578 with Joy, it is a painting of zoning over it, but if you don't trust the future and the future people  
579 we elect then you're limiting education out of fear. The people need to know if they are in a big  
580 game overlay and be able to use that as a selling point. We heard, at that hearing, the scoring  
581 for conservation easement is better if you are in a big game overlay. We talk about farmers  
582 trying to survive and being able to sell things like private property rights. This conservation  
583 easement thing helps give you an injection of cash if you choose to put your land in a  
584 conservation easement. That cash becomes available from NRCS, it helps to have the big  
585 game overlay there. It bothers me that we can't say anything because someone might take it  
586 wrong. It's up to us as a democratic republic to elect people that are going to do what we ask  
587 them to do. He is frustrated with the fact that we changed a plan that said what we needed it to  
588 say. What he doesn't want to say is that the big game overlay is going to stop people by telling  
589 them what they can and cannot do. I agree with Joy, the regulation process is where people  
590 need to come out and say I do or do not want regulation in these areas.

591  
592 Greg McCue lives in the Middle South Fork area in the high density overlay for the wildlife. He  
593 would make a plea to restore the wildlife overlay because 1) it may actually help people with  
594 100-acres on the North Fork, it may put them in a better position to develop a conservation  
595 easement, other organizations and other government organizations look at this. Those are the  
596 people, the people that have 100-acres that are ready for retirement, they can't be expected to  
597 carry on for free. The overlay could be a great benefit; and 2) he's lived in this county for 70+  
598 years. This is an area of the world that wealthy people and organizations want to move into.  
599 This overlay isn't to prevent Bob from building a house on the edge of the migration path. What  
600 may come into play is someone building miles of fence to keep their buffalo in which totally  
601 wipes out a migration path. If you don't have some sort of underlying reason or pre-thought-out  
602 reason for the wildlife to count in this county, you won't have a leg to stand on when you're  
603 talking to big money and big organizations. Finally, for personal and private property rights. We  
604 have a ton of rules on private property. If you have a stream or irrigation ditch running across  
605 your property, you don't get to dam it up just because it's your private property. That was  
606 determined years and years ago. Wildlife are a resource too and we need to protect that now  
607 and in the future.

608  
609 Chairman Bonine said he wants to come back to address Ms. Scott's comment, he wants to be  
610 clear in the difference between this Commission and the Board of County Commissioners. Yes,  
611 the County Commissioners are elected. This Commission is not elected, this Commission is  
612 appointed. Changes to the Land Use Plan are initiated by this Commission. The potential for

## Planning & Zoning Commission Special Meeting Minutes

January 23, 2024

613 changes to future Land Use Plans and when he speaks of future commissions he speaks of this  
614 board because they are appointed, not elected. This board is the board that initiates changes to  
615 the Land Use Plan.

616  
617 Meg Sommers said as she understands it, this Commission certified the plan and sent it to the  
618 Board, and they sent it back. She asked why. Chairman Bonine said presumably the plan came  
619 back from the Board based upon public comment they received; they chose not to adopt that  
620 version. Meg said surely the Board gave some reason, some part of the plan that they didn't like  
621 that they wanted fixed. Chairman Bonine said those are the changes that are being looked at  
622 today; the 20-acre lot size minimums, using only the high density of the big game overlay.  
623 Those changes were the changes made based on the public input that the Board received. Meg  
624 said tell her where there is some hope that the big game overlay will be reinstated. Chairman  
625 Bonine said it will be a subject of discussion after the public hearing. Meg is concerned that the  
626 Board will send the plan back again. Commissioner Bonine said to clarify, this Commission can  
627 certify the plan and send it to the Board. The Board can approve the plan as submitted, they can  
628 approve the plan in part, they can exclude things from the plan they just cannot add to the plan.  
629 If they add to the plan it has to come back to this Commission. This Commission will do what  
630 they feels led to do based on the compilation of all the public comment received over the whole  
631 process. Meg also said she does not understand the fear of reinstating the entire big game  
632 overlay as an educational tool. The previous land use plan, years ago we didn't have the gift of  
633 the science that we now have to understand those things. What harm is there in educating? To  
634 leave it out due to the fear that it might later become important to someone else who might  
635 regulate it, and maybe that happens because that's important at that time. There is no harm at  
636 this juncture in educating.

637  
638 The Planning Director, Joy Hill, commented on the discussion about how a Land Use Plan can  
639 be amended. She read from the *Park County, Wyoming, 2015 Development Standards and*  
640 *Regulations (Ch.1, Sec. 9.a): Authority to Initiate: Any member of the Board, Commission,*  
641 *Planning Director, County Engineer, property owner, or resident of Park County may request*  
642 *preparation of a Land Use Plan or Plan amendment. The Board, upon being presented with a*  
643 *recommendation from the Commission, shall determine whether or not to initiate the preparation*  
644 *of a Plan or Plan amendment.*

645  
646 Laura Bell asked if it was the Commission's hope or intent to certify or not certify today.  
647 Chairman Bonine said they came in with no specific intent, not having knowledge of how many  
648 comments there would be or time needed for discussion. The Commission is wanting to move  
649 as expeditiously as they can.

650  
651 Anne Young asked for an improvement in the sound system. It is hard to hear what is being  
652 said. Commissioner Bonine said we would do our best to be sure that what is being said can be  
653 heard, but also the public comments are addressed the Commission and not the public.

654  
655 Commissioner Brandon-Wintermote made a MOTION to close the public hearing at 2:26pm.  
656 SECONDED by Commissioner Peters. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

657  
658 At 2:35pm, after a short break, the Commission reconvened to hold discussion.

- 659  
660  
661  
662  
663
- Commissioner Brandon-Wintermote asked about the big game overlay – is it the commission's intention to increase it or keep it as it is.
  - Commissioner Peters said they have taken lots and lots of comments. Everyone here has put in a pile of time trying to hear what the public is saying. They are hearing it

## Planning & Zoning Commission Special Meeting Minutes

January 23, 2024

664 loudly from both sides. He said the last rounds they went through another layer of  
665 looking at everything. I think we are getting close to right. Commissioner Peters then  
666 read from page 84 of the current Land Use Plan Draft; *A higher level of review and*  
667 *scrutiny should be placed upon on developments within the Big Game Use Overlay to*  
668 *minimize the impacts of land use activities and infrastructure improvements on big game*  
669 *populations in high use areas.* This is where they are trying to find balance from the  
670 Land Use Plan as a guideline and the regulations to follow. From what he was hearing  
671 with what was stated today, the regulations are really where it is going to come down to  
672 every single zoning district. For the information to come from those zoning districts and  
673 that's where regulations can really hit. As to where we are at as far as a guideline right  
674 now, he feels they have done a great job compromising.

- 675 - Commissioner Mair said we take that big game overlay, and we look at it as  
676 informational. What is really important is that in the permitting process we do ask  
677 comments from Game and Fish, and they are highly regarded as far as information. This  
678 other is just information that was in the plan itself. It is important to know that there is  
679 another avenue for the Game and Fish to speak about big game and we do look at that  
680 information and take it into consideration in the permitting proces.
- 681 - Commissioner Peters said he wondered if anyone recalled a discussion a few meetings  
682 ago, we tried very hard to take the big game overlay and make it educational. There was  
683 a reason from some direction that we could not put it in an educational section only.
- 684 - Commissioner Brandon-Wintermote said the document is supposed to be a guideline  
685 and not supposed to be educational. If we left the maps as they were, are we losing the  
686 quality and the completeness of the data. Are we fractionalizing this information to where  
687 it's not usable? How is that information being lost? She understands that the game goes  
688 across the low and medium. A thought process has occurred that we were not going to  
689 scrutinize the low and medium as much as we would the high density. That's the reason  
690 we went the route we did; we were looking at the future and what were we really going to  
691 do with this information.
- 692 - Commissioner Peters said he thought the overlays were supposed to be available to the  
693 public on the Planning & Zoning website. He said he wonders if the big game overlay  
694 has been filtered down to high use only on the website now. The Planning Director said  
695 what is represented in the plan is what's available to the public, the only place where the  
696 full big game overlay is shown is in the appendix where we explain the methodology  
697 used by Game & Fish to create that layer. What is available to the public is what is  
698 currently in the draft plan not what was previously there, but it is still available in the  
699 appendix to show where the information came from. Commissioner Peters wondered if  
700 Planning & Zoning could put the information in a separate location in their database to  
701 where someone could go to the Planning & Zoning website and see what the high,  
702 medium, and low use overlay was just for reference. The Planning Director said what we  
703 must be careful of is the perception of trying to impose things that are not in our rules.  
704 That would be a question for the Board of County Commissioners possibly at their  
705 hearing. The Planning Director doesn't have the discretion to choose what information is  
706 put out to the public in that regard.
- 707 - Commissioner Mair agreed about possibly putting an avenue out for the public for  
708 reference possibly by referring them back to the Game & Fish for that information.
- 709 - Chairman Bonine said he is concerned about, through the overlays, memorializing data  
710 and what is the accuracy of the data. The big game are going to go where they are going  
711 to go. He knows there are historical migration routes, but as far as localized populations,  
712 they move around. The question becomes, are we creating a map based on data and  
713 whatever guidance that's providing in a year, in two years, in five years – is it accurate

## Planning & Zoning Commission Special Meeting Minutes

January 23, 2024

- 714 data? Are we advising people based upon inaccurate data? Logistically, is there a  
715 mechanism to keep that data updated and have that map amended on a regular basis.
- 716 - Commissioner Peters said he was going through the high use zones, and he knows of  
717 some areas, when that data was collected that the species were using those areas and  
718 now the migration routes area totally different area. It does bring into question on how  
719 you use that (data) if in the future (the big game overlay) would lead to regulations.
- 720 - The Planning Director said if using the reasoning that the data could be out of date then  
721 there should be no maps and no information in the plan. Roads change, topography  
722 changes, development changes, everything changes. Land Use Plans and regulations  
723 are for a moment in time, and the reason that we have amendments is to accommodate  
724 change. We did wait 25 years to change this plan and that was maybe an error in waiting  
725 that long. We are not proposing in this plan to wait that long at all, in fact the plan in the  
726 implementation section would rather have this plan revisited every 5-10 years. We have  
727 to look at the data we have right now, we have to make decisions based on that. If  
728 something drastic changes, we have the ability to come back in and make those  
729 changes.
- 730 - Commissioner Peters said this County is very concerned about Big Game use and it  
731 would be really nice to see a strong focus on federal areas. The Planning Director  
732 mentioned the Natural Resource Management Plan, that was adopted in 2020, that  
733 specifically focuses on resources on state and federal lands. That is where the county  
734 has placed its position on public land resources specifically. That plan is referenced in  
735 the Land Use Plan.
- 736 - Commissioner Brandon-Wintermote said, in regard to the 20-acre lot sizes, when they  
737 went through this plan they questioned the 20-acre lot size minimum. They did hear to  
738 some degree that people wanted to conserve ag land. Where did the 20-acre number  
739 come from. The survey actually said from 1-3 acres, 3-35 acres and 35 acres or more. It  
740 is hard for them to hang their hat on a number that they cannot solidify. She is not in  
741 favor of having one-acre minimum lot sizes out there. That is not the intent of this plan.  
742 The Land Use Plan is a blueprint. Whether this plan is certified or not, we are not  
743 changing the zoning in these areas. That has to go through a zoning map amendment  
744 process. Just because we took the 20-acre minimum out of the plan doesn't mean we go  
745 to one-acre minimum lot sizes. Nothing changes today, there are zoning map  
746 amendments and regulation amendments that have to go along with those changes. If  
747 you are living in GR-5, it stays in GR-5 until that zoning map is changed.
- 748 - Commissioner Peters added that the regulations is where this really matters, that is  
749 where we are hoping to get extremely strong data from every zoning district that points  
750 to what those zones want.
- 751 - Commissioner Eastman said there is obviously some bad information out there. The  
752 reasoning for taking out the 20 acre minimum was we didn't want to pigeon-hole certain  
753 areas into 20 acre lots. Almost all areas in the plan were staying the same or getting  
754 larger. There was no discussion about reducing lot sizes, certainly not down to one-acre.  
755 That was his reasoning – we were going to save some of this for the reg amendment  
756 stage, where people would have input in the area where they live. Not us casting a  
757 broad brush over everyone. Before he was part of the Commission, he didn't know, and  
758 maybe many people don't realize, that Game & Fish gets to comment on every single  
759 project, even down to a simple subdivision. Having that input was more specific and  
760 granular to the each project, rather than the broad brush of an overlay that may not be  
761 correct. We didn't intend it to look like all Game and Fish input was being thrown out the  
762 window. We didn't throw out the overlay, we just reduced it to the most critical/highly  
763 used. The lower use area didn't really mean much because it covers a large portion of  
764 the County. The Game and Fish gets a lot of input and that is not going away.

## Planning & Zoning Commission Special Meeting Minutes

January 23, 2024

- 765 - The Planning Director clarified the Big Game Overlay and the meaning of high, medium  
766 and low use. Low use is not intended to cover every place where you might see a deer,  
767 an elk or an antelope. The Big Game Overlay as a whole is the most critical areas for  
768 wildlife. The low use area is looking at the lowest use of the most critical area, the  
769 medium use is looking at the medium use of the most critical areas. It's not the lowest  
770 use of the County, it's the lowest use of what was found to be the most important. The  
771 methodology for the Big Game Overlay is included in the appendices.
- 772 - Commissioner Bonine asked what is the appetite for making modifications to the  
773 adoption draft. Commissioner Brandon-Wintermote asked if anyone wanted to make a  
774 change. Chairman Bonine said if there are changes, they should be incorporated into a  
775 motion.
- 776 o Chairman Peters said there's been a lot of input to get it where it's at right now.
  - 777 o Commissioner Brandon-Wintermote said she wishes they could keep the low,  
778 medium and high use overlays in some form, without losing it. It sounds like it  
779 being in the appendix makes it available for educational purposes.
  - 780 o Chairman Bonine said the appendix and information are not largely referenced  
781 anywhere. Are we expecting people to be compelled to find the information  
782 themselves.
- 783

784 Commissioner Peters made a MOTION to adopt/certify the current draft of the Land Use Plan  
785 (2024 adoption draft). SECONDED by Commissioner Mair. Commissioner Bonine sought a  
786 reading of the specific findings to adopt the plan. Commissioner Peters amended his motion to  
787 include the findings for approval:  
788

- 789 1. The updated Plan meets the general purpose of creating coordinated and harmonious  
790 development of the area under study and of the county as a whole;
  - 791 2. The Plan promotes the health, safety, prosperity, and general welfare of the county's  
792 residents, as well as promotes efficiency and economy in the use of land and its natural  
793 resources;
  - 794 3. The plan encourages a well-balanced, prosperous economy for Park County;
  - 795 4. The plan preserves and enhances Park County's unique character and protects its  
796 natural environment; and
  - 797 5. The maps and text of the updated Plan form the whole of the Plan, which replaces the  
798 1998 Park County Land Use Plan.
- 799

800 The Planning & Zoning Commission hereby certifies and recommends approval of the 2024 Park  
801 County Land Use Plan, the signature of the Chairman of the Planning and Zoning Commission,  
802 which is affixed to this Resolution, shall serve as certification of all maps in the updated Plan and  
803 serve the same purpose as affixing the Chairman's signature to each map in the updated Plan.  
804 This Resolution shall supersede any previous Planning and Zoning Commission resolutions  
805 related to the adoption or certification of a Land Use Plan for Park County. Resolution 2024-04.  
806

807 Commissioner Mair SECONDED the amended motion. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.  
808

809 Commissioner Brandon-Wintermote made a MOTION to adjourn the special meeting at 3:03pm.  
810 SECONDED by Commissioner Peters. Motion carried.

811 Respectfully submitted,  
812

813   
814 \_\_\_\_\_  
815 Erika Decker, Secretary



**RESOLUTION 2024-04**  
**PARK COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
**TITLE: RESOLUTION FOR THE CERTIFICATION OF THE**  
**2024 PARK COUNTY LAND USE PLAN**

**WHEREAS**, the Park County (“County”) Board of Commissioners (“Board”) initiated the process to update the 1998 Park County Land Use Plan (“1998 Plan”) in fall of 2021 by seeking and selecting a professional consultant team, Clarion Associates along with T-O Engineers and EPS, (“Consultant”) to facilitate development of a new Park County Land Use Plan (“2023 LUP”) and established a project team consisting of members of the Board, Planning and Zoning Department Staff and the Consultant;

**WHEREAS**, in March and April of 2022, to facilitate data and information sharing and garner a clear understanding of existing conditions in the County, the project team hosted 17 focus groups with over 75 participants representing a wide range of interests including: agriculture; arts, history and culture; conservation districts; development community; economic development and tourism; education/youth; environment and conservation; irrigation districts; municipalities; public land agencies; real estate representatives; utilities and infrastructure; Yellowstone Regional Airport; high school students from each school district; and students from Northwest College;

**WHEREAS**, the Board established a Land Use Plan Advisory Committee (“LUPAC”), consisting of 16 individuals from around Park County who represented different communities (the 12 planning areas in particular), geographies, and interests (e.g., agriculture, real estate, commercial/industrial, environmental and economics), to gather and share citizen perspectives and input at various stages during the 2023 LUP development process;

**WHEREAS**, the project team established a Technical Working Group (“TWG”), comprised of dozens of representatives from Park County departments, districts and service providers, municipal, state and federal agency partners, and special interest groups, and convened the TWG at key points during the 2023 LUP development process;

**WHEREAS**, the project team conducted a Vision and Values Survey in April of 2022, and over 700 respondents weighed in on what is working well in Park County today, what could be improved with respect to housing and development, economy, recreation, natural environment, and quality of life in the future, and what their vision is for the future of the County and the twelve individual planning areas in the County;

**WHEREAS**, the project team held three rounds of public engagement (a total of 11 in-person meetings, two virtual meetings, and two additional online surveys) to solicit input from the general public regarding work products produced at various stages during the 2023 LUP development process (June-July 2022, October 2022 and February-March 2022);

**WHEREAS**, one or more members of the Planning and Zoning Commission were present at each round of public meetings, participated in/attended other meetings offered throughout

the 2023 LUP development process, and were provided the opportunity to review and comment on various work products and drafts of the 2023 LUP;

**WHEREAS**, the Planning and Zoning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing to hear public comment and consider certification of the 2023 LUP at a special meeting on May 24, 2023, which was continued to June 21, 2023, and resolved to certify the 2023 LUP subject to changes by Resolution 2023-23 on June 21, 2023;

**WHEREAS**, the Board of County Commissioners held a workshop with the Planning and Zoning Commission on July 11, 2023 to seek clarification of the proposed changes and the contents of the resolution and agreed, alongside the Planning and Zoning Commission, to make changes to certain language in the 2023 LUP to address concerns of the Commission and the general public;

**WHEREAS**, at their regular meeting on July 19, 2023, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted to certify the 2023 LUP, with the agreed upon changes, by Resolution 2023-27;

**WHEREAS**, the Board of County Commissioners held a public hearing on October 3, 2023 to hear public testimony and consider endorsing and approving the 2023 LUP;

**WHEREAS**, based upon concerns of the public, the Board denied endorsement and approval of the 2023 LUP at their regular meeting on October 17, 2023;

**WHEREAS**, on October 25 and November 7, 2023, the Board and Planning and Zoning Commission met to discuss potential changes, which the Planning and Zoning Commission finalized at their regular meeting on December 13, 2023, and the new Adoption Draft of the Land Use Plan (hereafter referred to as the 2024 Park County Land Use Plan) was released for public review on December 21, 2023;

**WHEREAS**, the Planning and Zoning Commission held a duly noticed special meeting on January 23, 2024 to hold a public hearing and consider public testimony and written comments on the updated adoption draft of the 2024 Park County Land Use Plan;

**WHEREAS**, based on the foregoing, the Park County Planning and Zoning Commission finds the following to be true:

1. The updated Plan meets the general purpose of creating coordinated and harmonious development of the area under study and of the county as a whole;
2. The Plan promotes the health, safety, prosperity, and general welfare of the County's residents, as well as promotes efficiency and economy in the use of land and its natural resources;
3. The Plan encourages a well-balanced, prosperous economy for Park County;
4. The Plan preserves and enhances Park County's unique character and protects its natural environment;

Certification of the 2024 Park County Land Use Plan

5. The maps and text of the updated Plan form the whole of the Plan, which replaces the 1998 Park County Land Use Plan; and

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, the Park County Planning and Zoning Commission hereby certifies and recommends approval of the 2024 Park County Land Use Plan.

**FURTHER, BE IT KNOWN**, the signature of the Chairman of the Planning and Zoning Commission, which is affixed to this Resolution, shall serve as certification of all maps in the updated Plan and serve the same purpose as affixing the Chairman's signature to each map in the updated Plan. This Resolution shall supersede any previous Planning and Zoning Commission resolutions related to the adoption or certification of a Land Use Plan for Park County.

By the Park County Planning and Zoning Commission.

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
PARK COUNTY, WYOMING**

**ATTEST:**



Duncan Bonine, Chairman



Erika Decker, Secretary

1/26/2024

Date



## ***Park County Planning & Zoning Department***

*Mailing Address & Phone #:*

*1002 Sheridan Avenue, Suite 109  
Cody, WY 82414-3550  
307-527-8540 or 307-754-8540*

*Temporary Physical Address:*

*1501 Stampede Avenue  
Suite 2201  
Cody, WY 82414*

---

### **PARK COUNTY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

**Meeting 12:00 P.M., Tuesday, January 23, 2024** in the  
Grizzly Room at the Park County Library  
1500 Heart Mountain Street, Cody, WY.

This is a special meeting of the Park County Planning & Zoning Commission which is open to the public. For more information, please contact the Park County Planning & Zoning Department at 307-527-8540, 307-754-8540, or 1-800-786-2844.

### **AGENDA**

**[PUBLIC HEARING – Consider Certification of the 2024 Park County Land Use Plan](#)**

### **ADJOURN**

# PLEASE SIGN IN

## PLANNING and ZONING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING: PARK COUNTY LAND USE PLAN January 23, 2024

	Please <b>PRINT</b> your name	<b>IF INTERESTED:</b> Email Address for Park County Land Use Plan updates
1	Marion Morrison	theduchess@tftwest.net
2	Donna Merkel	donna1m99@gmail.com
3	Audrene Sims	audrene@branson.net
4	Connie King	Seague52@gmail.com
5	Margaret Lohman	lohman22 margaret@yahoo.com
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		
31		
32		

1  
no

# PLEASE SIGN IN

## PLANNING and ZONING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING: PARK COUNTY LAND USE PLAN January 23, 2024

	Please <b>PRINT</b> your name	<b>IF INTERESTED:</b> Email Address for Park County Land Use Plan updates
1	LAURA BELL	lbellwyoine@gmail.com
2	Bret Allard	sunlightbasin104@gmail
3	Deanna Allard	✓ ✓ ✓
4	DEBBIE VELEZ	
5	Colin Simpson	
6	Adam George	
8	Jude Baymper	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		
31		
32		

NO  
NO  
NO  
NO

# PLEASE SIGN IN

## PLANNING and ZONING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING: PARK COUNTY LAND USE PLAN January 23, 2024

	Please <b>PRINT</b> your name	IF INTERESTED: Email Address for Park County Land Use Plan updates
	1 CHUCK WALKER	CHUCKWALKER3@GMAIL.COM
	2 Alexandra Kirk	
NO	3 Kathleen Carkowski	
	4 BOB SAVALLA	_____
NO	5 <del>Alex</del> Charles Kirk	
	6 Doug Wachob	wachobdoug@gmail.com
	8 Zu Tofu	
NO	9 Eugene D. Spiering	
NO	10 Lloyd Thiel	
	11 Moo Sommel's	
	12 MARY Ramsey	<del>maryr</del>
	13 Terry Gardeyline	
	14 John MCGEE	
	15 Josh Metten	Jmetten@trcp.org
?	16 Bill Pilgrim	
	17 Dona Becker	sparksda@live.com
NO	18 <del>Charlie Moore</del>	
NO	19 Alex Few	alex@jhlandtrust.org
	20 Rebekah Burns	
NO	21 Olivia Berger	conservecody3@gmail.com
NO	22 Tony Murphy	tony@kemaxelevation.com
NO	23 Kah Wellia	
NO	24 Ben Wellia	
	25 Jennu DeSarro	JDeSarro@gmail.com
NO	26 Pia Parks	
	27	
	28	
	29	
	30	
	31	
	32	

# PLEASE SIGN IN

## PLANNING and ZONING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING: PARK COUNTY LAND USE PLAN January 23, 2024

NO  
NO  
NO  
NO  
NO  
NO  
NO  
NO  
NO  
NO  
?  
NO  
NO  
?  
?  
?  
?

	Please <b>PRINT</b> your name	<b>IF INTERESTED:</b> Email Address for Park County Land Use Plan updates
1	Patsy Eyde - Gary	
2	Kyle Parnick	on your list
3	Sue Lyka	
4	Nic Parrich	
5	Sabrina Crewe.	
6	Kala Spradlin	kala@revcody.com
8	Donna Hrabie	edhrabie@tarwest.net
9	Ann Murphy	annmurphy48@gmail.com
10	Sesh Short	
11	Tracy LaFollette	
12	TERRIE MARY	
13	Sue Casola - Murphy	kmmsem@gmail.com
14	BRIAN CLARKSON	
15	DAVE SKIFFZ	
16	Pat Ophim	
17	CARMEN HORNE - MINTYME	conserevcody@gmail.com
18	Kelly Jensen	kellyaj@dresnan.net
19	MARSHALL DOMINICK	
20	Faith Model	faithmodel@yahoo.com
21	Aimee Jones	
22	Emily Reid	
23	Aimee Young	ayoung@sagecreektrails.com
24	M. Alquist	
25	KRISTIN FONG	
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		
31		
32		



# PLEASE SIGN IN

## PLANNING and ZONING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING: PARK COUNTY LAND USE PLAN January 23, 2024

	Please <b>PRINT</b> your name	<b>IF INTERESTED:</b> Email Address for Park County Land Use Plan updates
1	Druce Shackelford	bshackw@ymail.com
2	Mary McKinney	mary_nps@yahoo.com
3	Sharon Rosen	strfitness88@gmail.com
4	Abby Scott	abby.mellinger.scott@gmail.com
NO- 5	RICHARD RIDGWAY	kap Ridgway@gmail.com
6	Alex Aguirre	aaguirre@trp.org
8	DAVE McMillan	dave@highcountrylife.net
9	Kelly Spiering	
10	PHILIP CAMPBELL	
NO 11	Janet Kempner	Kempner100@gmail.com
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		
31		
32		