

Bill Moser

(gives name and address) I'm astounded at the incompetence that was just delivered here. The people of Park County and the people of the United States spent 7 million dollars plus on the Upper Yellowstone Task Force which contains more information than you would ever want to have and these people never looked at it. All the water data, the drainage, etc. It's all there and they never bothered to get out of their chairs and look at it. I'd like to thank you for holding this meeting at a time in which the average Livingston and Park County worker is busy at their workplace so that the data that is collected here tonight, along with the data that obviously has been collected by various means in the past is all skewed towards the trust babies and the retirees, etc. and the average worker doesn't have either the information that the meeting is happening whereas certain subgroups pass this information amongst themselves and they all show up and the net result is that what's stated here is skewed to a point that it is invalid for the entire County. Those people that have interests and whatever, they have no idea that this is happening because of poorly provided appraisal of what's going on, or left out of the whole dialogue completely and for that I'm going to invoke the words of the 9th verse of the Chapter of Jude, Yahweh rebuke thee.

Leslie Figel

Hi Leslie Figel I'm the Director of the Chamber of Commerce and Visitor's Bureau here in Livingston. I want to speak in regards to Objective 12.5.1 in reference to vacation short-term rentals. (gives Address) In specific this is something I want to speak on, two months ago we had a meeting for the tourism advisory council down in Gardiner speaking on this very issue on the short-term rentals, something that's come up also in Bozeman as well to do a temporary moratorium, so it sparked interest on too many vacation rentals and not enough rentals for the whole citizens. There's one aspect of this I would really like to speak about and give to the general public is there's a lot of folks that don't understand that a short-term rental brings in more money to our economy. The taxes are still there, they spend more money at local restaurants, they spend more money at local grocery stores, the gas stations because it's people from outside the communities. They spend more money because the taxes are still being paid, the mortgages are still being paid, this is actually a good thing for our community. Now we do have a lot of these short term rentals that are folks that do live here half of the year and Texas is one of our number one states. We have snowbirds that live down there and come up here in the nice season so these are local residents as well. This is something that is actually so good for our economy, developing new business, bringing in developers to produce new homes. This is something that we want to work towards instead of chastising the short term rental market. This is also something that Gardiner is very passionate about as well. The short term rental market is extremely important for our County. If all of the businesses crashed like they did 16 years ago, the tourists still come, the economy still stayed strong, they still get gas. The number one expenditure here in Park County is gas, number two is retail, and number three is short-term rentals and hotels. If you add those together they become number 2, or twenty percent of our economy. This is something that is extremely important for us to not place a moratorium on. Number 2 the tourism advisory council two months ago, the governor's office was there and you know this is a legislative year, the Governor Bullock back in April this year announced that community infrastructure was something that was a huge crisis in the state of Montana. The office of Tourism now they are cooperating with the department of commerce and business development they are looking at the bed tax which is generated through tourism at the hotels for those of you who don't know. This 45 comes back to the convention and visitor's bureau which is used for marketing here in our community to keep the tourism market strong here and the other part which is 3% is something the department of commerce actually uses for other types of marketing and what not. They are looking at using this 3% to put back into the infrastructure which is roads and water, sewer, everything else. So I just wanted to kind of clear that up these are things at the state level that are being looked at and there is a lot of funding that comes from those short term rentals and tourism in Park County.

Linda Gibson

(gives name) I'd love to thank the board for holding this meeting. A little over a year ago I was given notice to vacate my rental where I was living. I'm a renter not a property owner. My family goes back to Calamity Jane. Our family came over from Norway to Livingston to work on the railroad. There's a silent epidemic going on with all due respect to Leslie we need to stop and put a freeze on rental property being turned into vacation rentals. We need to freeze it. I was given sixty days' notice by my land lady because of my circumstances and she was very understanding. (Peter asked that the GP be addressed) Yes, its number 6 on that second slide policy issues. Anyway, I was almost in a situation where I had to move out of Park County because there was no housing available for me as a single person. One or two-bedroom rental. I am a small business owner, I have pretty good housekeeping. I have been a small business owner since 1981. I clean whether its commercial or residential properties, so I do clean vacation rentals as well as regular homes. What is happening is people are being encouraged to take their rental property or turn it into vacation rentals or whatever and we are slowly losing available housing for the people that want to stay here and I do know a number of situations where people literally had to move to White Sulphur Springs because there was nothing here. A community is made up of multicolored fabric and I have watched Livingston change more in my 63 years than probably the whole history of Livingston. It's beautiful what is happening but we need to leave the local flavor here instead of focusing on the income because the income will always be here. There two things that created Livingston the railroad and Yellowstone Park. In fact, the railroad is what promoted us as the original and first entrance to Yellowstone Park but I don't think it's right that we turn into a community where we are just constantly rolling over vacation rentals. I felt bad that the Delmar hotel was turned into a business complex. I would like to encourage us to build more housing for temporary tourism and we can't deny Livingston the two heart beats in Livingston have been tourism, railroad, tourism, railroad and that changed in the 1980's but we don't want to lose our local people who are on a modest income who can't afford to buy and drop anchor here but the people that live here I think it's very serious. I don't know if there is anyone from HRDC here but we are in a silent epidemic where people have to move for one reason or another and there's not available housing and I would like to see a freeze on taking the existing, just the existing housing and turning it and putting a freeze on it (Peter stated the GP call for the County to look at this and there will be a more expansive discussion) Thank you very much. (gives address) Thank you very much, that's a huge relief.

Ken Cochran

(Gives name and address) I participated in the online comment portion of your gathering information. I would like to make a few additional comments. I would first like to comment, I commend the County for keeping an open and transparent community approach to planning for our future. The Draft that has been presented clearly indicates that it is a non-regulatory long range plan that identifies key social, physical, economic issues and I thank Andrew and Land Use Solutions for giving us the structure we need to go forward here today. The draft statement discloses that the enabling legislation that the Growth Policy was created on was enacted in 1999. That's correct, however; it didn't state that the 1999 enabling legislation made slight modifications to the state's much older authorizing statutes based upon planning laws developed in the 1920's. Thus what we are dealing with here today is over 90 years of history in Montana, to let the people of this County choose where and how they want to live, to work, want to play by participating in the planning of this County's growth development. The draft statement further states it is the policy of this plan to address major issues facing Park County. We're here today to discuss and hopefully get a recommendation for a Growth Policy, we are not here today to enact any ordinance. We currently have the 19, 2008 Park County Growth Policy which as required by law, needs to be reviewed and revised as necessary. We are here to do that. This is the process we are engaged in now and it's a continuation of our commitment by Park County citizens that we previously made to opt into the commitment for long term planning by establishing goals and principles and policies to direct the future development in this County. We'll do that by implementing policies that promote efficient, sustainable development including in my opinion, the requirement that new development pays for the services it requests, to optimize our prior infrastructure investments, to protect property rights, and to support local choice. I really like goal 7 giving us better broadband because we all know it's terrible. The areas dealt with in the draft statement and in our ultimate growth policy statement includes natural resources, land use, population metrics, housing needs, economic conditions, facility and local services. Those are all required by law, they are not the result of any special interest group's private agenda. Our community by having a growth policy statement in the past and updating it this time has accepted the responsibility and the opportunity of designing our own vision statement. If you're out in Montana each County that has a growth policy has provided its citizens with the framework for comprehensive community understand and that's why we are here today and you better understand what we are doing and give directives to our Commissioner's for County growth. This mechanism is the best statutory tool that is available for the implementation of County Growth Policies and it foster's a community approach. An inclusive, citizen participation in all levels of planning to accommodate diversity while promoting equality and community. With the community involved, and I wish we'd get a bigger facility so we could have more people here participating, we'll formulate actions with specifics if necessary to obtain the general goals set forth in the Growth policy over the course of the next 10 to 20 years. This comprehensive and responsible approach to our growth and this planning can only result in the delivery of dynamic, attractive communities for citizen consumers. (Peter interjects stating time is up) It can also provide a powerful tool for preserving farmland, open space, and habitat preservation resulting in the enhanced quality of land that we all want. Each of the citizens (buzzer) I'm closing. So I endorse the Growth Policy plan and request that the Park County Planning and Development Board adopt and send a resolution to the County Commissioners to approve and adopt this plan and that we the citizens of Park County work together with our Commissioners, County staff and consultants to formulate and adopt appropriate enabling policies.

Eric Hoiness

(gives name and address) Just listening to people up here and listening to the Board. I just wanted to make one recommendation that might be a good idea. Simplify it and make it easy for people to understand. I've seen Growth Policies before that were bigger than some books I've read. Make it easy, make it simple. It may sound silly but if you have agricultural community come in here and they have something that is 2 inches thick they are going to look at it and say I'm not going to read this; I don't like it. But if you have something that is specific, simple, easy; They'll say ok. It's not specific what I am saying, it's just giving you guys an idea so Thank you.

Jessica Wilcox

(gives name and address) I am going to change the topic to food. I am the food and nutrition services manager of Livingston health Care and I want to speak specifically about Objective 14.5 about identify areas of agricultural importance and implement mechanisms in these areas that support the ability of landowners to continue operation. I would like to suggest that we include not only existing ag land in our assessment but also potential development of ag land in or either rural or urban. I believe in a strong resilient food system in Park County. I am hoping that when we do develop this Growth Policy we consider areas where we could grow more food for our community making it more resilient. We have a very strong farm to institution program at Livingston healthcare in our hospital, we also have a growing and thriving farm to school program as well, we also uniquely have a food processing facility here within our food resource center. So I would like to suggest that we consider areas within the County and within the City where we can continue to grow food for our community making a resilient food system.

Peter McKenzie

Thank you for conducting this meeting, I appreciate it (gives name and address). I don't know how many people in this room were involved with the 2008 process. It started in 2005 I was on the task force dealing with the East Interchange. It was basically a lawsuit, I won't get into the details but it morphed into the comprehensive plan and then went to the Growth Policy. Backing up Bill and the gentleman that just spoke I am just blown away with how little public participation there's been in this process today. Back then in 2008 we met for ten months every other week. Two to three hundred people participated and I hear that you have 40 people interviewed, I don't know how many people went online. The real saddening part was at the end of it they took all the recommendations from the majority of the people and then a certain few people, and I use a nice word, played hanky panky with it and defied they will of the people. I see this going on right here, that document was 35 pages long, now its seventy-five pages. To that gentleman's point, it needs to be simple and you need to be listening to the people. Cause I'm here now, but I just found out about this meeting yesterday and I've been involved a lot. I know you all, some of those that see me don't particularly like to see me but the bottom line is there's property rights and I hear you guys want to zone the entire Park County and if that's the case you're going to have a big fight on your hands. I expect this process to go accordingly, what should have been the will of the people who want to be heard. Thank you very much.

Greg Brainard

(gives name and address) I don't have any specific items to address just kind of a global view of the Growth Policy here. I don't know how many people here read it but it was a pretty tough read. A lot of fuzzy language in there. I'm one of these people that likes to know exactly what's going to happen, why we're going to do it and when we're going to do it. Couple of items did really jump out at me. It guides the planning and the development, sounds pretty reasonable. The extent of the planning is up to the local governing body, that makes a lot of sense. County wide planning, that's where it starts to scare me a little bit. The reason it scares me is because if anybody looks to what the district is like, there's 15,000 people in the County 7,300 live in the city of Livingston. The districts are drawn so that they all come together right down here on Yellowstone and Park Street so you've got about a third of Livingston in each one of the District. 2,500 people out of Livingston are really seriously weighing what goes on with our County Commissioners. What it amounts to is people in the City of Livingston approve the County Commissioners. County Commissioners are going to approve this plan and, which really means people in the City of Livingston get to determine how the rest of the County is zoned. That's worrisome. Where it gets real scary is that line that property rights are inclusive. I see my neighbor Manny over here, I have absolutely no rights to what Manny does on his land, Manny has no rights to what I do on my land. If people in the City want to have zoning, that's great. But' I don't want the people in the City to try and impose City zoning on the people that are out in the rural sections of the County. I would really like to see something written in there to where we have some protection out of the County from what the people from the City want to have.

Anne Hallowell

(Gives name and address) I wanted to say I did notice that in the report there is nothing about figuring out the cost of subdivision regulations. Everybody's concerned about affordable housing and the cost of building houses, part of that cost is regulation. It used to be that you would have an acre or two and you came down here and within a month your neighbor's kid had a house, a place to build a house. Now it takes months and you have to hire specialists, etc. So here in your plan you do discuss changes, possibly changing subdivision regulations, so I think you should consider the cost of the regulations and that might also help you out with figuring out availability of housing. To the topic of the rental housing which was objective 12 and it says you are going to evaluate the benefits. I don't believe that County should be micromanaging private business. I think that is not fair for people. I would certainly hope that they basically stay out of private business. You're supposed to be encouraging it. And lastly I find the same question that the other gentleman just said I think it's on page 52, I am sorry I don't know what section. It's at the very end of the report. It has a little blurb about County and the City and it says that the Growth Policy planning context of Montana, the jurisdiction of Park County covers unincorporated areas of the County, unincorporated communities. Now in your Monkey Survey and in your stakeholder survey you have taken comment from individuals who reside in the incorporated City of Livingston and incorporated City of Clyde Park. No offense to their comments but their input is not supposed to be part of this. Back in 2014 when we did Monkey Survey, I came before you and I said the same question, why are people who are out of the jurisdiction allowed to be making comment. It was used in what would become possibly regulations for the rest of us. The rest of us would have to bear the new regulations and tax burdens that will be formed by this pool of basically diluted information. I find that very upsetting because here I am again two years later and on the Monkey Survey that you did this time that you posted online the results you could see by just counting down the names because the people listed their residences, and I didn't count PO Boxes because I myself have a PO Box in Livingston so I know that doesn't determine really where you live. But there were in the city addresses, at least twenty-five percent of the respondents and in that survey you only had a hundred and something, barely a hundred and something respondents. That's a big part of the people so I hope it doesn't take another two years before you change your methodology so you are representing the County. And, oh sorry, one other thing the Park Conservation District sent in some written comments and I just want to say I endorse those comments as well. They were more technical than I knew about and I appreciate that they sent something in areas that I was unable to speak to. Thank you.

Tammy Lewis

(gives name and address) So first of all I just want to thank you guys for doing the Growth Policy. There was an exuberant amount of work that was put into that. Anybody that looks at that can clearly see. I am talking about the objectives and the goals to obtain the objectives. The only thing that I would like to speak to is 12.5 having to do with rental properties. I have several rental properties in Livingston and I would prefer that no one can tell me that I couldn't short-term rent those properties out if I wanted to. I think it is important to protect the rights of people that own property in Livingston and Park County and if we choose to use them as Air B&Bs that's our prerogative as property owners. It's like Greg said, I don't want somebody else telling me what I can and can't do with my property. So I would really appreciate that when you guys take that into consideration you think about that particular objective and goal and then the other one is the subdivision goal I believe that is number nine. When they put the subdivision below my personal property and Montana statute does state that any growth, that the County and City are required by law to provide services; fire, ambulance and so forth. I think that's important. The taxes that were generated from the subdivision that was put below me I was told would not cover the cost of the increase of people that they needed to protect. So I think that it is important that that is something else that you guys follow through with. Thank you.

Marty Malone

(gives name and address) This draft document is clearly a result of a consultant's interpretation of what they heard from the private citizens or those that took the time to show up at the meetings. I have concerns that the meeting formats were not consistent and two different individuals presented at the meetings that were held across Park County. The Growth policy as a document is supposed to address the major issues in Park County. Two major issues that were not addressed were public safety and County budget. Number one concern in Park County is public safety be it law enforcement, search and rescue, volunteer fire departments, and communication issues. There are hundreds of thousands of visitors that pass through this County every year and nearly a million go to Yellowstone. Each one of those individuals has an expectation that if they need an emergency responder one will be there in a matter of minutes. Radio communications is very critical for these people. There are many dead areas in Park County that need to be addressed. It takes a substantial amount of time and money to solve this and Park County is very dependent on the Federal government for a substantial amount of its budget. Also we need to address this and see how we are going to live without Federal monies when they change the budget and it's not there. I have significant concerns with the questionnaire and the broad projections made by the consultant. Out of 180 questionnaires returned only 117 indicated name and address and 28 of those indicated they live in the City of Livingston. I cannot agree with the consultant's conclusion that the majority of Park County's rural landowners agree that the County should go ahead with active land use regulation based on that questionnaire. A more statistically relevant survey needs to be done. Park County staff should not be, on page 12 objective 2.2., Park County staff should not be spending tax dollars determining where wildlife corridors occur that's FWPs issue. Page 13 objective 4.1 consultant did not include state agencies who also have cooperative status with County governments. Page 17, 6.2.2 surface and groundwater are property rights and are protected by state statute, County commission has no business tell water right holders how to manage their water. Page 20, clearly the consultant has interpreted that trails and active recreation facilities are much more important than roads since there are several action items for goal 8 and goal 9 to include roads. The citizens of rural Park County depend on the quality vehicle road system for work and transportation of goods and services. Several action items need to be included in Goal 9. Bike trails and recreation paths should never take precedence over quality roads and bridges. Page 27, objective 12.4 extension economic development should be the priority department in working with the public to develop affordable housing. The County should not be in the direct business of providing affordable housing. The County does need to support and encourage private enterprise and nonprofits to provide this housing. Page 28, Action 12.5.1 an organization such as UM or Headwater Economics would be better suited to look at the impacts of short-term rentals. Page 33, Action 13.1.1&2 the word must should replace the, the word should should be replaced with the word must for the County Attorney. Page 33, Action 14.1.1, I oppose using tax revenue model to restrict land development opportunities. Let the market and individual land owners decide. This is a property rights issue. Page 34, Objective 14.5 we the County has no business determining what lands are critical agricultural importance and restricting development on those acres. That's a property right, private property right issue. Owners of the land should be the entity deciding whether or not to keep the land in Ag, not the government. On page 38, planning approach I believe the consultant took liberty with interpreting the questionnaire to interpret that the majority of the citizens living outside the City of Livingston wish to have their property zoned or active management held by County government. I do agree that there may be some neighborhoods that wish this, but that is their choice and it shouldn't be County wide zoning. Thank you.

Rick Lamplugh

Well that's a hard person to follow (gives name and address). First I want to thank you for all this work that's gone into this plan, it obviously a contentious issue and I think you are doing a good job with what you're doing. A couple things I want to address. One is the idea of growth. When I think about growth the first thing that I, as a Gardiner resident, the first thing I wonder is where are people going to live? It's a real, as the consultant spoke to, it's a real issue in Gardiner. I'm not one to say that I want to interfere with what somebody does with their private property, but as a community member I have to tell you we have teachers at Gardiner High School that have to commute from Livingston because they can't find a place to live in Gardiner. That's just one example. So something needs to be, that needs to be dealt with. I am not sure how to deal with it but I want to tell you as a resident and a homeowner there it is a crisis. Secondly, as the County grows, I want to see Park County's rural character protected but I also want to see us recruit good paying jobs to supplement jobs in ranching and agriculture. Park County as the vision statement says is a place where the natural environment is a source of economic diversity and jobs. Businesses providing high paying jobs like to locate in communities with the quality of life such as we have here. This means that we have to protect our County's water and access to public lands and we got to promote more connectivity between communities, and we must create more open space with trails. I would like the Growth Policy to empower the Commission to have a say when local communities are threatened by industrial mining interests, or multinational companies that want to develop our natural resources. The reason gold mine controversy has made the need for a community's say very clear. I want to see Park County map and protect wildlife corridors and under goal 2 of the interagency governmental coordination I would like to see included the words Park County promotes coexistence with wildlife. It's a little different than saying we want to reduce human-wildlife conflicts. I think those two are different concepts. Finally, the growth is coming, one other thing a Growth Policy should have a paragraph in the property rights section that acknowledges that one property owner's rights don't supersede or deny someone else's rights. Finally, growth is coming and we need a say in how our community grows, without a plan we are vulnerable to out of state residents deciding what's best for Park County.

Susan Nelson

(gives name and address) I want to thank you guys for the work you have been putting into this. I guess I'm kind of confused, I worked on the last Growth Policy along with several people too. I did vote on the online survey, I thought when I did that it was just kind of a vague overview so I didn't really look into it because in my opinion I wait for the document to be written and that is where I figure the process starts. I feel like the documents just been put out, now is the time you need to come back, you need to break these communities into and go back to where they have the document in front of them and start. I really believe in a round table process. I don't believe in, I think this is ok, I believe in breaking your County into groups like we did before so that you get kind of little communities and you sit down in a round table and you have a discussion. You talk, you respond, you come back. WE really got a lot of feedback so people could give their reasoning when they said stuff and it's just, at the starting of it to just kind of give your idea on a webpage is kind of a general we didn't know where to go, but now the document is written I think is now the start of the process. Please just understand that we like, as far as I'm concerned, little communities, we like some people from the East, we like some people from the South, in littler things where our opinions are felt like we are being hard is kind of the way I think we should start this.

Sue Martin

(gives name) I talked to Marty Malone about what I had to say today and he thought that I should be heard out so if I go over the five minutes please excuse me. I have been involved with planning for a really long time. I am a navy wife, my husband is a native born in Park County and when I lived in San Diego I had the privilege of working with the district in downtown San Diego that runs along the coastal lines all the way to the border. (Peter requested that comment be directed to the Growth Policy) I wanted to give you my background so you know where I am coming from because I think it's important to know that I am not just fallen off the nut tree. Anyway, I have a lot of background I have sat in your position for some months and weeks. I have worked and I have been involved in a planning department until I got removed by Larry Lahren when he excused all of us and then the process started falling apart at that point. I think that when you talked to a few people early on they were saying the same thing. When I read this policy I was kind of taken aback a little bit. I think the policy itself is not all that bad but there are some issues and I think they have been stated over and over today about the City telling the County what to do, the zoning issues that might involve farm land and what we envision it to be, in what used to be the doughnut so that has gone away that has been a really, but in reading this I saw a lot of conversation about what was going on in Gardiner but I didn't see what was going to happen in Clyde Park or Wilsall or other areas of the County. As Sue just said before me she had the same issues that I do. That we need to work with this as a group and in my preparation of coming today I talked to dozens of people telling them and they didn't even know that you guys were working on this thing. You put it in the legals and that's the part of the paper they don't read or they don't get the paper anymore so it's not out there for people to know when, where and why. That needs to happen. One of the things that I noticed in the last, just few years is the traffic in Livingston and it hasn't been addressed, but I am encouraging that you work with the City of Livingston, the State of Montana on some of those issues and look at putting one way streets in here. This summer was horrible and we had record crowds at the Park so that's probably why we had that, those that come into the Park. You couldn't get off main street; you couldn't get down Park Street. When people had been fighting to get across to the Northside hill because there was no access because the buildup from the railroad and the fifth street crossing. All of that impacted all of us on the North side of town and we've been begging for years to get that fixed. Put some effort into some of these appearances of becoming a city, it doesn't have to change the look of our buildings, it doesn't have to impact the businesses, it could enhance the businesses if more people would stay. I get so frustrated some days when I'm just going to the grocery store and I have been waiting at all these intersections and lights just to get through town and I see more people in front of me I just turn and go to Bozeman. I don't want to fight this fight anymore, I want to have a community that works and it's not working right now. We've seen a lot of bandaid fixes and little additions here and there, we've had hundreds of people killed on our roads going to the Park. That park road should be two lanes or at least have a grand series of turn lanes and passing lanes and things like that so that the people can come and go as they need to. Its not fair the underpass for B street is a safety and health risk. It could be that a big part of your correction from the north side homes. (Peter stated that most of these are City issues and not specifically in the County Growth Policy) Well, they do affect me so it is part of the Growth Policy cause I come down that way. Now I came, I was going home the other day, this is an example, I sat forty five minutes at the exit (timer goes off) going across by the City shops. I called the city 911 (Peter informed her the time was up) Yea well alright, the road was blocked at fifth street it was blocked at the passage cause it was full of water and the crossing was crossed. So there was no way unless I went clear out on 89 on Old Clyde Park Road to get back in town.

So those things are County issues and they need to be addressed. (Peter requested that she continue her comments after everyone gets an initial chance to comment due to time constraints) I understand but they are all interrelated. I can do that. I got a page and a half left that won't take long to finish. That's fine.

Charlotte Freeman

(gives name and address) I am a newcomer to Livingston, I've only been here 14 years at this point so I hope that you'll take my comments into consideration. I am one of the people that you guys say you all want to attract to Livingston. I brought a good high tech job that I have been working out remotely. SO the broadband issue has been a big issue for me, it's been a real problem the last year and a half or so. I also want to put in a good word for affordable housing which is becoming a real issue. I do not think that it's an issue that people who have invested their life savings into a rental house need to be carrying on their backs. So I think we do need some sort of County wide growth plan that has some directive for affordable housing because people are getting priced out but there's also other people who've invested their money in a rental house and they shouldn't have to take the fall for that. Broadband.. Oh trails, we need more trails, we need more assets, we need more ways for people who do enjoy riding their bikes and walking and doing things, doing recreational activities that we moved here to do, it will attract younger more affluent people, who then will be told that as residents of the City of Livingston that they don't have any voice in this process. (Interruption from the back) Anyways, that's my two cents as someone who moved to Livingston, bought a house, paid a lot of taxes over the last few years as a single woman who made pretty good money and I wanted to let you know that as a resident you guys are doing a great job.

Nancy Kessler

(gives name and address) Thank you all so much for this opportunity, for the work that you have done. I am obviously a City resident, I also pay County taxes, unlike my friends who live out in the County I get double taxed for quite a few things. So comments about City residents not having too much influence over this is in my mind very unfair. Because I am paying as much if not more. I am also like Charlotte, something of a transplant I have only been in Montana for 30 something years but I have seen a lot of different things in the West. I am a Jackson Hole survivor and I saw what happened with housing and affordable housing in Jackson Hole. Businesses went out of business because they couldn't get workers because the workers couldn't live there. It is, it can be a vicious cycle and I so appreciate the County getting out ahead of this issue. Bozeman is going through this now, they are not ahead of it they are trying to catch up. We can get ahead of it before it becomes a huge problem. Affordable housing is an issue already here and there are creative solutions it is not one or the other. The other thing I want to say about property rights issues, a friend out of state, but total property rights advocate had some land and was putting in a bed and breakfast and the next door neighbor decided to put in a pig farm. You can imagine what it did for my friend's business. They had to abandon their plans because of the odor from the pig farm made it impossible to attract visitors to their bed and breakfast. What's the answer there? Should the pig farmer not have been allowed to open a pig farm, should my friends have been able to stop them. WE got to be talking about these things. WE got to be sitting down and compromising some of the land owners here in the County I am not sure why you all think that zoning or zone is a four letter word. It can protect you, it can keep you from not being able to do rental properties on your ranch because a pig farm is there or a tire burning facility is there. We need to work together, look as a community and I so appreciate the efforts of this Board and of this plan. It is not zoning, nobody is using that four letter word, and I am sorry zone is the four letter word. If we don't communicate and come to compromise, we are just going to be combatting each other this is for both sides so thank you.

Michael McCormick

(gives name and address) I won't apologize for my short period of time in Montana, I wanted to be born here but that didn't work out. I want to emphasize two points. One, the point made about a local food system. I see that as almost an infrastructure issue. It's as important as bridges and roads. If our community does not have a strong, local, sustainable food system we're going to be lacking in many, many ways. Second, I want to give some voice to the people who we serve at our Livingston Food Pantry each month. Each month over the last several years we have been helping to feed approximately 700 people every month. 10% of the city's population. People in that population are generally unemployed, 80% of the people who come to the food pantry are there because of unemployment or underemployment and the longer these people begin to be chronically unemployed the farther and farther they get from any participation in our City and our County. They become disenfranchised, they don't participate economically, socially, politically and as you move through this process I hope you will keep that population in mind. They generally lack an organized voice. You're not going to hear them here tonight but remember that that population exists in our City and our County and give them consideration. Thank you.

John Nelson

(gives name and address) I remember here in the early 70's as a young boy my grandfather stood up in front of the County Commission and they were talking about five acre tracts and what's shocking to me is some of the same problems that they were talking about then, I remember and we are talking about them still. As a retired UPS corporate manager, one of the things I would like to see in this plan is what Michael McCormick had said. I am only 54 and I am retired cause I worked for a big company that took care of its people, but there's a huge amount of the population here that are not represented here at all. I am a volunteer at the food resource center and I am also a volunteer for HRDC. If we had some of them people here from HRDC they would probably know me as the tax man cause I volunteer to do low income taxes for the past five years down here so if you know anybody I am the guy who does that. One thing when I read the plan, I read it as an outsider, even though I have been here all my life I haven't been politically motivated. I've been kind of quiet but one of the things I noticed in good management and good planning is low hanging fruit. There are topics here that are going to be still discussed twenty years from now because we are not going to be able to solve them and we need to identify what they are. I wish I had taken the time to write these down so I could tell you. You know what these issues are, that are not going to get solved here. The low hanging fruit is what do we do to make our community better for all and they are simple solutions and I am, the gentleman that said keep it simple, I can't more iterate to the Board. There are things that can be done to this community that are simple fixes and then there are things that we are not going to be able to fix. It's not that, you know, the goal the 20-year plan, cause I guarantee if I could find my grandfather's notes I would love to bring them here and I could tell you. But, number one housing is an issue. It may not be the County's problem, it may not be the City's problem but we know it's the resident's problem and we have to address that. You cannot go in this community. Now there is hope. My daughter is 25 years old and her and her fiancé just bought a brand new house that David just built over there in the Star subdivision. She could not be here and her demographic couldn't be here, but there is hope. But what is sad about that, is she's a Park County graduate from 2010 and I don't think there is one other graduate in the last six or seven years that we can say that is our children that have bought a home here. That's broken so when we sit and do this planning we need to address that because one of the things that I thought that I am very fortunate is that my daughter said is I want to make Livingston my home and be successful so that someday she can be sitting in your seat. But if you look at that demographic, they are not going to be here. Look at our age group, you cannot forget that. I agree with what Mike says with that demographic. We can sit up here and talk about land ownership, talk about taxes, but we are forgetting about a huge group of people that the population's only growing. That's why some of these big issues are not going to get solved. Pick the low hanging fruit and solve it so twenty years from now my daughter is not sitting in a meeting like this going hey guys we got problems.

Mary Strick Roth

(gives name and address) I'm a year round resident of Gardiner and property owner. I'd like to thank you Mr. Fox and the Board for all the work you are doing and for all the efforts you've done in communicating this plan to us. I did participate in the survey and as a rural community member it gave me a great opportunity to express more fully than I can here today exactly what I was hoping such a draft proposal would have in it. I applaud you for the document as it stands. I am a strong supporter of County based comprehensive approach to land use growth and development and I have the following comments. I believe Park County should protect and conserve open space while ensuring land productivity is not lost. I understand that all the ranchers here and the farmers here have a lot of fear that outsiders are going to come in and start chopping up their land or putting pressure on them such that they will not be able to preserve the fundamental values that they have in the ranching community. So I think we should make sure that we are still not losing that productivity in the land in anything we do in the future. I would like the County to map wildlife corridors and preserve them and promote the coexistence of wildlife. Like Rick Lamplugh who spoke I do believe that coexistence is much different than educating people how to protect themselves from certain wildlife in the community. We have migratory animals that are coming in from Yellowstone. We have lots of elk and bear and other animals in our community that we have to learn to live with and doing otherwise is really going to shoot ourselves in the foot. It's important to maintain trails and trail networks and maintain their connectivity with communities and most importantly air and soil quality and water quality and quantity must be safeguarded. We need to share these resources that we have. We all live here together and so we really need to make sure that we are taking everyone's, everyone into consideration as we manage those resources. The County should work with existing water and sewer districts to ensure their facilities can be appropriately maintained to keep pace with growth. Gardiner is a small community with a sewer and water district and I worry sometimes about the quality and the capacity need we may have in the future with such a small community of only 850 so people that have to basically support that kind of infrastructure. So we really need the County to help us with that. The County should cooperate with the incorporated cities and the surrounding communities in establishing urban growth boundaries. We have cities like Livingston and Clyde Park, how far are those cities going to expand beyond their own boundaries right now. WE need to plan for that in the future. Sprawl should be held to a minimum and density should be encouraged. These are the value that underpin the most desirable communities in the United States today. Park County has the opportunity to learn from the mistakes and successes of other communities in other states. We shouldn't be afraid to learn from other states that have gone through the same things thirty, forty years ago and have come out on the other side with really desirable communities. Park County's 2008 Growth Policy is overdue for updating and review and I believe the projected trends in population growth is very conservative. This place is super desirable and extremely pristine and people are going to want to move here. People that live on the coasts that are tired of the density that they have, that want to experience the values that you all love and the rural amenities that you all love. So I do believe that we will experience more population growth than is projected for the next twenty years. The Growth Policy should take a more proactive approach in addressing this as well as public transportation. I urge the County to consider for those people who can't afford to have a car or multiple cars in their families, to consider alternative transportation needs for the residents including community services, bus services for everyone possible, to extend the communities like Clyde Park, like Gardiner for people who have to live outside of these places that are gateway communities and have no means to get back and forth to their jobs. The County's natural resource assets contribute enormously

to the economic prosperity and health of our communities and the quality of life and its why I'm here so I appreciate the fact that you're doing this now. Thank you.

Sally Brainard

(gives name and address) There are three short issues that I would like to address with the plan. One is the cost of implementing this plan. I know there's a suggested funding sources, taxes on gas, etc. but one of the things I was concerned with reading through many sections is we need studies. We need studies on water, we need studies on this, I am concerned about the cost of the studies because frankly we can study things at nauseam. I'm a little concerned about the broadband support. Yea, I would really like broadband high speed internet. I run an internet business myself, however, I don't think it's the purview of the County government to get involved with something that is strictly a private business. I mean if we had the market for high speed broadband right now we would already have it. Market forces would have taken care of it themselves. I seem to have forgotten my third comment so I'll leave it at that.

Chuck Donovan

I just didn't want the guy's flashing light to die. (gives name and address) I was a little surprised when I read through the final document that the goals were set up as priorities. Number one goal would be priority number one and go on down. You know, I see wildlife at number two and roads at number nine, that kind of offended me because I know that there is a school out in five acre tracts that really needs to have that road addressed. That kind of puts the raccoons ahead of the kids that are going to the school. See what I'm saying. That doesn't cut it with me. And then there's another thing in there, you guys are saying that we haven't done water studies now I know darn well we've done water studies. You guys have all gotten them from me because apparently they got lost in the courthouse, but don't feel bad about it because they lost them up in Butte School of Mines and I had to find them for them. But that's all been done twelve years ago you know, and they did the studies. So we kind of have the studies available already and we know what waters come down from every one of these creeks so that's really not a problem. There's a couple things that were somewhat wrong in there. I mean the priorities that you guys got on there, everybody wants something in that Growth Policy but I think it's the priorities that gets kind of irritating, it did me when I saw the kids were lower than the raccoons. Ok thank you.

Michelle Uberaga

(gives name and address) I had the opportunity to submit comments so I wanted to make it brief but there were, it felt like an appropriate time since you were talking about kids and schools and what attracts young people to this community like having (inaudible) and people. First I want to thank the Board and the County for all the really hard work in developing this Growth Policy I really appreciate it. I wanted to say as a young mother that I really do value trails and access to public spaces. I think that that's important. I also completely understand that roads should be a priority and access to our public lands should also be a priority. I just wanted to highlight that my kids go to school off of that five acre tract out there and we ride our bikes out there. It's a really nice bike ride except for a few spots where it could be improved. I really appreciate you thinking about the safety of those of us that choose to travel with their children around town, strollers or bikes. I really appreciate thinking about how we can connect our communities also. I think that's important to attracting young people to our community. I chose to live here because I think that it's a really special place and I hope that more young people will continue to do that and I want to thank you all so much for putting a lot of time and energy into this process and everybody here as well.

Ed Schilling

(gives name and address) I am one of the culprits that was involved in the very first Growth Policy, with my other colleague that's here. A thing I wanted to highlight especially to you board members is that I was one of the culprits that also changed the boundaries of the County Commissioners Districts which was not a thing we wanted to do, we were instructed by the State of Montana, somebody out of Helena, said every Commissioner district shall be equal in population and land size as much as possible. That's how it's come to be the way it is. Another issue I guess I want to state is that I 100% agree with every comment that Marty Malone has made. He has spent a lot of time and effort going through that and highlighting the things that he felt was important and I feel they were all very important. Another thing we just talked about the roads out there and the five acre tracts. I've been up there to pick up grandkids and that is a mess out there. I don't know what can be done but it's something I believe happened because we didn't have a, when that was done, we did not have a plan on how growth was going to happen in Livingston. Nobody knew that we were going to have all that housing out there I guess. So comment on that I think that is an issue, safety out there. Another thing is I guess is a housing issue. I think as the demand comes for vacation rentals people that are in it will probably oversupply the market so I think that it's something we don't have to address, maybe we shouldn't address because I think that we will put ourselves out of business by producing so many of them and they will have vacancies and then they will have to go back to long term rentals. Another issue that I feel very strongly about, I am against County wide zoning. I did take that survey on the internet but I think there was one issue that was not addressed in the selections that we could make. One of them was citizens initiated zoning and I think that was not in the survey and I think a lot of people might have looked at that as an alternative to County wide or doing nothing. So I think that was a mistake that somebody made, let's not point fingers but I think that should have been in the questionnaire. And we had community development, I'm not sure what that meant if that was citizen initiated or just the community such as Clyde Park. I think that could have been done a little bit different and whether after all this we do another one I don't know. I guess that's looking back. I think you had a good turnout here but I think if anybody that was at the initial Growth Policy we started in the Commissioner's office, we went downstairs, and eventually we ended up at the fairgrounds and still had standing room only so I think this is good that we get involved but I think there is a certain amount of people that are not involved that maybe should be and I'm not, I don't have the answer to how to get those people involved but that's what happens when you have public meetings nobody shows up and then when the decision is made everybody is pissed at you. Thank you.

Frank Rigler

(gives name) 73 years old, grandparents got married in Emigrant in 1893. I've been in the same place for 73 years. I have seen a lot of change in the valley. The saddest part is Yellowstone Park and now Gardiner, we have a housing problem. Well its Xanterra and the Yellowstone Park Association. For years Yellowstone Park, Xanterra was taking care of them the housing was in Yellowstone. They got their gravel in Yellowstone. They didn't haul up and down this road and spread weeds all over the forest. Anyways, that's just part of it. This is a little thing I wanted to present. I'm a little high strung but anyways. I have a real problem with Gardiner including the Gardiner Basin. They should be by themselves, Gardiner. They don't represent the people down the valley. They should be by themselves up there and when you had the last zoning deal they were just by themselves. It's up to the people in Gardiner to take care of their housing, you know, low income housing. Park Service created it and so did Xanterra and so did the Yellowstone Park Association for low income housing. Ok, here's a little thing I thought I'd read it includes a lot of stuff in here, addresses a lot of stuff with the Growth Policy but the first part I think is pretty relevant to what we're looking at (Peter states it needs to apply to the Growth Policy) What's that? Yea it does. Ok, like hiking trails. You know as far as I look at it the Growth Policy, why doesn't the city have a nice, nice community center. Why doesn't Gardiner have a nice community center? Do we need more hiking trails like Mr. Berg wants to have? No. We want to take care of our kids and our families and have a place to exercise. Here's the deal here, given the recent federal election results and the wide ranging implications on federal policies and budgets this Growth Planning process should be suspended for a year or at least six months so the County doesn't waste precious time and money on policies that depend on federal policy for operational budgets that are very likely to change significantly. We're in debt 20 trillion dollars, that's the reason Trump got elected. Some of this stuff is going to dry up and this County stuff is going to dry up too after. The Obama Administration issued a large number of executive orders you can read them down and down and down. But the main reason I want to talk to you, the people want to talk about water availability and water quality we need to acknowledge the problems associated with federal government spending resulting in large wildfires in the region and overgrazing in Yellowstone and I think it has to do with the fishing. These people won't be fishing in Yellowstone in another forty years if they continue the actions they have in Yellowstone Park. It seems that these are just as important if not more important than anything the County itself can do to help these issues, but before we consider that we need to acknowledge that agriculture has preexisting and secure water rights. Cause a few people don't believe in that and that's one of the damn opinions in the paper. The County should be stopped from stepping into this territory. Also state and federal are well equipped to handle water quality issues. It goes on to talk about infrastructure and this is very important, I've lived up there all my life and I've been talking to the Commissioners about this. Infrastructure should be limited to base priorities that serve the citizens of the County and that would be roads. Nobody bikes to work or to a ball game in the wintertime and Montana has a long winter. Frankly, these base priorities aren't being met. The County still needs to fix the County road on Old Yellowstone Trail south of Mulherin Creek. The bank just south on the east side of the new bridge used to be ripped up and could defend the structures of the new bridge. The old railroad right-of-way should be improved so we have a way out. When somebody gets hurt and there's an ambulance there nobody can get out. The County should be responsible and that should be right in the Growth Policy and then this culvert that State's fooled around with. The roads been closed how many times in my lifetime? It's been closed a lot since they put the new highway in, I think that was in 71. They put the other part through Yankee Jim Canyon in in 61. I sold that property with the big bridge there size of a garage door,

they put a little culvert in there, don't know how many times its plugged up. (Peter mentions the five minutes are up) Ok, thanks. In this state the Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks and the federal government are to remove noxious weeds, they don't do it. Then the County needs to address it. Noxious weeds are coming down from Yellowstone Park. That's the biggest problem a County landowner has, it's noxious weeds. You don't want to border Fish and Game, you don't want to border the Park Service or state grounds. As for wildlife corridors designated in the planning process, they should not be designated. These issues are best left to the state like the Fish and Game. We have seen great changes in wildlife behavior since the wolf reintroduction. It's reasonable to presume we will see more so any designations will likely be obsolete soon. Generally speaking, County resources should be spent on core needs of the County. Much of this document seems to be designed to make more work for outside consultant and government workers rather than serving the needs of the residents.

Jenny Harbine

(gives name and address) Thank you first for all of the work of the Board, the planning department, and the consultant back there for putting together this truly thoughtful Growth Policy. I appreciate the Growth Policy for what it is which is a document that I understand provides direction to the County in making decisions on issues that are really important to the people of the County. I think that the most important role that the Growth Policy plays is in providing guidance that reflects our collective values so I appreciate you putting a lot of thought into this process to give us an opportunity to express those values to you. I was pleased to see in reading the Growth Policy that largely the draft does reflect my values and the values that I know many others hold as well and in particular I thought all the goals identified were reasonable and appropriate and in particular I was pleased to see the County wishing to be proactive in working with state and federal agencies in human and wildlife interactions, in identifying opportunities to address challenges to our water resources in the County and also to take opportunities to develop a robust trail network. I think all of these issues are just examples where if we are proactive and thoughtful about identifying both future challenges and opportunities we will see better outcomes and outcomes that we really do support as a community. The other item I was really particularly pleased to see in there was the County's proposal to take a more proactive role in the future growth of the County. I think we can all in this room agree that growth will happen whether we're providing guidance to the County on how to deal with it or not. I think that the Growth Policy is, doesn't direct any outcomes, the Growth Policy doesn't zone any land as I understand it. But it gives us an opportunity to have an influence over the decisions that will affect all of us before it's too late, before we are in reactionary mode and reacting to one project or another after significant resources have already been invested. I also want to point out that on the topic of zoning that I understand a lot of counties have zoning county wide and that doesn't mean that any particular use is zoned out of every single area in the County. I think it's appropriate to have county wide zoning that recognizes existing uses and the values of the people in those areas and we can do that without prohibiting uses that individuals who want to see for their land in appropriate areas. I appreciate your time and thank you.

Sally Brainard

(gives name) I don't subscribe to the Livingston Enterprise. I don't want to spend money reading yesterday's news tomorrow. So I didn't even know about this whole iteration of the Growth Policy. I made the same point back in 2008 that there has to be another method to notify citizens of this sort of thing without depending on the Enterprise. Whether or not it's posters around town or some other venue because I am not a fan of the Enterprise. Thank you.

Sue Martin

(gives name) I feel that the Growth Policy was not completely inclusive of the whole County. I felt like it was skewed towards Gardiner and I saw very little in anything about Wilsall and Clyde Park or the planning of that community as far as water, sewer and their needs. I think Marty touched that as well. My very deeply held feeling is that the City elected person cannot have a say in the efforts of the County. It amounts to taxation without representation and that goes back to the foundations of our government. Your alternate energy mention in your policy is a joke. You've got windmills on the hill that are not functioning. I don't know what to say but it's there. I am not in favor of us spending tax dollars for these hiking trails that are for so few and yet in your writing you refer them to the seniors are going to use all this stuff. It isn't so. I have interviewed many people that live south of town and north of town who have visual access to those locations and they can count on one hand in a week how many people actually use those trails so I think that it's not a fair situation and one of the things that I would like to see that would benefit seniors if you will is a community pool where you can do aerobics, water aerobics, swimming lessons for kids, have a summer program for kids cause the city pool is only used about three weeks a year, it's not year round cause its outdoors it has (inaudible) as I understand. So I think that if we are going to be spending dollars it better cover more people and one of my last comments is when you're spending this County, the City taxes I want to remind you it's all taxes coming from us. Whether we are in the County, out of the County, live in the City and pay extra taxes whatever it is, it's all tax money and it better benefit the majority and not the minority. Thank you.

Alan Redfield

(gives name and address) I have some notes that I just made when I've been listening. On the water quality and availability, Bill brought up about the river task force that's a lot of data and it shoulda been used baseline data, water quality; Shields River watershed did a study, they should have it, it should be there. Infrastructure, we need to determine which ideas are the most critical and address those first because those are the ones that are probably the low hanging fruit as someone said. I'll mention the broadband. In several meetings in Cooke City I've found that they would like just to have some internet access. We can have wispwest, or something like that. So looking into that it's going to cost 20 to 25 million dollars just to get a tower in there where they can have that and that's coming out of Cody. That makes it pretty hard. The non-motorized trail systems, things like that quite often they'll get built but they're not maintained and we are finding that across the state. Me and the legislatures, several people from the Missoula area, they've had those trail systems but they are in such disrepair that they are asking the state to come and fix em. I just put a bill in to tax bicycles for trail maintenance because we've got to figure out a way. Sewer and water districts there may be some state funds available. Cooke City put a water system in, the contractor didn't finish it, it does not function properly. It's supposed to be a circular thing; they have to leave a portion of it open in the wintertime so it can even keep it from freezing. Their sewer system is nonfunctional, at least as far as the Forest Service is concerned but they can't get done paying for the water system. They have to get done paying for that before they even start on the sewer. So those are some of the kind of things that we have. Franklin brought up probably the shortest thing I've ever heard him say and to the point but he's right. You know, a lot of it's from the impacts of the tourism industry. We talk about water quantity and water quality, the stress on that river, the number of people on that river is only going to increase. There are people in the legislature right now trying to write rules for the number of people, and permit the people that use the river. These are the kinds of things out there that we got to be paying attention to but they are trying to address some of those issues and you want water availability, well you better start praying cause that's the only way we are going to get the quantity where we really need it to be.

Susan Nelson

Mine's real short. (gives name and address) I guess it's just my confusion and I just want to ask and this is just how I feel personally. When Anne was speaking or talking about the Growth Policy and that when all the info came in it was County residents and City, we all know the City is in the County. All that data should be considered, but then when Sue talks you say to Sue, you're speaking about City issues Sue, that's for the City to do. So we get kinda confused to how the City can give their input into the County and yet they have their own Growth Policy and we don't really have any say in the City so I guess for some of us it's a confusing little line that gets drawn. How much input the City does give in the County and where that line gets drawn and how we feel about the City, it's a different case. I just wanted to state that, thank you.

Nelson King

Thank you for the opportunity. (gives name and address) There's really only one thing I want to talk about right now, which is infrastructure roads. Our area has a reputation for having some of the worst roads in the County and we've been trying to address it for 25 years, 30 years but we've been watching is that the County's budget for roads as a portion of the money available has decreased and the demand for repairing and building roads has increased, partly because of more people and partly because there is more traffic. Our area has had, well the Wineglass if it were incorporated would have about 420 people in it which would make it the fourth largest city in the County, but it's unincorporated and the people are dispersed and it's very difficult for the people to make enough money to fix the roads. Now we tried to do what's called a rural improvement district, an RID, and the cost for that was almost binary you either did gravel road which is relatively low expense but not popular with the County or you did something with asphalt or some other kind of surfacing and that typically costs a million dollars or more. In fact, an asphalt road would have cost about 7 million dollars to do what we wanted to do, couldn't afford it. So I'm talking to the County at the base level of trying to do something for infrastructure, the roads which is after all probably your biggest (inaudible) in the room, in terms of money and finding a way to make, if it's an RID or some other County program but some way of making it possible for communities that don't have County roads but need to improve them, some way to make that possible. I think that should be part of the planning process because we're not the only ones with roads that need to be fixed. Thank you.

Ned Zimmerman

(gives name and address) Can you hear me? I'm a rancher from Wilsall and I had a few concerns about some of the language on 14.5.1 the idea is to create a map that defines agricultural land based on certain criteria. I'd like to speak and encourage the Board to consider that the person who owns the land and operates the land might be the one to determine what agricultural land is. It's been mentioned a couple of times tonight that food, locally grown food is important. I'm a big fan of that and I would hate to see somebody who wants to start a small vegetable garden or anything they want to do to grow food but their neighbor doesn't like it and they look at the Growth Policy and they are able to use that to put a ban on growing food because it's not meeting the criteria and policy of perfect soil so I'd like you to be mindful of that. I'd also like to, it was mentioned earlier that you can't open a bed and breakfast if somebody wants to open a pig farm across the road, often times it works the other way around where the pig farms been there for generations. That needs to be kept in consideration as well. I'm also a member of the, supervisor on the Park Conservation District. One of the things that we felt was important was when it comes to zoning we are not completely against it but we believe in grass roots, that members of a particular community that find themselves, are able to define their own growth policy and have capacity to do so. And also I would like to encourage you to extend the amount of time and the ability to take comments on this plan if you would please.

Peter McKensie

(gives name and address) I don't know if any of you have seen it but I am sure this should be part of any document you'd be looking at as a Growth Policy. This is a lawsuit that was done by the PPL Montana vs. State of Montana, the supreme court ruling about navigable waterways and who owns the river and this basically is very similar to State of Wyoming where owners along the rivers own property and it's not public property. If you'd like I can drop a copy off to you guys. This was done in 2011, it's pretty important. (Peter asks for the particular relatability to the Growth Policy) Just with river setbacks and stuff like that. Again, I'm making another request to get more input to not close this thing down we have more input for you so just think of that. Thank you.

Sue Martin

I have one more thing. I made a comment in the paper last week. (Gives name) I made a comment in the paper last week about how difficult this document was to read as it was developed and I am going to give you an example. There's a reference in there its PERS. To me that was Public Employee Retirement System, so you need to spell out all those acronyms or shortened terms throughout the document because I was asked several questions by folks about the abbreviations and when they said PERS I said oh that's the retirement system for the state what's that got to do with the policy. So that's how confusing these abbreviations are can become and how simply they can be misconstrued so that would be one of my efforts to spells it out. It might lengthen it but... (Peter lets her know that the first reference spells it out which is the accepted standard) If I started in Section 25, so you need to spell it out please.

Dick Juhnke

I'll make a comment. (gives name and address) Won't need that (in reference to timer). With what they're doing south of town for the bike trail is plumb ridiculous we got roads that need it a lot worse than that, for bike trails that nobody uses. Ok, we been trying to get gravel on Grannis Road, for twenty years we have not had a drop of gravel. We can't even get a grader up there and he's across the road. He's less than a quarter of a mile away and we can't get him to come up there. So we need to really get after these roads and to heck with bike trails. That's all I got.

Bill Moser

(gives name) I think it's around the 1930s you can look it up for yourself the United States would bring forth a ruling that the pursuit of happiness meant the ownership and control of private property. Secondly, there are four organic laws of the United States of America. (Peter asks Bill to speak to the Growth Policy) I am sir. The first one was the Declaration of Independence and you can find this on page one of the United States Code and so it overbears everything that you do. The first was the Declaration of Independence, the second was the Articles of Confederation which have never been repealed which established the United States of America which is a military government. Third was the Northwest Ordinance, in which the House of Representatives was benighted and the dowry was established so that the king did not end up with your property when you died, etc. The Northwest Ordinance has incredible bearing if you bothered to read it, upon what a Growth Policy can and cannot do. For example, the Bozeman City Council had traffic cameras on certain intersections where they were giving fines, and they along with the same type of things in other municipal districts were removed because they violated the Northwest Ordinance in terms of you cannot do this to this group of people without doing it to everybody and that is why when you go into another state and they say you have a broken windshield and you say I'm from Montana and your jurisdiction does not cover me. (Peter reiterated that comment should speak to the Park County Growth Policy) I am sir. I want you to understand what I am saying and that is that you need to read the Northwest Ordinance and it needs to overshadow everything that you try to do. The last item was of course the Constitution of the United States which is a civilian government. Thank you.

Jeff Ladwig

(gives name and address) I haven't been a Montana resident for very long, not at all but I came e here because I thought I would like it. I served my country and I worked for a long time. We came here, we spent almost a quarter of our entire net worth to come live here because we like it here, because of some of the stuff that they talk about; the amenities, the open land, the river, the park nearby. I've spent a lot of money in this community. Building materials, I've probably spent \$200 a month at Ace hardware. I've bought vehicles here. I pay my taxes and I just want to encourage this Board to keep up their work because people like to have certainty whether they agree or disagree with the particular plan or regulation or law, certainty is the main thing because then you can make a decision. Right now, basically what there is in Park County is anarchy, chaos, anybody can do whatever they want, whenever they want, wherever they want as long as they own the property. That's not a good way to have a viable community so as far as the document we're talking about today, everybody had some kind of suggestions for you, that's good but what I want to make sure happens is that this process does not stop. I may not agree with what those people said or what they were requesting but that doesn't matter. What matters is that we all get to have our input and some of the comments that I've heard seem to try and be shutting that kind of stuff down. I just want to encourage you to keep at it, don't give up please.

Debra Lamm

Good evening Mr. Chairman and the Committee. (gives name and address) I thought there had been a lot of comments I could comment on that I agree or disagree but what I did want to raise is a perspective that maybe hasn't been brought up on funding issues as we have been going through the last two years of the legislature and what I see coming forward. I think that we're going to have more restrictions and more limitations on funding from a state level as it relates to infrastructure and probably transportation as well. So keep that in mind that the State isn't always going to be there at the same level that it has been especially in light of the reduced revenues and increasing demands across the board besides just these issues.

Greg Brainard

One quick note. Ok, you don't even have to start the timer. I've heard a lot of talk about affordable housing, ok. I have heard a lot about affordable housing this evening. The catch here is to have affordable housing you either have to give money to the people which means jobs. Every time we get the opportunity to have some sort of an industrial project here we shoot it down so there's no jobs and there's no money to make the housing that we have affordable. The other option is to build more housing, every time we try and build a new development we shoot it down. So if you close off the supply of housing and shut down the supply of money you're never going to have affordable housing. It's simple economics. That's it.

Erica Lighthiser

(gives name and address) I just wanted to say thank you to the County for presenting this opportunity and I just sat in the back of the room tonight and I was listening to all these perspectives and I'm just really excited that so many people care about this place that I care about it too and as others have said tonight we may not all agree on everything that comes out of this evening but I think it's great that we are here and engaged and that we're listening to each other. Someone brought up a good point that maybe we could have a smaller group session, maybe more of a dialogue, more of a discussion based forums. I think that was a good idea, but I just appreciate everyone and their participation in tonight. I am so glad to hear from all of you. It just makes me feel that much more excited about living in this community. Thanks everyone.

Ned Zimmerman

I just think it's great that we can all come together and express our opinions and be civil about it and this year. I'd like to thank everybody that did so tonight. Thanks again.