

Michael Inman

From: Alan Redfield <redfield1@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2016 2:04 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Growth Policy

Question 1

Protecting the Agricultural base along with Timber management. Prevent the degradation of the rivers due the increased use and pressure of tourism.

Question 2

Manage resources from a local Level. Concentrate on the control of noxious weeds through intensive education for All landowners from city home owners to the Forest Service. Find a way to involve those people with little time to participate because of work.

Question 3

Emphasize personal responsibility because top down pushing from the government agency's cause distrust. Working Groups with common goals for the local areas may be one way to get things done but not the only way. No matter what you need large community buy in.

Question 4

' loss of open space, and until there is a state wide sales tax tourism will generate low paying service jobs

Question 5

The discussion to connect all to open space should not be a goal if it adversely affect property rights. The Agricultural industry which includes timber along with mining produces new wealth,as our products didn't exist before in the economy. When we produce this new wealth turnover 7 times or more in the community not just transferring from hand to hand.

Sent from my iPad

Michael Inman

From: Mary Strickroth <mjstrickroth@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2016 3:50 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Draft of Growth Policy

My name is Mary Strickroth and I'm a year-round Gardiner resident and property owner.

I'd like to thank the County for engaging in a transparent process that provides different ways for communities to be involved and I applaud the County for drafting the revised Growth Policy document.

I support a county-based comprehensive approach to land use & development and I offer the following comments for your consideration.

- I believe Park County should protect and conserve open space, while ensuring land productivity is not lost.
- I would like the County to map wildlife corridors & preserve them & promote coexistence with wildlife.
- It is important to maintain access to trails & trail networks & maintain their connectivity with communities.
- Most importantly, air & soil quality & water quality & quantity must be safeguarded.
- The County should work with existing water & sewer districts to assure these facilities can be appropriately maintained to keep pace with growth.
- The County should cooperate with the incorporated cities & surrounding communities in establishing appropriate urban growth boundaries. Sprawl should be held to a minimum & density should be encouraged.
- These are the values that underpin the most desirable communities in America today.
- Park county has the opportunity to learn from the mistakes & successes of other communities & states. Park County's 2008 growth policy is overdue for review & updating.
- I believe the Projected trends in population growth are very conservative. Park County is an extremely pristine & desirable place to live. Our population will swell perhaps beyond what we imagine - we need to address the existing housing crises in our communities to

adequately plan ahead. The growth policy should take a more proactive approach in addressing this as well as public transportation, and I urge the County to consider a plan to provide public transportation between Livingston & Gardiner.

- The county's natural resource assets contribute immensely to the economic prosperity & health of our communities and our quality of life. It is indeed why I live here.
- Park county should work with our incorporated cities & surrounding communities to create a vision for growth NOW to pre-empt wasted time & effort in case-by-case litigation.

Thank you.

Mary Strickroth

14 Gardiner View Rd.

PO Box 167

Gardiner, MT 59030

Michael Inman

From: lucinda reinold <lucindareinold@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2016 10:46 AM
To: Planning
Subject: Comments-Park County Growth Policy

Dear Park County Commissioners:

I would like to thank you for your efforts to engage the whole community in this process. It is important to hear every voice, both those who write comments and cannot appear at the public hearings, as well as those who are able to attend and speak at the hearings. Unfortunately, we are not able to attend the upcoming meeting as we will be traveling. But, we think it is essential that to have a Growth Policy and a clear plan for Park County that incorporates the majority of local community members' vision.

Although we know that growth will happen, we need to control that growth, grow smartly, make better decisions about how to grow, so that our quality of life is not impaired. Development must benefit the community as a whole! We must protect the rural character of Park County, preserve agricultural lands, in both the Shields and Paradise Valleys, and not allow industrial interests and development in the rural areas of the County, e.g. Paradise Valley and the Shields Valley, which will ruin the natural environment that we love and severely damage our quality of life.

The Commission should be empowered by the Growth Policy to take an active role when local areas are threatened by industrial interests, both local and multi-national, e.g. mining, asphalt plants, gravel pits, chicken plants. Also, the Commission should have the power to require that new residential developments be clustered around urban/towns rather than sprawl into the open space and agricultural areas that currently exist.

IMPORTANT! The Growth Policy must also address property rights such that one property owner's rights don't supercede, impair, or deny someone else's property rights. Everyone's rights must be considered. No individual citizen of the County, and no outside industrial or corporate entity should be allowed to do whatever s/he/they wants to the detriment of other citizens and their property. Zoning that protects every property owner from those interests who want to damage our individual quality of life and that of our community is a highly desirable solution.

We want the Growth Policy to protect our water, our natural resources, our access to public lands, and promote connectivity between communities and open spaces with trails, and walkable/bike-able downtown areas.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Lucinda Reinold
194 Bridger Hollow Rd.
Pray, MT 59065
and
Susan Reinold
196 Bridger Hollow Rd.
Pray, MT 59065

Michael Inman

From: Jenny Harbine <jenny.harbine@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2016 3:28 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Park County Growth Policy

I am writing to express my support for Park County's draft Growth Policy, which proposes a more proactive role for the County in future of growth and land uses. I believe that now, more than ever, the County should use available tools to help promote the quality of life and natural character that make this region so special.

Our county has seen a number of controversial development projects in recent years, including a tire dump, a gravel pit, and two industrial gold mine exploration proposals. In each case, our community has responded swiftly with concerns about the appropriateness of proposed development for the lands on which they are proposed. In cases like this, both the proponents of new development and their neighbors would benefit from clear direction from the county on where development should occur. Proponents benefit from the opportunity to plan their projects in appropriate areas, where they are less likely to face community opposition after they have already made investments. And the community benefits from the opportunity to have a voice in how neighboring lands are used before projects are proposed. I hope the County explores reasonable opportunities to create such certainty for Park County residents using available tools, including zoning.

In addition, I support the draft Growth Policy's goals, which reflect reasonable priorities for a county government seeking to maintain and improve our quality of life and values in Park County. I particularly encourage the County to finalize the following goals:

- Goal 1: Plan for and encourage development in the area around Livingston
- Goal 2: Partner with state and federal agencies to reduce human-wildlife conflicts
- Goal 4: Become active partners in management of federal lands
- Goal 5: Encourage efforts of non-governmental partners to address community needs
- Goal 6: Be prepared to make decisions on how to manage water resources
- Goal 8: Create a system of interconnected trails
- Goal 12: Provide for affordable, low income and workforce housing
- Goal 14: Take an active role in land use and development process

Goal 15: Diversify Park County's economy

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Jenny Harbine

713 Loch Leven Dr.

Livingston, MT 59047

Michael Inman

From: Heidi Anderson <sysyrinchium@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2016 6:15 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Comments on park county planning

Dear Park County Planning Board,

I am a current Gardiner Resident and have lived here for 14 years. I want to take the opportunity to thank you for working to ensure the process is open and transparent and with many ways for community members to engage. I like the on-line surveys and I'm sorry I was not able to make it to the public workshops or the meetings. I feel you have tried very hard to make the process inclusive.

I also commend you on taking a proactive approach to create a shared vision for the future. Change is inevitable and unfortunately for Park County so is growth. If we do not have a plan we are more likely to be reactive when there is a crisis. We are also more vulnerable to out of state interests deciding what is best for Park County.

Here are few of my thoughts that I felt the plan felt short of:

- 1) I want to protect Park County's rural character and I would like to see more of an emphasis on protecting ag and local food production. I also feel that it is likely in the future we will have less ag production in Park County. I would like to see significant incentives provided or explored to keep current land in ag production or put it in a land bank so that it does not get converted to subdivisions. I know that often once the parents dies, the children can no longer afford the taxes etc on the property and the only alternative it to sell the property into small parcels for housing etc. I think this is sad and would like to find a way for the land to remain in larger tracts.
- 2) It is a waste of resources to react on a case-by-case basis to protect special places from becoming industrialized. We need to plan the appropriate place for industrial development to give the community and businesses more predictability. We don't want to solve our problems in the courts.
- 3) We want to recruit good paying jobs and the types of businesses that attract high paying jobs are generally looking to locate in communities with a high-quality of life, which means we want the county to protect our water, our access to public lands, and to promote more connectivity between communities and open spaces with trails. These are jobs that keep dollars in Park County.
- 4) The growth policy section on trails demonstrates a strong understanding of what makes a healthy community and increases our property values -- more connectivity with trails, better access to trails, and walkable/bike-able downtown areas.
- 5) The growth policy did not address public transportation. This is critical as many people commute back and forth and with all the visitors going to YNP, often times it is very dangerous with the extra traffic and road rage. I think many people are willing to pay money for public transportation. What would be the cost?
- 6) The growth policy should empower the Commission to have a say when local communities are threatened by industrial mining interests or multi-national companies that want to develop our natural resources.

7) The growth policy acknowledges that ag is very important in the Shields Valley, but it is also important in the Paradise Valley.

8) There should be a paragraph in the property rights section that acknowledges that one property owner's rights don't supersede or deny someone else's rights.

9) Housing is becoming a huge problem in Park County. With most jobs coming from the service industry, there is little affordable housing. As a person who has always rented in Gardiner, I feel really fortunate that my house continues to not be a vacation rental. I have watched as many places in Gardiner have been converted to vacation rentals. I would like to see incentives provided for rentals to be for people who work in Park County. The growth plan showed that a large amount of people actually live in Park County but work outside of the county. If we want to continue to have service industry jobs in Park County, we need good housing.

10) Water is really important for everyone. We all need it in one way or another. With current climate forecasting hotter and drier temperatures and growth, water will soon become an issue. I would like to see the growth plan bring all stakeholders (boaters, ranchers, fisherman, etc) together on this issue to look at water projections and create solutions before there is a shortage. Even if we continue to have climate stay the same and not have it change to more rain than snow, we will still have a water shortage.

Thank you again for taking on this huge project and thank you for seeking public involvement.

Sincerely,

Heidi Anderson

Michael Inman

From: Duncan Hagemeyer <wdhagemeyer@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 10:03 AM
To: Planning
Subject: Growth Policy Comments

1. land uses;
2. population;
3. housing needs;
4. economic conditions;
5. local services;
6. public facilities;
7. natural resources;
8. sand and gravel resources;
9. wildland urban interface;
10. criteria for subdivision review; and,
11. when and under what conditions the growth policy will be reviewed and updated.

Without a plan - plan on simply accepting the consequences. Having no plan has worked pretty well for Park County since the beginning of the formation of the county. Few people, vast wide open space and being one of the most beautiful places on the planet did not require much thought. I come from a place more than 100 miles away. The old joke back in my youth was if you came from more than a 100 miles you were an expert jerk....or was that a jerk that was and expert. Either way I do not want to come across as a jerk or an expert. My comments are based on what I say happen in a very beautiful county in TN and how the county supervisors handled an explosion of population, business, and an enhanced social structure. Williamson County, TN was very much like Bozeman for most of my life. There were about 18,000 people there in 1965. Today it is pushing 200,000. The income levels have zoomed thru the roof. Land values mimic Bozeman. Had the county leaders not had the foresight to see that the old way was over and the new was staring them in the face this county would have become a mess.

I do not think that Livingston, in the next 20 years will become Bozeman. I know Bozeman will become Williamson County, TN. So, Park County has time to make a plan that will insure that the above - long list - of concerns can and will be administered in a logical and wise manner.

Allow me to comment on this list:

1. LAND USE:. Why would anyone ever suggest that this county should turn it's back on the rural agrarian lifestyle? It would be absurd to not insure that ranches, farms, and the rural feel is not protected. The visual impact of driving from the north to the Gardiner is the crown jewel of this county. The beauty is there is so much space that there is room for almost every facet of a society. Business, industrial use, recreation, city and rural habitation....we can have it all. If there is a plan. Recognize that people want different things. Some wish that nobody lived here. Some want to live only in the urban town, or city situation. Some want planned zones where they can have an association that tells everyone how to use their property.

To make this work there has to be a plan that has something for everyone. How you get there is hard. Why? Because to start a plan means that from this starting point there has to be some that will think they have lost their dream. But even for these people losing their dream concept has to accept the reality that if they do not adjust their thoughts they might find that they are in a worse situation. An example; a rancher has thousands of acres and dreams of leaving it to his kin for generations. Fine for today, but what happens years

from now when his kin do not wish to follow the old dream and find that their land is worth little because the region has been destroyed by bad planning. I can assure you this is the case in a number of counties that border Nashville. Williamson made the hard, and correct choices and today it is prosperous and well managed.

I suggest this is due to one key factor. We had "IMPACT FEES". For each new resident who desired to move into this - Bozeman type county - the rules were they had to pay for the next policeman, fireman, teacher, build the new roads and sewers, etc. For over 25 years my taxes have gone up almost nothing because I did not pay for the next new resident to come in and enjoy the benefits paid for by the existing land owners. Taxes on new land that was developed were made higher from the issuance of a permit to build.

Fortunately we live in a free country. We cannot deny the right of another citizen to move to another place. We cannot deny them the right to buy property. But, we can create rules that make them pay their fair share of what we have created. I suggest this county consider impact fees for any new development of any type.

2. POPULATION: This is a complex issue. No population no growth, fewer jobs, more bad stuff like crime and management issues. My only comment is Park county will be a magnet for the spillover from Bozeman to the degree that land values there impact land values here. It will be impossible to control the number or the class of the population that comes to Park county unless it mimics the rules and regulation of Gallatin County. This is pretty simple logic. I admit I prefer less population. But I accept that it must be considered and managed by a growth plan.

3. HOUSING: Forces that are greater than any individuals desire or control will govern housing needs. A correct plan would include measures that will induce income production at levels that our county can maintain a standard of living that is much higher than average. It is an above average place to live, why should anyone suggest that we create a plan that focuses on low class housing. We should attempt to have housing for all socioeconomic strata, but not lose sight that we want good paying jobs that support the need for better housing.

4. ECONOMIC CONDITIONS: It is likely tourism will always be the largest source of income for the county. To focus on supporting ideas that support more tourism makes sense to me. Smile and take the tourists money should be how we think and how our young people are taught. To create concepts like the non motorized corridor between Livingston and Gardiner makes too much sense to me to not make that happen very quickly. Think of ways to make the tourist slow down and stop and spend money should be a priority in any planning.

I am against any industry that destroys the natural beauty and the environment. This county has an immense amount of land that can be used for industrial purpose. Proper zoning is needed. It directs productive job creation to locations where there is adequate labor and does not offend citizens personal lifestyles. Gold mining could be considered if there were laws in place that imposed on any business, or officer of any company or LLC, or individual property owner an impact fee and requirement a bond that guaranteed 100% of any damage. These laws do not seem to exist in MT, so gold mines should be opposed.

5 & 6. As needed and funded by new growth

7. NATURAL RESOURCES: Nature is this county's resource. Keep it natural. See comments in #4.

8. Sand and Gravel....See comments in #4

9. WILDLIFE URBAN INTERFACE: I presume this is pertaining to the Grizzly and Wolf issues. Both are icons of this region. They support tourism. They support jobs for biologists, environmental science students, game wardens, photographers, writers, non-profits groups, Etc. They are a marginal enemy for the rancher given that they get paid when they lose their income producing animal units. It should be a zero sum game for the ranchers. They should never lose a dime for a lost animal. Money should be collected from the people who make money from protecting predators. It does raise the question should those that make an income from wildlife advocacy or management get paid if the wolves and grizzly are killed. I am for keeping the interface, so long as I don't come face to face with a Grizzly in my yard. If I go into their yard it is their right to interface with me. I believe, but have not proven, that the Grizzly has now come out of their territory and into mine. I support any thing that will keep them in their zone. This includes hunting, or capturing female bears and spaying them, and capturing bear cubs and bear spraying them. They need to learn at an early age that they don't like humans and humans don't like them. They have lost the fear and they need to be reeducated. Remember: "Every predator needs a predator."

10 & 11: I leave that to the experts, but I do suggest sooner rather than later.....Gallatin County is exploding.

By the way we need an auxiliary fire station down at Tom Miner Creek Road. I am willing to work with the commissioners on a program where I participate in the construction of a building. I would hope that my neighbors feel the same. We cannot get insurance at reasonable value.

Duncan Hagemeyer
24 Rock Creek Road
Emigrant, MT 59027

1-615-478-6006

1-406-848-9866 {allow rings and call will transfer to my cell or VM}

Michael Inman

From: Dan Sullivan <danvil@live.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2016 4:09 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Support for planning

We support the county's growth plan and hope it will work with community members like the Park County Environmental Council to make this plan even better. Let's go forward together to protect Park Co as we grow.

Dan and Carole Sullivan
Mustang Fresh Food
Livingston

Sent from my iPad

Michael Inman

From: Anderson, Jessica - NRCS-CD, Livingston, MT <jessica.anderson@mt.nacdnet.net>
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2016 3:32 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Park County Growth Policy comments
Attachments: Park County Growth Policy - Park CD comments.docx

Hello,

On behalf of the Park Conservation District, please see the attached comments on the draft Park County Growth Policy update.

Thanks,

Jessica Mayo

District Administrator
Park Conservation District
5242 Hwy 89 South
Livingston, MT 59047
406-222-2899 ext.111
406-600-0440 cell

This electronic message contains information generated by the USDA solely for the intended recipients. Any unauthorized interception of this message or the use or disclosure of the information it contains may violate the law and subject the violator to civil or criminal penalties. If you believe you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the email immediately.



Park Conservation District

5242 Hwy 89 South
Livingston, MT 59047
406-222-0212 ext. 111

Memo

To: Park County Planning Department
From: Park Conservation District
cc:
Date: November 14, 2016
Re: Park County Growth Policy

Following review of the draft Park County Growth Policy, the Board of Supervisors for the Park Conservation District (Park CD) would like to take the opportunity to submit written comments regarding the document. The Park CD works hard to protect the natural resources of Park County and we appreciate the opportunity to review and provide feedback.

- 1) In regards to the input that was used to develop the referenced document, the Park CD has concerns regarding the legitimacy of the questionnaire. A significant number of the questionnaire responses were from residents of the City of Livingston. We feel these comments lack relevance given those individuals live within the city limits. Those individuals are not in appropriate positions to dictate the property rights of rural landowners and/or residents.
- 2) We do not feel the Park County Planning Department or any other county department is in the jurisdictional position to develop wildlife corridors. Rather, Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks should provide the applicable data and recommendations.
- 3) Park County is not the appropriate entity to collect nor evaluate ground and surface water resources, nor should they (Park County) use water as a development limiting method. This is a state water issue.
- 4) Park County should not be in an authoritative or regulating position to dictate or make determinations regarding the classification of prime agricultural property.

- 5) Park County is not the appropriate entity to claim jurisdiction on water quantity in Park County, as this falls under the jurisdiction of the State of Montana. The Park County residents who own water rights should be granted the use of the water to that they are entitled to use by law.
- 6) The document (Park County Growth Policy) lacks an action item for maintaining quality roads. The infrastructure of roads and bridges are essential to the agriculture producers of Park County as they use these roads on a regular basis for their daily operations. One of the primary tasks of the Park CD is to permit all activities on perennial-running streams and rivers in Park County. The proper construction and maintenance of these structures is imperative to the health of our waterways and we believe that providing a safe road network should be a top priority.
- 7) There are two watershed groups in Park County; the Upper Yellowstone Watershed Basin (UYWB) and the Shields Valley Watershed Group (SVWG). Although these groups have compiled data, it was done under the perception that the data obtained would be used by these referenced entities to accomplish specific goals. There was, and remains, notable concern that the data gathered could potentially be utilized by other government agencies to pursue goals that are inconsistent with those of the particular watershed group and its members. Often, landowners were reluctant to grant permission to gather data on their property. The watershed groups nor their members should be required to share that information. This would result in a further decline in landowner participation in watershed groups and make it more challenging for them to continue with restoration efforts.
- 8) Decisions pertaining to land use and zoning are more productively and relevantly determined by working from the grass roots upward. When neighbors come together to choose how they want their neighborhood(s) to be structured, rather than being regulated by individuals and/or entities outside the area. It provides for ease in regulation enforcement and reduces litigation as well as promoting better relationships between neighbors.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback on the Park County Growth Policy. If you have any questions, please contact the District Administrator, Jessica Mayo, at 222-0212 ext. 111 or 600-0440.

Michael Inman

From: Catherine Logan <catherineplogan@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2016 4:04 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Draft Growth Policy Comments

Dear Planning & Development Board,

Thank for your work on the Draft Growth Policy. You did a great job engaging folks throughout the county with your meetings, workshops & on-line survey. Such an inclusive & transparent process will help us become a better community.

Taking proactive measures to create a shared vision for the inevitable growth in Park County is very important to myself & my husband. We don't want our county, or county seat to become like everywhere else - our lands & other natural resources are too important to allow that "Geography of Nowhere" sort of development to just happen. We'd prefer the county establish zoning for the protections zoning garner, and to clarify the responsibilities of land owners for themselves and other citizens.

It is a tremendous drain on citizens & public officials alike to always have to play Whack-A-Mole without having the basic protocol, or adaptive management means to better address issues as they arise and then possibly having to solve our problems in the courts. We'd like development plans to incorporate not only the economics, but the societal & environmental impacts as well. This approach would help us all by creating a more resilient, just and sustainable community that's less vulnerable to out of state interests, or inappropriate industrial development.

Expanding our local, organic food production and availability could be a cornerstone from which to build on, while enhancing the rural character we cherish and want to maintain.

Thank again,
Catherine & Jesse Logan
9C Avalon Ct., P O Box 482
Emigrant, MT 59027
333-4850

Michael Inman

From: Brad Shepard <shepard.brad@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2016 11:40 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Comments on Draft Growth Policy for Park County
Attachments: Park County Draft Growth Policy comments.pdf

Dear Sir or Madame,

I am submitting these written comments for the 2016 Park County Draft Growth Policy. I support having a growth policy for the county and city of Livingston. I support private property rights, but believe our quality of life and public trust to protect our local and regional environment and quality of life are an important quality for us. I will provide comments on the specific goals and objectives of the draft policy below.

Goal 1. I support encouraging development of Livingston, but believe the Yellowstone River corridor needs additional protection through the city and should not be developed. I think there should be some reasonable “set-backs” from the normal high water level. I believe that 500 feet is not unreasonable, but would be happy with 300 feet.

I agree that more formal agreements need to be developed between the City of Livingston and Park County regarding land-use, public safety and police and fire, garbage, sewage, and water.

Goal 2. I think Park County should work with wildlife managers. I think the growth policy should identify and protect wildlife migration corridors by limiting or directing building and human development away from these corridors. I think Park County needs to help educate Park County residents, especially residents new to the area, on how humans can live with wildlife and how managing wildlife usually requires that hunting occurs, so landowners know the hunting heritage of Park County and Montana. I believe there should be strong education about not feeding wildlife, except for song birds, and how food storage needs to occur to limit conflicts. I think that Park County should work with residents to promote access by hunters if a property owner, including ranchers, want to limit wildlife use of their lands. If a landowner want to promote wildlife use of their lands, they need to understand how their management will affect their neighbors.

Goal 3. While I support reasonable fuel management to reduce the risk of wildfire, I don't support the notion of cut the trees so they can't die. I believe reasonable fire breaks around residences should be recommended; however, I also think that residents that want to live adjacent to forested areas need to understand their risks. The county should educate these folks. It might be worth having a buffer adjacent to forested lands, especially National Forest lands where no building can occur, or where a landowner would build “at their own risk” with an understanding that they would receive limited assistance if a wildfire threatened their structures.

Goal 4. I urge caution in adopting Goal 4 on the County seeking cooperative agency status for managing federal lands. Does Park County have the budget and expertise to meet the requirements of this type of cooperative agency agreement? Will this cost us more money? While it sounds nice to have Park County be an active participant in land-use planning on federal lands, it will cost money. How will this be paid for?

Goal 5. I agree that having non-governmental groups involved in helping provide services for Park County; however, I wonder if the county is willing to have these non-governmental groups make decisions regarding planning and activities undertaken in Park County.

Goal 6. I support having Park County address water quality and quantity needs, but I was disappointed that there was not a goal related to the importance of the Yellowstone River to Park County and its residents. I believe the outbreak of PKD in fish in the Yellowstone River this past summer and the need for the closure of the river highlighted how important the Yellowstone River is to Park County. The Yellowstone River provides economic and quality of life benefits to most residents of the county and I think the Growth Policy should clearly recognize these benefits and address the protection of the Yellowstone River's corridor in this growth policy.

Goal 7. I think providing broadband internet access is important and it should be affordable. I'm not sure how Park County and private providers can work together to do this, but believe it is needed.

Goal 8. I support the maintenance of existing roads, but worry about the construction of additional roads, especially roads into remote areas that access very few homes. I think there needs to be a more careful look at private versus public roads and that public roads only be supported if they provide a broad public need.

Goal 9. I strongly support some type of county fee to take on newly constructed roads. In my opinion these fees should be high enough that they can be held in trust and interest accrued would pay for the maintenance of these roads.

Goal 10. I strongly support the requirement of sewage and water districts for new developments. I think the regulation of new developments needs to be done so that a certain housing density level or number of structures automatically triggers the requirement for centralized sewage treatment and water supply. I also think the County needs to consider limiting the numbers of wells drilled or amount of water that can be pumped as a certain gpm per area.

Goal 11. I am proud of Park County's recycling program and the use of this program by the residents of the county and I think this needs to continue to be a highlight of Park County's waste management.

Goal 12. I support including low income housing as part of the Growth Policy, but do not support shoddy construction or temporary housing structures. I think seasonal housing for Yellowstone Park employees is important to provide, but the concessionaires need to provide decent housing to get special consideration. I agree that seasonal rentals are becoming a problem and am not sure how best to address this issue without infringement on private property rights. It may be possible to do this through zoning, but that would require local property owners agreeing to implement a zoning district that would prohibit rentals.

Goal 13. I agree that protecting private property rights is important, but caution that I also am a firm supporter of each resident's obligation to the greater public good. Many folks live in Park County for the quality of life we find here. When an individual threatens that quality of life, I wonder what is the greater good.

Goal 14. I strongly believe that those individuals deriving profit from buying and selling land and property in Park County need to pay a bigger share to develop and support the infrastructure that supports the real estate business. Developers, buyers and sellers, and their agents need to help pay for this infrastructure.

Goal 15. I support some diversification of the economy, but I firmly believe that if we protect our quality of life here people will figure out a way to make a living here. This has proven true in many areas of the country, and we are seeing it here now. We are growing at a reasonable pace. Unlimited and unfettered growth is the strategy of the cancer cell. Let's be happy with our county and community.

Thanks for your efforts to manage growth of our county.

[NOTE: I have also included these comments as a PDF attachment].

Peace,

--

Brad

Brad Shepard
5 9th Street Island Drive
Livingston, Montana 59047
t + 1 406.223.3011
shepard.brad@gmail.com

Comment on 2016 Park County draft growth policy.

Overall I think the Draft Growth Policy document is very well done. The layout and break down with appendices make a large document more readable especially with the different color type emphasis. I appreciate that you made the document a learning tool with explanations of Federal, state and local regulations regarding gravel pits, water uses, wildfire and wildlife regulations.

That being said, it doesn't answer or clarify several things. Perhaps you would consider adding a sentence here and there to clarify what you know you are talking about but the reader may not.

- Is *Goal #1* the 4 mile donut? If not what?
- How do you define affordable housing?
- *Objective 12.1: Prepare a housing plan for all of Park County that identifies affordable housing needs and targets, identifies possible funding sources, and pinpoints implementation partners.*
- Do you mean taxpayer subsidized housing?

One question that has not been addressed in this document is what is the cost of subdivision regulations? The cost of these regulations has a direct impact on housing affordability costs. It would be good to have this answer before you rewrite the subdivision regulations (goal 9) and would help with the answer to Goal 12.

- *Objective 9.1: Update the subdivision regulations to ensure new subdivisions pay a proportional share of their impact when upgrading County roads to meet County standards.*
- *Goal 12: Provide for affordable, low income and workforce housing.*

Taxpayers should not have to subsidize housing for other workers. Sensible subdivision regulations can help reduce some cost factors (Bozeman is experimenting with smaller lots) and the bottom line is employers have to pay higher wages or supply housing if they want employees.

The County administration should not be micro-managing private businesses. The county should support self-reliant businesses not kill them.

- *Objective 12.5: Evaluate the benefits and impacts of vacation rentals on communities.*

The following are good basic premises:

- *Objective 13.1: When making decisions regarding land use, uphold provisions of the US Constitution and the Constitution of the State of Montana that protect private property rights.*

- *14.1: Recognize the relationship between enhanced revenues generated by new growth and the long term liabilities for maintaining infrastructure and providing services.*
- *Policy: Support a planning approach that recognizes some issues are localized, and other issues are countywide.*
- *Objective 14.5: Identify areas of critical agricultural importance and implement mechanisms in these areas that support the ability of agricultural land owners to continue operations*
- *Objective 14.6: Develop incentives to encourage planned development that will be served by existing or planned infrastructure near existing communities centers.*

I am against zoning but I do appreciate your efforts in the “Regulatory tools” section to explain various types of zoning in use in Montana and how they might apply to different parts of Park County communities with different needs.

Lastly, under your section:

- *The Planning Context in Montana. (copied below)*
- *County - A growth policy can cover all or part of a jurisdiction. In Park County, it covers the unincorporated areas of the county, including the unincorporated communities like Wilsall, Gardiner, Cooke City and Silver Gate. The growth policy calls for coordination with the incorporated communities of Clyde Park and Livingston, but it does not have jurisdiction to address issues or topics within the jurisdiction of those communities.*
- *City - Both Clyde Park and Livingston have adopted their own growth policies. The planning context of these documents may extend beyond their city limits, but they have no jurisdiction in the county unless annexation occurs or the city/town and county sign an interlocal agreement to share some planning responsibilities.*

You clearly state that the Growth Policy of Park County does not include the incorporated cities of Clyde Park and Livingston and that they in return have no jurisdiction over Park County Growth Policy with exception of the particular interlocal agreements. These being the case why in your appendix B, Stake holder interviews do you take opinion from Livingston residents and Clyde Park at all? Why does your Monkey survey incorporate opinion from city of Livingston residents? I realize Livingston is used as a generic area in the survey but 25% of the addresses of respondents are in the city proper (not including PO boxes.)

The inclusion of opinion from these out of area people is against the Montana Planning rules you set forth in this document as statement of the principle upon which this document is written. The inclusion of these out of area opinions represent a significant portion of collected opinion upon which you wrote this document.

City residents and county residents have very different views of the county administrative roll. City residents want concierged nature - an experience for their weekend entertainment viewed from manicured bike paths provided and maintained by the county. County residents view these bike paths as yet another source of noxious weed contamination of their crop and grazing pastures. This is just one example of why including incorporated city opinions makes a big difference in the overall outcome of the report and the future direction of the county planning. This is undoubtedly why the legislature wrote the planning restrictions between incorporated cities and counties to begin with.

Inclusion of Livingston and Clyde Park city opinion is very unfortunate and very unfair to County residents who will bear the burden and brunt of new regulations made based on conclusions from this polluted pool of thoughts.

Many of the recent county land conflicts arise because people buy homes and don't read their deeds and home owner association rules. They don't familiarize themselves with county and State laws. When something they don't like comes to the fore they want the county to remedy their lack of due diligence at the expense of all county residents.

Ann Hallowell
Fleshman Creek Road
Livingston, MT
November 16, 2016

Michael Inman

From: Tim Stevens <tim@kendedafund.org>
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2016 10:19 AM
To: Planning
Subject: Comments on draft growth policy

Dear Friends-

I am unable to make the draft growth policy public meeting tomorrow but I wanted to provide you with my comments, or at least my 10,000 ft view of the most contentious piece of the growth policy—whether or not the county should take additional steps to direct growth in the county.

The reality is that it's time for the county to consider more actively engaging in what/where/if/how and under what conditions growth takes place in the county. It is a mark of maturity and recognition that doing nothing is no longer an option. If no action is taken to provide the 'rules of the road' for growth in the county, we will continually be subjected to simply responding to the next ill-planned development, proposed gold mine, gravel pit, cheesy ticky-tacky schmaltz that in turn will only serve to degrade the qualities the draw people here in the first place.

To suggest we don't need additional regulation of growth is naïve. We are already seeing the impacts of growth- both positive and negative- in our county and that will only continue at an accelerated pace over time. Lack of planning only provides uncertainty for everyone—prospective buyers, realtors, current landowners, etc. A recent example from Gallatin Co.- a cousin and her family recently purchased a home in Bozeman in a growth area. The determining factor that drove whether or not they were going to purchase the home was – what will happen to the open space across the street? The realtor assured her that while that land was set to be developed, there would only be a certain # of homes per acre—can't recall the exact number- but if that question was asked in Park Co., the response would be 'gee, I can't tell you.' In today's day and age, that response is not good enough and certainly will not be good enough for folks looking to move to our community.

We must build the framework now to anticipate and appropriately direct the next 10 years of growth in our county, otherwise we are simply sitting ducks for the big money developers who will no doubt come our way. As has played out over the past 5-10 years, no land use direction in the growth policy simply shifts the burden of directing that development to the neighbors. It is inappropriate for the county to shift the burden for directing appropriate development to private citizens who must invest their time and resources into beating back an endless stream of stupid ideas that benefit nobody in the long term. Given all that has happened over the past few years, I suspect that you will find additional supporters in the county than has existed in the past.

Now is the time for the county to step up to the plate and make the decisions that will provide the county and its' citizens assurances that Park county will grow, but will grow in a way that is harmony with the land and its' people. Please, join the 21st century and most other counties across the rural west. This is not rocket science; it's backed by state statute

and case law and is a bare minimum of what's expected of counties in 2016. Time to grow up and step up.

Much thanks,

Tim Stevens
315 N. 3rd St.
Livingston, MT
406-223-3137

Michael Inman

From: Rick Lamplugh <ricklamplugh@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2016 4:31 AM
To: Planning
Subject: Comment on Park County Growth Policy

First, I want to thank Park County for ensuring that the process of developing a growth policy is open and transparent with many different ways for community members to engage. I am glad that the County wants to create a shared vision for our community's inevitable growth.

As the county grows, I want to protect Park County's rural character, and I want to see Park County recruit good paying jobs to supplement jobs in agriculture.

Businesses that provide high-paying jobs want to locate in communities with a quality of life like we have. This means we must protect our water and access to public lands. We must promote more connectivity between communities and open spaces 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 multi-national companies that want to develop our natural resources. The recent gold mine controversy has made the need for community say very clear.

The 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.

Growth is coming and we want to have a say in how our community grows. Without a plan, we are vulnerable to out of state interests deciding what's best for Park County.

Thank you,

Rick Lamplugh

14 Gardiner View Rd.

Gardiner, MT 59030

Michael Inman

From: Suzanne Purtee <suzanne.purtee@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2016 11:49 AM
To: Planning
Subject: Draft Growth Policy

I have spent much of this morning reading the policy, the survey comments and everything else.

Plenty has been said and much of it is on the right track -- we have a lot of people who are interested and passionate about Park County. I hope tonight's meeting results in some active steps and that the county continues to inform all of the residents about each step along the way.

thank you - I work so cannot attend tonight.

Suzanne, park county resident

--

JP

256.665.4821

Michael Inman

From: Rick Bass <rickbass27@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2016 2:11 PM
To: Planning

I'm writing to urge you to choose only options that preserve/increase where possible the open space quality of Park County and general milieu of wildness that is the great benefit of being close to public land and parks. I hope to see the high elevation checkerboarding reduced/consolidated as well.

Sincerely,

Rick Bass
196 Bridger Hollow
Pray, MT59605

Michael Inman

From: Peter Murray <pmwm12@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 4:35 PM
To: Planning
Subject: P Murray comments on 2016 Land Use Plan
Attachments: Comments of Park Co Growth Policy 1 Nov 2016.docx

Lawson: here is the fleshed out additions to my email comments.

Thanks for the good work.

Pete

Park County Growth Policy: 2016

Comments by Peter Murray, Old Chico

I have read the entire PCGP-20016. Here are some additional thoughts on the comments I provided the Park County Planning Department recently.

1. Park County Land Bank:

It would be interesting if a survey of large land parcels in Paradise Valley, for example, could be done to ascertain the likelihood of those parcels being developed during the lifetime of the current owners or being sold off after the death of the owners. If the current owners could be assured of keeping their property in agriculture or ranching, for example, it might be possible to create a Park County Land Bank in which properties in the program would receive preferential tax status as long as the properties were kept in agricultural or ranching activities. The property owners would be giving up some development rights while getting some tax benefits and keeping the property in the current farming or ranching status for future generations.

King County, WA has such program -

<http://kingcounty.gov/environment/stewardship/sustainable-building/transfer-development-rights/bank.aspx>

If a property owner had some long term incentive to keep the property in agriculture or ranching there might be less pressure to sell off parts of the property or the entire ranch, as the saying goes.

One of the benefits of such a program could be less indiscriminate development in the form of commercial ventures like a gravel pit along RT 89 or a small piece of property with a bunch of single wide trailers such as we are now seeing in Corwin Springs.

If the property were taken out of the program at some future date, as in the King County Plan, there would be some tax consequences such as a total or partial recapture of taxes based on the former tax schedule.

2. Development of housing stock for Park County.

A survey of workers in Park County might provide information of who works where, where they live, full time or part time, and how far their commute is.

Livingston, Gardiner, Clyde Park come to mind. If it were possible to determine where folks live and work it might be possible to create housing stock that could accommodate the folks who work in these areas. If there is the potential for more people to be employed in an area....Gardiner or Cooke City, for example, zoning for multiple family units might be created to encourage land owners to develop those kinds of housing units to accommodate the folks who might otherwise have to commute from Gardiner to Livingston or vice versa.

With many rental properties converting to Vacation Rental By Owner (VRBOs), the availability and affordability of housing is at a premium in many areas of Park County.

3. On the water issue...

I do not know what the current rules are governing water but there is a lot of water being pumped out of pivot and line sprinkler systems in Paradise Valley which does not actually recharge the aquifer or in the end reach the Yellowstone River. Most sprinkler water is lost to evaporation, plant growth and transpiration.

In Paradise Valley, for example, a serious discussion among the Upper Yellowstone Water Basin folks, the fishing industry and the municipalities and private water users needs to start soon. How much of the alfalfa grown in the Paradise Valley is used locally and how much is a cash crop for export out of Park County? Creating another irrigated field of alfalfa for export may not benefit the other stakeholders. The extra water might be better used by being left in the water system that feeds the Yellowstone River.

Other areas of the West have addressed the issues associated with the demands on water as a diminishing resource. Drought and climate change are with us and adjustments in water use will either come by proactively addressing the issue or by watching the collapse of the economies that depend on water as a resource.

A recent issue of the National Geographic addressed "Water in the West".....the Ogallala Aquifer in many areas has gone dry. Those farmers who have been converting to dryland farming are ahead of the curve while other farmers ignore the climate issue and will pump till the well goes dry....there is a message here for Park County's future. The continued or expanding use of a finite resource – water - can only lead to its collapse. The stakeholders on this issue should come to some form of understanding on how water will be allocated. Water is a Montana State resource. Perhaps there are processes in place now for handling the water Issue, but there is little public discussion on this critical topic which will affect Park County and beyond.

Michael Inman

From: Kristen Galbraith <kristen@nittanygrantworks.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2016 7:38 AM
To: Michael Inman; Lawson Moorman
Subject: FW: Park County Growth Policy - Review
Attachments: Park County Growth Policy - Review Memo.pdf; _Certification_.htm

FYI

Kristen Galbraith, GPC
Grants and Special Projects
406-222-6555

From: Jackson, Maria [mailto:MJackson3@mt.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2016 4:30 PM
To: Kristen Galbraith
Cc: Dave DeGrandpre; Cossitt, Anne; Byrom, Gus
Subject: Park County Growth Policy - Review

Hi Kristen,

As requested and as part of the CDBG planning grant technical assistance process, attached is the review memo for the County's draft Growth Policy. Please feel free to contact us with any questions.

Thank you,

Maria

Maria K. Jackson, Planning Specialist
Community Development Division | Montana Department of Commerce
301 South Park Avenue | PO Box 200523 | Helena, MT 59620
P: 406.841.2550 | F: 406.841.2771 | comdev.mt.gov

No virus found in this message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 2016.0.7859 / Virus Database: 4664/1 - Release Date: 10/13/16
Internal Virus Database is out of date.

MEMO

Date: November 16, 2016
To: Kristen Galbraith, Park County; Park County Commissioners; and
Dave DeGrandpre, Land Solutions, LLC
From: Anne Cossitt, Community Planning Bureau, Montana Department of Commerce
Subject: Park County Growth Policy (CDBG Planning Grant Contract MT-CDBG-15PL-26)

This memo presents the results of a review of Park County's draft Growth Policy prepared by Land Solutions, LLC. We encourage you to review these comments prior to finalizing the document. Please contact us with any questions or additional comments you may have. We are interested in what you think.

Comments:

The Plan covers the components of the Montana Growth Policy statute. The document includes a number of good maps and discussion. The following are suggested as a way to further strengthen this document.

1. **Land Use.** It would be helpful to include an inventory of existing land uses by type of use and acreage.
Resources: Montana State Library, interactive maps <https://mslservices.mt.gov/maps/gallery/>, scroll down to the Montana Natural Heritage Map Viewer: Land cover. This map is interactive and can provide detailed information on land cover useful for identifying land uses by acreage and as a % of total county land area. The interactive map includes all cover types and lists uses directly related to human use such as "cultivated crops," "roads," "residential," etc. The majority of the land cover types are vegetative types and more of a "natural resource" topic than land use.
2. **Population.** As a suggestion it would be helpful if the key population characteristics of the principal communities within the County, including population trends, were presented, in addition to examining population only at the County level.
3. **Housing Needs.** We strongly encourage including more information on the supply and condition of the housing stock within the principal communities of the County.
Resources:
 - **Housing White Paper, 2012 Edition.**
<http://housing.mt.gov/Portals/93/shared/docs/HousingDivision/WhitePaper/2012WhitePaper>
 - **American Community Survey - General Housing Characteristics can be found at:**
http://ceic.mt.gov/Documents/ACS/ACS_13_5YR/ACS_13_5YR_DP04_County.pdf

Michael Inman

From: Matthew Ohlen <matt.ohlen@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 6:01 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Growth Policy Comment

To Whom It May Concern:

As a Park County resident I would like to voice my priorities for the Park County Growth Policy. I would like the Growth Policy to promote slow, thoughtful growth that prioritizes maintaining open space and recreational uses of the amazing land in Park County. I want growth in Park County to be done in such a way that protects water resources and limits mining or industrial uses of our resources. As we saw this summer with the fish kill in the Yellowstone River, our outdoor recreational resources are not bulletproof and will only come under more threat if Park County allows mining and industrial uses of those resources. We cannot risk the damage to our resources (which already generate millions of dollars of spending) that consumptive uses of those resources present.

Sincerely,

Matthew D Ohlen

Park County Planning Board
 Growth Policy Public Hearing November 17th, 2016 4:00 p.m.

	Name	Address	Email (optional)
1	Wm Martin	3 Martin Way	—
2	Dick Gubke	19 W. Grannis Rd	
3	Dick Perry	107 Prairie Dog Rd	Liv
4	Cara Perry	107 Prairie Dog Rd.	Liv
5	Peter Murray	Old Chico	
6	DAN SULLIVAN	11 TOMAHAWK, PRAY	CORECONCEPTS@COMCAST.NET
7	Dan Nelson	46 Cherokee Creek Ln	NO
8	Mary Swanson	POB 82, Emigrant	
9	Alan Redfield	536 Mill Creek Rd	
10	BILLIE JEAN RIPPLE	PO Box 160, CLYDE PARK	
11	Alvin W. Hartman	PO BOX 20 Clyde Park MT	
12	Ed Schumy	Box 21 C.P.	
13	Joe Lamm	Box 1390, LIV.	
14	Linda L. Ulrich	PO BOX 235 Emigrant	
15	Debra Lamm	PO Box 1390 Livingston	dlamm@debralammm.com
16	Wendy Riley	PO Box 566 Emigrant	
17	Carol Reed	PO Box 84, Emigrant	
18	Jerry Ladawig	PO Box 1184 Emigrant	
19	Jeff Ladawig	" "	
20	GARRY COTANT	PO Box 508 LIVINGSTON	
21	Ray Gubke	197 W.	
22	Kristen Galbraith	POB 1766 LIV.	
23	Heather Jovanovich	309 S. 9th	
24	Ken Cochran	PO BOX 22 Pray	
25	Ron Ar + h 411	W. 15th	
26	Jill + Tom + M. M. M. M.	Linn	
27	Jasmyne Hall	318 S 7th	

Park County Planning Board
Growth Policy Public Hearing November 17th, 2016 4:00 p.m.

	Name	Address	Email (optional)
28	Ned Zimmerman	541 Daisy Dean	
29	Ray Sundling		
30	John Feetcher	608 1/2 1st E	
31	David & Lise Fine	Kingston	
32	Nelson & Rita King	5 WINDY WAY	
33	LES ARTHUR	Wilsall	
34	Vicki Sielaff	23 Alder Ln	
35	WAYNE SIELAFF	23 ALDER LN	
36	Mary Holman	Box 2424	
37	Allen Gahr	33 Eastey Ln.	
38	Jack Swanson	562 Meigs Rd.	
39	Greg Oyle	707 N N ST	
40	Lenore Haws	53 Belmont Ln	
41	Don Dwyer	522 E Heyser	
42	Michael W. Sisk	515 N Park St	
43	Chad Standish	Pray	
44	Glenn E Doernick	Olepe Park	
45	Jim Barnes	Park City	
46	Peter Mackenzie	Myas Lane	
47	Richard Huron	71 Merrill Lane.	
48	Gayleen Malove	PCD	
49	Lindie Gibson	111 N Yellowstone #4	
50	MART MALOVE		
51	Erica Ste	Liv.	
52	Ken Decker	WV.	
53	Mary Strickroth	Gardiner	
54	Rid Lamphy 2	Gardiner	

9c

Park County Planning Board
Growth Policy Public Hearing November 17th, 2016 4:00 p.m.

	Name	Address	Email (optional)
55	Manhattan Hillis	158 Pine Creek	
56	Kris Henson Dumm	Livingston	
57	Ron Burke	498 Jandone Rd Gardiner	
58	Jim SARG	223 S. 5th Liv	
59	PAUL SUNVISON	117 PRAIRIE DR	
60	Rick Halloran	19 Dear Run hwy	
61	Ann Hallwell	Freshman Creek Rd	
62	Anna Claire Scruggs	112 S. C. St.	
63	Mike Gomez	611 MD	
64	Sally Brainerd	419 OCP Livingston	
65	Celia Brainerd	"	
66	Art Vign	117 Falls Creek Rd	
67	Glenn Hunt	417 So. 9th	
68	Jim Hunt	417 S. 9th	
69	Esther Mannhardt	Livingston	
70	Doreen	"	
71	George	1924 N. Hwy 67	
72	Tom Lane	Livingston	
73	Manny Coetz	502 Old Clyde Pk	
74	Breg Coleman	11 Yellowstone Trail Livingston	
75	Halle Ryheimer	670 Elwood Hwy 86	
76	Bill Moser	1185 E RR Pray	bill.moser11@outlook.com
77	Michelle Uberuag	126 S. 8th St. Livingston, MT	michelle.uberuag@gmail.com
78	Lyra Ames	206 S. L. St.	
79	Bryan Welk	P.O. 35	Pray MT 59045
80	Don Freund	216 South 9th St.	
81	Jon Springer	63 Summit Way	Gardiner

Park County Planning Board
 Growth Policy Public Hearing November 17th, 2016 4:00 p.m.

	Name	Address	Email (optional)
82	Ehitz Hoiness	512 Frontage Rd East	
83	Suzanne Goodman	204 So K St, 2nd	
84	Edwin Johnson	88 Mel Heron Rd	edwin@montanaguide.com
85	Rick VanDusen	220 W. Montana	rdv59047@wisjones.net
86	CHARLOTTE FREEMAN	214 South C	cmf406@gmail.com
87	Jennifer Teigel	166 Miller	info@Livingston-Chamber.com
88	Debi Kowalzyk	1515 W. Park St	debk@yellowstonepioneerlod.com
89	Nancy Gruehl	1075 Hwy 89 So,	
90	Juanita Lux	1365 E. Gallatin	Juanita.Lux@gmail.com
91	Jessica Mayo	71 Willow Creek Rd.	jessicamayor40@gmail.com
92	Jessica Wilcox	617 N. 8th	jewilliams200@gmail.com
93	MICHAEL McCORMICK	28 FRONTRUN TRAIL	
94	Jeremy O'Hare	Box 955 Livingston	
95	Mark Hjortberg	231 SD St. Livingston	
96	Erica Lightniser	275 Convict Grade	
97	TAMMY LEWIS	PO Box 422	Tammy@aastorage.us
98	Kay Mortve	216 S Yellowstone	KMORTVE409@gmail.com
99	MICHELLE BECKER	515 W. PARK	MICHELLE@MAVERICKBROKERS.COM
100	Chuck Downone	187 Meigs	Downoneclark@gmail.com
101	MARK BENDER	315 South 8th Liv.	
102	Ann Schuller	1451 Hwy 89 N	
103	Nancy Keosler	914 W Clark	wkessler@hotmail.com
104	Jenny Harbine	713 Loch Leven Dr. Liv	jenny.harbine@gmail.com
105	Robin Addicott	86 Wineglass Rd	RobinAddicott@gmail.com
106	Lauren Dalzell	227 S. B St.	Ldalzellmth@hotmail.com
107	Kelly Niles	12 Horse Thief Tr.	Kelly@Fishingowlfarm.com
108	Jeannette Blank	418 S 9th St.	

Park County Planning Board
Growth Policy Public Hearing November 17th, 2016 4:00 p.m.

	Name	Address	Email (optional)
109	J. LITCHFIELD	291 S. I ST	
110	Dennis Glick	411 S. Yellowstone Liv	
111	DEWITT DOMINICK	34 Eagles Landing CP	
112	JEFF WALSH	12 Horse Triage Trail	JEFF@MERCURYCS.COM
113	Louis Hidalgo	(P.O. BOX) 513 EMIGRANT, MT.	(406) 223-8344
114	John Nelson	55 Merrill Lane	406-223-9097
115			
116			
117			
118			
119			
120			
121			
122			
123			
124			
125			
126			
127			
128			
129			
130			
131			
132			
133			
134			
135			

Park County Planning Board
Public Comment Form Draft 2016 Park County Growth Policy Update
November 17th, 2016

Name: JEFF WELCH

Address: 12 HORSE TACK TRAIL

Comments: AS A BUSINESS OWNER AND RURAL
PROPERTY OWNER IN THE SHIELDS VALLEY
I STRONGLY ENCOURAGE THE COMMISSION
TO ADOPT THE GROWTH POLICY AS A MEANS
TO BETTER PLAN FOR A SOLID FUTURE FOR
PARK COUNTY.

Thank you
