

Public Comment Received February 2019 - 10/7/2019

Date	Name	Comment
10/7/2019	Emily Coleman	<p>My name is Emily Coleman and I've been living in Jackson Hole for nearly four years now. I want to express my support for affordable housing in the area because as a member of this community, I find the lack of work force support incredibly frustrating. The people responsible for making this community what it is deserve more respect when it comes to stable housing. Most of my friends and I have or currently do work for non profits in this town and are invaluable members of this town. We've all had to move several times over the past few years and it's starting to drive my beloved community away. Please continue to support affordable housing efforts, including the one on 440 W Kelly. Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>
10/7/2019	Gwynne Carpenter	<p>As a local who has lived here for 4 years, I take care of numerous families children in the Valley. Teachers, local business owners, and blue-collar workers all rely on me to care for their children. I also volunteer for Teton Adaptive Sports and continue to advocate for those who don't have a voice. As a valued community member I ask you to reconsider your opposition to the 16-unit complex for W. Kelly. I have been camping and sleeping on couches for the past 5 months while waiting to win the lottery for an affordable house. With the cold months coming to the issue of the housing shortage is in my face every day. If I were to have adequate housing then I can continue to be a contributing member of this community, without it a lot of my resources are compensated. Thank you immensely for your time and consideration.</p>
10/7/2019	Jonah Sloven	<p>I just wanted to thank and remind you of the importance of affordable housing in Teton County. I have been bouncing around the valley for 7 years now and am currently in school, working, and volunteering to better serve our community. I hope to continue to make Jackson my home and wish to make it more accessible to everyone.</p>
10/7/2019	Nikki Kaufman	<p>I am emailing in full support of the full 16 unit housing project at 440 West Kelly. In my opinion, this project has been put at a stand still by a handful of loud voices representing only a few.—and a few who are not being directly affected by our dire housing crises. I have moved five times in four years—with houses being sold out from under me, my landlord creating a vacation rental, or my rent skyrocketing for an already rundown and expensive place. I am a young professional in Jackson with a full time job, but spend my free time picking up restaurant shifts to pay my rent. I also spend much of my free time volunteering for nonprofits in town that I believe help uphold our incredible community character. I represent a demographic of people in Teton County who are trying to work hard to stay in this valley—not own a second home here, not VRBO our houses to make extra money, but be a real part of this community and give back. We can not afford to wait for affordable housing anymore, and you can not afford to lose us if you don't want this place to be solely tourists and those seeking a tax haven. Plus, without us—who will serve them tacos, tune their skis, and plant their flowers? Lastly, if you believe that this project goes against our comp plan and will waterfall into more projects creating density issues and challenging our "community character," I'd ask you to take into consideration that 42% of Teton County employees are commuters. We are creating an ever growing carbon footprint within our valley and reaping no benefits. There commuters do not pay taxes, do not buy locally, do not give back to the community, etc but utilize our amenities, our roads and infrastructure, and leave their footprint. I believe many people who would be in full support of this project, do not have the time or energy to learn about the issue or voice their opinion (and especially attend 1pm meetings on a weekday) so I am trying to represent that group. Thank you for the hard work you have already put in to this project and I look forward to the council and commission working together to find a solution that keeps our community members housed.</p>
10/7/2019	Seadar Rose Davis	<p>Thank you for your continued work on affordable housing in our community. I've been fortunate to call this place home for over 15 years, and know personally the challenges of finding and keeping affordable housing. My husband and I have applied for over 5 homes through the Affordable Housing program, and though we have never been lucky enough to have that winning entry, we have seen many of our friends find stable housing through this program. We have also seen countless friends leave because of the lack of affordable housing, and grapple with that decision ourselves all the time. Every new home you can get into the ground for our community members is essential. There is an opportunity at 440 West Kelly that simply stated, needs to get started. Please move forward with this project and consider the needs of the entire community when making your decision. This project ticks a lot of boxes - in a complete neighborhood, close to transit options, schools, businesses and more. The people who will live in this project will no doubt add to the fabric and character of the neighborhood. Thank you for serving our community and taking on important issues like affordable housing.</p>
10/6/2019	Clare Stumpf	<p>I have lived out of my van every summer since 2014. I hope that the housing complex on 440 W. Kelly will be approved and underway soon. I want to be a member of this community, and I strive to contribute positively to the valley. Luckily, I just secured housing for the winter, but many are not as lucky as I am. When people who want to become engaged citizens have trouble finding a place to rest their head, their mental bandwidth for volunteering, running for local boards or offices, or even simply recreating is subverted to scrambling for housing. If we want our community members to be able to be their best, we should make sure that their housing is secure. This complex will be the first of hopefully many solutions to the crisis we are all experiencing in Jackson. The houses on that Kelly block are all sitting on multi-million-dollar parcels. If we don't knock them down to build affordable housing and fill them with local workers, we will end up with another Gill Addition. Do we want another block of empty mansions, or a block full of vital housing our own workforce? Two critical goals as Jackson Hole residents will be furthered by this complex: achieving 65% of our workers housed locally and reducing emissions. A majority of our local emissions come from transportation, and much of that is from the multitudes of people that commute from other counties. If we want to be a model community for fighting climate change, creating housing for local employees is a small but important step. Finally, I don't believe that the interests of a few neighbors on the Kelly block should overpower what is best for the most underserved—the unhoused—in our community. Creating affordable housing solutions will bring about change we should all welcome. I hope you all choose to support the project on West Kelly, and many future affordable housing projects. Your constituents are counting on you!</p>
10/6/2019	Julia Smith	<p>I am writing to voice my support for the affordable housing development project at 440 W. Kelly, and in support of any further projects. Affordable housing has been one of the biggest struggles for myself and my peers while living in Jackson. It is not reasonable for community members to be expected to pay big city rent with a lack of high income employment in the area. Even while working two jobs (and I feel that I am the minority having just two) I have felt the struggle to make living in Jackson affordable. If the town wants to continue to be a tourist destination, it cannot afford to lose its blue collar work force. Many people move to Jackson for all of its wonderful qualities: a sense of community, the access to the outdoors, its culture, etc. However, most of us are only able to make a few years run of it, and then have to move on because it is no longer financially feasible. It would be a great tragedy to allow this cycle to continue. Jackson is filled with people who love and care about it and want to become long-term, engaged citizens but that is simply not possible for many of us. Providing more affordable housing will certainly make it so that we are not faced with the harsh current reality that Jackson is simply unaffordable for a large majority of the population. I urge you to move forward with the development on West Kelly and to continue to approve and foster similar projects in the future. Thank you for your consideration.</p>

10/6/2019 Linda Williams I am having a huge problem understanding WHY you are not seriously considering the suggestions from the neighbors regarding 440 W Kelly Street. It appears to me that they are working really hard at being part of the "solution" here. And it also appears you all are successfully countering their efforts by being the "problem". How do you reasonably expect the voters to support SPEC issues when you can't move forward responsibly with existing proposals regarding housing.

10/6/2019 Michael Stern It is my understanding that the 440 West Kelly project is again on the agenda for the JIM meeting tomorrow, with the same set of tired options that the Housing Department has presented before. The same ones that have already been roundly rejected by the community. Do they think we have forgotten, or that we won't notice as they (you?) try to cram it down our throats one more time? Is this just Einstein's definition of insanity, or pure arrogance? A combination of both perhaps? Either way you, our elected decision-makers, need to put a stop to it. The community of citizens who have been engaged around this issue have insisted from the beginning, that we want to see compatible, affordable housing on this site. Such options have been developed and presented for your consideration, yet they appear nowhere in your deliberations. The path forward is simple enough. Accept the fact that the existing RFP process is fatally flawed and put an end to it. Work with our community to flesh out the best of the options we have presented to you - we have our preferences to be sure - and lets get this done. Work with us, not against us. Is that too much to ask?

10/6/2019 Perri Stern For 8 months now, we have been asking you to work with the diverse group of people who are concerned about the outcomes of the 440 West Kelly Ave. project; residents of the immediate neighborhood as well as countless other residents of the Town and County who are concerned about responsible development and sensible strategies for increased density in our neighborhoods. The Housing Department staff report for tomorrow's JIM meeting reads like the worst of the golden oldies-- the same, tired, unproductive options that you have rejected many times over. The community group has ALWAYS supported affordable housing and manageable increased density at 440 West Kelly Avenue. Rather than rehashing the same, unproductive, divisive options that you have been fed for the better part of the past year, options that prioritize heads-in-beds, rather than smart, responsible, neighborhood development, step up and work with the community. Seriously discuss and select one of the 3 very viable concepts that the community has offered in good faith for that site.

10/6/2019 Richard Greig Judy and I have lived in Jackson 48 years and at our home at 530 West Hansen for 46 years. We support workforce housing with a size and bulk consistent with the Character District of our neighborhood transitional zone as defined by the Teton County Comprehensive Plan (CP) NOT by the Town of Jackson "fill the box" LDR's. Six to eight units in one or two, two story buildings is consistent with the vision of the CP. resulting with a unit density 6 to 8 times the current density, not an order of magnitude density change options presented to you. As our elected county officials, we ask that you: continue to support designs for 440 West Kelly that conform to the vision of the CP for our character district; do not support designs that "fill the box" for either a two story or three story building; and do not abdicate your responsibility to require compliance to the vision of the CP to the Town of Jackson.

10/6/2019 Richard Greig Well here we are again with three proposed options which we have seen before and none of which were deemed acceptable. We do not support any of the three proposed options as: Option One would result with the original 16 unit proposal by Roller Development and Tack Development; Option Two sets the precedent for all further development of workforce housing in the transitional zones and would not be consistent with the Character Districts defined by the Comprehensive Plan; Option Three doesn't consider the town selling 430 and 440 lots to the county or a possibility of both county and town working with Habitat for Humanity or other similar entity. We do support designs of 6 or 8 units in one or two 2 story buildings that the neighborhood group sent to you previously. We hope you would consider these options also.

10/6/2019 Ryan Nourai In regards to the housing project proposal at W. Kelly. Please allow me to explain why I believe you should create a dense housing-project on West Kelly. As a homeowner, I hope my vantage point offers nuance compared to the loud voices on Kelly, and those who do not have access to housing. Be so bold as to leave some space for those that stick around year-round, for those that add context to this community. We all know the Indiana Jones - sized boulder comes in the form of money that sits in an empty house, not the nouveau riche who want a slice of heaven. The blame is not on those who want to live here with their broad windows and large-lawns, yet, it will be on the bodies who do not accommodate our work-force now. Two Thanksgivings ago I moved from the cul-de-sac of Glenwood, a stone's throw away from - what was - Lift. The move further east, I settled down in a home built by New West, two lots away from Mike Yokel, just to the East. When I first moved in, I looked around and was concerned by the lack of activity. Back on Glenwood, I couldn't sneeze without a neighbor saying bless-you. Slowly I came to see that the alleyway, full of affordable housing, Hall itself, and the small HOA I live within, was bustling with activity. At first, I braced for parking lot chaos when the Redmond housing project was completed, yet it went over without a blip. Good friends live in Redmond houses. Dear neighbors live in the houses that line the alley between Kelly and Hall. We walk each other's dogs, shovel each other's driveways, we sit on the gravel alley in the summer and drink beer. Were it not for the affordable housing surrounding me, my friends wouldn't be able to live in Jackson, and I wouldn't be able to live amongst them. Katie, studying to become a nurse (all while staying in Jackson) lives with two other gals (one also a nurse) on Hall, Taryn and Travis, local artists, live in the new Redmond homes. These people live and work in Jackson full-time. Ironically it is the owners of some of the homes within the HOA who do not live in Jackson full-time. The East Hall block is a microcosm of a working block within Jackson. Move three blocks east and two blocks north and you'll see the risk we take if the McMansions such as the one I live in were to be commonplace. It's a vapid, airless block. The sound of children laughing on a fall evening is three blocks away, near cache creek, another great example of a "mixed" neighborhood. The small margin you are looking for, for a perfect place to place affordable housing, it's going to be tough to find. Take this opportunity and do those living on the E. Kelly block a favor - give them a community. Allow them to feel the embrace of a community that weathers the winter together, before it goes the way of, "I don't know my neighbor" & "Sorry, I'm stuck over the pass". We have all seen friends move, and I know many of you have also seen friends make it work. I'm in no position to assume the plight of the person who cannot find housing. With that being said, I can tell you I have seen, hard-working, capable, and devoted community members leave, as a result of a lack of housing options. The Kelly project should be utilized to it's highest potential to create a vibrant, mixed neighborhood, within a city where the members of this community who keep it functional can live. Thank you for your time and dedication to this community; I'm constantly in awe by all of your work and feel lucky to have you read my note.

10/4/2019 Eliza Todd I am writing today to ask that you please support the housing on West Kelly. I am a young professional and have been in the valley the past seven years. I live/rent here with my husband and our rental has recently been put on the market. New housing options are critical to keeping ourselves and others in this town that we have grown to love and now call home. Thank you for your hard work and dedication to our community.

10/4/2019 Shelby Read I am emailing today as a private citizen concerned about our community's housing issues. I am keenly aware of what a secure, affordable home means to a person or a family. Secure housing is essential in our community and we have an opportunity to build a great project in downtown Jackson on West Kelly. Please move forward with this project and get housing units built. Gillian Chapman recently gave a presentation where she noted that there are currently 81 children in our school system who are homeless. I serve on the Habitat for Humanity Home Buyer Selection committee and am heart broken that the need for safe and clean housing is so great and that there are only 8 units available. Every unit matters to a person, a family, a child in our valley and I ask that you consider the deep impacts that can be made with this housing project. Of course housing is a challenge, but it is one we can continue to make our best efforts to provide to deserving community members who enrich this valley. Thank you all for your consideration.

10/3/2019 Carolyn Tomich Douglas Jackson Hole Town Council Members I am writing to ask about the status of the property at 440 Kelly. My home is directly behind that property (435 W. Karns). The fact that you and Teton County Commissioners purchased the property put all of us in that area in an awkward position. I was not happy that a proposed 3 story, 15-unit affordable housing project was being considered. For months the homeowners on Kelly Street fought the proposed structure. But as the months went by with "numerous meetings" nothing was happening. However when it was apparent that the structure or something similar was going to be built we were finally getting somewhere, NOT!! Again there were more meetings, more votes, more tabling the decisions. During that time I was fortunate that a developer was interested in my home as well as my next-door neighbors property. There was a signed contract in place, the developer did all the due diligence and everything was moving along, until the meeting that no one could agree on what to do with 440 Kelly, our contract with the developer went SOUTH. I was so happy that I was going to be able to sell my property. As a widow and going on 78 years old, I was looking for another area to move to. I cannot afford the high taxes and maintenance any longer in Jackson since 1950. At this point there doesn't seem to be any decision as to what you intend to do with the 440 Kelly property, and it is a huge concern to me. Please advise me as to what the future plans are for that property.

9/22/2019 Perri Stern As many of you know, I am the lead community organizer for the neighborhood group that has been working to find a viable solution for development at 440 West Kelly Ave. Attached please find a proposal from our neighborhood group, one that we believe presents workable concepts for the project moving forward. We appreciate your thoughtful review of this document and we would look forward to discussing with you at your earliest convenience.

9/14/2019 Justin Adams Strikes me that when there is nothing smart to do, doing nothing becomes reasonable. Please consider this as you contemplate 440 West Kelly.

9/12/2019 Meg Daly I strongly support building the full 16 units of workforce housing at 440 W. Kelly. As we all know, the housing is desperately needed. Please do not be influenced by a vocal minority - caving to NIMBYs sets a bad precedence. Housing density is not only the future for Jackson, but also it will ENHANCE rather than detract from neighborhood character. The more stable and rooted Jacksonites feel, the better all our neighborhoods and communities will be.

9/9/2019 Adrian Croke Good morning, County Commissioners! I'm currently at work and can't attend any of the meetings about 440 W Kelly, but I want to send a short note to let you know that I'm a resident of Teton County and I'm in support of workforce housing, and I sincerely hope you'll make the right choice to support workforce housing! I am one of the many people who work to keep this town afloat, but as an educator with no financial support besides my own income, I can't afford to buy a market home. I rely on the hope of affordable housing if I'm ever to own a home and stay in Teton County.

9/9/2019 Bruce Hawtin I appreciate your time and service!
I apologize for the lateness of this email. I am anxious to find out what the current thinking is for 440 West Kelly that we will be told at 2PM. I write this email not supporting the 15 unit proposal due to scale and parking, among other items.

9/9/2019 Christina Briones Habitat has been mentioned as a possibility of asking for a proposal. I think that is an excellent idea. I know Habitat's mission and how they operate having spent two terms on their board and having designed a project for them and worked on site. Because of donations from nation corporation, volunteer labor, and other factors, they know what the lowest paid employees need. They are also in need of a "next" project.

9/9/2019 Christina Briones This project has taken far too much of your time and I hope it can be finalized soon. The housing situation presented by the majority of working families in this town is very hard, especially if they have kids, which are the most valuable in the family. However kids are vulnerable and affected between economic situation that parents have to face with in too many families both parents have to work 2-3 jobs to sustain their homes, and they leave aside their own kids, their education, values, and quality time that parents supposed to provide to make them friendly, generous, compassionate, empathetic, integrity, and integrated to serve the community. Without more preamble, the only thing that I would like to ask you is, that consider more the low income families. Please help them to get their own house that they can call home. I believe that way they will be able to provide a better life quality. For those reasons I dared to write you, hoping you take into account this comments that for me are heartbreaking, thinking that those kids are the future of this community. Thank you for your time!

9/9/2019 Christine Kiely I'm writing to support higher density for the W Kelly workforce housing proposal. As a teacher in the district, I see the problem from two angles... both of which could be alleviated by more truly affordable rentals and homes for sale. My own rental could be sold at any point, leaving me without housing mid-year. Despite the insecurity of the rented room, I can't imagine being able to buy a one-bedroom for more than \$350K on a teaching salary with student loans. The families of students in my class have even fewer options, and in the last few years I've watched student after student leave our district for Idaho and other parts of the country. This hurts the community of our dual-immersion program along with the future and stability of these kiddos. Just this week, we've lost two Spanish-speaking students who moved to Idaho over the summer, leaving two English-speaking students without language partners for the rest of the year. Please consider any way to make these developments affordable for our incredible, dedicated families (and teachers), particularly keeping the density as high as possible for the upcoming W Kelly developments.

I am writing today to encourage you to support constructing 16 units at 430/440 W Kelly. What our community needs is more affordable housing, and we need as many units as possible. As a community, I believe we have to accept the changing nature of the Town of Jackson and commit to the reality that adding density will truly benefit our community.

9/9/2019 Jordan Rich I am disappointed in the narrow minded voices of the neighbors on W Kelly that have dominated the conversation on this issue. When I hear "preserve community character" what I really hear is "we don't want low-income families here" and it saddens me that we have such a narrative in our community. I ask you all not to listen to those voices, and to remember the greater good of additional housing for families in need.

The difference between 12 and 16 units doesn't seem like much, but it is the difference to 4 families who could no longer be struggling. Please vote today in support of 16 units at 430/440 W Kelly.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

I recently read in the paper that because I'm not partnered, and don't have children, the 440 West Kelly neighbors say that I would "destroy" a neighborhood by living there with other single person households. That's food for thought... (source)

Are you also aware, that in the first quarter of 2018, over 45% of our workforce commuted in from another county or state? We had both the highest inflow and lowest outflow out of every county in Wyoming. Thoughts? (source)

9/9/2019 Julia Johari

You need to look at what is best for the community, rather than a handful of fearful folks who are resistant to change. Please consider supporting a development of 16 units at 440 West Kelly -- even if this development is approved, it will still be a small dent in what we need to support the local economy here. Affordable housing is not charity, it is an investment -- we have a serious issue here with attracting and sustaining a local, quality workforce.

~~Kind regards,~~

9/9/2019 Kate Roberts

Please uphold the decision for 16 units at the W Kelly development site. I watched last week as the council balked to add truly affordable units to the Jackson housing pipeline to support our most vulnerable community members. This is your chance to follow through on that vision. Please don't allow change-averse NIMBY mentality to prevent you from taking steps towards housing equity in our community.

I am writing to you today about the West Kelly project. I know that there is backlash from those who live near the proposed site; however I believe the benefits of more dense housing outweigh the cost of our NIMBY neighbors: the cost of each unit is less and we are in dire need of affordable housing. The costs for developing one 600 sq ft one bedroom unit are approximately \$280K per unit, not including the land. The town paid \$1.7 million for the land. If they develop 16 units, the cost of the land per unit is \$106K, which puts the total cost of each unit (at a 16 unit per lot density) at \$386,000. If you reduce the number of units to 12, that puts the land cost (per unit) at \$141K, and the total cost per unit at \$421K each. At 8 units per lot, the land cost per unit is \$212K, and the total cost per unit is now \$492K. This is for a one bedroom, 600 sq. ft. The costs for two and three bedroom units go up from there dramatically. This is incredibly expensive and not affordable housing.

9/9/2019 Laura Langberg

This area has been zoned for the maximum 16 units and I urge you to follow through with this number. Change is tough, but we must look towards the future of Jackson. Will we be an empty town, filled only with tourists and mostly-empty second homes? Or will we have a vibrant community of homeowners invested in this place? I know many vibrant, creative, driven people who will have to leave Jackson (including myself) because housing is untenable.

You can't say you support community housing while saying you're not willing to build it. If you think the West Kelly area is not the right place for it, then you need to tell us where the right place is. We all know that density is going to be needed if we're going to build housing our workforce can afford. Please support the community's desire to provide workforce housing and approve the 16 unit proposal.

9/9/2019 Leah Schlater

I'd like both the Teton County Commission and Jackson Town Council to vote YES on the affordable 16-unit design for the 440 West Kelly property.

9/9/2019 Ray Kominsky

Again I come to you as a property owner of a single family residence, we are very concerned about the new proposal of a 2-story apartment complex for 440 West Kelly Avenue. The 2-story unit as proposed is actually larger than the original proposed 3-story complex. The proposed unit would have parking spaces for 18. The original proposal which was smaller was rejected by both the Teton County Commissioners and Jackson Town Council, this new project, we feel, should be rejected also.

Councilman Stanford,

First, thank you for your voice and your votes to date on 440 W. Kelly Ave.

9/8/2019 Dan Peterson I'm writing because it seems like someone is trying to "pull as fast one" with tomorrow's vote. The proposal being put forward is for a building with even more square footage than the 16 units that was rejected last month. This is hardly a compromise that is being suggested, as while there are few details and no sketch available, with more total square footage it can hardly be less formidable and less out-of-synch with the existing neighborhood than that 16 unit proposal was. So please do not let anyone pretend tomorrow that this proposal in any way addresses the concerns of the neighbors who have come and spoken at your meetings. In a way this is even worse, to call it twelve units, as if it's a compromise, and then propose something yet bigger?

And to state again, we are fine with change, and more density, say eight town houses, something reasonably progressive yet consistent with the existing neighborhood.

Thanks for your support as we work through this, Regarding the 12 units proposal for 440 West Kelly that you will be reviewing this Monday, please inquire carefully just what is being proposed. If it is indeed, for more total square footage than the 16 unit proposal that was voted down last month, it can hardly be smaller or less formidable than that. But do ask just to be sure.

9/8/2019 Dan Peterson And if it indeed three stories, and as big, then please do not pretend that this 12 unit proposal, or the town council in voting for it, has in any way acted on the concerns the neighbors have brought to you. Relabeling the same type of structure as 12 units, instead of 16, is not addressing anything meaningful.

I'm only asking you to be honest
First, I would like to thank the Teton County Commissioners, the Town Council, the Housing and Planning staffs for all the dedicated work to address an increasingly pressing need for affordable housing for critical needs employees for the town and county work force.

Your choice of 430/440 W. Kelly for an urban, high density experiment is not in the best interests of good planning, the existing good health of the neighbors or the prospective owners of proposed units if you choose a 12 or 16 unit development, of similar square footage.

9/8/2019 Dick Shuptrine If you will step back from the cost of your initial investment, the overall monetary commitment of the buyers will never be truly affordable.
The cost of each unit, 1-2 or 3 bedroom, should not be the basis or the over-riding reason for choosing the most appropriate structure for this property.

I have taken the time to drive all around town and my observations of the higher density developments is that there is vehicular sprawl around most of them, no green space and no place for dogs or kids to be, except in neighbor's yards.

I do support a smaller overall building footprint, 8 units maximum, with adequate green space and landscaping and extra parking on site for guest and recreational vehicles.

9/8/2019 Estela Torres Thank you for your consideration.
I was happy to read about Commissioner Propst' idea for Habitat on Kelly Street. Although Habitat has not responded, they are presently in management transition and may not be able to at this time but perhaps in the near future. I'm hopeful someone will contact them to see if they are willing or able to submit a proposal for this project because I believe their concept of need for selection of families is the best way to spend tax dollars for affordable housing.

Thank you for your service and for all the energy you have to expend for these difficult issues.
Dear Town Council and County Commissioners, It was brought to my attention that the Town Council and County Commissioners will vote on the 440 W. Kelly Avenue project tomorrow Monday, September 9 in a closed meeting.
Is it legal to conduct such an important meeting without public input? Revised plans and costs have not been made available to the public and it is my understanding that you will vote on the largest building yet with the highest density. Will the building be 2 or 3 stories? How can you possibly build 12 units, adequate parking, and storage for residents on such a small parcel of land? These decisions will drastically impact the character of our neighborhood and livability for new residents.
I support less than 10 units. This scale would be much more appropriate for the lot and provide sustainable options for both neighbors and new residents.
I also support efforts to classify this housing as category 1 affordable housing. However, it is my understanding that the housing will serve middle and higher income households. How does this help the workforce community? How does this plan help the people who need housing most? How does this differ from the current free market, other than simply adding inventory?

9/8/2019 Lauren Brzozowski

In the meantime, this project has distorted the real estate market by over pricing properties in this neighborhood (most for teardown). Middle-class families have been pushed out of the free market and neighbors now have to pay for this mistake. When we purchased our home we did not expect this drastic rezoning. Speaking with neighbors, most were left out or unaware of the 2018 rezoning process. Was this decision also made without public input behind closed doors?

I find the entire process and "special workshops" held privately without public particularly suspicious. One opportunity to provide input on the design for the structure is not enough and could have long lasting consequences for our community.

Mark and Greg,

I'm writing to you once again about 440 West Kelly because I trust you both to respect the value of a fair, transparent and open public process, in spite of whatever you might think of the merits of the particular proposal before you. The proposal that the Housing Department will present to you tomorrow at the JIM is as far from a fair and open public process as we have seen to date around this contorted issue.

Consider the following:

- The staff report issued last week asks you to approve a 12-unit, 24 bedroom project without any supporting information other than a description of the units and their costs. There is no supporting information whatsoever, no architectural plans, proformas, financial arrangements, or other obligations.
 - The report also neglects to mention that this proposal is in fact the largest building proposed thus far, even larger than original 16-unit proposal. This new version is 9,900 net square feet, versus 9,100 for the original.
 - We have also been informed that no public comment will be taken at tomorrow's meeting, in spite of the fact that this is an entirely new proposal for the property.
 - The Suggested Motion would give the Housing Department carte blanche to negotiate any agreement it saw fit. And to top it off, you are expected to approve this in 30 minutes time.
- This shell game needs to stop, now! I implore you to tell the Housing Department to stop trying to manipulate this RFP process to an outcome that is clearly not what the community wants.

Those of us who have opposed these proposals have been very clear that we support a new project that develops workforce and affordable housing that is in context with the surrounding neighborhood and creates long-term value for our community.

Please reject this, and any future proposals under this RFP process and let's restart it as a collaborative project that we can all be proud of. Thanks as always for your dedication to our community.

9/8/2019 Nancy StClair

Please reconsider your vote on the 440 West Kelly from 12 units to 8 units. we would like to keep the integrity of our neighborhood. I will not go into all the reasons that we have submitted to you again. I do not wish to waste your time or mine. Thank you

Tomorrow, you will be asked to vote on a revised 12 unit building that the Housing Department has been working on privately with the developer since August 19.

We have not seen any plans or costs or numbers for this revised 12 unit building.

IT'S THE BIGGEST BUILDING YET

Based on the staff report, the revised 12 unit building appears to include 9,900 square feet of living space the LARGEST building and most amount of density that has been proposed to date--

- ☐ 1st building (16 units, 3 floors): 9,100 sq. ft livable space
- ☐ Revised 16 unit building, 3 floors: 9,400 sq. ft livable space,
- ☐ Original 12 unit option, 2 floor: 6,350 sq. ft. livable space

We do not know if this building is 2 stories or 3 stories tall but it appears that given the square footage, it would have to be 3 stories. There will be 18 parking spaces. We have seen NO plans, no costs.

9/8/2019 Perri Stern

According to the staff report the housing will serve middle and higher income households.

The RFP for this project was developed without community input. Public comment has repeatedly been stifled. There is NO public comment being accepted at your Monday meeting. Why????

Why was there a Special Workshop held with only Town Council subsequent to the rejection of the 16 unit building and not County Commissioners? The County owns a larger share of the property than the Town (55%-45%).

The process is broken.

Please: Restart the RFP process, work with the community, and address these significant flaws. We are on a very slippery slope here.

I remain committed to seeing something positive happen on this site.

I support affordable housing that is designed responsibly, transparent in process, and in context with the neighborhood.

Your work to accommodate concerns regarding the development of 430/440 West Kelly in a manner that best considers individual and community interests is appreciated. As you endeavor to reach consensus, I offer the following observations and questions:

12 units may slightly ease the concern about vehicle parking. I will be interested to view the proposal. Storage remains a serious consideration. Since this discussion began earlier this year, I have been more aware of typical personal items stored outside, including trailers, boats, RVs, smaller motor vehicles, etc. Will those be restricted?

In researching guidelines for outdoor gross motor play space for children, 75 sq. ft./child is recommended. How does the current proposal measure up? Will this be adults only residences? If so, how could such a restriction be assured? And how about dogs and their needed outdoor space? Will neighbors be impacted?

9/8/2019 Sandy Shuptrine Snow storage and water run-off remain of interest, as does the amount of impervious surface on the lot. Too much asphalt and building materials, without natural area, will likely contribute to growing heat retention in urban areas (which it is my understanding the government suggests this become), as well as potential for flooding during extreme weather events which are becoming more frequent. As you may be aware, in the recent past, three 500 year floods have occurred in certain U.S. areas, within a 5 year or less time frame.

I strongly encourage you to consider the longer-term value of the project you are reviewing by thinking about the above. I am becoming less supportive of the "filling the box" goal at the expense of personal and family values for living, especially when they conflict with community planning over many decades. Instead, I hope you'll be able to collaborate on housing that will fill basic needs, not only bed space. We have affordable housing in town that has met the criteria. I've been in urban density housing that inhibits human spirit and hope, when I worked in underserved and under resourced neighborhoods as a college student. We are not so desperate that we need to promote such outcomes in our relatively small western town.

We have a very difficult environment for creating housing for a workforce that keeps expanding in an overheated real estate market. That is a given challenge. Please do your best to consider all components of the problem. I wish you, and us, well.

9/8/2019 Susan Hedden Please support the Habitat proposal for 6 units at 440 units at West Kelly. Any larger development would not be appropriate in that neighborhood.

9/8/2019 Tom Davidson I am writing to express my support for reasonable development on w Kelly ave. This neighborhood needs a reasonably sized building that blends with the current homes and does not overload the neighborhood streets. Please consider a moderate sized building with adequate parking. I also support low income housing at this location rather than middle to higher income housing.

As homeowners in the 440 West Kelly neighborhood, we'd appreciate your seriously reconsidering any plans for a 16-unit project on that lot. Even 12 units is excessive for that size lot – 8 would be acceptable, since we know that housing is greatly needed in Jackson.

9/7/2019 Gloria and Dave
Lorenzo

Please look at the whole picture. We're not unreasonable; we want the best solution for as many people as possible.

Thank you in advance

Hi everyone!

Hope you don't mind the informality. I am expressing my support for the project in my neighborhood at 440 Kelly.

I've been receiving lots of email regarding the 440 Kelly Ave housing project—essentially a skip and a jump from my house on Flat Creek Drive—many, if not all of you know where I live. I am not the least bit concerned about the size of this project and I was content when it was larger, hence not weighing in sooner—I valued the concerns of those living directly around the property. That being said, we will have those who don't want anything in their backyard no matter what. But we all know if we don't take significant actions to get units on the ground quickly our neighborhoods will not look like our neighborhoods, our neighbors will be moving out of town without affordable options.

Presently, there are at least three, maybe four or more actually, houses for sale two doors down from me in either direction listed at 1.2 million dollars and higher; one for 1.4 another for 1.8, and those are the only ones I've paid attention to—the trend is clear to all of us. This is not a sustainable model for keeping our community intact. I love my neighbors—most of them. Joking. I'm slowly losing those neighbors and gaining some part-timers and keep-to-them-selves. There are more and more dark houses every year, with out of state plates in the driveway on occasion. This is not a community. People make a community.

9/7/2019 Jessica
Chambers

Please proceed with this project and others like it in the future to ensure we have everyday people, and both literally and figuratively! living in our neighborhoods and the town of Jackson! You all have been elected with this mandate—to build housing for everyday people and not let our neighborhoods go to part-time people, or only those able to afford million-dollar-plus homes.

I strongly encourage you to stay the course with this project and undertake others like it on the future. You all ran for office knowing full well you would never please everyone! And you all know there will be push back from most neighbors who can't see the bigger picture: the fabric of our community will change without more affordable housing. All aspects of the community benefit from having everyday long term residents.

In short, I support you and value the thankless work you all do.

Thank you for proposing housing options and looking at the big picture. Please stick with the present 12 unit plan for 440 Kelly. Four Forty West Kelly is in an old established neighborhood. Although I am truly interested in affordable housing in Jackson, I am also extremely interested in you making the right decision based upon history and the opinion of neighbors who live in the area. Some are very old and if property taxes go up due to your purchase, they will be unable to pay the increase. If you choose to degrade the neighborhood you will not attract a neighbor, therefore degrading the community.

9/7/2019 Mary Obringer

Jackson is not only a town but a way of life. Please rethink the project on 440 West Kelly and use the site to build 6 unit 2 story units.

Thank you for your consideration

The Agenda Documentation for JIM on July 23, 2019 presented in the "What We Heard" column that overwhelmingly the public believes both the "Revised" 16-Unit Option and the 12-Unit Option are "too tall", "to bulky", or "too big" and don't fit in with the existing neighborhood character. Using just the total floor area of the proposed units you are now being asked to consider, the proposed building is bigger than either of the above mentioned buildings. Apparently "existing neighborhood character" means little to the Affordable Housing Department.

9/7/2019 Richard Greig

Nine of the proposed twelve units have more than one bedroom and therefore will likely be marketed to households of three or more individuals. To qualify for one these units, the income for a household three must exceed 120% of the MFI of \$88,650 or \$106,380. With only the land cost considered, the public investment for each of the proposed twelve units is \$141,951. It seems more appropriate to invest this money in affordable housing for lower income households.

Thank you for your consideration.

We moved here in 1975 - 44 years back. We live south of Jackson, and are approaching the end of our lives - being older than dirt. We write this only to make evident that we are not physically affected by what you do with 440 West Kelly.

Nevertheless we feel compelled to comment.

We expect that you, our electeds, all suffer with this problem. We know you are wrestling with solutions, with how to be fair, how to achieve balance and at the same time, how to house our workers. We sympathize.

However, it is beyond us why you would ever consider pillaging that neighborhood with what is proposed. To erect a building of this size, of this bulk, in the midst of a single family neighborhood violates all norms for zoning residential property. Along with the three story bulk, sixteen units means 32 to 64 more people, 32 plus more cars, pets of unknown number, all crammed on to couple of city lots in west Jackson. Will these residents be neighbors?

8/1/2019 Larry Kummer

And for what?

Though unintended, projects like this essentially provide below market housing for workers, which will allow the Marriott's of Jackson Hole to continue building hotels here, bringing low-paying jobs, needing more low income housing. We have become a developer's Mecca - developers whose names end in "LLC." And we subsidize them.

The population density of Jackson is already most evident: Driving through town at this time of year is an exercise in frustration, - drivers running lights and taking chances. Moving and parked cars everywhere. Curb space is at a premium, dominated not just by cars, but boats, fishing rigs, trailers and motor homes -- many for sale -- often obscuring vision.

We are suffering from an acute case of Overtourism. We have long been oversold, along with our national parks, and so must live with the result. Try hiking to Inspiration Point.

Most of this dog and tail chase is beyond anyone's ability to control, but you, our electeds, can still solve this problem. What you do here will set a precedent allowing it to happen anywhere.

Sell the property !! Buy something less sensitive. And let the neighborhood remain a neighborhood.

I understand that after much research, deliberation, and public discussion you will be voting on whether to approve 16 units of workforce housing on W. Kelly St. in just a few hours. Although there has been ample time for public discourse, I may as well weigh in at the eleventh hour to echo the voices in favor of this project.

About 10 years ago, I rented on this very same block for a few years. In my experience it seems to be an ideal location for higher density development. With the rodeo/fair grounds on one side, Karns Meadow on another, and easy access to Snow King, Broadway, and Pearl West Kelly Street is almost at the apex of town. Residents can choose from many routes to mitigate traffic congestion. Alternatively, there are at least 3 bus stops within a short walk.

7/31/2019 Alyson Spery

Now I know there are others who live in this neighborhood currently and have expressed their disdain for this project. And just like I'm expressing my own, we are all entitled to an opinion. However, more important than those who rely on first-hand knowledge to form their opinion, are those who've studied our area and developed the Comprehensive Plan. I support this project because it meets the needs and the vision for development in Jackson as carefully identified by the Long Range Planning experts in our Planning and Building Department.

Those who live in Jackson and say they are in favor of providing more housing, just not in their neighborhood, remind me of the liberal opponents to bussing in the '50s, '60s and '70s. Liberal, white northerners supported school desegregation until it affected the schools in their neighborhoods. They fought back with veiled racist campaigns against integrating their children's schools due to "inconvenience". When society cannot see past its own bias, we must rely on the experts to direct society to change. We need our electeds to remind us of our innate hypocrisies and guide us to do what is best for the community, not what is best for some.

Thank you for voting in favor of the West Kelly St Workforce Housing Project tomorrow morning.

7/31/2019 Hilary Cantu

I strongly suggest you vote in favor of building workforce housing on West Kelly. We desperately need to offer people who work in this town a comfortable, affordable, solid place to call home. They are the backbone of this community and deserve to feel secure and stable in their housing situations. Please vote yes and approve this project.

7/31/2019 Jamie
Engebretson

I have been living in Jackson for almost 13 years. I obviously have seen the influx of people come over the years, the increase of real estate, and the lack of housing for the locals. During the last few years I have unfortunately watched many educated, driven professionals leave because there was a lack of affordable housing or housing in general. Having space on Kelly St. to build housing for our workforce brings an opportunity to retain good hard-working citizens of Jackson. There is no excuse not to provide opportunity to those who want to remain in Jackson and aid in bringing revenue to our county.

7/31/2019 John Stennis

I appreciate your willingness today to reconsider the vote on 440 W. Kelly. As a former Town Planning Commissioner through the Comp Plan process, we knew change might be hard but that it was worth fighting for. We downzoned the County with the express desire to shift density into Town and support "town as heart" as a place for housing all of our community. The "not in my back yard" mentality runs deep and represents a very vocal but not necessarily large part of our community. Many of our workforce who would truly benefit from this housing don't have the luxury of attending every lengthy public meeting, so they are not being heard. I especially appreciate Emily Cohen's quote from the New and Guide article this morning, "Change is hard and disrupting the status quo inevitably will ruffle some feathers." If we truly care about workforce housing and not just paying it lip service, it's time to "ruffle some feathers". Not following through with this project does not honor our Comp Plan or our community. To those who voted against this last time I say; be brave. Vote for housing and take pride in fact that you are supporting having a healthy and diverse community.

My name is Lauren Brzozowski and I live at 375 W Karns Ave. I am 40 years old, a 20 year valley resident, and a Teton County School District Teacher.

My husband and I purchased our home in the proposed development area in 2009 after living in a Teton County Housing Authority property from 2005-2009. When we purchased our free market home, CC&R's limited 2 story development and high density. We understood the limitations of our property but valued the character of the house and neighborhood over other factors. We do not plan to leave the valley, sell, or alter our property. Since then, zoning has changed and we have witnessed home prices and sizes increase and outprice average middle income families.

While living in our Housing Authority Property @ 522 E. Kelly, we experienced the benefits and challenges of affordable income properties. On the positive side, we had a reasonable monthly mortgage and stable housing within town limits. Our unit was 864 sq feet, 2 beds, and 1 bath, and contained a unit above and below us. A family of 4 lived below in the same sized condo. The upper unit was a free market property with the same dimensions. The building itself was approximately 2500 sq feet and you could find up to 7-12 people living in the unit. Two of these units along with 2 large townhomes were built as part of Scott Sheppard's development on a lot similar in size to the 440 W Kelly. In total, 8 "families" gained housing from the development.

7/31/2019 Lauren
Brzozowski

If you look at Housing Authority data, you will notice that all original affordable owners have sold their units. In some instances, condos have changed hands 2 to 3 times. Why? They were not a long term solution. Units lacked inside and outside storage resulting in cluttered porches and makeshift sheds. Basement apartments lacked natural light and airflow. No parking for guests or service vehicles. No storage or parking for bikes. Poor construction leading to noise and sound issues. I could feel the effects of high density living on a physical and psychological level. When we were able to move out, I remember the feeling of my body and mind relaxing for the first time in years.

As you move forward in your planning, I encourage you to plan quality housing that meets long term goals for community members. I encourage as few units as possible so residents can take pride in their homes and living conditions. If you build the proposed 12 or 16 unit development it will stick out like a sore thumb and most definitely become a short term solution for owners. Considerations must be made to match the character of the neighbourhood.

Thank you for time and consideration

I am a local kindergarten teacher and fully support affordable housing. It is projects like this that maintain our community character. We NEED housing for low/middle income professionals, who are a vital part of a functioning community.

7/31/2019 Molly Nash

If you do reconsider the vote, you'll be putting the needs of the entire community before the needs of a few vocal neighbors. "Not in my backyard" type of arguments will always exist. Please don't let them hold this community back.

Unfortunately, my partner, who is on the research team at the Teton Raptor Center, and I plan to move after this coming school year because we want to build a life together. We cannot afford to do so here in our beloved Teton County. Please please approve this affordable housing project so that other young professionals can make it work.

I am sure you have been contacted by many people over the last 24 hours.

That's because we care. We care about the future of our town, we care about the importance of affordable and workforce housing.

Your votes today are pivotal.

7/31/2019 Perri Stern

Putting the 3 story 16 unit building at 440 West Kelly Avenue seems to be being portrayed as the lynchpin of all workforce housing, all future efforts, an "all or nothing" situation.

It is not all or nothing, either/or, black or white.

The solution is in the gray area, in an area of compromise, where all interests, needs and concerns are balanced. This can and must be accomplished.

I am not sure I can attend the meeting today; I work full time.

But, I hope you will maintain your decision to reject the 16 unit building, and provide the leadership we desperately need in this area.

Lead the way for a revised, better project that can be welcomed, supported, celebrated by all, as a positive step towards improving workforce and affordable housing opportunities, here in Jackson.

First, thank you for your service to our community. I can't imagine how hard it is to work to make Jackson Hole the most amazing place to live, while dealing with so many differing opinions. With that being said, I'd like to offer you my opinion on the 430 and 440 West Kelly workforce housing project.

My husband and I have lived in the county for 17 years now and cannot imagine living anywhere else. We've lived the life of ski bums, gotten married, have moved on to careers, and have had our 2 children here. We are invested in this community and have seen the growth over the last 17 years and still love the fact that we can go into a restaurant on any given night and randomly see a friend. I like to think of Jackson as still having a small town feel with the amenities of a city. And with the amenities come the issues of a city, which clearly includes affordable housing.

I am not going to lie. I struggle with affordable housing and do not have all the facts to back me up. On one hand, as a taxpayer (homeowner on Aspen Drive), I feel that I should only have to subsidize housing for government employees. Why am I responsible for private business employee housing, when businesses are flourishing? On the other hand I work for Region V BOCES (C-V Ranch) and oversee human resources which includes the recruitment and retention of staff. We all know that story - with a continuous ad for employment in the JH Daily!

So, what does all this mean? It means I struggle personally to reconcile all my personal thoughts on the subject of affordable housing, know I don't have all the answers, and know it's not something easy to fix or we'd have done it by now. BUT I always vote yes to support workforce and affordable housing. I might not like all the aspects of it, but the reality is it's what is best for our community. When I think of the 430/440 West Kelly development I think of 2 things in particular.

1. If the argument against the 16 unit project is to preserve the neighborhood then voting yes is the only thing to do. Yes, this vote will bring change, but that is inevitable. The neighborhood will either continue to be a place where working people live (only have additional units they live in) or it will turn into a mecca for 2nd home owners. People living on regular wages in Teton County cannot afford \$1.2M to \$2M tear down lots or homes that, on top of the purchase price, require updates. So I reiterate my point - the vote of yes to this 16 unit development, while changing the number of units in the neighborhood, at least preserves the fact that the neighborhood remains local working people. It's the people that live in a neighborhood and the values they share, not the buildings, that make it a neighborhood.

2. I am the Director of Finance for a government entity so I fully understand the fiduciary responsibility you have to your constituents. As a constituent I want you to build the most cost effective housing, and not drive costs up per a unit because of a compromise for fewer units. I feel that it is your duty to make sure we develop these projects with cost as a huge consideration. This helps keep rental and purchase costs down, ensures tax dollars are spent in the most responsible manner, and makes sure we have the highest impact (most units) to the community.

Again, while I personally struggle with some rules, regulations, know someone taking advantage of the system, those internal (and external) debates never keep me from realizing the bottom line is this community needs more affordable housing So I vote yes. All the time.

In closing, I have 2 vacant lots across the street from my home. They will be developed some day. I would much rather have 6 apartments of local working community members living across from me than 2 McMansions of 2nd home owners and short-term renters. One improves the neighborhood, one detracts from it.

Thank you for considering these thoughts. Again, I appreciate your dedication to our community.

Thanks for your consideration and decisions. And while I realize there are vastly different opinions (which I truly understand), I do think taking a step back is the right decision at this time.

For what it's worth, I think the NH-1 zoning as it was applied in the Comp Plan/re-zoning process is hugely problematic, and guarantees that Jackson (at least the actual town) will be nothing but the extreme Have's and Have-nots if left to run it's course. i.e. the death of the middle class.

Although on the rise for years, the home prices have sky-rocketed in the last 6 months to a year, abnormally, in Jackson, while prices are already on the decline in many other places.

Supply-demand, economic conditions, sure... all factors.

But, what else is? The new zoning in Jackson. The purchase of the lots at 440 by the Housing Authority; re-establishing land values in the area based on high density, and driving up home prices severely in the remaining single-family zones. Plus, the political framing of what development in the NH-1 zone needs to be. THE RESULT - sky rocketing prices in and out of the NH-1 zone. This is the problem with overshooting the up-zoning so severely on that scale, particularly when the damage to the whole town if realized would be catastrophic. Should there be high density developments in Jackson, yes. But not as currently viewed through the NH-1 at large. It eliminates the middle class by turning everything into either elite single homes (Gil, etc.) or increasingly ghetto-ized other neighborhoods (like what is supposed to happen to this neighborhood apparently), via the elimination of the middle ground, or at least severe reduction of it. It drives the price of both way up. Also severely harms the possibility of vertical mobility for the working class. Now the options are polarized.

I think we are already in a recession, so maybe that will have an impact. Better planning would also have an impact. In the end the problem won't be solved, but there are better outcomes possible than what we are seeing now. There are other options.

Thank you again, and good luck.

7/31/2019 Samantha Hannon

7/30/2019 Bridger Call

7/30/2019 Chris Owen
Commissioners, my name is Chris Owen and I live in an affordable unit in the Pearl and Jackson building. It provided me housing after 5 years of applying at my most desperate time and has allowed me to remain as a member of this community. I would like to ask you to support the 16 unit proposal for Kelly Ave. and the Davis and Rice project for Mercill Ave. They provide the most units for the working class members of this community in areas that you have approved for density through the comprehensive plan. Please don't cave to NIMBY politics and approve these projects so hard working people like myself who cannot attend meetings on a Tuesday morning can continue to have a chance to live and be part of our great community.

7/30/2019 Jean Day
Please vote yes to build the 16-unit housing at 440 West Kelly. I live in Rafter J; if you can find land here or near, I am in favor of your building workforce housing "in my backyard" (preferably "affordable" too).

7/30/2019 Philippa Barr
I am a 26-year-old female practicing as an architecture graduate here in Jackson. Originally from New Zealand, I moved to Jackson last December on a one year working visa. In reading yesterday's article in the News & Guide, the 440 W. Kelly project was brought to my attention as I read that the younger working people of Jackson were lacking a voice. So, on behalf of my generation, I am in favor of this project moving forward and beginning the movement towards what the comprehensive plan is trying to achieve. Jackson obviously has some serious housing issues that is driven by the idea of the town being a resort destination, it has made the town in-affordable for our younger generations to work and live here. I appreciate the effort that the Town are trying to achieve with the zoning changes, and I agree that we need to focus on creating higher density housing in the town center. Of course this is going to "ruffle some feathers", especially those of the surrounding neighbors, like with all change, but I believe we need to progressively move forward to resolve one of the biggest issue's in Jackson, that being a lack of affordable housing. I fear that by disapproving this project, the property will be forced to sell and like a lot of property in Jackson, especially in the center, will be sold for an extortionate price which will add to the issue at hand. I do hope this project will be approved as I believe it will help create a movement towards a more diverse and resilient community.
Thank you for your time.

This whole process has been tough. I understand all the points of view on this, and can relate to all of them. I feel like there is a right/appropriate project for the neighborhood, it just needs to be found, but decisions are being made to prevent that from happening. e.g. looking at actually different options.

I just turned 41 and my wife is 37, we live at 425 W. Karns. I moved (back) here in after grad school in 2006 with my then girlfriend (now wife) and about \$500 in my bank account. I was coaching at the Jackson Hole Ski Club earning about \$28,000 a year, and we bought and operated Drive Signs, a small local business in town. I continued to work for the JHSC (non-profit) for over a decade. We lived in very small rentals for the first few years, we applied for affordable housing units but never got one, in retrospect that was fortunate! We bought a 2 bed 1 bath condo near Snow King and lived there for years. Fast forward a bit, we had kids sold the condo, bought the lot at 425 W. Karns and built a house. It wasn't cheap, it wasn't easy, but we did it. We built the house, then the zoning changed, which in itself is kind of a tough thing to do to people, especially when the change is to a ridiculously high (for Jackson) zone, that would be disastrous if it ever comes to full fruition.

I studied planning at the University of Utah, and got a Masters Degree in Urban Planning and worked in a planning firm in Salt Lake for a couple years. At one point I applied for a job with the TOJ in the Planning Dept. but didn't get it. I am a firm believer in urban density, but I am also a firm believer in good design, and the importance of spatial context.

We chose to live in this neighborhood because we like it, we like the location, and we like our neighbors too. I was at the meeting last week and a picture of my house goes up on the powerpoint with a story about how the neighborhood is transitioning, and used as example of what we don't want to happen... Wait? What? Apparently I am now a; 2nd home owner, Hedge funder, silver spooner, trust funder, NIMBYist... Actually no, not one of those is remotely accurate. I have heard some good thoughts expressed at the meetings both in favor of and opposed to the project, I have also found some of the rhetoric used at certain points to be inaccurate at best, and completely offensive at worst.

There is an opportunity to have 440 be a good project, but we haven't seen that yet. The Housing Director talks about the subsidy (cost) being more of a burden if less units are constructed, which theoretically is true, but those numbers are made up, the developer even said so much in the last meeting, stating that they haven't even priced the project yet. And oddly none of the budget info was presented.

7/29/2019 Bridger Call

It definitely feels like we are being told that we are not as important as service workers who may want to come live here for a couple years (a transitional population). The fact is that this neighborhood is made up of exactly what is the hardest to come by in Jackson, long-time working people. If there is a middle class this is it. It is categorically not the second home owners and/or super wealthy. There is nothing transitional about the population of the neighborhood, the transition is being forced upon people who don't want it. We are being told that this is about people, not buildings... Look at the people then.

I just accepted a job that will have us in Salt Lake for the foreseeable future, but there is a high likelihood that we will be back here before too long. What are we coming back to? I was leaning away from taking the job, in favor of staying here, all of this happening in Jackson is a factor in me/us deciding it was probably better to leave. We want to just rent the house, but again, all of this convinced us to list. We do feel like we are being pushed out, so does my neighbor. He has lived here all his life and this whole thing has been extremely hard on him, me, all of us. There is "cost" to this that isn't being talked about much. If you were in our shoes you would understand.

Last week it seemed like a good decision was made in the form of the decision NOT to do the wrong project, but apparently that is being reconsidered. The priority remains to do a good project that is appropriate for the spot and that is well-received by the community, including the existing community.

I have said all along that densification should happen, including in this neighborhood. That does not mean that it should be a neighborhood of subsidized apartment building-like structures. There isn't the infrastructure to support the kind of increase that is being discussed. It has been suggested that if it's not this project, it's something worse in the hands of private developers. Yet, that has not happened so far.

Redevelopment is necessary and is often good, but it can also be bad. The project at 440 as presented is not good, and it's obvious. A three story building with a drive way all the way around it in that spot? Seriously? How is this what anyone wants? I am sorry that the wrong lots were selected for the project being discussed, but that is not a valid reason to do this thing. If you want to develop those lots do something else, something that fits. If you want to build that building, build it somewhere else, where it does fit. Just make the projects appropriate.

We, our neighborhood have been notified of a meeting tomorrow to reconsider votes on the 440 W. Kelly project. So, here we are again, jumping out of our skin to attend meetings to defend our neighborhood.

I have driven all over town, looking at projects and especially East side, where I see very dense housing in a good way. Good job on that. Neighborhoods. So I ask you, why is it ok to build a three story box with 12-16 APARTMENTS, on the west side of our town???? Those deed restricted units, one bedroom, 500 sq. ft. with one parking space and no garage at a price of \$300,000 (really), would require a \$9,000 deposit from the 3% restricted deeds, but on a 30 yr note, @ 4-5 % monthly payment would be \$14,000 plus property taxes, insurance. And then, the HUGE homeowners dues that would go up every year, mainly the snow removal. So, that's close to \$2800 per month. If you fill the box with building and cars, you have no room to move the snow to. It will have to be hauled out and that will be very costly to the homeowners. This is the Elite Work Force, who came to Jackson to ski, river run, snowmobile, etc. etc. with toys abound and no room for them or visiting friends and family to park or whatever more and more, and nowhere to put those things. This project is a mess in the making!!!! Why are you spending so MUCH money on this dumb concept. These people, if they bail in will soon bail out because they NEED more than a pit stop.

7/29/2019 Christy Karns
May

The re-zoning procedure was quite questionable to say the least. I only heard from a neighbor that this was happening, or I wouldn't have known at all. My life was in total turmoil at the time and didn't know all that was going on. And that is what happens in people's lives. This zoning redo is so unfair! At those meetings to the public, you were given a sticky note to write your thoughts on. Really? This is so disrespectful of the people who have worked, built homes, raised families to be pushed out by their own town and the new people coming in.

In the years to come, the long range, who is going to buy a house in the middle of two three story buildings? No one. So, it's a developers dream, probably controlling the price down the road. This is not going to increase the value of our property, but will certainly increase our property taxes. I'll tell my kids to beware.

Please commissioners, don't let this experiment start. It's the beginning of a huge mess! Please do quality over quantity. There are a few people who seem to have too much control over the future of our town. Please stand up to them.

Thank you, I appreciate all your efforts.

7/29/2019 Claire Tramm

I understand the county is considering building over a dozen units of workforce housing on Kelly in accordance with our local plan. We desperately need this housing in our community and the zoning makes sense for building it there. I think we should stay the course and build this workforce housing despite what the vocal neighbors may say; we cannot cave to these kinds of NIMBYists when the overwhelming logic for our community is in favor of building more housing and in this particular location.

My name is Emily Cohen and I am submitting public comment in regards to last week's vote on the 440 West Kelly proposed workforce housing project -- and asking you to reconsider your vote. I happen to be the Executive Director of KHOL, but I am submitting this comment as a private citizen. I do not have a journalistic role at the station.

Change is hard. And disrupting the status quo inevitably will ruffle some feathers. When the loudest voices you heard from on this project, are not surprisingly, those who live in the neighborhood, you aren't hearing the full story. Those property owners are people who already have security, who in many cases are retired and had the time to attend a hearing in the middle of a workday.

You did not hear the voices of working people like myself -- though that doesn't mean we aren't paying attention.

7/29/2019 Emily Cohen

Jackson can be and should be a model for a livable community in the west. Not a community just for the rich. The language used by many of the neighbors speaking in opposition to the development was frankly appalling, describing projects such as these as the "ghettoization affordable housing." When you chose, in effect, a vision for this neighborhood as one for people who likely don't even live here now (because those are the only people who can afford a \$1.2 million property), over residents who are already working in this community, and trying to live here, we hear you.

The Comp Plan, the recent rezone, Engage 2017 and this RFP for designs, all show a steady move towards progress. Why derail it now? It sends a message that these deliberate community planning efforts matter little in the end.

The promise of progress and of a livable community for all should not be compromised by the interests of a few.

Please reconsider your vote.

7/29/2019 J. Scott Page

The county is considering whether to build 16 units of workforce housing on Kelly St. The Comp Plan says to do it, the zoning says to do it, and we desperately need them. But a handful of very vocal neighbors don't want it. They say they want housing, but that it should go somewhere else. Which is what everyone says.

NIMBYs shouldn't always get their way. This community needs more workforce housing.

7/29/2019 Mike Yin I have read in the N&G that you are reconsidering the vote on the 440 W. Kelly project. I know there were some character concerns on the project, however I would urge you to approve it and support the 16-unit proposal. Jackson Hole is in need of affordable housing, and I distinctly remember someone telling me that perfect is the enemy of good. I will continue to work on seeing how I can give you more tools in your toolbox, but the need is here now. Especially given that WCDA is about to look over the King St Rental proposal, we need to show that we do in fact see that there is a need that needs solving in the affordable housing area. If we as a county decide to do nothing, I imagine it will be hard for WCDA to think that there is a pressing need to support that affordable housing project as well.

Thanks for all you do

7/29/2019 Mila Dunbar-Irwin I'm writing to ask you to please reverse your no vote on the Kelly project before the minutes are approved from your last meeting. I understand that you were concerned about the character of the neighborhood, however, you don't seem to be considering the character of the entire community, the goals of the comprehensive plan, and the fact that if we as a community want more affordable housing projects they will have to go in existing neighborhoods, which will inevitably change the character of that small slice of Jackson. Jackson is continuing to lose people who can afford to live and work here, and that is one of the main goals of the comprehensive plan. Without affordable housing projects, there is no way for people who work in this community at regular jobs to afford to live here - you know this. These projects will have to go in someone's neighborhood. I hope the county is committed to actually making the goals of the comprehensive plan happen. I hope that you reconsider, don't lose sight of your greater goals, don't give into NIMBYism, and approve this project which would bring much-needed housing to the larger community of Jackson. You sent out an RFP, this proposal meets the new zoning regulations and the terms of the RFP, turning it down because of concern for neighborhood character leaves one to wonder, what housing project won't change neighborhood character? A new, market-rate, single-family home? Please re-consider your vote.

I understand that the decision to reject the proposal for the 16 unit apartment building at 440 West Kelly Avenue will be reconsidered tomorrow.

I urge you to maintain your vote to not approve the 16 unit 3 story building.

7/29/2019 Perri Stern The neighbors and many other citizens of Jackson Hole have been saying throughout this process that we want to see a project built on this property. We support affordable and workforce housing. 16 units on this parcel of land is too much. A smaller, less dense building would be more appropriate for the site.

The whole affordable /workforce housing conversation has become super-over heated. Why is this project being portrayed as an "all or nothing" situation? Why is the fate of JH workforce and affordable housing being placed on this project?

What has changed since your vote on July 23, just 7 days ago, that you haven't known for up to six months ago?

Is it that a few community members showed up at you meeting this morning voicing their support for affordable/workforce housing? If so, I ask why didn't they show up on the 23rd or contact you before your vote on the 23rd? And their comments now outweigh all those you have received from community members before and on the 23rd?

7/29/2019 Richard Greig Is it the rumor that WCDA declined to award LIHTC to the 174 N King Street project which would jeopardize providing 30 low income rental units? If so, is it responsible planning where the outcome of a project in one town zone affects another project in a different zone?

The process used in pushing the 440 W. Kelly project forward is shameful. By the time the public became aware of it, the RFP had already been issued and 3 proposals were received. Reconsidering your vote on 440 W. Kelly tomorrow will continue this shameful process. Yes, you probably can do this but the community deserves better.

I'm writing today in support of the 16-unit project at 440 W. Kelly and encourage you to vote in favor of the project tomorrow. Please vote yes and thereby honor the zoning density the Town Council put in place for this part of town as well as the priorities of our Comprehensive Plan, including Town as Heart and affordable workforce housing. There are precious few opportunities to make a difference for affordable workforce housing and under-developing this property now will be a wasted opportunity in perpetuity. Thank you for reconsidering your vote and thank you for your service.

7/29/2019 Robbin Levy Mommsen Best Regards

7/29/2019 Tom Davidson Hello I am writing you regarding the 440mwest Kelly plan. I feel this building would be an eyesore in the neighborhood and should be reconsidered. We need to make sure due diligence is done with respect to traffic, wildlife and quality of life for the curren residents. I believe that housing is the most important issue facing our community but building a high rise in a residential neighborhood full of one story homes doesn't make sense. Please reconsider the design of the project.

In 2007 the Housing Authority paid \$1.95 million from the SPET tax to purchase five acres at 3590 North Kennel Lane for workforce housing (Jackson Hole News & Guide, July 3, 2019).
 In the July 24th JHN&G a discussion continued regarding the possible sale of the property mentioned above.
 TWELVE years after the passage of the SPET tax, a decision has not been made. Where could we be with workforce housing if the Raines property had been developed in the last ten years? The Raines property (5 acres) could be "rezoned for housing 20, 87, or even up to 150 unit"..(JHN&G, July 24, 2019).

7/28/2019 Judy Greig Yes, I know the argument about wanting to preserve the rural integrity of the County. What about the integrity of the NH-1 and NM-2 zones (transition zones or town residential core)? Don't we deserve to have the integrity of both these areas preserved?
 So here we are on July 28 and 440 West Kelly is still only be looked at as a three story complex on 0.31 acres in a stable neighborhood. No alternatives are being considered by the Housing Authority for that property. The workforce housing on Redmond and Hall Streets (or something of their size and scale) are well done, have an attractive streetscape, and could perhaps fit into the Kelly Avenue location nicely.
 My husband and I support the need for responsible workforce housing. We would like to see it done in a way that preserves the integrity of both the Town and County,

7/26/2019 Richard Greig Thank you for listening to our concerns regarding 440 West Kelly. We will continue to support workforce housing but at the density of 6 to 10 units on this site and other areas in the transitional zone in the Town of Jackson.
 Gentlemen, we would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your consideration to this projects impact on our area, and the community in general.
 A special thanks to Commissioners Barron and Epstein, and Propst. Perhaps you can speak to those not so inclined to check out other alternatives, and consider the distaff impact on the community as a whole.

7/25/2019 Loyola and John Kiefling We are not inclined to believe we have heard the last of this proposal, and urge you to keep our concerns in mind. Putting that many people together in such a unit, would certainly result in people problems. Short tem residency produces a variety of problems, some serious, that we would certainly see as a result of such development.
 Much thanks for you continuuing consideration to this matter.

7/23/2019 JoAnn Hoff Please consider revising the 440 West Kelly project to 8 units max rather than 12 or 16. Adding 12 or 16 units to these lots is just bad design and incongruous with the surrounding neighborhood. Forcing the project through at this size will only increase an already negative perception of affordable housing. This neighborhood is as worthy of conservation as Wilson. Thank you for your time and consideration.
 pls excuse my typing. i have a broken wrist and typing one handed. thx

7/22/2019 Linda Williams i have been following with interest the 440 w kelly street proposal. west kelly is an established single family neighborhood and has been forever. these residences are mainly working folks and some renters. what comes to my mind is the county owned property by the aspens, where the zoning already includes multi family residents and commercial development. will you allow this to be developed with affordable housing? you all know it won't happen because those area neighbors will tie you up in litigation as long as possible. money speaks in teton county. i don't think the 440 w kelly residents have the same deep pockets and it saddens me to think you will allow their residential neighborhood to be so drastically changed. if you vote to approve this west kelly intrusion of their neighborhood, you need to be consistent and do the same to the west bank neighborhood with the deep pockets.

7/22/2019 Reynolds Pomeroy I am writing to express my support for the original 16-unit workforce housing design at 440 W Kelly as presented by the Roller/Tack Development team, and I urge you to vote for this alternative during your Special Joint Meeting with the Jackson Town Council tomorrow. This alternative meets all the goals and intentions of the NH-1 zone and will require no additional public subsidy to complete according to the housing staff report. This is sure to enhance the already strong support for this project from the broader community. The bulk and scale of development on this parcel (and the several others that are in play in the private market) will change, there is no doubt, and this was the understanding and expectation when the NH-1 zone was designated for the neighborhood. The original plan has been thoroughly vetted – please resist the temptation for additional tweaking and/or expenditure of time to consider alternatives.

Thank you for your efforts towards addressing our community's workforce and affordable housing needs.

While we fully understand the ongoing importance of affordable housing, we do not understand local government seriously compromising existing neighborhoods by dramatically altering their character and potentially displacing substantial numbers of full time working people with units for sale and out of their price range. Our property, next door, accommodates several such individuals. Sure, we can join the list of those selling, but it does not consider the impact to our renters, valued community contributors.

Gradual and reasonable transition, yes. Maximizing development potential at neighborhood expense and upset to settled local workers, no. Some of us affected by the 440 Kelly proposal (we are the property directly west of it) are willing to endure the construction disruption if the end result is a reasonable quality of life for those who reside there and nearby. This includes:

*parking contained on the property.

*snow storage contained on the property and maintenance access that does not 'borrow' neighboring property.

*enough space for the wildlife that are part of our community to move through safely and without harm.

7/22/2019 Sandy and Dick Shuptrine

*at least modest outdoor space for children to play, pets to poop, families/friends to enjoy good weather together, perhaps a small garden. For example with a modest greenspace and picnic table -such as that where the housing department resides or at Town Hall or the Admin. building. Also a sidewalk for trikes, strollers and the like, presently included as I understand. Balconies, disconnected from natural surroundings are not good enough for human spirit and development. In many cases it is the essence of Jackson Hole, which would be diminished. Although mostly intended for one or two dwellers per unit, life events (marriage, childbirth, etc.) can easily change the composition of those residing there.

*enough natural ground to help absorb big rain/water events, i.e. not close to 100% impervious surface.

16 small units is simply too dense to accomplish the above in the space available. 10-12 units might allow a little more living quality for those who will reside there or on the residential street that exists. Leaping directly to high urban density from rather quiet residential does not seem productive for accomplishing other Comprehensive Plan goals. The resulting public subsidy, for fewer units, is a relatively small increase in the scheme of housing investment by the community.

This proposal seems to us to be "silo thinking"... Housing isolated by itself, not considering the individual, community or environmental aspects. To ease the pressure, perhaps consider how commercial zoning occurred, and potentially revisit it....with the then mayor drawing lines without public discussion quite a few decades ago. How much commercial development is needed to keep us vital? My view is that we are out of balance at the expense of taxpayers and workers. Private business is doing OK (we have been a part of that).

Thank you for considering our perspective

7/19/2019 Bruce Bonich

My name is Bruce Bonich and I recently graduated from the University of Denver after going to highschool here in Jackson. I wanted to voice my opinion about the housing project that the town is currently considering on Kelly. I believe that a 16 unit design makes significantly more sense due to the severe lack of housing that currently exists in Jackson. Density should be maximized to provide for more housing. It also does not make financial sense for the town to build less units when the total cost to the town is the same for both designs. Thank you for your hard work.

7/19/2019 Emmett deMaynadier

Please select the 16 unit option for the affordable housing project the town is proposing. Jackson desperately needs housing and only building 12 units when you could build 16 units for the same cost to the town does not make sense and is not a good use of public funding.

7/19/2019 Greta Durbin

Please select the 16 unit option for the affordable housing project the town is proposing. Jackson desperately needs housing and only building 12 units when you could build 16 units for the same cost to the town does not make sense and is not a good use of public funding.

7/15/2019 Ray & Sharleen Kominsky

As a property owner of a single family residence, we are very concerned about the proposed 3-story apartment complex for 440 West Kelly Avenue. This project would destroy the integrity of single family neighborhoods throughout the Town of Jackson. The property owners on West Kelly are against the project because of traffic, project design and this district is not subject to urban design. None of the above studies have been made for this project.

We request you reject both the proposals for 440 West Kelly Avenue.

I am writing IN SUPPORT OF 2-story multi-family housing in Jackson, with enough parking for two cars per household.

There are many 2-story homes in the Town of Jackson now, and the scale fits with the height of our cottonwoods, pines and aspens. There is still room for light to shine on the yards and streets.

We have always had a shortage of housing, especially affordable housing, because Jackson is such a special and desirable place to live. And, we will always have more people who want to live here than can live here.

At some point, Jackson will be full, whether we allow 2-story OR 3-story housing.

So while we still have so much community character, let's fill in with 2-story homes as our older stock becomes available, and when that capacity has been reached, let's say no more growth.

If it is a problem for businesses to find workers, then the number or kind of businesses that can be sustainable might be at their max. I am not arguing for a static town. Particular businesses come and go, people move away or pass away, so there is always opportunity.

If large new hotels want to build within the Town of Jackson limits, please just say no. Our roads are overcrowded, and we are at risk of losing what we have that people come here to experience.

Thank you for listening and for the work you do for us.

Don Opatrny,
Laurie Andrews,

7/10/2019 Larry Thal, Matt
Faupel, Jeff

Collins, Laura
Bonich, Dennis
Callaghan

The Board has reviewed all material submitted regarding this potential development, including original submissions by developers, responses to questions, public comment and various potential revisions, including 12 unit and 16 unit alternatives. Based on all regulations, code and the stated mission of the Affordable Housing Supply Board, we wish to inform you that we unanimously recommend pursuit of the 16 unit alternative, noting that this proposal does not absolutely maximize what might be built on this site and provides appropriate return on the public funds invested.

Sorry to send such a lengthy email, but I think I'll miss the next public meeting on 440 West Kelly and I wanted to make my voice heard.

I was disappointed to see that the Town Council and County Commissioners are considering scaling back the number of units to be built at 440 West Kelly. In order to build inherently affordable housing, we have to allow significant increases in density so that we can increase the housing supply as much as possible given our limited land available for development. The denser you make this particular development, the lower the public subsidy per unit, and the more public money you'll have available to build more housing elsewhere. It's really that simple. We have too few housing units in this valley, and we need to build more. You spent 1.7 million to buy this parcel, so be efficient about it. This neighborhood is walkable to downtown workplaces and START bus stops, and it's exactly the type of location that should have dense housing.

Some of the current Town Council members understood the importance of density when they helped Joe Rice get around onerous restrictions to build more units in his proposed apartment building on West Broadway. (and on that note, I think you need to research ways to give significant density bonuses to private developers of rental housing, and we need to accept 4-6 story buildings in the right places). You understood the importance of density when you upzoned the West Kelly area and proposed this project in the first place. Don't get cold feet now. Stand up for housing.

Unfortunately, incumbent homeowners are the most likely to email you and to show up at meetings to complain about change. But you should focus less on complaints from incumbent homeowners and focus more on removing roadblocks to housing development. Ultimately, the neighbors' lives will be just fine no matter how many units you build. They may not be happy about it initially, but really, life goes on and they'll get used to it and continue to lead happy fulfilling lives. Don't be scared of them. They have a house in a great location, and many of them likely purchased when inflation-adjusted housing prices weren't as ridiculous as they've gotten today. They can sell out one day having realized a massive gain in valuation, and in the meantime they'll have spent a lot of time skiing and hiking and walking to farmers markets and JH Live concerts. If a new building causes them lasting distress, that's on them, not on you. I don't mean to imply that neighboring homeowners are not hard workers or that they're undeserving or anything negative about their character, but I'm just saying, if they have to deal with a bunch of cars parked on the street and have to deal with looking at a big building, it's just a small problem in the grand scheme of things. Their personal preference can't hold up progress for the rest of the community.

There are plenty of hard-working members of the community who could afford \$600,000 for a deed-restricted 3-bedroom, if only there were any for sale. I'm not currently one of them, but if those well-paid members of the community had more options to buy, it might free up rentals for workers lower on the totem pole and reduce price pressure on the older private condos/townhomes that occasionally come up for sale. The more housing we build in Jackson, the less competition there will be for even more affordable options in Victor or Alpine, too. Those areas have been seeing crazy price increases too as well-compensated professionals find that there are essentially no options to buy in Jackson Hole.

I don't buy the argument that we have to tread lightly on this development to avoid backlash. There will always be backlash from neighbors who don't want change. It's a constant. Even neighbors who agree with the idea of more density are going to complain if you build it on their quiet street. If you cave on this development, you'll face pressure to cave on every development. Make a bold statement that density is coming and that we all have to live with it. Maybe then, when you build 16 units and the sky doesn't fall, we can talk about additional increases in density in the right places. Don't just pay lip service to housing. Build more housing, and give private developers density incentives to develop inherently affordable housing.

Thank you for your time.

6/7/2019 Adam Blatt

I'm writing with concern regarding the proposed Kelly project.

Please note, I have been on THA list for several years. I am among those who need housing. (I'm quickly typing on my phone. As such, excuse any errors).

Agreed, the need for housing is crucial. Lets step back and make measured plans that consider the day to day livability that, I feel, is quite frankly worsening at present. Kelly is horrible location for more than 2-3 units in the proposed spot!

I'm compelled to speak out as this location is absolutely not suited for new density. Our parking and traffic situation need not worsen with these "creative" solutions that lack long term vision and are fatally flawed in unrealistic expectations that of 1 car households.

The surrounding streets already present driving flow issues. I use Kelly as an artery to bypass the stop-and-go and constant people darting out into traffic jaywalking or being on vacation in the middle of the road. It's cute, I get it, this is a tourist town. We all benefit from tourism in this service based economy.

However, I can't imagine the bottleneck that will be created with this Kelly debacle. What a disaster! Imagine in winter. Off-street parking, yeah right?

THA as it is is a bit of a broken system but that is a much longer letter.

Larry Huhn has presented a viable plan that allows for density in a space that could accommodate it. He has funding, land, a track record of success.

A private citizen is stepping in and (again) providing vital infrastructure to Teton County. Why not let him solve yet another problem? No need to pay a consultant to do it. Factor Mr. Huhn's rental pricing vs. Hidden Hollow. Yes its steep, but its not a barrier to entry that is Hidden Hollow or the new normal of rents that will continue to climb.

6/5/2019 Megan Rumsey

To say that Hog Island neighborhood would lose rural character is an idea rooted in a past nostalgia, not based in reality.

Drive out, take a look. What do you see? A trailer park. And it WORKS. You see high-density housing and many happy families (many of which have likely resided long term). Larry's Old West Cabins, are an attractive development that has been a solution for many individuals and families. I lived there and loved the beautiful view and smartly situated individual dwellings. Here Larry considers things like storage, parking, flow of traffic, and he even has a laundry facility and low maintenance landscaping. He is a detail guy and if he benefits financially for being one, let's let him. He pays taxes.

I fear these things are not always/often considered in THA. Some of the units do not even allow for outside enjoyment at the place of residence. It is unrealistic to cut parking and say that there are more pedestrians -it is just NOT the case. The parking situation is tragic. Let's not add to chaos.

The area near Munger houses a gravel pit, a construction district, and offices for property management, the DMV. It's a hodgepodge of new and old that happens to have a school. Huge bonus for families.

To say adding a nice density development would worsen the character is laughable. Fact is, many would embrace moving out of town proper.

Maybe there aren't as many Nimbys on Hog Island?

Look Jackson is Jackson. Its always been expensive. Most of us were priced out long ago. Town looks better without all the factory outlets that were once the square. At worst, it is quickly turning into a luxury "western" disney-esque facade will encompass the whole town in perfectly burnished barnwood. At best town is growing up and touts all you could ever want and then some.

Now let's consider, this gentrification directly detracts from a long term community feel. I've heard locals say they have exit strategies in place "Jackson is circling the drain." Its possible to put the brakes They housing proposal at 440 W Kelly mocks the sacrifice and achievement of the rest of the neighborhood. To many of these people, their house is more than their home, it is their nest egg. Please reconsider the ripple effect of massive density on these good people.

5/22/2019 Justin Adams

Also, please consider the futility of solving the 'housing problem' in Jackson Hole. Suppose ten thousand worker units came onto the market today. Would they sell out by the first snow? Maybe. And that is the point, there is infinite demand for the JH product and Asian buyers have not shown up yet in a significant way. The more units you build, the more you need because the people moving into the theoretical ten thousand units coming onto the market today will also demand services that immediately calls for more density. We cannot build our way out of this problem. Ironically, more housing makes the problem worse because it demands even more and more housing.

At your 5/13/19 joint meeting, Mayor Muldoon chided some neighbors for not having discussions on developments in the 440 West Kelly neighborhood during the formulation of the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Regulations (LDR's). I agree with him at least with regard to my earlier participation.

So, how does the proposed development at 440 West Kelly stack up with the current Comp Plan, LDR's, and Housing Program Specific Requirements?

Section 3.2 Core Residential of the Comp Plan applies to the neighborhood of 440 West Kelly. It states: "... Multifamily structures will be predominantly found on larger residential lots along mixed use corridors. The size and scale of multifamily structures will be predominantly two stories with three stories considered in specific cases with proper design." and "For these larger structures, ... and be broken into multiple smaller buildings when possible." 440 West Kelly is centered in a stable, single family residential neighborhood, not "along a mixed use corridor". The development model proposed by the Housing Department for 440 West Kelly and resulting with a three story building is not specific to that property. Contrary to the Comp Plan, the development model will be used and result with three story buildings throughout both of the two transition zones.

5/16/2019 Richard Greig

NH-1: LDR's (2.2.9) state: "Individual Building (max. gross floor area): 10,000 sf". Neither the Deed Restricted Housing Exemption nor the Workforce Housing Floor Area Bonus exempt this restriction. Just the "habitable area" of the 16 unit Roller/Tack proposal exceeds this maximum requirement.

A "Specific Requirement" of the Housing Program RFP is "... and a minimum of 1,500 sf of habitable space on the ground floor with street facing entries is required." to "enhance livability and promote placemaking within the neighborhood." The Roller/Tack 16 unit proposal does not satisfy this minimum requirement.

I urge you to send this proposed development back to the Housing Program with instructions to modify the development model used for 440 West Kelly so it is consistent with our Comp Plan, LDR's, and their RFP. Otherwise, we need a community conversation about changing the vision of our Comprehensive Plan, our LDR's, and define a workforce housing development model that the community can support.

A question/comment for all of you.

5/15/2019 Tessa Johnson

If an individual filed for a building permit on Kelly Street for a three story building or even a two story building for a good number of units, would you look at it the same way the housing authority is being looked at? I truly do not think so.

Private citizens and the Housing Authority should be treated the same. Looking at the drawing in this morning's paper, I think the benefit of the town having gotten this far with a concrete proposal is it puts what had been an abstract hope and plan for greater density into something more concrete, something we can actually picture and discuss.

My major concern is that I can't see where this is going. Is the town going to facilitate one or two or maybe a dozen of these tumors sprouting up in our neighborhood, before losing interest in the project, perhaps because of negative feedback from the town more broadly, or because it's just too expensive, or because there aren't enough people with that much spending power who will spend that much for that little of place?

5/13/2019 Dan Peterson

Or are they really going to use maybe \$200M of tax revenue to buy the land for 100 of these things and turn Jackson into some kind of model community housing experiment - rather like we saw in the 1960s? And if it's going to be the latter, that needs a lot more thought, about what kind of recreation and amenities and greenspace we need in Jackson for town to be anything like the Jackson we now know - once it has all that density.

So my wish is that you put this particular project on hold while we slowly assess, forward to the community, what it is that we are really out to do.

As an architect and a 14 year member of the Town's Design Review Committee, I want to share my concerns regarding the bulk and scale of the Housing Department's proposed project at 440 W. Kelly. While I have been a longtime advocate of density and housing (and own a TCHA home myself), I believe that the proposed building's prototype - a 3 story attached unit building - is the wrong template for this part of Jackson. As strange as it is to imagine the proposed building surrounded by single story ranches, an entire street with this building form replicated over and over again would be equally bleak.

5/13/2019 Karen Parent

I understand that cost efficiency is a priority, but I wonder why the housing department could not propose a duplex, triplex or attached townhouse style project? These kinds of buildings would be a much better fit for the current and future W. Kelly Ave. As certain as housing is a priority, so is the creation of great and compatible neighborhoods. Getting the bulk and scale correct is absolutely critical, and I strongly urge you to scrutinize this project and consider whether there are other possible layouts and configurations.

I believe that by now you might be tired of hearing from people who live in West Kelly. I think it is very commendable the work you are doing trying to provide housing for the workforce; for people like me (a single professional), who have not been able to buy anything in town but need to continue working in it.

I have read the News and Guide article about the two design proposals for the 440 West lots. The design by J. Roller looks nicer but still has an incompatible level of height mass and density to quote Perri Stern. Tack developer has an incredible area of windows facing north. I can't imagine what will the cost of maintaining those units warm in winter will be. Unfortunately, none of the developers put those buildings in context with other homes in the neighborhood except a little portion we can see of the house on the East side of the development proposed by J. Roller. I am also still shocked by the price that one bedroom unit, \$300,000.00! will cost. As I mentioned before, I have worked as a professional here in Jackson for 16 years and I am still wondering what is the workforce you are targeting with those prices. I have been living in West Kelly, renting an apartment, for 16 years (which I will have to leave because the rent is going up too much, next year) because I could not even afford to buy anything "affordable" here in town a couple years ago. Can you imagine how people who work for the town of Jackson (police officers, star bus drivers, maintenance and snow removal crews) moreover the ones working for hotels, restaurants, or any store here in Jackson can afford to buy one of those units? Please, really put yourselves in the shoes of the workforce and come up with more creative and affordable ideas that respect the character and scale of the neighborhoods around town.

5/13/2019 Marisa Santacruz

Although we would like another opportunity to speak, we are not sure if public comment will be permitted at today's meeting.

5/13/2019 Perri Stern

Prominent architects, urban designers, members of the JH Design Review Commission, city planners, former elected officials, neighbors, non-neighbors, people who have lived in the neighborhood for 1 year and 50+ years, current renters, current owners, people whose family built this town--

We have all spoken up and asked you to reconsider this project.

Are you listening?

A few thoughts before you continue your discussion....I do not know what the ideal number of units is, but I ask you to consider some outside space for all the 440 residents, particularly children and pets. Or will they be restricted? Please include sidewalk, perhaps a picnic table and dog run in the back of the property, as well. Spaces that are a part of everyday life and do not require mounting an expedition with kids or pets to interact with the outdoors.

5/13/2019 Sandy Shuptrine

My question is what kind of environment is being created for people in our western town. Is a bed the overriding consideration? Have you been keeping up with the news of the last week, regarding human impacts on the essential components of our planet? I hope you will choose being truly 'sustainable' over trying to accommodate every humans' need/want. How many affordable places will be displaced should this stable neighborhood be stimulated to intensive redevelopment by governmental actions? Our housing challenges are not unique, but we still have the opportunity to respond with multiple priorities in mind.

Dick Greig's comment last week about the number of jobs being created vs. the community's ability to keep up rang true. While we wish to do well by our workforce, I question whether it should be the sacrifice of quality of life and community character. This may be a case of needing to anticipate unintended consequences and resisting going there. Good site planning can help.

Thank you for your consideration.

Thank you for your time. I am hoping these emails are reaching you, and even if they are not this has been important to me for my own sake. In the last week I have had some more conversations with neighbors, as well as some folks from other neighborhoods, and just wanted to share the takeaways as this (particular project) heads toward a decision. As always I only speak on behalf of myself, but do feel increasingly that my opinions are shared in many cases.

Everybody appreciates the difficulty of the situation for all involved; The TOJ, the Elected's, the Planning Department, the Housing Authority, the people who need housing, and the people who already live here! Everybody is in a pickle of some sort, and there is no silver-bullet solution.

From what I have gleaned nobody questions the need for more housing, particularly "affordable", nobody seems to dispute the need for increasing density in the town (neighborhoods like ours). What is being questioned is the strategy/planning and or lack thereof, subsequent execution. The planning department is under-staffed and overwhelmed. Although there are many tangents, you (Elected's) are not planners in this role. It seems you are essentially being asked to serve as planners due to the lack of strategic planning at large. This feels wrong. Please recognize that the lack of a viable plan does not excuse the need for one!

In this case it has led to a situation where a development is unnecessarily being pushed forward that does not fit, when it easily could. The size of the structure, the look of the structure, the streetscape, parking, etc. are the problem, not how many people can live there. It doesn't have to be that way, and I do think there are places where similar structures can and do work. (Grove, etc.) This has more to do with the where than the what.

5/12/2019 Bridger Call

This project, give or take 6, 8, 10 units is not going solve anything in of itself, job growth and the need for housing will continue to out pace the ability to generate "affordable" housing. So as we risk diminishing the quality of life in this and other neighborhoods (debatable of course) with developments like this we aren't actually solving anything. If anything we are just pushing out the more stable long time residents and families in favor of a (often) more mobile/transient population (speaking in generalities obviously), when both are needed. This project is also not singularly going to ruin Jackson, but it can do harm, and set a harmful precedent in it's execution.

With this in mind I am going to call this the Hippocratic Oath of Housing... In medicine the imperative is to do no harm. However, through deliberate practice we know that sometimes a treatment must cause harm in order to create cure (surgery, Chemo, etc.). But never should these decisions be rushed into and generally serve as a last resort when other options have been examined, explored and exhausted. The same is true here. Hard decisions need to be made, but should be only through deliberate practice, while unnecessary harm can and should be avoided.

This leads me to my last thought...

This problem is not unique to Jackson, virtually all resort towns, or other expensive zip codes, face this issue, and have people commuting for work. Park City, Vail, Aspen, Manhattan, etc. the list is long. The problem is common and the solution is elusive in a capitalist society. So similar to above we can attempt to "transform" the housing stock in Jackson with projects like this, but won't really be solving the problem. And we can't significantly change the demographic needs and ratios as the population increases. Meanwhile we risk degrading the quality of life for all Jackson residents as the population increases because affordable housing stock is not the only resource/infrastructure under stress and/or not capable of supporting more people. Roads, services, public safety, etc.

Planning that includes good public transportation to the bedroom communities is more likely to help the problem while maintaining character than haphazard redevelopment. (I am sure that many people would disagree this statement!)

Again, more dense development models must be explored, but we also must be deliberate, strategic, and measured in the approach and execution.

I know you have heard a lot of comments that either of the applications you are considering for 440 West Kelly are too large and dense. I concur particularly when I consider what you have approved for Hidden Hollow and the Sagebrush Apartments, both zoned NH-1 as is 440 West Kelly.

5/11/2019 Richard Greig

Per the Housing Supply Plan FY 19/20 and the Greenwoodmap app., Hidden Hollow has 74 affordable/workforce units on 6 acres and Sagebrush has 32 workforce units on 2 acres. These result with affordable/workforce unit densities of 12.3 and 16 units/acre respectively and average 13.4 units/acre.

It seems only fair that this average unit density be applied to 440 West Kelly's 0.31 acres resulting with 5 units (4.154 units rounded up).

I realize 13.4 affordable/workforce units/acre is below the minimum required density of 17.4 units/acre for NH-1 but you found this appropriate for the Hidden Hollow or Sagebrush Apartments developments. It is unreasonable that you are considering allowing 2.5 times this minimum required density for 440 West Kelly.

I hope you do not select either of these proposals and reissue a RFP using 6-8 units, around the minimum number, for 440 West Kelly.

I appreciate your consideration

I will get to the point. I am astounded that you would ever consider a three story, 16 unit, 30+ foot high, townhouse project as being appropriate for 440 West Kelly Avenue. Those two blocks of West Kelly Avenue have been an established neighborhood for a long time and this building will have a devastating impact on their quality of life, not to mention their property values.

Is this the precedent you want to establish? What possibly could be next? This effort in other areas of the Town of Jackson could substantially, in time, alter the quality of life as we know it today.

Affordable workforce housing is the number one challenge in Jackson. I support the need for additional density but this is a very poor example of how to meet that challenge. There are other locations that the bulk and scale of this effort is more appropriate. I know that Pete Karns has a 4 acre plus piece of land on West Broadway that he would like to develop. Call Pete.

5/9/2019 Bruce Hawtin

I mentioned at the public comment period that the property that Carolynn and I owned on Nelson Drive was proposed to be the same zoning as 440 West Kelly Avenue. When we realized how devastating this zoning would have had on the neighborhood, we asked for, and were given the right, to down zone two zones. That meant less units at two story's. The impact on the neighborhood was much more important to us than the lower sale price.

Wouldn't you have done the same thing? Knowing you all as well as I do, I think the answer would be yes!

The property on West Kelly is a good location for affordable housing. How about two buildings, at two story's, with 5 units each, or something at that scale.

Please do not approve this project as proposed.

I will get to the point. I am astounded that you would ever consider a three story, 16 unit, 30+ foot high, townhouse project as being appropriate for 440 West Kelly Avenue. Those two blocks of West Kelly Avenue have been an established neighborhood for a long time and this building will have a devastating impact on their quality of life, not to mention their property values.

Is this the precedent you want to establish? What possibly could be next? This effort in other areas of the Town of Jackson could substantially, in time, alter the quality of life as we know it today.

Affordable workforce housing is the number one challenge in Jackson. I support the need for additional density but this is a very poor example of how to meet that challenge. There are other locations that the bulk and scale of this effort is more appropriate. I know that Pete Karns has a 4 acre plus piece of land on West Broadway that he would like to develop. Call Pete.

5/9/2019 Bruce Hawtin

I mentioned at the public comment period that the property that Carolynn and I owned on Nelson Drive was proposed to be the same zoning as 440 West Kelly Avenue. When we realized how devastating this zoning would have had on the neighborhood, we asked for, and were given the right, to down zone two zones. That meant less units at two story's. The impact on the neighborhood was much more important to us than the lower sale price.

Wouldn't you have done the same thing? Knowing you all as well as I do, I think the answer would be yes!

The property on West Kelly is a good location for affordable housing. How about two buildings, at two story's, with 5 units each, or something at that scale.

Please do not approve this project as proposed.

it is my hope that each of you will have an opportunity to drive west Kelly Avenue before your next meeting on Monday, May 13. I would hope that you would also stop to study the lot and envision the two or three story units proposed for workforce housing. Please view the lot from both Kelly Avenue and Karns Avenue.

5/8/2019 Judy Greig

The Housing Supply Board places emphasis on the "streetscape". Please also keep in mind 16 individuals/families, one or two cars per family, perhaps young children with a lack of a place to play outside (keeping in mind the heavy traffic on Kelly Avenue) and the lack of parking.

It was interesting to me to hear Bruce Hawtin, a local architect, comment at the May 6 meeting that this project is wrong for this site and this neighborhood.

I appreciate your time in further assessment of this project

Thank you for your time and consideration.

I am sorry I was unable to stay at the meeting yesterday long enough to speak, as I had to go pick up my kids. I did however watch the presentations and comments online. I am writing to reiterate what I see as the key points as you consider this difficult matter.

The 440 W. Kelly project can and should move forward, but should do so sensibly. It would not be hard to greatly increase the density of this neighborhood with developments that enhance the existing. In this case a well-designed structure of say 6-10 units at a height of 2 stories would be a huge increase in density, and probably be well-received. I know there are more considerations; timing, finances, etc. but obstacles can be overcome for the right development.

We worked our way into home ownership in Jackson, and this neighborhood is where we ended up. We don't want to "cash out", we want to live here. I have two kids 3 1/2 and 5 years old, I love the idea of families like ours living in our neighborhood... a neighborhood that is a great place for families in many ways. The narrative is that we need more small units for service industry workers, etc. And while this is true in aggregate it is not the whole story, we also need housing for families that is affordable (whatever that means anymore). And as we continue down the unsustainable path of growth we are on without some clear plans and/or direction, building hotels of bartenders (sorry, couldn't help it) feels like a self-fulfilling prophecy.

I support densification. My education, former work, and experience (Masters degree in Urban Planning University of Utah 2006, ex- Associate planner @ Bear West) all tell me this. And this is not a case of NIMBYism, because I do think this neighborhood (my neighborhood) should be redeveloped at higher density than it currently is. However, I believe this should remain a family neighborhood (albeit more dense), so not the single bed units, with the (needed) highest density structures more strategically and sensibly located than this.

What seems to be missing here is the planning. The Comp Plan is a start, and I do appreciate the work that goes into that, I know it's not easy, I used to be a planner. But the Comp plan as it stands is debate-able, constantly becoming obsolete, and does not answer specific questions, nor does it offer guidance in the nuance of each project. When it comes to this project everything that is being offered in terms of information has been engineered retroactively. The January staff report on the project and the April Housing Department report do include useful information, but they do little more than rationalize decisions that have already been made. There was and still is no indication of strategic planning and implementation taking place. It feels like general statements and random implementation. The exploration of alternatives should be at the heart of any planning process.

Just the matter of parking for the proposed development is fairly ridiculous given the winter parking laws. Maybe if we found 15 celibate service worker monks to live here there would be enough parking... And what about the larger town infrastructure? Can we really absorb a 15+ fold increase in density in this area?! The traffic, the parking, the services, the everything... This is just one, relatively small project, but it does set the tone for the neighborhood, for better or worse.

Why was this lot selected for this development? Why did the RFP rule out two story options by keeping such a high minimum unit requirement? I read the meeting notes, but they are not satisfying. Again, the planning process, specifically the exploration of alternatives, was diverted.

Meanwhile other projects that could actually move the needle in terms of housing supply are out there (Munger, etc.). Seems like a good time to step back and do a little planning.

The housing authority wants to make an impact, this is good, but decisions are seemingly being made based on superlatives and general themes rather than ground-truthed wisdom and an actual plan. This thing is being rushed through and it feels very forced. You are our checks and balances in the equation! The model that is being created is not a desirable one, not a sustainable one. And is not one that enhances our town and/or neighborhood, seems more like the fast track to where we don't want to be.

The intent to create more housing is good, but as the saying goes, the road to hell is paved with good intentions. Unless the plan is to curb the need for more housing in Jackson by rapidly making it less desirable to live here... In which case, I think the plan and the implementation is genius!

It's not too late to make a good decision. Pick a design firm/builder now if you must, but look at alternatives. I was more impressed by the sensibilities of the UDS representative than that of Shaw/Roller Tack. But it was obvious that the information and direction that the designer/developers were given on this project was incomplete, rushed, and inconclusive. They both (the developers) seemed to be saying that they can make this project what we want it to be, if we can figure out what that is...

This thing is not ready to build, there is a lot of work that needs to be done, and there is still time to get it right. Again, thank you for your time and consideration.

Please find attached my comments regarding the development proposal, which will be submitted for your approval by Jackson/Teton County Affordable Housing at your Joint Information Meeting next Monday, May 6.

As my comments point out, this RFP process has done our community a valuable service by revealing some of the serious flaws in the application of the Housing Supply Plan and the current Town zoning as it is applied to our neighborhoods.

I urge you to pause at this critical juncture and seriously consider how this project will set future precedent for town development. You need to reformulate how this project will be executed.

Everyone in our community understands the critical need to develop affordable housing, but how that is done is even more important.

Thank you for your commitment to our community.

5/7/2019 Bridger Call

5/1/2019 Michael Stern

The April 17, 2019 JHN&G article "2 firms vie to develop housing on West Kelly" describes a Development Model used to develop workforce housing at 440 West Kelly. It also states this model, which I'll call DM440, was also used to develop 174 N. King Street. DM440 is currently before you to pick a developer allowing this project to proceed.

I submit DM440 was never part of the community conversation in the development of the 2012 Comprehensive Plan nor the 2018 Town zoning ordinance as applied to "Transitional" Core Residential NH-1 and NM-2 zones. Transitional is defined as "Subareas where most of the community would agree that development/redevelopment or a change in character would be beneficial ...".

I believe that just implementing DM440 at 440 West Kelly, 100% of the community would agree the character of these zones has been changed. Therefore, before doing so, an honest community conversation is required to answer at least the following questions:

1. Does the community support title transfer from privately owned to community owned land required by DM440?

CONSIDER: NH-1 and NM-2 are the only zones defined as transitional. At DM440 minimum density of 15 units on 0.31 acres, 1800 units would require 37.2 acres. Currently 182 lots, covering 38.4 acres, in these zones are developed as Single Family Residential (SFR) lots . Therefore, 1800 workforce units would require 120 "440 West Kelly developments" and 97% of current SFR area.

4/28/2019 Richard Greig

2. How does the community finance an DM440 transition from an essentially stable neighborhood to mostly workforce housing?

CONSIDER: The community purchased the 440 West Kelly property, 0.31 acres, for \$1.7 million dollars or \$5.5 million dollars per acre. Using the acreage required for 1800 workforce housing units from #1 above, the community cost will be \$204 million dollars. The history of using SPET taxes for workforce housing is mixed as two applications in 2017 were turned down. There is no guarantee that SPET will finance a DM440 transition.

3. How do current residents leaving the changed character of their neighborhood receive a fair market value for their property?

CONSIDER: If 440 West Kelly is developed per DM440, the fair market value of adjacent property will decrease. DM440 is an exercise of eminent domain which requires "just" compensation to all original owners in these zones.

I appreciate your consideration.

I write to you as lifetime adult planning volunteer and public official charged with planning decisions and recommendations, as well as a co-owner of 460 West Kelly, adjacent on the west to 440 West Kelly-a proposal before you.

I'll begin at the end...although trying valiantly, designers are simply unable to provide quality of life for prospective residents as well as consideration for existing neighborhood character within guidelines of our own Comprehensive Plan (Plan) at the current density proposed. A density respecting what the Plan calls for would be more compatible for initiating a reasonable transition to higher density. The current proposal is more than 2.5 times as dense as required, I understand. I believe plan numbers of 6-8 units, or slightly more, on the .3 acre parcel could work, however. There is a 10' utility easement at the back of the property, but no alley for access or onsite mobility.

Now, into the weeds.

My family (the other co-owners) and I have only been aware of the meeting schedule of the project for less than a week. Apparently, there were flyers put in doors during spring break that never got to us. We are scrambling to gather information and have some distance yet to cover, but were able to listen to this week's presentations by the two current development team finalists.

While appreciating attempts to meet various considerations, many concerns and questions arise. Such as underground parking. At first blush this seemed a swell idea, but the reality of our always challenging and ever more erratic climate crept into my thinking.

I can envision tenants' worldly possessions and vehicles floating around or frozen into their extremely tight storage closets. Sump pumps are not always perfect...a lesson from our former White Glove business. Screened, covered parking at ground level may be more appropriate, conducive to building resident interaction and better for air quality.

4/24/2019 Sandy Shuptrine Snow shedding and removal would be tough. In one case, the 10' side setback from our property line is already depicted for pathway access and stairways, creating unsafe and conflicting uses for tenants if snow lands there.

You probably can guess that I would like the green roof idea, but after personal experience with the former roof at the Visitor's Center (then maintained by White Glove) we know it is easier said than done. Reasonable safe access and maintenance must be considered.

In my pre-adult life, I spent 4 years familiar with downtown Chicago. This proposal resembles some residential buildings there, although row houses offer more living space. We are inching toward the Hong Kong model. I am well aware of the desire to provide 1800 deed restricted, worker housing units within town, but not at the expense of the dignity of those residing in it or nearby. Meanwhile, the driving force behind that goal has been seriously compromised by the Wyoming Legislature. The vision may need rechecking, especially an assumption that most workforce housing will be in recently designated NM-2 and NH-1. Other in-town opportunities exist.

Nor has the 1800 unit goal been identified as overriding to our whole Comprehensive Plan which calls for ecosystem wholeness first with social and economic issues to be figured in. In the eyes of a longtime resident (me), the emphasis has swung to accommodating businesses and individuals, threatening the golden goose, our natural resources, we value and rely upon. This situation will always be an ongoing challenge. Our natural resources (97+% public land, majestic scenery, abundant wildlife and endless outdoor pursuits) are our treasure and economic engine, but cannot be maintained if turned into a cancer of unlimited growth which damages our community character and chokes our water and air quality, while removing any sense of rural WY character.

The cart is before the horse if housing overrides the natural resource considerations that have been put on hold. Totally exempting town from natural resource considerations is not reasonable as it is the site of pre-development habitat and the wintering location for wildlife in the region. For the most part, they have not read the Comp. Plan. We are the ones who have aspired to be stewards.

We, as co-owners of 460 W Kelly, will continue to research the proposal and ask you to do the same. This is not just about numbers, but rather the community's ongoing effort to address issues which arise, without irreparable harm to what we value, rely upon, and strive to achieve as a whole.

I was at the joint Town and County meeting this afternoon but did not get a chance to provide public comment. I live at 365 West Kelly Avenue and like many others in our neighborhood, I am very concerned about the planned density for the parcel at 440 West Kelly. Moreover, I am increasingly dismayed at conversations that focus on developing workforce housing, which sounds more like workforce warehousing, rather than creating homes in neighborhoods where people will want to live for a long time.

Three proposals have been received in response to the RFP. Each presents a version of a "Motel 6"-like box that is completely out of scale, character and context with our neighborhood. A neighborhood meeting was held at my home on March 20. More than 15 families attended. Following is a summary of what was discussed:

CONCERNS:

- The development of 440 West Kelly Ave. sets an important precedent for future development in our neighborhood. Several other properties in our neighborhood are either for sale or appear to be vacant and primed for development.
- We are not opposed to increasing density but it must be done in a "smart", thoughtful, planned way that enhances our neighborhood and doesn't remake it. We need to build neighborhoods, not just build (ware)housing.
- The planned density places an incompatible level of height, mass, and density into an otherwise one and two story, single family area. It does not "sustain Jackson's unique character as a development reflecting that community character", to paraphrase the Town Council's Statement of Strategic Intent.
- The proposed density puts unreasonable and unrealistic stress on traffic, parking, wildlife. There are no sidewalks on the street.
- As much planning as the Town and County do, it is not neighborhood based.
- Why is the Housing Department, (which is a Town/County entity) sponsoring a project that is not compatible with our neighborhood?
- The RFP calls for a basic schematic so this means we don't know what we're getting in terms of design.
- The planned units are not family oriented. Family oriented housing would enhance the existing neighborhood and help respond to the issues facing our Latino community.

4/8/2019 Perri Stern

WE PROPOSE:

- The neighbors recognize the need for and importance of affordable housing and increased density in Jackson. However, the planned development of this parcel is not at all in line with the scale and character of the neighborhood.
- We believe that 6 attached townhouse units on the site would be consistent with the neighborhood scale and character. 6 smaller attached townhouses on that site would be much more compatible with the surrounding area, and likely more financially feasible as well. If you put 6 townhouses on a site that previously had 1 single family home, you have added 5 housing units. This could be replicated on other lots.
- Bring down the height requirement to 2 stories
- Include a design review process that allows for neighborhood input on any proposal.

Thank you for your consideration

Due to age related conditions we will not be able to attend the open meeting in regard to the development proposal for 440 West Kelly Ave. However, we hope you will consider our comments. The neighbors' of this area have proposed the following considerations for the present proposed development.

Having resided in Jackson for nearly 50 years at 330 West Hansen St. we have seen a number of changes that have left the town of Jackson less than the welcoming western community this city wanted to project in order to attract the masses. We have a number of friends from Alaska, Oregon, California, Colorado and Texas who no longer come to Jackson to enjoy the community, outdoor activities and environmental displays that they used to enjoy. As they tell us, they can buy a t-shirt anyplace. This is not Vail, no matter how much you change the community....the very changes you have undertaken actually detract from the "small western nature" of the area for the increased numbers of visitors, and their money that you wish to attract. Will you open your minds to consider the subject at hand and future of the overall community. Many in this community consider most of your actions and proposals are already set in stone before the very hearings you wish to get input from.

For example; Mr Baron, in one of your last council meetings as mayor, as reported in the Jackson Hole Guide, you said you would only approve the renewal of the Rodeo permit if they lowered the sound levels....this never occurred.

Mr. Jorgenson, as our conversations re. your parents leaving the area, we agreed with them in their perception that living in Jackson changed so much that perhaps a different area might be best for them.

Mr. Muldoon, as we chatted during your brief stop prior to the election...we said you indeed had our vote, and we wanted you to help maintain the present Jackson community integrity and check into Baron's Rodeo application renewal.

Housing Director April Norton recently was quoted in the Guide; "The Housing Department's mission is preserving community character and providing a spectrum of options for affordable housing.... Preserving community character hardly means the construction of a 3-story housing unit, such as the height of the new housing units being constructed behind the Forest Service Office, in the proposed location on Kelley. Have any of the officials looked at the new ongoing construction units and tried to see or perceive such a 3-story structure in the Kelly Street location? Is that really preserving community character?"

Yes, skepticism aside, Jackson residents do pay attention your community activities and politics.

To reiterate the West Kelly neighbors suggestions and proposals:

1. The neighbors recognize the need for and importance of affordable housing and increased density in Jackson. However, the planned development of this parcel is not at all in line with the scale and character of the neighborhood.
2. We believe that 4-6 attached townhouse units on the site would be consistent with the neighborhood scale and character. Six small attached townhouses on that site would be much more compatible with the surrounding area, and likely more financially feasible as well. If you put 6 townhouse on a site that previously had 1 single family home, you have added 5 housing units. This could be replicated on other lots.
3. Bring down the height requirement to TWO stories.
4. Include a design review process that allows neighborhood input on any proposal.

The new development being proposed for a large no of units is not compatible to our neighborhood of one or two story houses. We bought in this neighborhood because of the small family oriented area. We love the undeveloped Karns meadow for the wild life viewing. We know many of our neighbors, and if high density building project is introduced here, the area will change forever. The reason why people like Jackson so much, is the small town feel..not the Aspen 's or the Vail 's of Colorado. And most of the commissioners ran on this platform. But if building in family residential area, the town will lose this important aspect of being a small town.

I understand the need for more housing here in Jackson, but the only way you are going to be able to house 60% of workforce is stop the commercial business here in town, and we know that is not going to happen. We do not have the land available for enough low income housing to be built here. So, to keep the small town feel a more reasonable solution is 4-6 units on those lots. You now have 4-5 more homes without increasing parking, traffic and impact on neighborhood. The units could be larger so families could be able to buy there.

Every time a new development goes up in Jackson more concessions are being given to the builders to build these larger complexes. It needs to stop somewhere and the sooner it does, we will not have the large mountain city that we all say we do not want.

Please consider the wishes of our neighborhood moving forward.

4/3/2019 John and Loyola Kiefling

4/3/2019 Nancy StClair & Loren Nelson

Rob and
3/25/2019 Johanna
Holbrook

Good afternoon commissioners, my name is Rob Holbrook and I live in the new NH-1 zoning here in town. My neighbors have taken up arms it seems to shut down a well needed housing development here in the neighborhood. I feel there reasons for not wanting the development are not good enough to out weigh the overwhelming need for housing. I am the paving Forman for Evan's Construction and a Lift Operations Supervisor in the winter for JHMR. Both of those companies are in dire need of more workers and housing people is always the biggest obstacle. Mostly just wanted to make sure you guys got a positive email towards the development in our neighborhood. Thanks for your time.

I have just seen and read the minutes of January 29, 2019. WOW, this is something. You took it upon yourselves to purchase a piece of property without consulting the people who live in the Town of Jackson. I can't find anywhere that states that it was even a consideration to purchase the above mentioned property. Perhaps we, the residents of the Town of Jackson, don't have any say in the purchasing of property by the Town? If I am incorrect please advise me.

2/8/2019 Carolyn Douglas
Also, reading the minutes of February 4th and the 5-0 vote to initiate plans to build a 15 Unit- 3 story housing complex. When was a notice of this meeting put in the paper? I can't understand how you all could vote on something so "quickly" and without input from the residents who live on West Kelly as well as residents on West Karns. I am baffled that all this took place in such a very short period of time (days). The fact that you are intending to build a structure right in the middle of the block makes no sense at all. Where would the "tenants" of this complex park?? There is very little parking on that street, so I am interested in what you all have discussed with regard to parking as well as more traffic? While reading the minutes I noticed that most of you didn't seem to be in favor of the plans for this complex and then to my surprise reading further you all "voted" for it. Please help me understand why this project was voted unanimously on so quickly to move forward.

I should mention that my home is directly behind the planned structure and I certainly am not in favor of having neighbors that would be able to look directly down on my property. I know my neighbors to the right and left would not like it either. Would you? Also have you given any consideration for the owners of properties on West Kelly and West Karns as to how much the 3 story-15 unit housing structure could de-value our properties?

Thank you for your attention to this email.

This letter is intended as input on the pending development of the property at 440 W. Kelly into affordable housing units. I should disclose that I live one house East on Karns Ave.

In general:

The recent zoning changes mark a step forward for the TOJ, I am generally very supportive, and appreciative of the time and thought that goes into this work.

Recent zoning changes open doors.

Similarly, I think it is good we have an ambitious Affordable Housing Authority in the TOJ, the housing issues are daunting and persistent.

I support the densification of "urban" Jackson, including in my own neighborhood. I also support continuing efforts to seek out and provide affordable housing opportunities. In fact I believe other/more neighborhoods near the town center should be considered for more dense (re)development. I trust that the interests of existing home owners will be kept in mind throughout. I also support rhetorically that we are concurrently trying to maintain a character and identity to our town and neighborhoods.

The Affordable Housing Authority and the TOJ will rightly be seeking to make an impact with affordable housing projects. And to have said projects serve as positive example of development moving forward. There is a great opportunity to do just that! There is of course an opportunity to do the opposite. While the Affordable Housing authority will be eyeing new projects, the TOJ Town Council and Planning Department have the responsibility of ensuring that they are in the best interest of the residents of Jackson, and serve as a buffer of sorts as they are essentially 'public' projects in terms of purpose, funding, etc.. This probably means tempering the expectations of the housing authority on some projects.

Scoping and the identification of alternatives are key components of the planning process. I urge you to always consider a wide range of alternatives on AHA developments.

It is important that LDRs (parking, streetscape, etc.) are followed for Affordable Housing Authority projects not just private developments. The zoning changes are significant, and will in themselves create evolution within the existing development paradigm. My view is that these (AHA) projects should serve as models of the benefits of compliant and thoughtful development, and as a glimpse of what we actually want our neighborhoods to be.

2/3/2019 Bridger Call

In specificity to this project:

At 440 W. Kelly turning a single family lot into more dense housing is a worthy objective, and should happen.

On this project the RFP (as I read it) calls for a very high number (12-18) of units, citing that NH-1 zoning allows for high density and 3-story buildings. This is true, and the latitude that the NH-1 zone offers is good. However, that does not mean that 'maxing out' is what should happen in this case. Alternatives should be considered.

This neighborhood almost all single family 1 story homes, granted this is due largely to the vernacular of the times. This is a neighborhood where many of the long-time Jackson folks live, and where people did work their way up to home ownership locally and organically. And while this area should be densified as it is redeveloped, it should not be destroyed by disproportionate moves. I do not believe that a 3 story 12-18 unit development on this property is appropriate. Again, alternatives should be explored.

There exists a balance between policy and practice. In this case much can be achieved without over-reaching. Even a development of 4 units would be a 4-fold increase from the existing, 8 units an 8-fold increase. When I picture this neighborhood's best case moving forward, it is increasingly dense and updated architecturally, becoming home to a multi-fold increase of 'real' Jackson residents, but still a cohesive neighborhood.

I am not suggesting that proposals/designs for 12-18 unit developments should not be explored, but so should 4-10 unit developments. Please also look at 2 story options. See what actually fits the neighborhood, and pick a design that enhances the existing neighborhood, not destroys it. Please consider the overall picture, not just the number of units that could be crammed in. I appreciate your time and consideration, and thank you for your dedication past, present, and future to the Town of Jackson, and the people who live here.