



Envision Gallatin

LAND USE & HOUSING STRATEGY

Steering Committee Meeting #2

December 13, 2023 | 2:00-4:00pm

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89434555269>

Notes from December Meeting

General Status Update

Discussion: Draft Land Use and Policy Audit (30 min)

- Do the Overarching Themes/Policy Gaps identified reflect your priorities for the FLUM/HS process?
 - Lori—the themes seem to align with common topics related to the health department, especially the need from stronger subdivision regulations.
 - Does not seem to be any obvious oversights at this point
 - Health—the themes appeared to capture typical policy gaps
 - Another component that could be expanded upon is the need to reinvest in infrastructure in mobile home parks, especially as those may degrade over time.
 - Zach—initial themes seem good but nothing to add here.
 - Jackie—nothing too add, but will email with additions as they arise.
- There's a lot of information in the policy document and its as much a working document for the project team as it is for the Steering Committee.
 - Garrett—happy to see all this information in one location to provide a more holistic look of what is already planned for different parts of the county.
- Are there any plans/policy documents relevant to this effort that that we've missed?

Discussion: Draft Outline - Housing Needs Assessment (30 min)

Will the proposed approach/content provide sufficient guidance relative to the County's role?

- Zach— add the following language to the second bullet: "assess the impact of second and vacation homes as well as vacation rentals"
 - Recently had a meeting where compliance staff came forward with a request to begin thinking about how vacation rentals were regulated/tracked (currently operating under a complaint-based enforcement approach).
 - Don't let this take up too much space (a bit of a hot-button issue) but wanted to acknowledge that this is coming up in the County.
 - Lori—the City of Bozeman may already be exploring this topic, could look to them to see what options are out there.
 - Brian Duffany—even if the County doesn't want to establish a large regulatory program, it would be advised to at least track where these properties are

- Jackie—would add that tracking vacation rentals is also useful from a disaster management standpoint so officials can effectively communicate evacuation strategies if need be.
 - Zach—the start-up cost for software to track vacation rentals may be significantly large (even if it's only the tracking piece of it, which could lead to a regulatory, expensive road).
 - Heather—word of caution: this is a volatile topic that could throw off the whole process.
 - Brian—I'm hearing "tread lightly"
- Heather—it would be great to have a side-by-side comparison of housing costs, what wages are need to afford those houses, and what wages are currently common in the county.
- Heather—would also like to see this information linked to transportation and infrastructure factors.
 - This information will all be closely linked, especially as recommendations came out for where housing should be placed.
- Heather—also helpful to define need/gap in relationship to demographics when shifting to policy recommendations.
 - Brian—I do think we will be able to identify gaps by income range, unit types (what's needed v. what's built).
 - In these instances, gap analyses can point out massive gaps that aren't that useful. However, EPS is going to attempt to use this information to create realistic targets based on what the market dynamic are in different parts of the county and how those are relating to job flows/commuting trends across/intra-county.
- Darcie—one of the roles for this group is to gut-check that we are framing the information correctly to get the feedback that we need.

Discussion: Draft Outline - Land Use Profile (50 min)

- Does the outline cover the topics you'd like to see addressed? Does the proposed organization and level of detail seem logical in relation to the existing condition information provided in the Growth Policy document (Chapters 4 and 6)?
 - Lori—How does Part 1 relate to Sensitive Lands work and Growth Policy?
 - Darcie—we are trying to tie closely to both the sensitive lands plan and growth policy, but are adding additional layers based on what we heard was needed. In this instance, we are providing an existing land use analysis to provide a clear picture of what's really happening on the ground today. This will also relate to existing service capacity and what other plans are pointing to for the future. So not reinventing the wheel, but intentionally building on pieces to align with the work we are doing.
 - Darcie—one of the things we're proposing to do is build this information out as a storymap that allows folks to zoom in and out of specific areas that are relevant to folks.
- Garrett provided an overview of the existing land use map organization/characterization.
 - Darcie—from a usability standpoint, there is intention in not guiding this by the distinct areas that people are used to referencing (and therefore not creating an expectation that every 'place' in Gallatin County is needing its own specific policy direction).

- Lori—yes, happy to see Parkston and Ponderosa Pines included as their own topic areas.
 - From a transparency standpoint, I would like a write-up that describes how the boundaries were created
 - Garrett—it's difficult because land use patterns don't align precisely with municipal or geographic boundaries, but agree that the general information should be provided to describe how the boundaries were created.
 - Darcie—and the County will maintain some internal version of the document that clearly describes how the boundaries were created so that they can make edits in the future, as needed.
- Do the proposed subareas seem logical based on the criteria presented?
 - Garrett: Do you think Willow Creek, Gallatin Gateway, and Amsterdam/Churchill have similar land use designations?
 - Community Core is the preferred name.
 - Bridger Bangtail and South Foothills—these areas have a wider range of land use patterns but they remain fairly similar. How do folks feel about combining those two areas?
 - OK with combining them, but no strong opinions.
 - Brian—while today they have similar patterns, does South Foothills have stronger development pressures that could affect policy direction?
 - Garrett—yes and now, conservation and AG land could be limiting factors, however the County is seeing subdivision requests in this area.
 - Darcie—Brian has a good point, the areas will ultimately guide policy direction for the future, so if these are developing in a way that the county would like to change, now is the time to group areas accordingly.
 - Ted—are the descriptions used on this map transferrable across the county? Or are we looking to develop different requirements for each of these areas?
 - Darcie-- The land use categories are proposed to be the same, but the details may vary by area.
 - Garrett: Do we think the Canyon and Hebgen Basin can be combined?
 - Ted—I would treat them as one, very similar.
 - Lori—a lot of development pressure along the lake that you might not see along the canyon area.
 - Brian—there are also topographical differences as we can closer to West Yellowstone (flatter lands may be more developable).
 - Garrett—maybe we keep these two separate for now and see where our analysis takes us.
 - Garrett: We will also include a disclaimer that public lands included in these subareas will be excluded from our review.
- Zach Brown—In reference of the Land Use Profile outline: Do we have the capability to easily map irrigation canals and ditches? Many of them have not been mapped, is my understanding, but I do have a rough scale MT Bureau of Mines and Geology Map in my office.
 - We do have the ditches in the outline and they will be reflected.

- General opinion is that there are some details that need to be ironed out but we are headed in the right direction.

Next Steps (10-min)

- Steering Committee Meeting #3: December 13
 - Review/discuss draft County Land Use Profile and Housing Needs Assessment