



Envision Gallatin

LAND USE & HOUSING STRATEGY

Steering Committee Meeting #4

May 15, 2024 | 1:00-3:00pm

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

Agenda:

Welcome and Roll Call

The following Steering Committee members were in attendance:

- Matt Fulton
- Wylie Phillips
- Zach Brown
- Lila Fleishman
- Wylie Philips
- Garrett McAllister

Approval of February meeting notes

Meeting notes were approved unanimously without discussion.

Public Comment

- No members of the public were present.
- SC: Request to make Steering Committee agendas and meeting materials more prominent on the project website (perhaps on the 'Get Involved' page) to increase awareness of these meetings and encourage public participation.
- County staff: Agendas are currently posted on that tab, but they are not as prominent as they could be. We'll make some adjustments.

General Status Update

- Clarion: First round of community outreach (Phase 3) is complete. Project team's ongoing work is focused on Phase 4: FLUM and Housing Strategies.
- June meeting of the Steering Committee will be focused primarily on review of the draft Housing Strategies

Discussion: What We've Heard So Far– Summary of Round 1: Community and Stakeholder Engagement

- County staff provided an overview of key findings from the first round of meetings and subsequent online survey, public comments received via phone and e-mail, and ongoing discussions with various community stakeholders (e.g., municipalities, service providers, conservation organizations)
- SC member: Curious to hear from EPS and Clarion about how the sentiments that were shared regarding housing compared to other communities that they've worked with.
 - EPS: Comments were striking; what we would typically hear in high-end markets like Aspen or Teton County. Underscores the severity of the situation.
 - Clarion: Would have expected to hear that sentiments were more "split down the middle" in terms of those who were for growth/expansion of housing supply and those who were anti-growth/pro-property rights.
- SC member: Is the sample size valid? Seems pretty small to be considered representative of 'consensus.'
- Clarion: This was not a statistically valid survey, so it is a more limited sample. Typical in a process like this that more people will get engaged later in the process when there is something more tangible to react to (e.g., draft FLUM and housing strategies). Would anticipate that we'll hear more from pro-property rights folks at the next stage. We will also need to continue to do targeted outreach to underrepresented groups to make sure we're getting an array of input.
- SC member: Validated feedback provided by business community (about the challenges housing costs/shortages pose for employers and business owners) based on personal experience.
- SC member: Did we hear much about stopping growth altogether? Examples cited (Aspen, Jackson/Teton County) are maybe more constrained than Gallatin County, but likely provide some important lessons about how well they have managed or not managed growth over an extended period.
 - County staff: Some. Desire to moderate growth, but do it in a way that doesn't impact quality of life. A number of respondents indicated that they do not want to see Gallatin County become [insert fast growing mountain community].
- County staff: Added that the purpose of coding qualitative data is not necessarily to arrive at quantitative results- Meghan showed some interesting percentages that show how many folks are discussing what topics- but the quotes we can pull from the open-ended questions and the narrative descriptions are a very powerful aspect of this that you don't necessarily get from statistically validated quantitative data.
- SC: Anticipate that an antigrowth sentiment will emerge later in the process.

Discussion: Development Suitability

- Clarion: Provided brief recap of how the project team arrived at the current draft.

- County staff: Walked through some initial observations about the result and some suggested changes in the criterion/methodology and thoughts on overlays for the next iteration of analysis.
- County staff: Does the overall approach make sense in terms of level of specificity that this analysis provides to help inform future land use? Are we on the right track?
- SC: Think that relative weights on suitability analysis makes more sense than equal.
- SC: How will the suitability categories ultimately be translated to something that informs density/intensity of future land use?
 - County staff: Not sure yet. We'll be working through that question next.
- SC: Think the more generalized approach makes sense; easier to defend methodology versus parcel-by-parcel level of detail.
- SC: Think that keeping the variations in suitability within individual parcels makes sense (to avoid parcel assignments being perceived as arbitrary). Also allows for more flexibility in the review process.
- SC: Like direction it's headed.

Next Steps (10-min)

- Refine suitability analysis and flesh out draft Housing Strategies
- June meeting of the Steering Committee will be focused primarily on review of the draft Housing Strategies

Public Comment

No public comment was provided.