

PUBLIC COMMENT
Packsaddle Road Abandonment
IN OPOSITION OF

Darryl Johnson

From: WENDY MCGLINSKY <windymcg@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 4:20 PM
To: Darryl Johnson
Subject: Commentary To Be Considered during the June 13th Packsaddle Road Project Hearing

Darrel Johnson and Members of the Teton County Board of County Commissioners,

Please consider the contents of this letter during the June 13th public hearing concerning the road being built by Jesse Horton/Ag Rim LLC. I regret that I can not attend.

I have serious concerns regarding that road and especially concerning the county's assumption of maintenance of that road. Previously, I've discussed my dismay about potential development of the western side of the valley. A letter voicing my concerns is included in the December 14th BoCC Information Package. Since writing that letter, I've been exploring the various reports and comments included in the Teton County Public Works Department section on the Packsaddle Road Project. I've read letters supporting the project, and letters from people defending the old road. I've looked at the four options to be considered during the hearing on June 13th, and especially, I've looked at the The March 3rd report from Teton County Engineering Tech Publics Works Department which details the projected costs of maintaining the developments proposed in each option. I believe Option 4 best serves the majority of Teton County taxpayers. In fact, I believe it is the only responsible choice.

I know you are familiar with the estimated maintenance costs associated with each of the options, so I will mention them only briefly:

Option 1 involves year round maintenance of Horton's new road. $20 \text{ snow plowings} = 10.4 \text{ miles} / 3 \text{ mph} \times 20 \times \$125/\text{hr} = \$8,700$ $6 \text{ gradings} = 6 \times 3 \text{ hours/mile} \times 10.4 \times \$125 = \$2340$. **Year round maintenance = \$32,100 / year.**

Option 2 involves year round maintenance of a smaller section of the new road. $2 \text{ miles @ year round maintenance } (\$3,200/\text{mile}) = \$6,400$ $7.4 \text{ miles @ current maintenance } (\$1,511/\text{mile}) = \$11,200$ **Total = \$17,600 / year.**

Apparently in Option 3, Teton County will purchase land and build a parking lot at Kay's Hill to "Create an end destination for year round users through acquisition of 1+ acres to be developed into a more appropriate parking area for recreation users. Packsaddle Road will not be maintained during winter months. $\text{Spring clearing} = 4 \text{ days} \times 10 \text{ hours} \times 2 \text{ graders} \times \$125/\text{hr} = \$10,000$. $\text{One grading} = 8.8 \text{ miles} \times 3 \text{ hrs/mile} \times \$125/\text{hr} = \$3,300$ $\text{Current Maintenance} = \$13,300$. $\text{Cost to build } 110' \times 270' \text{ Parking Area} = \$87,500$ (Extrapolated from Fox Creek Park & Ride) $\text{Cost to acquire 1 acre} = \$10,000$. **Total = \$13,300 / year + \$97,500 initial investment.**

Option 4 leaves things as they are with the old Packsaddle road opened each spring and maintained in the summer. $\text{Spring clearing} = 4 \text{ days} \times 10 \text{ hours} \times 2 \text{ graders} \times \$125/\text{hr} = \$10,000$ $\text{One grading} = 8.8 \text{ miles} \times 3 \text{ hrs/mile} \times \$125/\text{hr} = \$3,300$. **Current Maintenance = \$13,300 / year.**

In short:

Option 1: \$32,100/year

Option 2: \$17,600/year

Option 3: \$13,300/year + \$97,500 Initial Investment

Option 4: \$13,300/year

Option 1 involves significant, ongoing, financial commitment. Option 3 requires a sizable initial investment, and Option 2 costs the taxpayers 4,300 more than the current situation. However, as I read the opinions of those taxpayers, I didn't see many clamoring for the improvements. Rather, several who've submitted letters of commentary would prefer their tax dollars go to maintaining existing roads. Others argue the current, winter-closed road is sufficient. Folks with ATVs, snowmobilers and sledders in particular seem quite fond of the current arrangement. In fact, the only supporters of a new road maintained by the county are people whose properties would be more easily accessed by that road.

Jesse Horton can and will build his road on his property; however, I see no reason for the county to assume responsibility for it. Year round maintenance of all or part of Horton's road involves significant, ongoing expense to the county and serves only a few county residence. On the other hand, many/most residents seem satisfied with the old road, closed as it is in the winter. And opening and maintaining the old road in the summer is not particularly expensive. I believe Option 4 serves the majority of taxpayers with the smallest expenditure of taxpayer money. I urge you to make the only responsible choice for all the taxpayers of Teton County.

Sincerely,
Wendy McGlinsky
439 Liberty St
Beacon, NY 12508

Darryl Johnson

From: Barbara Norton <barb@mondove.com>
Sent: Monday, May 30, 2016 4:12 PM
To: Darryl Johnson
Subject: Comment for Horton Scenic Parkway Development

May 29, 2016.

To: Teton County Idaho Commissioners, Darryl Johnson-Public Works Director

From: Barbara M. Norton

Subject: Opposition to the Horton Scenic Parkway Development

Thank you so much for giving us the opportunity to comment on the proposed Packsaddle Road Development. Unfortunately, we will not be able to attend the public hearing on June 13, 2016 so I ask that my letter be read aloud during the hearing and entered into the public record..

My husband Boyd and I along with Lee and Al McGlinsky have been owners of 400 acres of the land that is next to the proposed road development for almost 50 years. We have placed almost all of this land in a conservation easement so that it will forever remain as it is, an unspoiled nature reserve.

Since it is not right up against our land, the existing road has not had much impact although we have had instances of trespassing, littering and vandalism to signs and fences. The new road, however, is another story. It will severely impact our land since it abuts the eastern boundary of the land. We had no knowledge of this road until we visited our land last July and saw the devastation caused by clearing right up to this boundary. At no time were any of us contacted by the developers and told of their plans.

Since the new road will have such impact on the land, I urge you, the Teton Valley Commissioners, to adopt Option 4 – Do Nothing Scenario.

Here are some of my objections to this proposal:

Objection 1. Proposed parking area. This parking area abuts our land. It will be 8.39 acres large. A parking area as big as a city parking lot is a use not compatible to other uses in the general neighborhood which is rural. In Option 3 which is to develop a parking area at the base of Kay's hill, a parking lot of 1 acre plus or minus is proposed. If this is thought to be adequate, why must the proposed parking area be the huge 8 acres? Why such a big one in a rural area?

To give an idea of just how big the parking area will be, here is how 8 acres looks when placed in Driggs.

A. Eight acres is greater than the total parking area of Broulim's Supermarket plus the Driggs City Center Building, the U. S. Bank and U. S. Post Office.



B. Eight acres is larger than the entire city block occupied by the Driggs Elementary School and Teton School District building with surrounding parking.



The first three Proposed Options that were given in the memorandum of March 21, 2016 from the Public Works Director to the County Commissioners assumes that this parking area will be built. There is no mention of the enormity of the parking area and no objections to it.

If this is indeed to be a scenic parkway as named, the parking area will be a gigantic scar upon the natural beauty of the land. Furthermore, it must be maintained and patrolled – by the county if it should take over this parking area. The following maintenance issues are NOT addressed in the March 21, 2016 memo to BOCC:

A. Trash – For inevitable trash in the parking lot, the county will have to provide containers. The containers will have to be animal (bear) proof which are more expensive than regular trash cans. The trash will have to be collected. If this is not done, the trash will blow onto our land since it is right next to the parking lot and will further impact our land.

B. Sanitation – Unless the county provides for public toilets and collects the waste, the public will use our land for a toilet – hazardous waste as well as toilet paper, etc.

C. Security – With that big a parking lot there will be inevitable car break-ins and other crimes. The county Sheriff will have to handle these.

D. Emergency Services – With more people using the road and parking lot there will be accidents and other emergencies. The Ambulance Service District will have to handle these.

I did not find any cost estimates for these services in Options 1-3. Therefore, if Teton County accepts the donation of the parking lot, it will place an undue burden on county services, the county budget, and the taxpayers of Teton County.

Objection 2. With such a huge parking lot, the developers must be anticipating a large increase in the number of cars on the road. If the county accepts the road, the costs given for the four options are for upkeep (plowings and gradings) only for the present. With more traffic, the road will have to be rebuilt more often, the cost of which will be passed on to Teton County taxpayers.

Objection 3. The proposed use is not in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. It will not “preserve natural resources”. It will instead destroy the natural resources of the land by making additional scars on the land and serve as a barrier to animals needing to migrate along traditional paths. Furthermore, Teton Valley as well as the state of Idaho have been very concerned with noxious weeds, rightfully so. Whenever land is disturbed such as happens when you build a road, noxious weeds spring up beside the road, spread to adjacent land and are extremely difficult to control.

It will not “maintain, nurture and enhance the rural character and heritage of Teton Valley”. It will be a step to turning Teton Valley into another Jackson, WY.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment.

Barbara M. Norton

PO Box 2605

Evergreen, CO 80437-2605

Darryl Johnson

From: Bill Leake
Sent: Thursday, June 02, 2016 4:54 PM
To: Darryl Johnson; Holly Wolgamott
Subject: FW: June 13 Hearing - Packsaddle Road/Scenic Parkway proposal

FYI

Bill Leake
Chair, Teton County Idaho Board of Commissioners
208-521-4689
bleake@co.teton.id.us

From: Jean Norton [jean_anne_norton@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 02, 2016 2:23 PM
To: Cindy Riegel; Bill Leake; Kelly Park
Cc: windymcg@yahoo.com; mcziplock@gmail.com; boydn@earthlink.net; Al McGlinsky; Lee McGlinsky; barb@mondove.com
Subject: June 13 Hearing - Packsaddle Road/Scenic Parkway proposal

Dear Teton County Commissioners,

I am writing regarding the Packsaddle Road development. I am unable to attend the meeting on the 13th of June, so would like this letter to be read aloud and included in the public record. As one of the co-owners of the conservation trust that borders the proposed parkway and parking lot, I wish my views to be considered.

Of the four options listed, I would like to express my support for Option 4 – the “Do Nothing” scenario. This option provides the most cost effective option for the county, has no additional negative impact on the community, residents or wildlife and does not incur any unforeseen consequences.

I have already written to you to voice my concern over Option 1 – accepting the Scenic Parkway as presented. In addition to having a detrimental effect on the community and the local environment and wildlife, this option more than doubles the yearly maintenance costs of the road, with no corresponding savings or increase in revenue to the county. The number of people who benefit from it is relatively few. Further, the creation of a stadium sized parking lot is not a benefit to the county, it represents a liability.

In an area so relatively remote, such a large car park is quite likely to attract a range of undesirable activities: large parties, overnight camping, vandalism, drug use and underage drinking. To prevent such activities, there will need to be increased police patrols, and this represents even more expense to the county on an ongoing basis.

Even if the parking lot is not misused in any way, litter bins will have to be provided, and these must be cleared regularly, again at an additional cost to the county. If they aren't provided, and if they aren't emptied frequently, people will litter, and the area will become a mess and a health hazard.

For these reasons, neither Option 1 or Option 2 is acceptable or cost effective.

Option 3 is slightly better, as the size of the parking lot is much more reasonable, and the area is also somewhat less remote. This reduces the likelihood of it being misused, although some additional police patrols may still be required, and litter bins are still a must.

Overall, the best option is Option 4. Leaving the situation as it is will keep county costs at a minimum, and will mean that the best interests of the wider community are being looked after.

Kind regards,

Jean Norton

11A Canada Road

Arundel, West Sussex

BN18 9HZ

United Kingdom

Darryl Johnson

From: Jean Norton <jean_anne_norton@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 02, 2016 2:19 PM
To: Darryl Johnson
Subject: June 13 Hearing - Packsaddle Road/Scenic Parkway Proposal

Dear Teton County Commissioners,

I am writing regarding the Packsaddle Road development. I am unable to attend the meeting on the 13th of June, so would like this letter to be read aloud and included in the public record. As one of the co-owners of the conservation trust that borders the proposed parkway and parking lot, I wish my views to be considered.

Of the four options listed, I would like to express my support for Option 4 – the “Do Nothing” scenario. This option provides the most cost effective option for the county, has no additional negative impact on the community, residents or wildlife and does not incur any unforeseen consequences.

I have already written to you to voice my concern over Option 1 – accepting the Scenic Parkway as presented. In addition to having a detrimental effect on the community and the local environment and wildlife, this option more than doubles the yearly maintenance costs of the road, with no corresponding savings or increase in revenue to the county. The number of people who benefit from it is relatively few. Further, the creation of a stadium sized parking lot is not a benefit to the county, it represents a liability.

In an area so relatively remote, such a large car park is quite likely to attract a range of undesirable activities: large parties, overnight camping, vandalism, drug use and underage drinking. To prevent such activities, there will need to be increased police patrols, and this represents even more expense to the county on an ongoing basis.

Even if the parking lot is not misused in any way, litter bins will have to be provided, and these must be cleared regularly, again at an additional cost to the county. If they aren't provided, and if they aren't emptied frequently, people will litter, and the area will become a mess and a health hazard.

For these reasons, neither Option 1 or Option 2 is acceptable or cost effective.

Option 3 is slightly better, as the size of the parking lot is much more reasonable, and the area is also somewhat less remote. This reduces the likelihood of it being misused, although some additional police patrols may still be required, and litter bins are still a must.

Overall, the best option is Option 4. Leaving the situation as it is will keep county costs at a minimum, and will mean that the best interests of the wider community are being looked after.

Kind regards,

Jean Norton
11A Canada Road
Arundel, West Sussex
BN18 9HZ
United Kingdom

Darryl Johnson

From: Bill Leake
Sent: Thursday, June 02, 2016 7:54 AM
To: Darryl Johnson
Subject: FW: Teton County Board of County Commissioners

Bill Leake
Chair, Teton County Idaho Board of Commissioners
208-521-4689
bleake@co.teton.id.us

From: Boyd Norton [boydn@earthlink.net]
Sent: Wednesday, June 01, 2016 5:09 PM
To: Bill Leake; Kelly Park; Cindy Riegel; Commissioners; Lee McGlinsky; Julie McGlinsky; w McGlinsky; Jean Norton; Tamara Sperber; kimberly@tetonlandtrust.org; "Barbara Norton"@mondove
Subject: To: Teton County Board of County Commissioners

To the Teton County Board of County Commissioners:

I ask that this letter be read at the June 13 hearing and made part of the hearing record.

We are co-owners, with Al and Lee McGlinsky, of the 400 acre property bordering on Targhee National Forest and containing the upper Rammel Hollow. We have owned this undeveloped land for 50 years. All but 16 acres have been put into a Conservation Easement through the Teton Regional Land Trust as a means of protecting important wildlife migration and aesthetic values of the area.

I urge you to adopt Option 4 - take no action and do not accept any part of this so called Scenic Parkway. It appears that an out-of-state real estate developer will be the only beneficiary of this scheme. Teton County taxpayers will end up subsidizing his plans for massive development - essentially like a welfare program for the developer. In addition, I urge that the commissioners examine carefully the need for an 8.39 acre parking lot. Do you realize that an 8 acre parking lot is bigger than the playing field and dugouts and the first few rows of seats AT YANKEE STADIUM AND MOST OTHER MAJOR LEAGUE BALLPARKS. What possible use could such a huge area parking lot serve in a remote area? And will the county be required to handle sanitation, litter, fire avoidance, police patrolling at taxpayer expense? This is a no win situation for Teton County whose heritage of rural values and scenic beauty we have long admired since moving to Idaho Falls in 1960.

Please consider all this very carefully. I hope you will reject the acceptance of managing this "Scenic Parkway" and huge parking lot.

Thank you.
Boyd Norton

--
303-674-3009

Recipient of Sierra Club's 2015 Ansel Adams award for Conservation Photography
Boyd Norton [Wilderness Photography](#) *"One of the 40 most influential nature photographers from around the globe."* Outdoor Photography Magazine U.K.
My Blog: <http://thewildernessphotography.blogspot.com>

Co-Founder & Co-Director Serengeti Watch

Charter Fellow: International League of Conservation Photographers & Founding Fellow International League of Conservation Writers

Recent books: *Serengeti: the Eternal Beginning* (October 2011, Fulcrum); "*Boyd Norton has captured the magic of this ancient and majestic ecosystem.*" Jane Goodall

Conservation Photography Handbook (February 2016; Amherst Media) [Now Available on Amazon](#)

Books-in-Progress: *Perfect Money* (a novel); *Tickling the Dragon's Tail: How I Once Blew Up a Nuclear Reactor and Went on to Save Wilderness Worldwide* (a memoir)

Darryl Johnson

From: Al McGlinsky <al2mcg@q.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 04, 2016 1:28 AM
To: Darryl Johnson
Subject: My comments for the June 13 Horton Scenic Parkway public hearing

Dear Teton County Commissioners,

I will not be able to attend the June 13 BOCC hearing on the Horton Scenic Parkway proposal. Please read aloud and include this statement in the materials presented as surely would have happened, had I been able to attend.

As a Teton County land owner and taxpayer for over 50 years now, I believe *Option 4* is best: *Do nothing (accept no part of the Scenic Parkway)*.

Like it or not, one result of that option is that the roads that Jesse Horton has already built will enable yet another private gated community. I suspect that beyond zoning and lot sizes, the county has no say over how property owners might develop or use their land. Still, there is no good reason why the cost of maintaining roads we hadn't needed should be passed on to all Teton County taxpayers. So Option 4 is indeed best.

Remember, the county had no plans to alter Packsaddle Road until Jesse Horton came forth with his "Scenic Parkway" proposition. When a change in long standing practice is suddenly proposed, it is always good to ask **Who Benefits?** Obviously, Jesse Horton's proposal, a long "scenic pathway" through his property along which he can sell "view lots" benefits HIM.

The existing roads already provide access both to those who have farmed the land for generations and to USFS lands. They also preserve snowmobile groomers and users established right of ways, protect important wildlife, a matter important in the county plan. The Kay's hill to Packsaddle Road, Milk Creek and Hoopes Road constitutes a shorter loop accessing Hiway 30, and save taxpayers money each year because they require lower maintenance, require no new cattle guards, no additional fencing, signage, restrooms nor trash removal services at the newly proposed, overly large (8.3 acre??) parking lot.

Another concern appeared to me when reviewing the Packsaddle Road packet contents. If you look at the map details near what we and others always called the corrals (1/4 mile eastward from the USFS boundary where Packsaddle Road begins to bisect our land), you'll see that the radius of the turn in the road that bisects our property (that would newly be connected to Jesse's 8+ acre parking lot) has been **increased**... (ostensibly to enable larger trailer pulling vehicles and logging trucks). BUT, the only way to do that would be to shave that corner *off our property* as the drawings show would indeed be done. Why were we not being consulted as to our willingness? Bummer...both in recommending that loss to our (conservation easement protected) property and in not involving or even informing us about it!

Within the packet, the contents are arranged in a manner that ignores the above fact and immediately focusses on details of road construction, on whether it would be the county or Jesse who would pay for this or that, includes numerous and repetitive eMail exchanges between Jesse and BLM about his possible purchase of two 40 acre parcels, etc., etc. Putting all these details *first* implies they are most germane...of utmost importance. Strong letters opposing Horton's plan appear very late in the pile. Two quick examples: my letter

for the December 14 hearing which makes many important points against the Horton proposal does not appear until page 97 (of 104) and another by Tetonia resident (Rob Young) against the proposal is placed very last.

The name of Jesse Horton is no longer conspicuous as an applicant. Why/how that change? Not all the input provided by the public has been included. (Check the public input provided after December 14.) Why?

In closing, while I prefer the *do nothing Option 4*, should the BOCC decide to provide off road parking for recreational users, after an initial expense to purchase land, Option 3 does that very well and more cheaply on *one acre* at the base of Kay's hill... a far better location year round.

Thank you for all you do on behalf of keeping Teton County beautiful and property taxes affordable for those of us who are living on very limited incomes.

Sincerely,

Alfred M. McGlinsky
12713 memory lane
Nampa, ID 83686

Hi,

Info presented at the Town hall has changed my perspective a bit. Good info was presented by Johnson.

General:

1) Not in favor of Teton county accepting the Parkway and vacating the present road. We did not ask for the Parkway. Keep it private. It will cost more money to maintain because of the length. We have other roads that need attention. We already have a supplemental levy. Many of us don't want it to be permanent or increase. My assessment is that the main users of the present road, starting at Kay's Wall, (by quantity) are recreationists (it's a gut feeling by observation...I can't prove it.). They are very tolerant of, and often times expect, a less than perfect road.

2) The present road works and is more direct. People living on the bench land knew what the roads were like when they purchased the land. If they want access to the Parkway as a private road and have the convenience of a subdivision without the "inconvenience" of being in subdivision, they can talk to Horton. Complaining that keeping the present road will cause a second road to border their property is invalid. We did not ask for the Horton road to be built. He just did it. The fault is Horton's. It is not the responsibility of Teton county citizens to bail them out. There are plenty of parcels that have two or more roads along the border.

3) Sue Berkenfield made a good point about "...build it and they will come." The Parkway would make a loop on a nicely graded road, hence, more through travelers. Packsaddle Rd. is already in need of repair with just the mainly local traffic. Kay's Wall can be intimidating to some. That's good. It encourages an out and back trip, not an easy loop. People have to WANT to go there. The tendency is for people to back away. The object of that road is to move local people around, not encourage casual cruisers to ride through. It is not a tourist attraction. The Parkway could become just that.

4) Kay's Wall can be challenging to some. Again, that's good because it lowers casual use. Though I sympathize with the horse trailer guys, nothing says they HAVE to take that route. There are, literally, go-around solutions. I liken it to the lack of wisdom in taking an overloaded 18-wheeler over Teton Pass. In both cases, the smart move is to go around, lower the weight or choose a more appropriate vehicle.

5) Kay's Wall is steep by modern road standards, but not impossible. Erosional problems on the hill have simple engineering solutions. Sure, it may require more attention than a flat road after snow melt, BUT, it is less expensive than taking on Parkway maintenance.

6) I have been suspicious of the reasoning behind spending 2.5 million on a private road to "give away" to Teton county. I find the sentiment is echoed by others. We have no assurances committed in writing and enforceable, that the lands affected will remain agricultural. If Horton wants us to believe him, he can place it all in a land trust to be forever agricultural. Also, as far

as I know, Idaho law would still allow him to place a few McMansions up there, receive an AG exemption and pay less in property taxes than most of us.

Snow Season

1) Packsaddle Rd. from Kay's Wall west and north has gone through evolutionary phases from a path that zigzagged up the hill in the 1970s to the straight shot is now. In that time, friends, family and I have XC skied it, hiked and now Rodeled it (long distance gravity sledding). At first it was break-your-on-trail with and occasional snowmobile track, then the road was straightened in the 1980s (I think) and more snowmobiles used the road, making skiing easier. Later came the snowmobile trail grooming crew. Wow, it was a pleasure to ski efficiently for the first time. We are in solidarity with groomers Harmon and Hansen on wanting to keep the present snowmobile route as it is. Though we don't snowmobile, we have committed to buying registration tags to support these guys IF the route remains the same.

If snowmobile grooming followed the Parkway, the special terrain features that make it attractive would be lost. A Parkway route would be bland by comparison because the curves are more tame and the pitches are less interesting. As I have mentioned in earlier emails, the present road holds snow better (I have compared) gathers snow better and has the better solar aspect to help the snow last.

2) For those of us who depend on gravity sports, the present road is ideal because of the quality and frequency of the appropriate gradients. Starting a slide from the top of Rammel Hollow (Packsaddle L. Rd.), out of the possible 3-1/4 miles to the base of Kay's Wall, only 0.4 mile total walking is needed between drops. Not bad... and it only costs a liter of water and half a power bar (or brownie).

3) The esthetics of the route must be mentioned, because it is a motivator and a reward. After winding and diving the mile down Packsaddle L. Rd. through the forest, the shadowy trees are quickly left behind and the rider bursts into the sunshine on an open field of snow, the Tetons spread brilliantly before you. The effect can make you say, Whoa! The game is to see how far you can glide before having to hike again (or re-run that mile). The Parkway would have us turn sharply south at the corral...lose all of that speed... and put us into a gulley, no view, not good. The snowmobile path, right now, lets us dive to the south after a short walk east. I'll skip the in between sections through the trees. The very best part is the last sweeping turn to the east that ends west of Kay's Wall summit and Kay's Wall itself. As you ski or walk to the summit, the Tetons emerge dramatically once more as the Kay's Wall pitch drops away to the leading line of Packsaddle Rd. It's a wonderful way to end the day in the snow, whether by ski, sled or snowmobile. The Parkway does not have the excitement or the drama of the present road. A winter recreationist needs and will seek these "carrots" as a reward. It's an incentive that motivates you to stay healthy, so that you can do it again and again. Since many of us are gravity-powered, we are dependent upon the snow grooming and the character of the route. Once again, the Parkway doesn't have it.

4) Kay's Wall is often THE destination for families with children of all sizes and sometimes the grand parents. From summit to intersection, Kay's Wall can give a 1/4 mile slide, but most do not have the skill or equipment to that. Most slides are short runs not from the summit. But when you are a little kid, who cares. Most people go out of their way to be courteous and there can be a sense of community there, especially during the holiday season. I have met people from all over the U.S. at that spot as well as foreign visitors. I have also met people from out of state who have remembered the place and have come back year after year. It's fun, it's inexpensive and easy to access...a rarity that should not be lost.

5) Clay Smith has said that sliding Kay's Wall is dangerous, so is operating heavy equipment, (I have done it) but will that stop him? It's relative. Yes, people may be hurt. What's new? It's part of life and recreation to take some risk. The key is to take responsibility for your actions and not blame someone else if you suffer misfortune.

6) Finally, here's a thought. Bainbridge land forms the south border of Kay's Wall. They have tried unsuccessfully, at least since the 1970s, to sell it. They complained of not having access to the top of the land, yet they have a paved road to the bottom...what's the problem? Well, I asked the land trust if that land is of interest to them. I also asked if the lower, flatter eastern portion could be designated as a parking area for recreationists as part of the land trust deal. Provisionally, the woman with whom I spoke, thought it was a great idea. She seemed especially interested in the enhancement-of-recreational-opportunity angle. Could solve some of the problems: sell an unsalable parcel (thus helping the Bainbridge family) and provide parking away from the road etc. You get the drift I'm sure. The west end of the parcel has a small section that connects directly to the Targhee Forest...that's good too.

Hope this helps,
Rob Young 3072 Aspen Dr., Teton, ID 83452 456-2246

Dear Mr. Johnson,

I am unable to attend the hearing about this on December 14, so I would like to send the following letter, to be read out aloud at the hearing and entered into the minutes.

I have serious concerns about the plans for a new road to replace the existing Packsaddle road.

In July I had the opportunity to visit the land owned by my parents (Boyd and Barbara Norton) and the McGlinsky family, which borders Targhee National Forest and contains the upper Rammel Hollow. I have not seen the land for many years, and I was eager to revisit it, to once again see the beauty and peace of it, and to reminisce over the many happy memories both our families share from the many camping trips we all had there.

To my dismay, the land that I remembered so well had been breached; the very place where we used to camp had been cleared, all the trees removed, leaving only a muddy track, and as we surveyed the damage, the quiet was shattered by a bulldozer that appeared on the neighboring property, already at work clearing more land for this road.

There were survey stakes well inside the fence line that we believed, for nearly 50 years, was the boundary of our property. We had no knowledge of this survey, no opportunity to question it, or commission our own survey prior to the destruction of the place we had known and loved so well.

Indeed, had we not come to the area when we did, we would not have known about the plans for the road at all. If we had, we would have voiced our opposition from the very beginning.

When my parents and the McGlinskys bought the land, back in the 1960's, they did so because they wanted to preserve it, to keep it as untouched as possible, a sanctuary for wildlife and a place that we, and others, could enjoy in its natural state.

Toward that end, both families made many financial sacrifices. My family is not a wealthy one, and I know that my parents often had difficulty paying the mortgage and putting food on the

table for my brother and I while we were growing up. Even now, as with many people, money is tight, and both of my parents have had to continue to work even though they are more than a decade past retirement age. Had they been willing to compromise their principles, they could have sold or developed the property, and lived very comfortably on the proceeds. They did not. They chose instead to put the land in a conservation trust, so that it would be safe for future generations to see and enjoy. They recognised that conservation and protection of our natural resources is about making difficult decisions, and standing by one's principles, even if it means having to make personal sacrifices.

It is also worth noting that at no point did either my family or the McGlinskys ask for public funding to realise their vision for the land they own. Although they have made sacrifices to leave a legacy for future generations, they have done this out of their own initiative and have funded it themselves. Jess Horton's vision for his land is for his own personal gain, yet he is asking for public help in achieving it, which is ironic to say the least.

The decision you will have to make about this new road is not an easy one, and it will have an impact on the future of the whole area. I realise that it is not up to the county to determine whether the road is to be built or not, as it is being done on private land, owned by Mr. Horton (though whether he owns *all* of that land is up for debate!). Although Mr. Horton has said that he will build this road regardless of whether it will be maintained by the county or not, I feel that if he must maintain this road on his own, he will be much less inclined to build it to begin with. I also have concerns that at some point, if there is a contractual relationship between the county and Mr. Horton, the county may be asked, or even compelled to contribute to the costs of actually building the road. By refusing to enter into an agreement with him to take over the road after completion, I feel the county will also avoid any scenarios where it will end up being pressured into assisting with funding its construction.

Every road is a scar on the environment. With each new one that is created, there is a resulting destruction in the quality of the land, a disruption to the deer, elk, badgers, and bears that inhabit it, and a loss of scenery and beauty for the human residents. Once the landscape is destroyed, once the wildlife have been driven out, there is no going back, no way to undo the damage, and the generations that come after us will never be able to see it as it was. Please don't let this happen.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Kind regards,

Jean Norton

Dear Mr. Johnson

I apologize for not being able to attend the December 14 hearing on this important matter. But I do ask that this statement be entered into the hearing record. And, if it's not too long, to be read at the hearing.

It was in the summer of 1960 that Barbara and I were headed west across Wyoming, with an eye toward California, land of sunshine and aerospace industries. I had just received my degree in physics from Michigan Tech when we stumbled upon the Teton Range and Jackson Hole. It was instant love and we secretly claimed this mountain range as *ours*. Immediately I scratched the aerospace industry and California from my list and instead took a job as a nuclear physicist at the National Reactor Testing Station in Idaho. We settled in Idaho Falls.

Within months of settling in Idaho Falls we discovered Teton Valley. This was, and is, a very special place. Jackson Hole may have spectacular views of the range, but Teton Valley became to us the "quiet side" of the Tetons and the views, in my opinion, were equally magnificent. We, and friends of ours, explored the Western Slopes of the Tetons in hikes and backpacking trips out of Teton Valley – up to Alaska Basin from Teton Canyon, to Wind Cave in Darby Canyon, and up through several other canyons where there were almost no trails into magnificent alpine basins. I've made numerous trips to the top of Table Mountain where, as you know, the pioneer photographer William Henry Jackson made the first photos of the Tetons in 1871. He did so by accessing it from Teton Valley. And by the way, some of this is covered in my second book, *The Grand Tetons* published by Viking Press in New York in 1974. Also, I was one of the handful of people who drew up the boundaries and lobbied and testified in Congress to have the Western Slopes protected as the Jedediah Smith Wilderness Area.

In the mid-1960s an opportunity came up to purchase a piece of land in Teton Valley. Together with the McGlinsky family we purchased the 400 acres in Rammel Hollow area owned by Adrian Cook of Tetonia. It was never our intention to sell or subdivide this land. It was simply a joy to visit once in a while and to camp and let our children roam around our hillsides of Douglas fir and pines and aspen and enjoy the beauty of the place with views of the Tetons as Wilson Price Hunt may have seen them when he possibly crossed our land in his expedition in 1811.

All but a few acres of this land are now in a Conservation Easement through the Teton Valley Land Trust. It is our desire to keep this land as pristine as possible for protecting wildlife and aesthetic values of the area.

Fast forward a half a century from our purchase of the land to today. An out of state developer now wishes to change the character of Teton Valley. At least on the western side of Teton Valley. I'm not sure of the intentions of this developer, but they cannot be good. He obviously does not have any knowledge of the history and heritage and the *feeling* of this place and his only intent is to make as much money as possible. I wonder if the rest of the residents of Teton Valley agree with his intentions. I think not. At least I hope not because I think most folks here like where they live and do not want it changed by an out-of-state developer with no roots here and no apparent feeling for the beauty.

Now to the question of the road that this developer proposes be taken over by the county. On the one hand, the existing Packsaddle road from the Kay place is very steep at the start. It makes for difficult, though not impossible access. The developer has made a somewhat easier access road. However, for the county to take over and maintain this road, as the developer proposes, only provides more profit for the developer to sell his lands adjacent to the road and make a huge profit while burdening the taxpayers of Teton County with additional expenses to maintain access. My question is: since the developer has paid for this alternative road, does he expect the county to pay for those expenses or is it to maintain the road? Either way it will be up to Teton County taxpayers to subsidize it.

Another major concern has to do with a parking lot being bulldozed adjacent to our property line on the east side of our land. He has planned an 8 acre parking lot! This is far larger than the parking lots of many supermarkets and shopping centers! Why? This would only increase traffic in the area, creating litter and greatly increase fire hazards from visitors who do not understand the serious fire danger in a dry climate. I fear that there may be other purposes planned for this mega-parking lot. Is this for some type of commercial development? We are strongly opposed. And by the way, we, the Norton and McGlinsky families, were never consulted by this developer about his plans which will have severe impact on our land and the lands of others in the area.

In short, we ask you, the Teton County Commissioners, to weigh very heavily the benefits and costs of taking on and maintaining this road. Such costs not only include tax burden to Teton Valley taxpayers, but aesthetic costs as well. I fear that with such massive development more road building will follow and the quality of life here will suffer badly.

Thank you for your time.

Boyd Norton

PO Box 2605

Evergreen, CO 80437

December 2, 20015

Re: December 14 Public Hearing testimony of Alfred M. McGlinsky, In Opposition to Jesse Horton's "Scenic Parkway" Development Proposal

Dear Mr. Johnson,

We are sorry not to be able to attend this important public hearing because we no longer live in eastern Idaho and now live several hundred miles away in Nampa and travel is no longer as easy for us as it was when we were young. For that reason, I wish to make this letter a part of the hearing record. I would also like this to be read this aloud to the public and the Teton County employees in attendance, again, because I would surely have had the privilege of doing just that if I could have been at this public hearing.

For about 50 years we have co-owned with the Norton family 400 beautiful acres tight to the Targhee national forest. It is our land that is cut by the Packsaddle Lake Road giving the public access to the national forest. We bought the land from Adrian Cook of Teton, whose family, we believe, had homesteaded it. For the most part, the privately owned land around us for miles has always been agricultural—no homes, few fences--those mainly for cows. As a result, an abundance of wildlife such as deer and moose breed and call this place home. To name a few who also depend on such habitat, (designated in 2005 as "species of greatest conservation need" by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game and/or as "Sensitive Species" by the USFS) : Brewer's sparrows, Swainson's hawks, northern goshawks, great grey owls, three toed woodpeckers, flagellated owls, are among the species present.

It has always been our family's hope that future generations will have such incredible places to enjoy—they are indeed, increasingly rare. Toward that, at the turn of the century we put Conservation Easements on our 400 acres through the TRLT in Driggs. To us, the significant financial sacrifice required by doing that was less important than the opportunity to preserve all this far into the future for our children and all folks to enjoy. We agree with the many who have travelled the world and still claim the beauty, peace and quiet of this Teton Valley is among the finest. Well worth preserving!

It is a fact that the existing Packsaddle and Hoop's Roads have been in use for more than a century, providing access to the privately owned lands, farm fields and the national forests to the west. So clearly, this proposal by Mr. Horton to replace those roads was not one initiated to alleviate a serious problem that Teton County had identified as suddenly needing to be fixed.

The minutes from the Teton County BOCC meeting on 7/13/2015 state that Mr. Horton claimed the "existing road does not serve the public and isn't good for the property owners". (Historically many would disagree.) Further, the minutes say that Horton "developed a plan which was reviewed by the county's previous engineer, who encouraged them to consider replacing the entire road." (That seems so unlikely: Had he the legal authority to so recommend? Exactly what portion(s) of the existing road(s) is referred to? Has this conversation/ "directive" with the county's previous engineer and Horton been verified? Are we to believe that Horton's motive was to build 10.6 miles of roads *across his property* just to benefit the county?? Or is it to make even more money selling off a variety of pieces of his property on roads he has newly contrived to be designated a "Scenic Parkway"?) It ought to be mentioned that the existing Packsaddle and Hoop's Roads give county

users a considerably shorter access to state highway 33 than the route Horton has built and is now hoping to transfer maintenance to the county.

Those minutes also report that Mr. Horton stated that he had the approval of all adjoining property owners. Blatantly not true! I can name six adjoining property owners who, to this day, have never been consulted, let alone have approved. He's never approached me and others. If he had, we would certainly have opposed the construction of the parking lot adjacent to our property and that of Jeff Copeland. I have little hope that fencing and posting signs would keep people using that parking lot from coming onto our land. Perhaps you have not seen what has happened to the large and very sturdy sign (put in place, I believe, by Teton County) at the beginning of where Packsaddle Lake Road crosses our property. It is riddled with bullet holes and lies flat on the ground, it's double 4X4 posts having been broken off. Our land shows such trespassings as fire rings and sawn remnants from wood gathering...precisely what the downed sign asks the road users not to do, given that it is a stretch of private land that the road now crosses to provide USFS access beyond.

The minutes also report flatly that Mr. Horton wants *all* his road to become a county responsibility...not just a portion as Commissioner Riegel had suggested. I see no reason why it should be an all or nothing matter. Why? Who benefits, one must properly ask?

Moving to another document regarding this Scenic Pathway idea, it seems to me that Mr. Johnson's July 9, 2015 memo to the BOCC may have "cherry picked" from the four mentioned Teton County documents and focussed just on providing *access to public lands*. However, those same documents express equal concerns for protecting natural and other resources, for preserving the valley's beauty and for maintaining the quality of life for the enjoyment of current and future citizens. *All* these purposes must be weighed, balanced...not just access to public lands.

I will close this by saying that so beautiful and rare a place as the Teton Valley needs protections or it will become like too many other once lovely, but now overpopulated places. It is not in the best interest of all Teton County citizens to build or maintain a "scenic pathway"; their views from almost anywhere they reside in the valley are already magnificent! I doubt that many, if any, would drive further west for a better view of the Tetons. There is no county wide clamoring for that...just those of Mr. Horton's relatively recent involvement in creating AgRim.LLC and Grandview Ranch LLC.

So, please do not ask all the county taxpayers to pay for Mr. Horton's rather obvious gamble at becoming even more wealthy while compromising wildlife and other important values we and future Teton valley folks hold so dear.

Thank you for the service you commissioners and dedicated professionals do on our behalf.

Sincerely,

Alfred M. McGlinsky
12713 Memory Lane
Nampa, ID 83686
208 465 0404

Dear Mr. Johnson,
I can not attend the hearing on December 14th, so I ask that this statement be read into the record of that hearing.

Thank-you for your assistance,

Wendy McGlinsky
439 Liberty St.
Beacon, NY 12508
203/243-7327

You have heard already, or you will hear soon, the thoughts of Boyd and Barbara Norton and of Al and Lee McGlinsky. Fifty years ago, these two couples bought four hundred acres (give or take) of unirrigated rangeland facing the Teton mountains across Teton Valley. The young idealists consigned their land to conservation easement and so promised not to develop their property, ever, because they wanted their personal piece of wild Idaho saved for wildlife and for future generations. I am one of that future generation. I am Wendy McGlinsky, eldest daughter of Lee and Al. I have two sons to follow after me.

I have lived for the past thirty years in Connecticut and New York where development has claimed many/most "wild" places for exclusive, private owners. On my way to work, I drive smooth, asphalt roads through fenced forests which guard pristine vacation homes. As I pass those engineered landscapes, I miss the desolate rangelands of my childhood; I remember bouncing over the dirt road to the McGlinsky/Norton property in Teton Valley. So many years later, I can still close my eyes and smell the dust of that road. I hear the wind in the aspens; I see the valley and the pines and wild flowers, and below me, I see dry pastures and scrappy ranches. I close my eyes to remember, and I see a piece of our country as it has been for a hundred years or more.

I believe Jesse Horton threatens this vision. He is a developer. He makes money buying land, "improving" it, and re-selling it. At the moment, he is "improving" a property next to that bit of old Idaho owned by my family and the Nortons.

Jesse Horton has the right to do what he wants on his property, but he's asking the county to take over maintenance of the road he's building, and I am suspicious of his motives. I suspect he's dreaming of profit as he buys and improves dry rangeland. I suspect he's banking on building and selling a less expensive version of Sun Valley. In fact, I believe he envisions lovely, vacation homes with breath-taking views of the mountains as he's scraping out a "scenic by-way" to service those future lots. "Scenic by-way" sounds great in a real estate blurb. I see him selling his road to the public by arguing it will provide better access to public land. To back up this argument, he's carving out a parking lot which he insists will serve Forest Service land despite its distance from that land. Pleading long-term benefit to the county, he petitions the county to maintain his improvements.

Clearly, Jesse Horton is served by his road and his parking lot. Of course he'd love to have the county maintain them. But does the county really benefit as well? Tax revenue from the lots which Jesse Horton might develop along his new, county-maintained road might pad county coffers, but I worry that, in pursuit of tax revenue, Teton County will sell that which makes Teton County wonderful.

Here, on the East Coast, I am surrounded by the aftermath of such bargains. Here, farmland and forests have been subdivided and "improved" into secluded, fenced and landscaped, forest hide-aways. Many owners visit on weekends and pay high property taxes for the privilege, but they are not invested in the community nor in the history of the place. Driving past those carefully constructed private compounds, I am homesick for a place which remembers what it was, and I am glad that fifty years ago, two idealistic

young couples bought a bit of land in Teton County, cast aside potential profit and pledged to keep that bit of Idaho as pure Idaho.

I hope you will think carefully on what might be lost as you consider the parking lot at the top of Jesse Horton's "scenic by-way" and especially as you consider taking over maintenance of his "new and improved" road.

Sincerely,

Wendy McGlinsky
439 Liberty St.
Beacon, NY 12508
203/243-7327

Julie McGlinsky
1150 Melvina Way
Eugene, Oregon 97404

December 4, 2015

Re: December 14th Public Hearing testimony of Julie A. McGlinsky, in opposition
to Jesse Horton's development proposal to realign portions of Packsaddle Road and Hoopes
Road and vacate the existing easement

Dear Commissioners Leake, Park and Riegel,

Thank you all for your service overseeing the world-class lands and waterways of the Teton Valley. Because my parents and family share your love of this area, fifty years ago they pooled finances with the Nortons to buy 400 acres, bordered by national forest and agricultural land. Rather than developing this investment for personal gain, they converted it to a conservation easement. My family's vision is to reserve this land for migrating wildlife, groves of spectacular aspen, unpolluted springs, and fields of wildflowers. We are committed to caring for the unique assets of the Teton Valley that enhance the lives of its residents. Jess Horton's proposal would have the opposite impact.

Commissioner Riegel couldn't have been more correct in noting that landowners neighboring Jess Horton's proposal "may not want to attract more people to the area". Currently on our property I find horse and foot tracks, and an occasional fire circle near the perimeters. Reducing the steep nature of the road, providing kiosks and the development of an 8 acre parking area will mean more traffic, trespassing, littering, possible fires, degradation of our property and intrusion on the wildlife corridor. When last there, rock trucks and road construction rigs, able to navigate the new road, passed multiple times an hour. They drove the ATV riding public off the road and dominated the environment. Contrary to what Mr. Horton stated, the current road has been adequate for decades. It is much better for the county's interests and neighboring owners than activity the proposed road would facilitate.

I am unconvinced that taxpayers of Teton County should maintain a road serving the needs of a North Carolina developer. Further, the proposed road seems likely to cost more. Clearly Jess Horton needs and will continue with heavy construction traffic. Additionally there is likely to be more traffic. This use will degrade the road more rapidly than current residential and recreational use. Does anyone think an 8-acre parking lot, capable of holding 16 cars and 6 trucks with trailers is a good idea without bathrooms, garbage collection, and fences? If the intention the new parking area is access to public land, why not locate it at the base of the road to national forest instead of the proposed site (and construction) between Jeff Copeland's and our properties? The proposal seems designed to both serve the needs of Jess Horton and increase financial demands on the county.

Finally, I think it's important to set the record straight that Jess Horton did not contact this adjacent property owner or get our approval for his proposal, as recorded in the Board's July 13th minutes. Our family has not yet seen the entire proposal. Instead, it is rumored that Mr. Horton conducted a land survey, which we have not seen. Based on this data, he proceeded to clear a

roadway on property previously behind our fence line without even contacting us. I find this disregard for his neighbors troubling.

Clearly there are multiple sound reasons to oppose Mr. Horton's proposal. Let me thank you again for your diligent service to our treasured Teton Valley. How refreshing to travel from Jackson Hole, with its traffic and millionaires, into this beautiful valley managed to support local people, the scenery, and the wildlife that make it so precious.

Sincerely,
Julie McGlinsky
541-232-0421

Lee Ann McGlinsky
12713 Memory Lane
Nampa, ID 83686

Dear Mr. Johnson,

Please enter this letter into the record at the Public Hearing on Dec. 14, 2015. Thank you.

In the mid 1960s my husband and I bought 400 acres of land in Teton County bordering the Targhee National Forrest. We couldn't afford the price by ourselves so we joined another couple, Boyd and Barbara Norton, to buy the land and place it into a Conservation Easement with the Teton Regional Land Trust. We felt it was vital to preserve this beautiful place for wildlife and prevent it from being developed. When we did this we knew we were making a huge financial sacrifice but it was more important to honor our values about the environment than to make money on this land in the future. Our Conservation Easement protects this land in "perpetuity, forever honored by all heirs and present owners" You won't get this iron-clad promise from a developer.

Now a North Carolina developer, Jesse Horton, threatens this easement and what it represents by buying as much as 7,000 acres of Teton Valley and planning a road enabling massive development bordering our easement. Contrary to Mr. Horton's statements to you, he not only didn't get our agreement to this development but he never even notified us or our co-owners, the Nortons, of this planned road and development. There is even a questionable boundary where Mr. Horton bulldozed a grove of aspen trees and erected an electric fence on what we think is our property, also without notifying us. His proposed 8 acre parking lot will encourage littering and trespassing across our property to get to the Targhee National Forest and Pack Saddle Lake. Presently people park at the beginning of the Pack Saddle Road and travel up the road, not across our conservation easement.

You only have Mr. Horton's word on what he plans for development in his 7,000 acres along the new road he is making and expects Teton County tax payers to maintain. The current road has been used by all of us for at least 50 years and doesn't need replacing. Everything Mr. Horton proposes will make a huge profit for him. View lot homes (maybe large ranches or summer homes) on a county maintained road will sell for high prices,

Mr. Horton's proposal doesn't conform to the Teton County Comprehensive Plan adopted Dec.13, 2004, which states that "conservation and protection of important plant, fish and wildlife habitats should be encouraged as a matter of public policy". Teton Valley was designated in 2004 as an Important Bird Area by Idaho Fish and Game and the Audubon Society for the essential habitat it provides migratory birds. Encouraging more fencing, residences and destruction of sage brush habitat negatively affects all this. Mr. Horton will certainly benefit, but how does this benefit Teton County tax payers ?

I urge you to reject Mr. Horton's road proposal until you have more time to consider the long term effects on the valley and find out more about Mr. Horton's past business dealings in North Carolina.

Sincerely,

Lee Ann McGlinsky

November 30, 2015

District 33 Grooming Board of Directors
654 N 4212 East
Rigby, Idaho 83442

Mr. Darryl Johnson, PE/PLS
Public Works Director, Teton County
Idaho Public Works Department
150 Courthouse Drive
Driggs, ID 83422

RESPONSE TO LETTER FROM D. JOHNSON, TETON COUNTY, DATED NOVEMBER 18, 2015

Dear Mr. Johnson:

This letter is being sent from the Snowmobile Trail Grooming Board of Directors in response to your letter dated November 18, 2015, to address the Packsaddle Road and Hoopes Road proposal. The Snowmobile Trail Board desires to maintain the descriptive easement that the county has maintained for many years, because the proposed new route crosses the traffic road numerous times making it unsafe for the public during snowmobile season. The existing trail holds snow a lot better than the proposed new route, if we maintain this easement for snowmobilers it could be closed in the summer, if needed.

We do not agree with vacating the existing county road easement, as this access is also part of our snowmobiling trail system. If we give up this easement, we will have trouble connecting some of our snowmobile trails that are currently established. It is not cost effective to dead-end snowmobile trails. We also have concerns with the parking lot above Jeff Coplan's house because the county is not going to plow the road in the winter. Further consideration on parking lots and trailheads is needed.

If you would like to discuss further or have any questions, please feel free to call Randy Horman at (208) 521-0254.

Sincerely,



Randy Horman, Operations Supervisor, Grooming District 33
Clint Hansen, Madison County BOD Representative
Doyle Barney, Madison County BOD Representative
Tom Barry, Jefferson County BOD Representative
Craig Byington, Jefferson County BOD Representative
Bob Hansen, Teton County BOD Representative
Travis Molten, Teton County BOD Representative