
Core Committee Meeting #7- Minutes November 2, 2011

In Attendance:

Core Committee

Julie Stomper (General)
Cleve Booker (General)
Ian Noyes (General)
Daven Hensel (General)
Dennie Arnold (Agriculture and Rural Heritage)
Pete Koson (Economic Development)
Amy Verbeten (Natural Resources + Outdoor Rec)
Tim Adams (Transportation)

Teton High School Representatives

Joe Madsen
Jordan
Amanda
Gina Hickey
Aaron Taylor

County Staff

Angie Rutherford

Consultant Team (Team 2020)

Jennifer Zung (Harmony Design + Engineering)
Bruce Meighen (AECOM)
Joe McGrane (AECOM)
Nancy Locke (AECOM)

Public

Anne Callison

Meeting was called to order at 8:40 a.m.

1. **Minutes** - Meeting minutes from meeting #3 and #6 were review. Dennie made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Dave seconded. All were in favor and the motion passed.
2. **Presentation from Teton High School Sub-Committee** – Two groups from the Teton High School presented the process that they have used in developing a vision statement and opportunity maps for Teton County. Their presentations are summarized here and a copy of the complete Vision Statements are attached to these minutes.
 - a. Group A – Their vision for Teton County is for a “teen friendly community and environment”. Process included starting with small groups, gathering input from the student body during lunch periods, coming back together as a class and discussing the input from the rest of the students. Opportunities identified on their map include:
 - i. Motocross track between Driggs and Victor
 - ii. Recreation Center in Driggs perhaps located near the new middle school. The Recreation Center could be run or staffed by students
 - iii. Transportation connecting Driggs, Victor, and Stateline
 - iv. Art center similar to the one in Jackson near Broulims
 - v. Bowling alley in downtown Victor near Pierre’s (lots of student support for this)
 - vi. Community job fair for students
 - vii. Help small business with reduced taxes
 - b. Group 2 – Process similar to Group 1. Vision is for a “community that values its natural heritage, has a vibrant economy, diverse consumer options, and a teen-friendly environment” Opportunities identified on their map include:

- i. Recreation center in Driggs near the High School
 - ii. Industrial development near Packsaddle Road or the old dump
 - iii. Motocross track near industrial site near the old dump
 - iv. Civic Center either in Driggs (serve the whole valley) or Victor (more convenient for Jackson commuters)
 - v. Students mostly wanted McDonalds
 - vi. Residential development area identified between Driggs and Victor near the highway
 - vii. Business development south of Broulims
 - viii. Greenhouse near high school for students
 - ix. Library near greenhouse
3. **Framework Maps and Discussion-** Three Framework Maps were presented which were based on the maps developed during the Framework Workshop with all of the Sub-Committees and the Core Committee last week. It was noted that the Frameworks are still preliminary which is why they are being presented trace paper. The goal today was to make sure that the big ideas that are larger scale get on the maps. There are several smaller 'big ideas' like dark night skies that won't be addressed on maps. The Frameworks are to identify where growth is most suitable and create a structure for growth no matter when or if it happens. Each Framework has a land use base and an amenity base.
- a. Framework 1 – includes a series of land use zones which try to address how to change land development form without losing base entitlements. In each zone you are allowed to the base entitlements only if clustering is used with minimum development acreage (60 acres, 80 acres, 100 acres, not determined). Several 'zones' were identified:
 - i. Rural zone – 20 acre min zone, base parcel min 60 acres
 - ii. Conservation zone – A20 land down-zoned to 1 DU/60 acres but development not allowed and compensated
 - iii. 2.5 ac zone – require clustering to get base entitlement, if no clustering then pay into fund which could be used to fund trail systems or other community amenities. Summary entitlements are preserved with conditions.
 - iv. Separator Zone –provides visual separator between communities of Driggs and Victor
 - v. Amenities for this Framework include
 - 1. Trail system along Teton River
 - 2. Perimeter trail around the valley
 - 3. Valley-wide recreation program with a different feature in each community. Recreation program is 50% focused on tourism, 50% on locals. Many resort communities use recreation centers as way to get visitors to stay longer. Main recreation center focused in Driggs just off of the highway.
 - vi. Discussion about the need to balance natural resource preservation and recreation development – especially around the Teton River. There is possibility of using a trail that accesses the Teton River as an educational opportunity to help the public realize how sensitive the natural resources are.
 - b. Framework 2 –Identifies character zones based on what is on the ground currently
 - i. Zone A (red) are urban zones
 - ii. Zone B (white) have a different community character and sustainable land guidelines (SLG) such as conservation neighborhoods. These might have more rules to follow such as no clearing of vegetation allowed when constructing a home. Industrial character area identified near the Driggs airport.
 - iii. Zone C (green) is an area with higher level of sensitivity for wildlife.
 - iv. Zone D (blue) includes the existing wetland system and would have a high emphasis on water quality.
 - v. Amenities for the Framework include
 - 1. A wide scenic corridor designation 0.5 mile on each side of Hwy 33.

2. Ag Heritage area in the north east portion of County with each city having a historic conservation area/museum destination.
3. Observatory on the hill northeast of Felt.
4. Solar field south of Driggs which can serve as a separator between communities
- vi. Discussed the no clearing regulation – what would this mean in an area infested with weeds? Perhaps there is requirement to restore the area to native vegetation that is weed free.
- vii. Discussed the location of the Ag Heritage area and that the location identified is not the best farm ground in the valley due to early frost and late thawing. Better location is west of Hwy 32.
- c. Framework 3 – Limiting fragmentation is the focus. Growth is focused in existing populated areas.
 - i. Quality Growth Neighborhoods (red) – include populated areas such as Driggs, Victor and Tetonia and also “Drictor” and historic townsites such as Clawson and Felt. Potential to up-zone in these areas to encourage more density. Platted but not developed areas were excluded from Quality Growth Neighborhoods.
 - ii. Rural Neighborhoods (yellow) – between 2.5 and 20 acre zoning to be changed to larger lot patterns, 1du/60 acres +/-.
 - iii. Rural Conservation (green) – very large lots. Possible TDR program that uses these as sending areas if the Quality Growth Neighborhood zones could up-zone enough to be receiving areas.
 - iv. Amenities identified take advantage of what is there.
 1. Rail trail connection with spur to Horseshoe Canyon.
 2. Road connectivity on Stateline (bridge to Leigh Creek area).
 3. Transit hubs in concentrated development areas (Driggs, Victor, “Drictor”, Hatches Corner, Tetonia, Felt. Transit hubs are located on the maps but each is to the scale appropriate for each area. Illustration shows a seamless transition from road to pedestrian rail trail.
- d. Big Question is - are these the right Frameworks to work from or do we need to change? None of the Frameworks should be negative.
- e. Comment that Framework 1 should add more green west of Highway 32 near Felt.
- f. Discussion on how the County will pay for identified amenities. The purpose of the Frameworks and the Comp Plan is to identify what the community wants in the future so that it is well planned out. It will be up to the community to make it happen with funding and the implementation plan can be tied to a funding structure but this depends again on the community. It was noted that having a plan in place may help the community find large donors to make it happen.
4. Next Steps – these same Frameworks will be reviewed by the Sub-Committees for additional feedback. The Sub-Committee chairs were advised to not get into details that cannot be put on the maps and to focus on the bigger picture items. Then the Frameworks will go to the public during the public workshop on December 6th. A request was made that the core committee have another meeting so that they could review the frameworks more and give more feedback since they were just presented today. This should preferably happen before the public workshop. The consultant team and county will facilitate scheduling this additional meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.