
Core Committee Meeting #13- Minutes April 19, 2012

In Attendance:

Core Committee

Julie Stomper (General)
Cleve Booker (General)
Dave Hensel (General)
Ian Noyes (General)
Amy Verbeten (Natural Resources + Outdoor Rec)
Jack Haddox (Transportation)
Pete Koson (Economic Development)
Diane Temple (Community Events + Facilities)
Dennie Arnold (Ag + Rual Heritage)

Teton County

Angie Rutherford

Consultant Team (Team 2020)

Jennifer Zung (Harmony Design + Engineering)
Cameron Gloss (AECOM – via phone)

Public

Stacey Frisk

Meeting was called to order at 1:05 pm.

1. **Minutes** - Meeting minutes will be approved at the next meeting.

2. **Framework Plan Map**
 - a. The revised Composite Framework Map was presented. Changes were made based on SC comments during their meetings last week.
 - b. **Mixed Agriculture Area**
 - i. The name of the Rural Conservation area was changed to Mixed Agriculture. Where this area was defined was moved to the area within the old Waterway/Wetland Corridor that was outside of the wildlife overlays. The new Waterway/Wetland Corridor along the Teton River was reduced so that the eastern boundary lines up with wildlife overlay and the western boundary lines up with the FEMA floodplain boundary. This was changed as suggested by the Ag SC. Also area east of the highway and south of Driggs was changed to Mixed Ag since it was pointed out that this area has a different quality from the Rural Ag land on the north.
 - ii. There was concern expressed that this new Mixed Ag zone that included much of the wetlands in the valley does not offer enough protection of wetland areas. Much discussion about how and where the wetlands are defined ensued. Decided to include the language currently in the Waterway Corridor in the Mixed Ag description as well. This language is “Development limited by USACE wetland regulations and floodplain regulations”.
 - c. **Rural Conservation to Rural Ag**
 - i. The area formerly called Rural Conservation west of the Teton River was changed to Rural Agriculture based on comments from the Ag SC. This area was previously distinguished from the Rural Ag areas on the north because the last CC meeting discussion about this area being different from the ag lands on the north. This area also has more wildlife overlays than the ag lands on the north. Comment was made that from a wildlife perspective, the current description of Rural Ag is o.k. for protection, if the development intended there is defined as it is currently.
 - d. **Rural Neighborhood**
 - i. Discussed the Rural Neighborhood area north of Driggs along Packsaddle and that it stretched too far to the west. Areas that far west on Packsaddle are very rural in nature. Committee agreed to stop the Rural Neighborhood area at 2000W.
 - e. **Scenic Corridor**

- i. Scenic Corridor is shown as 1300 ft each side of the road. Ag SC wanted it to remain at its current 330 ft distance from the highway ROW. The CE+F SC thought it should stay as shown. NR+OR SC had suggested a compromise to 660 ft. Concern was expressed that it is hard to make a recommendation on the width when the regulations have not been defined. It was acknowledged that there was a lot of confusion by the public on what the scenic corridor meant – many thought it prevented any development. Discussion also included that although some felt it reduced value due to restrictions, some thought that it is vital to economic success and that developers or business that want to locate here will not be deterred by design standards.
- b. City area of Impacts
 - i. Regulations that are applicable depend on the AOI agreements with the cities. In Driggs the Driggs rules apply. In Victor the County rules apply. Scenic corridor should be taken out of the Driggs AOI but left in Victor.
 - ii. Industrial zoning shown north of Driggs reflects the current Driggs AOI M-1 Zone.
 - iii. Discussed expanding the Industrial zone east of Driggs in the Driggs Centre area to include the existing gravel pits. Committee decided to leave as is to avoid precedent of change the future land use map to match existing conditions and not necessarily reflecting was it desired.
- c. Densities
 - i. Comment was made by the public that the ‘foothills’ zone was one area that was not supported by the Framework online survey. Comment also made that what the public was commenting on the online survey was the existing foothills area that is zoned A2.5 but this “Foothills” area does not have that high density defined. The “Foothills” area designates that this area is different than other areas of the County due to topography and vegetation and proximity to the National Forest.
 - ii. The question of densities should be discussed as it is the ‘elephant in the room’.
 - iii. Question asked that we should look at the cost implications to the County of different densities and locations of those densities.
 - iv. Question asked if we are talking about Zoning or just density and not necessarily how to achieve that density. For now just considering density.
 - v. Comment was made that the results of the recent public meetings indicate that no one wants more than A20. Not everyone agreed that was the case of the public as a whole.
 - vi. Suggestion was made that all areas outside of the Rural Neighborhoods be 1/20 ac density with no density bonuses for clustering.
 - vii. Another suggestion was made that all areas outside of the Rural Neighborhoods be 1/40 or 1/80 with density bonus to 1/20 if development is clustered.
 - viii. Comment made that we should have more than 2 zones and that creativity in development should be encouraged.
 - ix. Other densities suggested were Rural Neighborhood 1/10 ac with bonus to 1/2.5; Foothills 1/20 with bonus to 1/8ac; Rural Ag 1/60 with bonus to 1/20; Mixed Ag 1/120 with bonus to 1/40.
 - x. No decision was made and suggested that the plan will include a range of appropriate densities. Decided to continue the conversation at the next meeting.
- 3. Next Steps**
 - a. Decided to schedule an additional meeting next Tuesday, April 24th at 7:00 p.m.
 - b. Everyone should send comments on the Goals and Policies and the Implementation Plan to Jen and Angie by Tuesday April 24th.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 3:10 pm.