



Sharon Fox <sfox@co.teton.id.us>

Late bloomer

1 message

Frank Russo <[REDACTED]>
To: pz@co.teton.id.us
Cc: Shawn Hill <shawn@tetonvalleyadvocates.org>

Tue, Aug 4, 2020 at 8:34 PM

Commissioners,

I put some of the most precious land in the valley in a conservation easement. I therefore have reason to be offended whenever someone wants to develop on land that should and must be protected.

There are literally thousands of acres in the valley that aren't on the river, aren't on Teton Creek, aren't in the middle of wildlife corridors and aren't critical to making the creek the protected space designation it deserves.

I am opposed to the late bloomer blunder.

Please put a stop to this development and please stop making it time sensitive for VARD to respond.

Frank and Maryann Russo

Sent from my iPhone



Sharon Fox <sfox@co.teton.id.us>

Teton Creek Corridor Project

1 message

Darbi Neff <[REDACTED]>

Wed, Aug 5, 2020 at 8:48 AM

To: pz@co.teton.id.us

I'm writing today to ask you to please support the voices of the people that live in the proposed Late Bloomer Ranch area. They and the people of the community would like to see the campground relocated to at least the southwest corner of the property. Time and money has already been put into the corridor project and would be a shame to just turn our backs on and forget about. We the people ask that the standard 45 day review by Idaho Fish and Game be put in place.

--

Darbi



Sharon Fox <sfox@co.teton.id.us>

Late Bloomer Ranch

1 message

Shivani Pechtl <[REDACTED]>
To: pz@co.teton.id.us

Tue, Aug 4, 2020 at 4:33 PM

To: TCP&Z

Please require meaningful improvements to Late Bloomer Ranch. Please set forth **the standard 45-day review by Idaho Fish & Game**. Please support the wishes of the neighbors and **relocate the campground to the southwest corner of the property. Please protect the enormous public-private investment in the Teton Creek Corridor Project.**

with love and grace~
Shivani Pechtl, LAc

[870 W 3000 S](#), Victor

Mindfulness, Somatic Practitioner & Holistic Coach
[REDACTED]



Valley Advocates for Responsible Development

August 4, 2020

Teton County Planning & Zoning Commission
150 Courthouse Drive
Driggs, ID 83422

Re: Conditional Use Permit for Late Bloomer Ranch CUP

Dear Commissioners:

The proposed Late Bloomer Ranch Campground CUP lies well within the [Teton Creek Corridor Project](#), a \$14-million dollar restoration initiated by Friends of the Teton River, Teton Regional Land Trust, Teton Valley Trails and Pathways, Valley Advocates for Responsible Development, and countless others who share a vision for a restored, vibrant Teton Creek corridor.

I am writing this letter on August 4, 2020 at 4:34 PM, minutes before the written comment deadline. This is because I have been waiting for the applicant to post the information required by the Planning & Zoning Commission at their July 14, 2020 meeting. I do not think it is fair to impose a deadline on the public but allow the applicant to submit materials at their leisure. **In the future, I would recommend the Commission impose a deadline for the applicant so the public can review the entire application.**

The applicant's Wildlife Habitat Assessment, Impact Analysis, and Mitigation Plan is inadequate and fails to consider impacts to Big Game movements, fails to include local datasets, and fails to analyze alternatives. I have attached a response to the Analysis prepared by Megan Smith of Eco-Connect Consulting. For these reasons, it is imperative that the analysis undergo the customary 45-day review by Idaho Fish & Game (IDFG), and that all other substantive and procedural elements of the county's Wildlife Habitat Overlay ordinance are required. Wildlife in this location is globally-significant and cannot be given short shrift.

VARD has invited Late Bloomer Ranch to collaborate with the TCCP Partners. To date, this offer has not been accepted. This is unfortunate, and we fear the millions of dollars and thousands of hours that have gone into the project will be unacceptably compromised by a hastily-assembled CUP.

Please continue this item so that IDFG review is conducted properly, and so that the TCCP partners can offer meaningful input.

Respectfully submitted,

Shawn W. Hill
Executive Director

August 4, 2020

To: Shawn Hill, Executive Director, VARD

From: Megan A Smith, Owner/ Wildlife Ecologist, EcoConnect Consulting LLC

Re: Late Bloomers Campground Wildlife Habitat Assessment, Impact Analysis and Mitigation Plan

delivered via email

Dear Shawn –

The following is prepared in response to your request for feedback on the Wildlife Habitat Assessment, Impact Analysis and Mitigation Plan that Alder Environmental (Alder) prepared for the Late Bloomers Ranch dated July 24, 2020. While the information that Alder has included is accurately portrayed, I do have some suggestions for additional information and further analysis that Teton County, ID may want to pursue as a component of this application process. My suggestions fall within three areas of concern: (1) wildlife habitat and movement (2) impacts to ecological function and (3) alternative impact analyses.

WILDLIFE HABITAT AND MOVEMENT

As is indicated in Alder's report on Figure 3, the proposed CUP area is located within Teton County's "Big Game Migration Corridors and Seasonal Range" as well as "Songbird/ Raptor Breeding and Winter Habitat" Natural Resource Overlays. Additionally, the proposed CUP area is located within the Teton Creek Waterway Corridor and immediately adjacent to a Scenic Corridor (Teton County, Idaho 2012). Alder indicates that:

"Elk may pass through the Property during seasonal migrations, and the agricultural meadows on the Property may be used in the winter as elk foraging areas. As part of the Teton Creek Corridor project native wildflowers and grasses have also been planted on the neighboring property to the west to provide winter forage for elk and improve elk winter range in the area."
(Alder, pg 2).

This statement is in line with Teton County's mapping of the area's natural resource overlays. In opposition to Teton County's designation, the State's probability models indicate that the area has a low to medium probability of habitat use. The State's probability models have not all been vetted and finalized by state biologists (particularly the mule deer model indicates that it is draft information) and therefore may not be complete. While the metadata does not indicate the scale at which these models were intended to be used, based on the geographic breadth that is covered by the model's habitat layers, it is likely that they are inaccurate at the local, parcel scale. Therefore, local datasets such as the County's Wildlife Habitat Overlays should be given deferential treatment when comparing datasets.

What is not clear is if the impacts from the proposed development will significantly alter big game movement activities along the County designated natural resource overlays. It is without question that the habitat in the CUP area will be altered and that available winter forage for elk will be removed. As Alder's report mentions, the Teton Valley Regional Land Trust has recently planted winter forage for elk on an adjacent property to the west of this project area. The impacts of this proposed development on this recent habitat enhancement project were not analyzed.

IMPACTS TO ECOLOGICAL FUNCTION

Alder indicates that the agricultural meadow in the proposed CUP area will be removed and/ or impacted and acknowledges that:

"Direct impacts to indicator wildlife species due to the proposed development are a result of fragmentation of habitat and movement corridors." (pg. 4)

Furthermore, the report acknowledges that:

“The ongoing Teton Creek Corridor project and associated recreational pathway will be located north of the road (Creek Bottom Trail) in the northwest corner of the Property and will not be [physically] impacted by development within the CUP area but may itself have recreational impacts to wildlife.” (pg. 4)

What additional impacts to ecological function are expected from an increase in human use along this corridor from the proposed development as well as cumulatively from all development currently approved and proposed south of Teton Creek? The report compares the impacts expected from this proposal to those expected from the approved, Targhee Ranch Estates but does not address the cumulative impacts from the two developments in concert. Furthermore, of greater interest than a comparison with the Targhee Ranch Estates impacts would be a comparison of the proposed impacts with those currently allowed under mixed agricultural/ rural neighborhood zoning.

A neighboring endeavor to the west is the Teton Creek Corridor project. This creek project’s intent is to restore the natural habitat of the corridor. This restoration project is likely to increase the use of the corridor by wildlife. What negative effects will this proposal and the Targhee Ranch Estates have on the desired outcomes of the Teton Creek Corridor project?

ALTERNATIVE IMPACT ANALYSES

The proposed development application would benefit significantly from the inclusion of a cumulative impacts analysis as well as a comparison between the proposed development’s expected impacts versus those currently allowed under mixed agricultural/ rural neighborhood zoning.

- Will the development proposed under this CUP application increase or decrease the impacts currently allowed on this property located adjacent to, and within, the Teton Creek’s natural resource overlays?
- How will the proposed development affect the Teton Creek Corridor project, desired outcomes, associated habitat enhancements and wildlife movement areas?
- Since the vegetative cover is consistent across the property, are there alternative locations on the property that would lessen impacts to wildlife movement, Teton County’s Natural Resource Overlays and associated species and habitats as well as the Teton Creek Corridor’s enhancement goals?