

# Class 1 Tools

Tool	Pros	Cons
<b>DONATED CONSERVATION EASEMENTS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No public cost (SG)</li> <li>• Has proven effective in Teton County (SG, P)</li> <li>• Voluntary (SG)</li> <li>• Meets non-development conservation goals of Comp Plan (St)</li> <li>• Permanent (SG)</li> <li>• Tax benefits (SG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not appropriate for all landowners or in all situations</li> <li>• Long-term monitoring and management to ensure goals are being met can be challenging (T)</li> <li>• May not specifically address goals related to protecting habitat, scenery, and open space (i.e. easements for the sake of prohibiting future rezoning) (St)</li> <li>• Not necessarily strategic and can result in piecemeal conservation if not associated with a conservation plan (SG, T)</li> </ul>
<b>PRIVATE LAND TRUST</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has proven effective in Teton County (SG)</li> <li>• No public cost (SG, St)</li> <li>• Voluntary (SG)</li> <li>• Tax benefits (SG)</li> <li>• Important partnership with the County (P)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long-term sustainability of private trusts cannot rely upon new easements (St)</li> <li>• Stewardship fees can be a deterrent to land owners (St)</li> <li>• Long-term monitoring and management to ensure goals are being met can be challenging (T)</li> <li>• Can result in piecemeal conservation if not associated with a conservation plan (T)</li> <li>• Effective in large transactions, but not always in right location for Comp Plan goals (SG)</li> <li>• Could be more effective if private philanthropy were leveraged with a public funding source (P)</li> </ul>
<b>DEDICATED FUNDING SOURCE FOR PURCHASE OF OPEN SPACE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Even small amounts of funding can be used to leverage private philanthropy (P, T, St)</li> <li>• Consistent with Comp Plan policies (SG)</li> <li>• Taxing authority allowed by state (SG)</li> <li>• Would complement federal and state funding (SG)</li> <li>• Allows for active stewardship, without necessarily having to purchase development rights (T, St)</li> <li>• Partnerships with JHLT or TCSPT could increase effectiveness (St)</li> <li>• Has proven very effective in other locations (T)</li> <li>• Funds could be used for acquisition, stewardship, and monitoring (T)</li> <li>• Allows for targeted acquisitions (SG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land prices may be too high for it to be effective (SG)</li> <li>• Concerns about both additional taxing and developer exactions (SG)</li> <li>• Other efforts have been successful without an additional funding source (SG)</li> <li>• Additional funding not readily available (St)</li> </ul>
<b>AGRICULTURAL ASSESSMENT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has been effective at continuing to encourage agriculture (SG, T, St)</li> <li>• In the WY constitution and regulated at state level, so is appropriate if it matches state definition (SG)</li> <li>• Low cost (SG)</li> <li>• Meets goals of Comp Plan (T, St)</li> <li>• Could be used in conjunction with other tools (St)</li> <li>• Helps reduce costs of maintaining open space and agricultural use (SG)</li> <li>• Highly acceptable to farmers and ranchers (T)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has not been used very often (SG)</li> <li>• Tool has been “gamed” at the public’s expense by landowners in the past (SG, P)</li> </ul>

# Class / Tools

Tool	Pros	Cons
<b>MAXIMUM HOUSE SIZE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has proven effective and seems to be publicly acceptable (SG)</li> <li>• Could be tied to open space conservation incentives (P)</li> <li>• Could allow the combination of units under certain conditions (SG)</li> <li>• Works for residential development (SG)</li> <li>• Could be tied to a funding source (e.g. house larger than 10,000 sq. ft. considered in return for fee that goes into environmental protection fund) (SG)</li> <li>• Current scale in relation to lot size seems appropriate (SG)</li> <li>• Important for protecting against housing and environmental impacts (St)</li> <li>• Should include basements based on justification upheld by the supreme court (St)</li> <li>• Comp Plan calls for a look into incentive for conservation easements created by allowing additional floor area in exchange (St)</li> <li>• Meets Comp Plan goals of buffering natural water bodies from development, protecting scenic resources, maintaining character, and reducing energy consumption (T)</li> <li>• Could be better coordinated with Non-Subdivision PRD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not work for agricultural buildings; should be exempt (SG)</li> </ul>
<b>MAXIMUM DENSITY</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has proven effective and seems to be publicly acceptable (SG, P)</li> <li>• 1 per 35 maximum density is consistent with Comp Plan goals for rural areas (St)</li> <li>• Allowing multiple units on a single parcel at 1/35 without subdivision density should be examined as means to avoid 35s (St)</li> <li>• Should not be applicable to agricultural buildings (SG)</li> <li>• Needs to reflect market conditions (SG)</li> <li>• Should be applied in conjunction with other tools (T)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New lots at lesser density is not consistent with Comp Plan goals (St)</li> <li>• Greater density leads to more tax credits and conservation easements (SG)</li> </ul>
<b>SITE COVERAGE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has proven effective and seems publicly acceptable (SG, P)</li> <li>• Should include reduced fire requirements to reduce coverage (SG)</li> <li>• Landscape surface versus impervious surface should be evaluated from a wildlife standpoint to determine which standard make most sense in rural areas (St)</li> <li>• Should not be applicable to agricultural buildings (SG)</li> <li>• Address Comp Plan goals of buffering natural water bodies from development and protecting wildlife habitat and scenic resources (T)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impervious surface is easier to administer and comprehend for the general public (St)</li> <li>• Lot size not particularly relevant when much of the site is in permanent open space (SG)</li> <li>• Does not address concerns regarding energy use and material demand for construction (T)</li> </ul>
<b>USE PERFORMANCE STANDARDS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has proven effective and seems publicly acceptable (SG, P)</li> <li>• Additional performance standards may be appropriate (SG)</li> <li>• Ensure goals of a district are addressed by each use; standards could be district specific (St)</li> <li>• Conditional uses standards can work well (SG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be limited to protecting character and don't need to be so use specific (St)</li> <li>• Favors spot zoning (SG)</li> </ul>
<b>CHARACTER BASED ZONING</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be the focus based on the Comp Plan (SG, St)</li> <li>• Must allow for sustainable agricultural operations (SG)</li> <li>• Should include affordable housing as part of character (SG)</li> <li>• Could include design review (SG)</li> <li>• Multiple Rural zones based on desired character are called for by the Comp Plan and will allow many of these tools to be implemented predictably through base zoning (St)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zoning alone does not protect open space (SG)</li> <li>• Difficult to administer (SG)</li> <li>• Needs more sophistication (SG)</li> </ul>

# Class 2 Tools

Tool	Pros	Cons
<b>PUBLIC LAND TRUST</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TCSTP has been effective (P)</li> <li>• Provides an additional option for landowners (SG)</li> <li>• Voluntary (SG)</li> <li>• Public subsidy of stewardship reduces financial burden on easement donator (St)</li> <li>• TCSPT could implement multiple tools that meet goals of Comp Plan (St)</li> <li>• Can be more strategic than other mechanisms (SG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs additional staff or funding resources for adequate stewardship (P, SG, St)</li> <li>• Has not been a major source of conservation easements (SG)</li> <li>• Long-term monitoring and management to ensure goals are being met can be challenging (T)</li> <li>• Can result in piecemeal conservation if not associated with a conservation plan, or if acquisitions do not meet goals of Comp Plan (T, St)</li> <li>• Has resulted in some “donut” and “backyard” easements (St)</li> </ul>
<b>STEWARDSHIP REQUIREMENTS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achieves desired conservation without having to obtain conservation easement (St)</li> <li>• Could be effective at reducing noxious weeds (SG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definitions of public open space are unclear (e.g. golf courses, agricultural land) (SG, P)</li> <li>• Would be more effective if voluntary, incentivized, and/or includes cost sharing (SG, T)</li> <li>• Could conflict with property rights (SG)</li> <li>• Stewardship is too complex and site specific to benefit from any but very basic regulations (SG)</li> <li>• Costly (SG)</li> <li>• No opportunistic (SG)</li> <li>• Burdensome and lacking flexibility for agriculture (SG)</li> <li>• Difficult to monitor and enforce (SG, St)</li> <li>• Stewardship education and advice may be more effective (SG, T)</li> </ul>
<b>AGRICULTURAL ALLOWANCE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has been effective (SG, St)</li> <li>• Generally supported (SG)</li> <li>• Will be most effective if modified to match the state’s 35 acre allowance (SG)</li> <li>• Allow ranches to continue to be economically viable (SG)</li> <li>• More effective if allowance remains broadly defined (SG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definitions of active farming and ranching need to be clarified or better specified (P, SG)</li> <li>• 70 acre requirement might make more sense for exemptions than for actual agriculture use (St)</li> </ul>
<b>AGRICULTURAL EXEMPTIONS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly acceptable (SG)</li> <li>• Desirable if exemptions remain broadly applied to all aspects of agricultural operations (SG)</li> <li>• Has effectively kept agricultural land active (SG, St)</li> <li>• Reduced time and expenses of working through LDRs (SG)</li> <li>• Most effective if agriculture is clearly defined (St)</li> <li>• Help achieve agriculture objectives of the Comp Plan (T)</li> <li>• Cost effective (SG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lacks transfer of density to complete neighborhoods (SG)</li> <li>• Does not include wildlife fencing standards (P, St)</li> <li>• Needs to better balance Comp Plan goals (SG, St)</li> <li>• Exemptions for additional development have potential to create more post-agriculture nonconformities than process exemptions (St)</li> </ul>
<b>AGRICULTURAL ACCESSORY USES</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows for multiple sources of income on agricultural lands to maintain viability (SG, St)</li> <li>• Has been effective (SG)</li> <li>• Meet goals when the accessory use is required to be associated with agriculture (SG)</li> <li>• Could be expanded (SG)</li> <li>• Could be paired with other incentives or requirements for conserving open space or habitat (T)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regulations should be clarified regarding requirements for uses that are actually accessory to agriculture vs. uses that are agricultural in character (St)</li> <li>• Potential to impact community character (SG)</li> <li>• Not as user friendly as it could be (SG)</li> <li>• Can be taken advantage of (SG)</li> <li>• Sometimes inconsistent with agriculture definition (SG)</li> </ul>

# Class 2 Tools

Tool	Pros	Cons
<b>AGRICULTURAL RESOURCE OVERLAY</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could be a good complement to the NRO and SRO if integrated with those overlays (SG)</li> <li>• Could minimize negative impacts while allowing accessory uses that provide positive impacts (SG)</li> <li>• Could work well for areas adjacent to agriculture that are impacting the ability for continued agriculture (St)</li> <li>• May not be difficult to implement (SG)</li> <li>• May be more useful in some areas of the county than in others (P)</li> <li>• Could help identify and prioritize areas important for agricultural conservation (T)</li> <li>• Could incentivize strategic conservation of agricultural lands by purchase of land or development rights, or transfer of development rights (T)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costly and complex (SG)</li> <li>• Additional regulations could inhibit agriculture or drive farmers and ranchers out of the county (SG)</li> <li>• Would require mapping of appropriate areas (SG)</li> <li>• For lands in agriculture, a zoning classification catering to those needs is an alternative consistent with Comp Plan goal of predictable base zoning (St)</li> <li>• Timing may be too late for this tool to be effective (SG)</li> <li>• Without the economic support structure and available skilled workforce it could be cumbersome on landowners to implement (SG)</li> </ul>
<b>SUBDIVISION PRD (CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relatively cost effective (SG)</li> <li>• Has been effective in Teton County and elsewhere (SG, T)</li> <li>• An important option for landowners (P)</li> <li>• Could be important in areas of conservation where complete neighborhoods are not possible (SG)</li> <li>• Can be used in combination with the noncontiguous PRD (SG)</li> <li>• Meets Comp Plan goal of clustered development with a better development pattern than 1/35 (St)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doesn't accomplish transfer of density to complete neighborhoods (SG)</li> <li>• Allowing division of a 22.3 acre property does not achieve better clustering than 1/35 (St)</li> <li>• Need better clustering requirements, need better definition of desired open space that is tied to landscape level analysis (St)</li> <li>• Has been limited in use due to cost and complexity (SG)</li> <li>• Not user-friendly (SG)</li> <li>• Needs to be updated to reflect what the community wants (SG)</li> <li>• Is not predictable enough (SG)</li> </ul>
<b>NON-SUBDIVISION (FAMILY COMPOUND) PRD</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results in protected open space, tax revenue, and participation in non-profits (SG)</li> <li>• Has been effective with a low public cost (SG)</li> <li>• Can be used in combination with the noncontiguous PRD (SG)</li> <li>• Effectively constrains development to a limited portion of a site (SG)</li> <li>• Has resulted in a number of conservation easements by allowing more development, but not functionally increasing units (St)</li> <li>• Could link to maximum house size or other performance-based incentives (P)</li> <li>• Need to maintain some way for a pre-existing easement to build its reserved potential if that potential is consistent with the regulations (St)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rewards 35 acre division (St)</li> <li>• Needs to be updated to reflect what the community wants (SG)</li> <li>• Complicated and difficult process (SG)</li> </ul>
<b>OPEN SPACE OR CLUSTER ZONING</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent with Comp Plan goals of achieving cross lot clustering (St)</li> <li>• Could be based on wildlife information and design best practices to identify best clustering in an area (St)</li> <li>• Support for exploring this tool further (SG, P)</li> <li>• Works on 3/35 areas (SG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seems to duplicate PRD and overlays with no added benefit (SG, T)</li> <li>• Will not work on 1/35 areas (SG)</li> <li>• Does not directly link to goal of shifting development (SG)</li> <li>• Decreases property values and provides little protection (SG)</li> <li>• Too heavy handed (SG)</li> <li>• Decisions of neighbors impact the "last person in" (St)</li> </ul>
<b>CONSERVATION EASEMENT ASSESSMENT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has proven to be a great incentive to land owners (SG)</li> <li>• Tax incentives are powerful tools to help JHLT and the Nature Conservancy (P)</li> <li>• Tying the incentive to the goals of the Comprehensive Plan might incentivize higher quality open space (St)</li> <li>• Tax credits for conservation easements can be successful in advancing the values agreed upon in the comprehensive plan if they are linked to the conservation value of the property; for example, on a sliding scale (T, SG)</li> <li>• Mechanism for incentivizing, rather than requiring stewardship (T)</li> <li>• Appropriate for agricultural land (SG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced property taxes may not be a strong enough incentive (SG)</li> <li>• Substantial reduction in taxes might impact important source of revenue (SG)</li> <li>• Conservation easements already reduce the value of land, and therefore the property taxes (SG)</li> <li>• Current low quality easements such as "backyard" easement make assessment difficult without providing community benefit (St)</li> <li>• Changing current rules would require work at the state level (SG, St)</li> <li>• Public subsidy too high and benefit too low (SG)</li> </ul>

# Class 2 Tools

Tool	Pros	Cons
<b>PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS (PDR)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate in certain situations (SG)</li> <li>• Effective in conjunction with Transfer of Development Rights (SG, T)</li> <li>• Achieves goal of reducing development potential in rural areas (SG, St)</li> <li>• Might have application in Conservation Subareas where the Comp Plan goal is reducing the amount of development (St)</li> <li>• Would work if paired with a system to prioritize and evaluate parcels (SG)</li> <li>• Consistent with Comp Plan policies (SG)</li> <li>• Could include an option for a partial donation of development rights (SG)</li> <li>• Has been effective for the County, JHLT and the Town of Jackson (SG, P)</li> <li>• Development rights (thru a non contiguous PRD) may provide partial cost recovery (SG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs a permanent funding source (SG)</li> <li>• Already being done by local land trusts and through conservation easements (SG)</li> <li>• Funding the purchase of conservation easements is more appropriate (SG)</li> <li>• Costly and complex (SG)</li> <li>• Would be difficult to effectively establish with the high land values in Teton County (SG)</li> </ul>
<b>PAYMENTS FOR ECOSYSTEM SERVICES (PES)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could include one-time payments (e.g. mitigation) or ongoing payments for stewardship (SG)</li> <li>• Could involve a long term (5-20 year) lease with annual payments to provide defined environmental benefits with payments based on economic value of land, environmental value of land and length of lease (SG)</li> <li>• May be a way to encourage landowners to “do the right thing” in relation to findings from the habitat connection study (St)</li> <li>• Could be effective when linked with extinguishment of development rights commensurate with bonuses in development rights in complete communities (SG)</li> <li>• Directly relates to stewardship responsibilities and costs (SG, T)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires a funding source (SG, St)</li> <li>• Difficult to manage and monitor (P)</li> <li>• Costly and complex (SG)</li> <li>• Could compromise agriculture (SG)</li> <li>• Not enough landscape scale degradation in Teton County currently for this tool to make sense (SG)</li> <li>• Public benefits are unclear (SG)</li> <li>• Many possible uses are already regulated (St)</li> <li>• Could be useful in conjunction with the current mitigation standards in the LDR’s (SG)</li> </ul>
<b>BUILDING PERMIT QUOTA SYSTEM</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Directly addresses the location of growth targets in the Comp Plan (St)</li> <li>• Comp Plan states that our economic sustainability should not rely on growth (St)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires either first come/first serve program or scoring system that would add complexity (St)</li> <li>• Would have to be designed to consider the appropriate relationship between what was occurring in complete neighborhoods and what was allowed in rural areas (St)</li> </ul>
<b>NATURAL RESOURCES OVERLAY (NRO) (LDR SEC. 3270)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good tool for analysis (SG)</li> <li>• Has been an important and effective tool (SG, P)</li> <li>• Would be most effective if it required an individual EA in conjunction with development plans (SG)</li> <li>• Allows for a systems approach (SG)</li> <li>• Considering the amount and type of development in addition to the location of development in areas of habitat value is called for in the Comp Plan (St)</li> <li>• Could be considered in relation to other tools (St)</li> <li>• Directly ties development impact to the protection of wildlife habitat (T)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs to be updated (currently in process) (P, SG)</li> <li>• Misused for site planning (SG)</li> <li>• Needs greater flexibility for landowners to site and then mitigate new development (SG)</li> <li>• Requires adequate funding for the creation, monitoring, and updating of overlays (SG)</li> <li>• Generally works but mitigation standards need to be revisited to provide more clarity and options for off site mitigation (SG)</li> <li>• Costly (SG)</li> <li>• Too subjective without enough flexibility (SG)</li> <li>• Not site-specific; sometimes requires actions that are not actually necessary (SG)</li> <li>• Vulnerable to expansion without local control (SG)</li> <li>• Over-regulates agriculture (SG)</li> <li>• Would be better addressed through other processes (St)</li> </ul>

# Class 2 Tools

Tool	Pros	Cons
<b>SCENIC RESOURCES OVERLAY (SRO) (LDR DIV. 3300)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important to protect skyline views (SG)</li> <li>• Good analysis tool for site planning and visual mitigation (SG)</li> <li>• Can be redrawn to match Character District mapping (P)</li> <li>• Matches policy objectives of the Comp Plan (T)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too subjective (SG)</li> <li>• Lacks flexibility (SG)</li> <li>• Lacks regulatory force (SG)</li> <li>• “Foreground” and other terms need to be better defined and clarified (SG)</li> <li>• Costly (SG)</li> <li>• Not site-specific (SG)</li> <li>• Vulnerable to expansion without local control (SG)</li> <li>• Potentially restrictive of agricultural operations (SG)</li> <li>• Would be better addressed through other processes (St)</li> </ul>
<b>VEGETATIVE COVER TYPES (LDR SEC. 3211)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good tool for site analysis (SG, P)</li> <li>• Effective if used with individual EA in conjunction with development plans (SG)</li> <li>• Useful in prioritizing land for protection and informing mitigation (T)</li> <li>• Could include a sensitivity analysis to match vegetation types to mitigation and conservation decisions (T)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not fully reflect concern for key species (SG)</li> <li>• Ranking system is flawed (SG)</li> <li>• Mitigation is unpredictable (SG)</li> <li>• Mechanism for prioritizing is subjective and/or unclear (SG)</li> <li>• Costly (SG)</li> <li>• Subjective (SG)</li> <li>• Not site-specific (SG)</li> <li>• May adversely impact agricultural operations (SG)</li> <li>• Would be better addressed through other processes (St)</li> </ul>
<b>WATER BODY, 10-YEAR FLOODPLAIN AND WETLAND BUFFERS (LDR SEC. 3220)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good tool for site analysis (SG)</li> <li>• Would be more effective if consistent with federal/Corps guidelines (SG)</li> <li>• Existing buffer distances are consistent with published literature on the topic, but could be modified to meet objectives (T)</li> <li>• What impacts are allowed in these resources should be evaluated in considering the effect these resources have on the amount, type, and location of development (St)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100 year floodplain or greater buffer may be more appropriate in some areas (SG, P)</li> <li>• Need more flexibility in setbacks (SG)</li> <li>• Wetland setback is unnecessary and may be counter to good site design (SG)</li> <li>• Mitigation needs to be more predictable (SG)</li> <li>• Does not necessarily lead to stewardship requirements (SG)</li> <li>• 10 year floodplain is not defined by FEMA. Goal would be better achieved by protection of riparian vegetation (SG, St)</li> <li>• Wetland banks/man-made not a 1:1 offset wetland loss or degradation (SG)</li> <li>• Wetland protection needs additional bolstering (SG)</li> <li>• A more comprehensive effort to map this in rural areas is needed (SG, T)</li> <li>• Would be better addressed through other processes (St)</li> </ul>
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (LDR SEC. 3140.A)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has been effective in Teton County (SG, P)</li> <li>• Good tool for site analysis (SG)</li> <li>• Effective when science-based conducted by consultants, rather than government agencies (SG)</li> <li>• Addresses goals of the Comp Plan (T)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application is unpredictable and does not offer enough flexibility (SG)</li> <li>• Costly (SG)</li> <li>• Needs strengthening and fewer exemptions (SG)</li> <li>• Measuring cumulative impacts is difficult (SG)</li> <li>• Needs to be more affordable to property owners (SG)</li> <li>• Does not include stewardship requirements (SG)</li> <li>• Some uses exempted, which may result in Comp Plan goals not being as effectively achieved (T)</li> <li>• Would be better addressed through other processes (St)</li> </ul>

# Class 2 Tools

Tool	Pros	Cons
<b>MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has been effective for wetlands , and could be appropriate for additional vegetation types (P, SG)</li> <li>• Could be applied to the removal of trees to obtain views (SG)</li> <li>• Should link to NRO and vegetation mapping to include mitigation for critical habitat (SG)</li> <li>• Existing tool is designed to achieve goals of Comp Plan (T)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Unavoidable” impacts not clearly defined and can be too subjective (SG)</li> <li>• Sometimes administered unnecessarily (SG)</li> <li>• Expensive (SG)</li> <li>• Needs more predictability (SG)</li> <li>• Needs to better align with state and federal requirements (SG)</li> <li>• Issues related to NC and BC (SG)</li> <li>• Unbalanced (SG)</li> <li>• Existing requirements do not effectively address off-site mitigation opportunities (SG)</li> <li>• Currently too many exemptions (SG)</li> <li>• Does not allow enough flexibility (SG)</li> <li>• Requires long-term stewardship and monitoring (SG)</li> <li>• Would be better addressed through other processes (St)</li> </ul>
<b>STORMWATER MANAGEMENT (LDR Div. 4900)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has been effective in Teton County (SG, P)</li> <li>• Consistent with several Comp Plan policies (T)</li> <li>• Could incorporate new technologies to reduce runoff (SG)</li> <li>• Should follow NPDES water quality best management practices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not a significant problem in rural districts (SG)</li> <li>• Needs strengthening and fewer exemptions (SG)</li> <li>• Needs clarification as to requirements for various lot sizes (SG)</li> <li>• Would be better addressed through other processes (St)</li> </ul>
<b>RESOURCE CONSERVATION</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could be included in EA or development plan approval process (SG)</li> <li>• Could be included in building codes to reduce waste of energy and water (SG)</li> <li>• Should be linked to the need/demand that a new development generates (SG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not a significant problem (SG)</li> <li>• Costly (SG)</li> <li>• Complex (SG)</li> <li>• Does not work for agriculture (SG)</li> <li>• Needs strengthening and fewer exemptions (SG)</li> <li>• Could be redundant with other tools (SG)</li> <li>• Few examples of other ordinances that address water resource issues (T)</li> <li>• Would be better addressed through other processes (St)</li> </ul>
<b>RESTORATION &amp; MITIGATION BANKING</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could raise money for conservation easement purchases or habitat improvement (SG)</li> <li>• Could allow some large landowners to benefit by keeping open space (SG)</li> <li>• Could be part of valuing conservation easements, consistent with the relative value of habitats</li> <li>• A program that placed fees on non essential habitat alternations could fund mitigation work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High cost of land may render this ineffective (SG)</li> <li>• Costly (SG)</li> <li>• Complex (SG)</li> <li>• Does not work for agriculture (SG)</li> <li>• Requires monitoring and implementation resources (St)</li> <li>• Would be better addressed through other processes (St)</li> <li>• Could be difficult to regulate (SG)</li> <li>• Requires a funding source (SG)</li> <li>• Only relevant where there is development pressure on wetlands or habitat that could be mitigated off-site (T)</li> <li>• Recent studies report that wetland mitigation banks are not more successful in achieving ecological objectives compared with individual mitigation efforts (T)</li> </ul>

# Class 2 Tools

Tool	Pros	Cons
<b>BULK AND SCALE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has proven effective and seems publicly acceptable (SG, P)</li> <li>• In the rural areas form may not need any more regulation than the FAR and max building size (St)</li> <li>• Floor Area Ratio (FAR) standards address the Comprehensive Plan objectives of buffering natural water bodies from development, protecting scenic resources, and maintaining rural character (T)</li> <li>• Much more common means to regulate the scale of development than establishment of a maximum house size (T)</li> <li>• Should not be applicable to agricultural buildings (SG)</li> <li>• Should be organized by district, not use (SG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FAR standards typically do not address concerns regarding energy use and material demand for construction (T)</li> <li>• Lot size not particularly relevant when much of the site is in permanent open space (SG)</li> </ul>
<b>USE ALLOWANCE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contributes to the protection of community character (P)</li> <li>• Has proven effective and seems publicly acceptable (SG)</li> <li>• Works well in non-commercial zones (SG)</li> <li>• Use allowances should be reviewed to determine which are really appropriate in rural areas (St)</li> <li>• Uses should be consolidated (St)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs to be revised for commercial areas (SG)</li> <li>• Includes too many uses (SG)</li> <li>• Protecting character is subjective (SG)</li> <li>• Too subjective and open to abuse, including for agriculture (SG)</li> <li>• Institutional/commercial uses other than those of an agricultural character should not be located in remote rural areas according to the Comp Plan (St)</li> </ul>
<b>NATURAL RESOURCES PERFORMANCE STANDARDS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basing allowed development on natural constraints is consistent with Comp Plan policy (T)</li> <li>• Base site area and net site area makes sense to most people (St)</li> <li>• Could be adapted as performance standards linked to development potential or other benefits (T)</li> <li>• Need the ability to rank and evaluate projects (SG)</li> <li>• Needs to be specific to various site conditions (e.g. slope, wetlands) (P)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complex (SG)</li> <li>• Redundant with other tools (SG)</li> <li>• Too subjective and open to abuse, including for agriculture (SG)</li> <li>• Difficult to prioritize species (SG)</li> <li>• Determining allowed development through a sites specific EA might not achieve the desired predictability (St)</li> <li>• Most available examples of design and stewardship standards for wildlife habitat and other natural resources are regulatory rather than performance-based (T)</li> <li>• Could be implemented through the design and stewardship requirements of other planning tools (T)</li> </ul>
<b>NONCONTIGUOUS PRD</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has been effective, despite limited use (SG)</li> <li>• Adds flexibility (SG)</li> <li>• Receiving areas should be mapped (SG)</li> <li>• Should be designed for the single land owner of the sending and receiving area – not prohibit partnerships – but acknowledge that the single land owner is the likely user (St)</li> <li>• Enhanced TDR concepts of tying multipliers to natural value of land conserved might be applicable (St)</li> <li>• Meets the Comp Plan objectives of directing development toward complete neighborhoods and reducing development potential in rural areas (T)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seldom used; barriers should be further explored (SG,T, P)</li> <li>• Can be difficult to understand; benefits not clearly conveyed to public (SG)</li> <li>• Need a better system for evaluating proposals (SG)</li> <li>• Generally not economical because of housing , density, market, infrastructure requirements and time (SG)</li> </ul>
<b>ENHANCED TDR</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could add flexibility required for a TDR program to work in Teton County (SG)</li> <li>• Concept could be integrated with Non-Contiguous PRD (St)</li> <li>• Can be used to reduce overall density and build-out by creating the perception of balance (SG)</li> <li>• Should be coordinated with other planning tools and regulations that would prioritize lands for protection or provide additional guidelines and incentives regarding design and stewardship (T)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economics do not seem to work in the Teton County market (SG)</li> <li>• Could be complex or cumbersome to implement (SG)</li> <li>• Costly (SG)</li> <li>• Generally not successful unless there are very high densities or strong incentives (SG)</li> <li>• May not achieve program simplicity or certainty in the approval process, both of which have been identified as important factors in the success of a TDR program (T)</li> </ul>

# Class 2 Tools

Tool	Pros	Cons
<b>WILDLIFE FRIENDLY FENCING (LDR SEC. 49220)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to balance preservation of agricultural operations with protection of wildlife (SG)</li> <li>• Appropriate in Teton County (SG, P)</li> <li>• Can complement base zoning provisions (St)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs more flexibility for agriculture (SG)</li> <li>• Need to identify funding to work with landowners to improve noncompliant fencing (P)</li> <li>• Need additional incentives or encouragement (SG)</li> <li>• Needs better oversight of fencing contractors (SG)</li> <li>• Should be left to NRTAB to enhance (St)</li> <li>• Need fewer exemptions</li> </ul>
<b>WILD ANIMAL FEEDING (LDR SEC. 3230)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has been effective (SG, P)</li> <li>• Education is a critical component (SG)</li> <li>• Can complement base zoning provisions (St)</li> <li>• Meets Comp Plan goals of limiting human-wildlife conflict (T)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already a law (SG)</li> <li>• Needs better enforcement (SG)</li> <li>• Should be left to NRTAB to enhance (St)</li> </ul>
<b>VEGETATION MANAGEMENT STANDARDS (LDR SEC. 4130, 4140)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has been effective (SG)</li> <li>• Can complement base zoning provisions (St)</li> <li>• Should look at native species that are also attractants (St)</li> <li>• Likely to help achieve the comprehensive plan objective of protecting wildlife from the impacts of development (T).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overly restrictive (SG)</li> <li>• Should include a greater educational component (SG)</li> <li>• Should not be applicable to agriculture (SG)</li> <li>• Existing regulations create some of the problems because the local animals have adapted to eat the local plants (SG)</li> <li>• Should be left to NRTAB to enhance (St)</li> </ul>
<b>OUTDOOR NOISE AND LIGHTING STANDARDS (LDR TABLE 43370.A.2)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has been effective (SG, P)</li> <li>• Can complement base zoning provisions (St)</li> <li>• Should be revised to reflect best management practices (SG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be left to NRTAB to enhance (St)</li> <li>• Agriculture should be exempt to light operations at all times of day (SG)</li> <li>• Need to revisit energy mitigation standards as they relate to outdoor lighting (SG)</li> <li>• Better standards needed (SG)</li> <li>• Has been poorly administered (SG)</li> </ul>
<b>BEAR CONFLICT PREVENTION AND MITIGATION</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has been effective (SG)</li> <li>• Can complement base zoning provisions (St)</li> <li>• Meets the objectives of the comprehensive plan of limiting human-wildlife conflict (T)</li> <li>• May be best applied in selective areas (SG)</li> <li>• Addresses expanding bear habitat (SG)</li> <li>• Can support agriculture by funding removal of animal carcasses (SG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear whether bears or human activity should be controlled (SG)</li> <li>• Blanket requirements for entire county not appropriate (SG)</li> <li>• Would be most effective county-wide (SG)</li> <li>• Enforcement mechanism needs to be clarified (SG)</li> <li>• Should be left to NRTAB to enhance (St)</li> <li>• Bird feeder regulations are excessive (SG)</li> </ul>

# Class 2 Tools

Tool	Pros	Cons
<b>DOMESTIC ANIMAL CONTROLS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could be effective if applied county-wide (SG)</li> <li>• Can complement base zoning provisions (St)</li> <li>• Reduces impact of domestic animals on wildlife (T)</li> <li>• Generally effective (SG)</li> <li>• Should only be applied in specific areas (e.g. next to Park, not in agricultural areas) (SG)</li> <li>• Winter closures for recreational use in critical habitat areas may be appropriate (SG)</li> <li>• On leash dog rules would be effective (SG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education may be most effective (SG)</li> <li>• Unclear whether regulations should apply to cats, dogs, or both (SG)</li> <li>• Should be an ordinance not a zoning issue (SG)</li> <li>• Difficult to enforce (SG)</li> <li>• Unpopular (SG)</li> <li>• Should be left to NRTAB to enhance (St)</li> </ul>
<b>WILDLIFE CROSSINGS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work has already been done to identify and prioritize key crossings (SG)</li> <li>• Signage and alerts at crossings are most appropriate (SG)</li> <li>• Appropriate as funding allows (SG)</li> <li>• Wildlife friendly design, including crossings, could be required in new developments (SG)</li> <li>• Can complement base zoning provisions (St)</li> <li>• Could be combined with NRO or Conservation Plan to identify priority areas (T)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should not be an LDR, but rather a cooperative effort with WYDOT and Wyoming Game and Fish (SG)</li> <li>• Overpasses require significant funding (SG)</li> <li>• Should be left to NRTAB to enhance (St)</li> </ul>
<b>EUCLIDEAN ZONING</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People understand the concept; it has been used for many years (SG)</li> <li>• Is still necessary (SG)</li> <li>• Hybrid with other types of zoning seems to be the most effective (SG)</li> <li>• Spot zoning is preferable to conditional use process (SG)</li> <li>• Industrial and heavy impact uses need to be segregated from other uses (SG)</li> <li>• Protection of specific uses and allowance for public uses in rural areas could be handled through overlays (St)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zoning alone does not protect open space (SG)</li> <li>• Limited light industrial discourages new businesses (SG)</li> <li>• Zoning should be character based per the Comp Plan (St)</li> <li>• Leads to exclusionary or unfair housing (SG)</li> <li>• May be difficult to change zoning in NC districts</li> </ul>
<b>PERFORMANCE ZONING</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate to move from discretionary toward performance based zoning (P)</li> <li>• The concept should be used to allow more flexibility in PRDs (SG)</li> <li>• Should be linked with other tools (SG)</li> <li>• Hybrid with other types of zoning seems to be the most effective (SG)</li> <li>• Has generally been effective (SG)</li> <li>• Could be used to achieve the Comprehensive Plan objectives of protecting wildlife habitat and natural water bodies or to protect wildlife from the impacts of development due to design choices and construction activities (T)</li> <li>• Should not be too strict regarding site coverage outside of open space (SG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited community support if performance is tied to variances (SG)</li> <li>• Zoning alone will not protect open space (SG)</li> <li>• Deemed undesirable in JH in the 92 plan (SG)</li> <li>• Comp Plan calls for movement away from this toward more predictability (St)</li> <li>• Should use performance criteria/data to form districts up front not case-by-case (St)</li> </ul>
<b>BASE SITE AREA (CALCULATION OF POTENTIAL BASED NATURAL FEATURES)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tool is easily understood (SG)</li> <li>• Could be linked with other tools (SG)</li> <li>• Should not be too strict regarding site coverage outside of open space (SG)</li> <li>• Effectively reduces densities and development (SG)</li> <li>• Hybrid with other types of zoning seems to be the most effective (SG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has not been applied predictably (SG)</li> <li>• Rounding results in unfair calculations (SG)</li> <li>• Total acreage would be a more appropriate metric (SG)</li> <li>• Comp Plan calls for movement away from this toward more predictability (St)</li> <li>• Use performance criteria/data to form districts up front not case-by-case (St)</li> <li>• May not have much function beyond resource protection standards that already exists in the code (SG)</li> </ul>

# Class 3 Tools

Tool	Pros	Cons
<b>CONSERVATION PLAN</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a system for prioritizing and evaluating conservation opportunities (SG, T)</li> <li>• A list of acquisition priorities would be useful (P)</li> <li>• Proactive, rather than restrictive (T)</li> <li>• Creates opportunities for partnership and shared decision-making between various agencies, organizations, and the private sector (T)</li> <li>• More effective and appropriate tool for strategic conservation than a Green Infrastructure Plan (T)</li> <li>• Certain specific parcels that might not be prone to a voluntary donation could be identified and funded through public funds (SG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduces privacy about conservation priorities, which helps protect the public buying property closer to fair market value (SG, P)</li> <li>• Might overlap with NRO update, JHLT planning, or other efforts (SG, T)</li> <li>• Limits more opportunistic acquisitions (SG)</li> <li>• May not tie to public and private funding resources (SG)</li> <li>• Does not effectively account for agriculture (SG)</li> <li>• Comp Plan and Character District partially address this already (SG, P)</li> <li>• Costly and complex (SG)</li> <li>• Could result in “targeting” specific landowners (St)</li> </ul>
<b>GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotes habitat connectivity to reduce fragmentation (SG)</li> <li>• Comp Plan identifies this type of idea for Town (St)</li> <li>• Comp Plan calls for active recreation opportunities to be provided responsibly in order to relieve pressure on public lands (St)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goals already being achieved through pathways system, abundant public lands, and other efforts (SG, P)</li> <li>• Redundant with other programs and tools (SG)</li> <li>• Could be limited by costly ROW purchases (SG)</li> <li>• Additional protection may be more appropriate if it is opportunistic (SG)</li> <li>• Interferes or inappropriate for agricultural lands (SG)</li> <li>• Costly and complex (SG)</li> <li>• Typically applied in much larger metropolitan areas</li> <li>• Recreational component could be a disincentive for voluntary donation of land</li> </ul>
<b>AGRICULTURAL SUPPORT ORGANIZATION</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could be effective if it’s specific to livestock and crop production (SG)</li> <li>• Would allow for those with experience and expertise in agriculture to work directly with agricultural community (SG)</li> <li>• Might be able to identify suitable agricultural land not in production and conglomerate such pieces (St)</li> <li>• Could partner with county to monitor utility of agricultural tools (St)</li> <li>• Could help with connecting landowners with a skilled workforce (SG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other organizations already serve this function; redundant with existing efforts (SG)</li> <li>• Creates additional costs and administrative complexity (SG)</li> <li>• Different agricultural operations have different priorities (e.g. farmers, dude/guest ranches) (SG)</li> <li>• There may not be demand for this from farmers and ranchers (SG).</li> </ul>
<b>CONSERVATION AND LIMITED DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improves tax advantages for donated easements (P)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tax incentives should only be used if they result in a transfer of development into or next to complete neighborhoods (SG)</li> <li>• Limited applicability, since most of the un-subdivided land in the county is zoned for 35 acre minimum (SG)</li> <li>• Prone to abuse (SG)</li> <li>• There is not always a clear public benefit (SG)</li> <li>• Redundant with other existing programs and regulations (SG)</li> </ul>
<b>CONSERVATION-ORIENTED PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May be appropriate near complete neighborhoods or in conservation areas where there are not complete neighborhood options (SG)</li> <li>• The large lot-large project option, whether as a subset of the PRD or its own PUD, has produced a lot of conservation (Shooting Star, Melody, Spring Creek, and ISR resulted in more conservation than all PRDs combined) (SG, St)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could add to overall development potential (P)</li> <li>• Prone to abuse (SG)</li> <li>• There is not always a clear public benefit (SG)</li> <li>• Redundant with Resort Districts and other tools (SG)</li> <li>• Not likely to be effective in current growth environment (SG)</li> <li>• Lack of community support (SG)</li> <li>• Can be unpredictable for adjacent landowners (SG)</li> <li>• Goal could instead be achieved through PRD design and other tools (T, St)</li> <li>• PUDs/large PRDs create communities separated from complete neighborhoods (St)</li> <li>• Does not fit 1/35 base zoning system (St)</li> </ul>

# Class 3 Tools

Tool	Pros	Cons
<b>URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARY</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would be a codification of the Complete Neighborhood/Rural idea in the Comp Plan (SG, St)</li> <li>• Could be applied to Stable and Transitional neighborhoods (T)</li> <li>• Could be applicable in South Park (P)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires a population growth projection, inventory of existing public facilities and their capacities, and assessing the community's needs for different land uses and facilities in the futures (T)</li> <li>• Already covered by the Character District Maps (SG)</li> <li>• Not permanent (SG)</li> <li>• More applicable to urban areas (SG)</li> <li>• Redundant with other tools (SG)</li> <li>• Seems incompatible with conservation area zoning called for in the Comp Plan (SG)</li> <li>• May not be necessary if zoning matches Comp Plan, the policy is already in place it's a matter of implementation (St)</li> <li>• In some situations, UGBs lead to rural sprawl and spillover into adjacent communities (T)</li> </ul>
<b>SPRAWL INDEX</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Might be useful in evaluating development plans (SG, T)</li> <li>• Could be used to score the location efficiency of individual land parcels for development, and help to meet the Comprehensive Plan objectives of directing development toward complete neighborhoods (T)</li> <li>• Could be used as a performance metric as part of another tool (T)</li> <li>• Could be useful in front end planning (St)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Typically used to evaluate and compare entire communities to one another (T)</li> <li>• Character District Maps and monitoring of Town/County development ratios provide more information than an index (SG)</li> <li>• Given rural nature of most of the community, may not be useful for evaluating parcels or subdivisions (SG)</li> <li>• Could be difficult to manage (P)</li> <li>• Redundant (SG)</li> <li>• Not cost effective (SG)</li> <li>• More urban in nature; unnecessary (SG)</li> <li>• Not predictable as a case-by-case evaluation tool (St)</li> <li>• Untested in similar communities (T)</li> <li>• Could be skewed by 2nd home inventory (SG)</li> </ul>
<b>URBAN SERVICE AREA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Might be a consideration if annexation pressure becomes an issue (SG, St)</li> <li>• Could be applied in some areas of the County (T)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exists within current regulations (SG)</li> <li>• Implementation could be undercut by state law that allows homeowners to form a rural water district with County tax funds (SG)</li> <li>• Partially accomplished by the Comp Plan (SG)</li> <li>• Not worthwhile or applicable in Teton County, given lack of county utilities and 35 acre development pattern (SG, St)</li> </ul>
<b>ADEQUATE PUBLIC FACILITIES ORDINANCE (APFO)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requiring/encouraging community water and sewer might improve natural resource conservation (St)</li> <li>• Allows infrastructure to be timed appropriately with development (SG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure not an appropriate growth control mechanism (SG)</li> <li>• More appropriate for the Town of Jackson</li> <li>• Not worthwhile or applicable in Teton County, given lack of county utilities (SG, St)</li> <li>• Would need a better forecast of future needs (SG)</li> </ul>

# Class 3 Tools

Tool	Pros	Cons
<b>TDR BANK</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Appears to be an effective tool for truly transferring density (SG)</i></li> <li>• <i>Can be used to reduce overall density and build-out by creating the perception of balance (SG)</i></li> <li>• <i>Could be linked to a funding source (SG)</i></li> <li>• <i>Could help Teton County to meet the Comprehensive Plan objectives of directing development toward complete neighborhoods, reducing development potential in rural areas, and protecting open space for wildlife habitat and scenic character (T)</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Economics do not seem to work in the Teton County market (SG)</i></li> <li>• <i>Costly (SG)</i></li> <li>• <i>Implementation would be complex and potentially cumbersome (SG)</i></li> <li>• <i>Fund raising could be difficult (SG)</i></li> <li>• <i>Demand for development in receiving areas is lower than sending areas (St)</i></li> <li>• <i>Allowed development in receiving areas is not high enough to make a program effective (St)</i></li> <li>• <i>Generally not successful unless there are very high densities or strong incentives (SG)</i></li> <li>• <i>Requires more administration (SG)</i></li> </ul>
<b>PERMANENT PROTECTION LINKAGE PLAN (PPLP)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Formalizes what has been underway for many years in Teton County (SG)</i></li> <li>• <i>Process is transparent (SG)</i></li> <li>• <i>Could help track shift of development (P)</i></li> <li>• <i>Would likely function similarly to a standard transfer of development rights (TDR) program. However, it appears that the development rights would be allocated by the Town on a performance basis to individual projects (T)</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Needs to be clarified how the entities acquiring development rights (e.g., land trusts) would be compensated for the initial pre-allocation of units to the complete neighborhoods (T)</i></li> <li>• <i>Not viable in Teton County (SG)</i></li> <li>• <i>Costly (SG)</i></li> <li>• <i>Implementation would be complex and potentially cumbersome (SG)</i></li> <li>• <i>Unclear where funding comes (SG)</i></li> <li>• <i>Addresses upzoning in complete neighborhoods more than conservation of rural areas (St)</i></li> <li>• <i>Restricts achievement of complete neighborhood goals based on purchase or donation of conservation easements (St)</i></li> </ul>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENT ZONING</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Recognizes existing development that might not conform to surrounding zoning or the vision of the Comp Plan (SG)</i></li> <li>• <i>Allowable changes should not degrade surrounding areas (SG)</i></li> <li>• <i>Has been effective (SG)</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Need to anticipate how properties might change into something else as the market changes (SG)</i></li> <li>• <i>Regulations should be designed to achieve future, not allow the past. Good regulations from the past should be carried forward (St)</i></li> <li>• <i>Nonconformities should be treated as such with an appropriate policy regarding their maintenance (St)</i></li> <li>• <i>Zoning alone does not protect open space (SG)</i></li> <li>• <i>Accomplished by PUD (SG)</i></li> <li>• <i>Time to remove NC and BC zoning (P)</i></li> </ul>
<b>FORM-BASED ZONING</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Hybrid with other types of zoning seems to be the most effective (SG)</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>More applicable to urban areas and complete neighborhoods; not appropriate for rural areas (SG, P, St)</i></li> <li>• <i>Community may not accept the idea of de-emphasizing density in favor of concepts of how the building related to public space (SG)</i></li> <li>• <i>This doesn't appear to take into account many of the important resources in Teton County (SG)</i></li> <li>• <i>In rural areas relation of building to landscape is more important than relation of building to public realm (St)</i></li> </ul>