

**PUBLIC RESPONSE #1**

	<b>Class 1 - Tools That Work for Teton County</b> <i>Please explain why the tool is appropriate for Teton County.</i>	<b>Class 2 - Tools that could be Modified to Fit Teton County</b> <i>Please describe the modifications needed to make the tool to fit Teton County.</i>	<b>Class 3 - Tools That Don't Work for Teton County</b> <i>Please explain why the tool is <u>not</u> appropriate for Teton County.</i>
<b>Active Stewardship</b>			
Donated Conservation Easements	Does work – dependent on stripping value for tax purposes - so is very much linked invisibly to the PRD.		
Private Land Trust	JH Land Trust is an essential partner. It is clear though that a public funding source would lever private philanthropy greatly – look at Hardeman meadows in 1989.		
Public Land Trust	TCSTP works – but does not have the resources for proper stewardship.		
Stewardship Requirements		For LDR open space requirements this needs work as the community questions for example if a golf course real qualifies as open space that protects wildlife habitat and movement, plus agricultural open space. The location that calls this most to question is Three Creeks – as they fence the course in winter to prevent elk use of the area – or movement through it.	

Conservation Plan		I think the new character district does help to prioritized. If a public funding source is developed as expressed in the new comp plan – then an acquisition priority would be helpful – but realistically as in any governmental land purchase some privacy helps protect the public buying property closer to fair market value. One priority would be for easements or fee title ownership where there is no public land and we have identified logical wildlife crossing structures – this should be called out now and prioritized. One example is the scrapped Joe Rick property on Broadway at the five way – state ownership on the west, public open space in Karnes meadows – the landing spot for a structure is on the currently vacant Rice property.	
Green Infrastructure Plan		We have this already in our pathways system and abundant public lands.	
Dedicated Funding Source for Purchase of Open Space	A goal in the current plan.	Needs to now be actualized. Even a small amount of dedicated funding will greatly leverage private philanthropy.	
<b>Agricultural Resource Protection</b>			
Agricultural Allowance		Definitions of true agricultural use need to be strengthened.	
Agricultural Assessment		Although we need to support true farming and ranching – this mechanism has been gamed.	
Agricultural Exemptions		Wildlife fencing standards can continue to be improved for agricultural lands.	

Agricultural Accessory Uses			
Agricultural Resource Overlay		Could be useful in Alta – question its value in Jackson Hole proper.	
Agricultural Support Organization			
<b>Conservation Design</b>			
Subdivision PRD (Conservation Subdivision)	A critical tool – it is used more than it is assumed as a private discussion between an owner, land trust, real estate appraiser and the IRS.		
Non-subdivision (Family Compound) PRD		Would like to see if more square footage in a single house beyond LDR's can be swapped for open space requirement – performance based.	
Conservation and limited development projects		Anything that improves tax advantages for donated easement should be explored.	
Conservation-oriented planned development projects			With our current latent development potential this will not work as it is additive growth.
Open Space or Cluster Zoning		This should be explored.	
<b>Financial Land Protection Incentives</b>			
Conservation Easement Assessment		Should be explored as again tax incentives are Linley our most powerful tool to help the JH Land Trust and the Nature Conservancy to do their work.	
Purchase of Development Rights (PDR)	The JH Land Trust and the TOJ in partnership do a good job with this. A permanent public funding source could supplement and needs to be developed.	Actualize the permanent public funding source.	

Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES)			Interesting but I do not see how government can manage or monitor.
<b>Growth Management</b>			
Urban Growth Boundary		Has value especially for South Park - using High School road plus new receiving zone identified in NW South Park as the boundary.	
Sprawl Index			Too difficult to manage
Urban Service Area			No
Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO)		Absolutely needed in this valley. Infrastructure follows at time s by over a decade or more approved development.	
<b>Individual Resource Protection</b>			
Natural Resources Overlay (NRO) (LDR Sec. 3270)	Imperative - and we are on a path to improve and make more exact.		
Scenic Resources Overlay (SRO) (LDR Div. 3300)	More subjective but imperative - need to redraw now with character district mapping.		
Vegetative cover types (LDR Sec. 3211)		On the pathway - and critical analysis tool.	
Water body, 10-year floodplain and wetland buffers (LDR Sec. 3220)		Riparian setbacks should be expanded to 300' in important corridors such as Flat Creek for example.	
Environmental Assessment (LDR Sec. 3140.A)	Working - good that consultant are technically hired now by government rather than the application.		
Mitigation Requirements	Working wetlands - other types of critical vegetation types could be explored.		

Stormwater Management (LDR Div. 4900)	Working well.		
Resource Conservation			
Restoration & Mitigation Banking		An idea worth perusing.	
<b>Performance Standards</b>			
Maximum House Size		Would like to explore if a performance based to exceed maximum house size could be tied to required permanent open space – especially on 35 and 70 acre parcels.	
Maximum Density	Critical tool - maintain		
Bulk and Scale	Critical tool		
Site Coverage	Critical tool		
Use Allowance	Important tool as it ties to community character		
Use Performance Standards	Mainatin		
Natural resources performance standards		Tis needs to be developed as all acreage dependent on slope, wetlands etc. is not the same.	
<b>Transfer of Development Rights</b>			
Noncontiguous PRD	Maintian and explore why it is not used more often.		
TDR Bank		Worthy to explore	
Enhanced TDR		Explore	
Permanent Protection Linkage Plan (PPLP)	A good idea to help track.		
<b>Wildlife-friendly Design and Management</b>			

Wildlife Friendly Fencing (LDR Sec. 49220)	We are getting there – more to go on agricultural lands as well as finding funding to work with landowners to unwind old non-compliant fencing.		
Wild Animal Feeding (LDR Sec. 3230)	Good policy in place.		
Vegetation Management Standards (LDR Sec. 4130, 4140)		Should be explored.	
Outdoor Noise and Lighting Standards (LDR Table 43370.A.2)	Good policy in place.		
Bear conflict prevention and mitigation	Good policy in place.		
Domestic animal controls		Should be explored.	
Wildlife Crossings			
<b>Zoning</b>			
Character Based Zoning	Good tool – we will see how LDR’s line up.		
Acknowledgment Zoning			Time to find a pathway to remove NC and BC and just define the zoning – character.
Euclidean Zoning			
Performance Zoning		In general we are moving from discretionary to performance based. We should stay on that pathway. The worst tool ever developed in this county was the PUD-AH.	

Base Site Area (Calculation of Potential based Natural Features)			
Form-Based Zoning		Most applicable in town and resort districts - the town is ahead of the county on this.	

**STAKEHOLDER RESPONSE #1**

	<p align="center"><b>Class 1 - Tools That Work for Teton County</b></p> <p align="center"><i>Please explain why the tool is appropriate for Teton County.</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Class 2 - Tools that could be Modified to Fit Teton County</b></p> <p align="center"><i>Please describe the modifications needed to make the tool to fit Teton County.</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Class 3 - Tools That Don't Work for Teton County</b></p> <p align="center"><i>Please explain why the tool is <u>not</u> appropriate for Teton County.</i></p>
<b>Active Stewardship</b>			
Donated Conservation Easements	Proven record in the community, <b>source of 75% of conservation easements. This is probably where we should continue to focus.</b>		
Private Land Trust		Proven record, but may need some changes to provide more protection.	
Public Land Trust	Not a major source of conservation easements, but worth keeping. <b>Could be greater if we have a funding source. Since this is a limited resource, we need to be strategic about this, not just reacting to opportunities.</b>		
Stewardship Requirements		It is worth discussing, but I have concerns about how you can do this and respect private property rights.	
Conservation Plan		Need to determine a system for prioritizing and evaluating.	

Green Infrastructure Plan		Requires a system to identify needs and lay out potential green space network. There greater value in having connected quality habit instead of fragmented and isolated habitat.	
Dedicated Funding Source for Purchase of Open Space		Consistent with Policy 1.4.d. Requires identifying a funding source.	
<b>Agricultural Resource Protection</b>			
Agricultural Allowance		Might need to look at definition of "active farming or ranching."	
Agricultural Assessment	Does not appear to be used much, but no reason to throw it out.		
Agricultural Exemptions		Need to balance preservation with protection.	
Agricultural Accessory Uses	I have heard no complaints.		
Agricultural Resource Overlay		We may be too late for this to do any good in most of the County.	
Agricultural Support Organization			I think we already have organizations that do this function. I am not convinced another group will help.
<b>Conservation Design</b>			

Subdivision PRD (Conservation Subdivision)		Need to have a broad community based workshop to discuss what we are trying to accomplish and what are the appropriate multipliers. Should discuss a system that provides greater benefits for parcels that provide higher value for wildlife with emphasis on species that need help like sage grouse and moose.	
Non-subdivision (Family Compound) PRD		Same comments as above.	
Conservation and limited development projects			Too easy to abuse and often no clear benefit to the community.
Conservation- oriented planned development projects			Too easy to abuse and often no clear benefit to the community.
Open Space or Cluster Zoning			Seems to duplicate PRD with no added benefit.
<b>Financial Land Protection Incentives</b>			
Conservation Easement Assessment		Sliding scale to adjust credits to reflect value as wildlife habitat, but I am not sure how much of an incentive reduced property taxes are.	
Purchase of Development Rights (PDR)		Need a system to prioritize and evaluate parcels as you do not have unlimited resources. It is consistent with Policy 1.4.d.	

Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES)		Should investigate a system similar to CRP that would involve a long term (5-20 year) lease with annual payments to provide defined environmental benefits. Payments would be based on economic value of land, environmental value of land and length of lease.	
<b>Growth Management</b>			
Urban Growth Boundary			Character District Maps provide more information than a simple boundary line. Would this be more useful than the transition zones that have been identified?
Sprawl Index			Character District Maps provide more information than an index. Given the rural nature of most of our community, I doubt the index would be a useful tool for evaluating parcels or subdivisions.
Urban Service Area		The idea has merit, but I am concerned that the implementation would be undercut by state law that allows homeowners to form a rural water district with County tax funds.	

Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO)			I do not think we have a good enough forecast of future needs to make this work. Best example is how we do the transportation portion of the Comp Plan separate from the Plan itself.
<b>Individual Resource Protection</b>			
Natural Resources Overlay (NRO) (LDR Sec. 3270)		Need to update focal species and NRO boundaries. May want to include focus on preservation of sage habitat to protect sage grouse.	
Scenic Resources Overlay (SRO) (LDR Div. 3300)	Important to protect skyline views.		
Vegetative cover types (LDR Sec. 3211)		Ranking system might need to be revised to reflect concern for species like moose and sage grouse.	
Water body, 10-year floodplain and wetland buffers (LDR Sec. 3220)		Is 100 year flood plain more appropriate in some locations?	
Environmental Assessment (LDR Sec. 3140.A)	It seems to be working.		

Mitigation Requirements		Consider mitigation for loss of sage habitat. Consider mitigation for removal of mature trees to obtain views. Perhaps 4:1 young trees in valuable habitat.	
Stormwater Management (LDR Div. 4900)		Encourage the use of new technologies like impervious parking surfaces to reduce runoff.	
Resource Conservation		Any new development should be able to prove it can provide enough water to support the need it generates.	
Restoration & Mitigation Banking			An interesting idea, given the high cost of land, I question if it would work here.
<b>Performance Standards</b>			
Maximum House Size	It works and seems to be accepted by most of the community.		
Maximum Density	It works and seems to be accepted by most of the community.		
Bulk and Scale	It works and seems to be accepted by most of the community.		
Site Coverage	It works and seems to be accepted by most of the community.		

Use Allowance	It works and seems to be accepted by most of the community.		
Use Performance Standards	It works and seems to be accepted by most of the community.		
Natural resources performance standards		Need to be able to rank and evaluate projects.	
<b>Transfer of Development Rights</b>			
Noncontiguous PRD		Hard for people to understand. If it is used the benefits need to be clearly conveyed to the public. Need a better system for evaluating proposals.	
TDR Bank			Economics do not seem to work in our market.
Enhanced TDR			Economics do not seem to work in our market.
Permanent Protection Linkage Plan (PPLP)	It formalizes what many of the electeds have been doing in their heads for years, but makes the process transparent.		
<b>Wildlife-friendly Design and Management</b>			
Wildlife Friendly Fencing (LDR Sec. 49220)		Need to continue to work to balance preservation of Ag operations with protection of wildlife. There are local non-profits that can help achieve this balance.	

Wild Animal Feeding (LDR Sec. 3230)		It works, but need better enforcement. Need to encourage people to improve habitat on their property.	
Vegetation Management Standards (LDR Sec. 4130, 4140)	It works.		
Outdoor Noise and Lighting Standards (LDR Table 43370.A.2)	It is working.		
Bear conflict prevention and mitigation	Occupied bear habitat is expanding. Trash containers and bird feeders are the biggest source of bear conflicts. It is a small price to pay for living in a rural area.		
Domestic animal controls			Biggest source of predation on small mammals is cats, not dogs. You could pass an ordinance, but I doubt you could enforce it.
Wildlife Crossings	Work has been done to identify and prioritize key crossings. Need to start planning implementation.		
<b>Zoning</b>			
Character Based Zoning	It is consistent with the 2012 Comp Plan.		

Acknowledgment Zoning		We need to recognize existing development that might not conform to surrounding zoning or the vision of the Comp Plan. We also need to look at how those properties might change into something else as the market changes. Any changes allowed cannot degrade the surrounding areas.	
Euclidean Zoning	People understand this concept. It has been used for many years.		
Performance Zoning			If performance is tied to variances, I do not believe there is community support for this idea.
Base Site Area (Calculation of Potential based Natural Features)	We are using it now and people seem to understand it.		
Form-Based Zoning			I am not sure the community would accept the idea of deemphasizing density in favor of a vague concept of how the building related to public space.

**STAKEHOLDER EXERCISE #2**

	<b>Class 1 - Tools That Work for Teton County</b> <i>Please explain why the tool is appropriate for Teton County.</i>	<b>Class 2 - Tools that could be Modified to Fit Teton County</b> <i>Please describe the modifications needed to make the tool to fit Teton County.</i>	<b>Class 3 - Tools That Don't Work for Teton County</b> <i>Please explain why the tool is <u>not</u> appropriate for Teton County.</i>
<b>Active Stewardship</b>			
Donated Conservation Easements	No cost, proven record. Key question: What can TC do to increase donation of CEs? One answer is stable, predictable LDRs.		
Private Land Trust	No public cost, proven record.		
Public Land Trust	Modest success. Still important as option to Private Trusts.		
Stewardship Requirements		Stewardship is too complex and site specific to benefit from any but very basic regulations (such as prohibiting import of noxious weeds). Best to encourage voluntary stewardship thru Land Trusts, TCNRD, etc. Cost sharing can be an effective stimulus, if it is flexible, such as G&F grants.	
Conservation Plan		This is already in place thru JHLT planning and county overlays. Since purchase of CEs or fee is opportunistic, it is better not to have a plan with priorities in place. That complicates the "market" to get lands protected. The need is more funding, private or public.	
Green Infrastructure Plan			Redundant. We have a surplus of data. Our minimum green infrastructure is already protected. Additional protection is warranted, but it will be opprtunisitc.

Dedicated Funding Source for Purchase of Open Space		High Priority!!! The county needs to dedicate funding to open space. There is already private, federal and state funding. Other than a few specific projects, TC has failed to dedicate funding. One source should be a RE transfer tax. TC needs a plan to get stae enabling legislation.	
<b>Agricultural Resource Protection</b>			
Agricultural Allowance	This is extremely important. TC needs to continue to keep this allowance broadly defined.		
Agricultural Assessment	This is in the WY constitution and regulated at the state level. It is safe for the foreseeable future.		
Agricultural Exemptions	This is extremely important. TC needs to continue to keep these exemptions broad. Also, the Director of Planning should have the ability to grant further exemptions at his discretion.		
Agricultural Accessory Uses	Even though relatively few of these have been permitted, they are still critically important. They should be expanded. Agricultural land needs to have multiple sources of income to be profitable in a non-agricultural community. If it is not profitable, it is eventually sold for development or agriculture is discontinued.		
Agricultural Resource Overlay		This would be an excellent addition to the existing 2 overlays. It could be used in at least 2 ways: first to minimize negative impacts and second to allow accessory uses to provide positive impacts.	

Agricultural Support Organization			Redundant.
<b>Conservation Design</b>			
Subdivision PRD (Conservation Subdivision)	This is working. The problem is that it is not user-friendly, and therefore not used enough. We need more predictable regulations and enforcement. Also, we need more flexibility for the land owner. Very complex issue, but needs critical attention.		
Non-subdivision (Family Compound) PRD	The above comment applies here also. This use is an excellent land use and community result: permanent open land, tax revenue, major donations to and participation in non-profits. We need to make this option easy, quick, and flexible. Today, it is like pulling teeth.		
Conservation and limited development projects			We do not need this as a specific tool. It already happens through existing regulations, such as PRDs. A conservation funding source would increase this.
Conservation-oriented planned development projects			Redundant. We have this in the Resort Districts and otherwise it is possible through PRDs. Do not complicate things with a new (old) tool.
Open Space or Cluster Zoning			Redundant. Overlays work toward this.
<b>Financial Land Protection Incentives</b>			

Conservation Easement Assessment			This is regulated by WY, not TC. No change needed. However, all property in TC under CE does not now receives agricultural assessment. It must be in agriculture. But, typically, a CE reduces the value and therefore reduces taxes.
Purchase of Development Rights (PDR)			Redundant. Fund the purchase of CEs. Development rights (thru a non contiguous PRD) may provide partial cost recovery.
Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES)		This is a big area that should be investigated over the long run. Both onetime payment, such as for mitigation, and ongoing payments.	
<b>Growth Management</b>			
Urban Growth Boundary			Redundant and not permanent. i.e, South Park.
Sprawl Index			Redundant and not cost effective
Urban Service Area			Not worthwhile here
Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO)			Not worthwhile here
<b>Individual Resource Protection</b>			
Natural Resources Overlay (NRO) (LDR Sec. 3270)	Excellent tool for analysis, but misused as the key tool for site planning. Need much great flexibility for the land owner to site as he wishes and then mitigate.		

Scenic Resources Overlay (SRO) (LDR Div. 3300)	Excellent tool for analysis and as one consideration in site planning and visual mitigation. This tool needs improvement both for flexibility and also more teeth.		
Vegetative cover types (LDR Sec. 3211)	Good for site analysis, but this tool today does more harm than good. The ranking system is flawed. Mitigation is unpredictable. This should not be used for site design. If used correctly, this tool should make mitigation much more flexible and predictable for the applicant. This needs to be completely revamped.		
Water body, 10-year floodplain and wetland buffers (LDR Sec. 3220)	Good for site analysis, but these setbacks should be reviewed and more flexibility allowed. Wetland setback is unnecessary and counter to good site design. More flexibility is warranted and mitigation should be predictable.		
Environmental Assessment (LDR Sec. 3140.A)	Good for site analysis. But should be applied more predictably with more flexibility.		
Mitigation Requirements	This should be expanded beyond unavoidable impacts, and used to mitigate impacts from desired best site design. Mitigation should be allowed for development in a predictable, cookbook format. This would encourage the use of PRDs and more permanent land protection would result.		
Stormwater Management (LDR Div. 4900)			Not significant in Rural district.
Resource Conservation			not a big deal

Restoration & Mitigation Banking		This tool could have multiple bottom lines. It could raise money for CE purchases or for habitat improvement in the most critical areas or for most critical species.	
<b>Performance Standards</b>			
Maximum House Size	It works. Do not change it. Possibly allow combining units under certain conditions, such as with no impact on SRO.		
Maximum Density	It works. Don't change it.		
Bulk and Scale	It works. Don't change it.		
Site Coverage	In the Rural District, it works. Don't change it.		
Use Allowance	Consider more CUPs for accessory uses for agriculture in the Rural district, possibly within an Agriculture Resource Overlay.		
Use Performance Standards	Additional ones may be appropriate.		
Natural resources performance standards			Complicated and redundant.
<b>Transfer of Development Rights</b>			
Noncontiguous PRD	Good tool. Seldom used, but extremely beneficial when it has been used. Map receiving areas to promote use of this tool. (In your example, you mean Stilson, not Granite Ridge. Also, there was at least one example pre-1994, in John Dodge.)		
TDR Bank			Not viable here.
Enhanced TDR			Not viable here.
Permanent Protection Linkage Plan (PPLP)			Not viable here.
<b>Wildlife-friendly Design and Management</b>			

Wildlife Friendly Fencing (LDR Sec. 49220)	Needs more flexibility for agriculture.		
Wild Animal Feeding (LDR Sec. 3230)	Good regulation. But education is a critical part.		
Vegetation Management Standards (LDR Sec. 4130, 4140)	Overly restrictive, should use education as a greater part.		
Outdoor Noise and Lighting Standards (LDR Table 43370.A.2)	OK		
Bear conflict prevention and mitigation	Good, except bird feeder regs are excessive. Also, this is an area to support agriculture by funding removal of animal carcasses. (Burial no longer works due to grizzlies.)		
Domestic animal controls	Should be county wide regulations, not through conditions of approval of subdivisions.		
Wildlife Crossings			Do not add to LDRs. Work cooperatively with WYDOT etc
<b>Zoning</b>			
Character Based Zoning	Retain as is.		
Acknowledgment Zoning	Retain as is.		
Euclidean Zoning	Retain as is, and add as appropriate		
Performance Zoning		The performance zoning concept, but not performance zoning per se, should be used to allow more flexibility in PRDs.	

Base Site Area (Calculation of Potential based Natural Features)	This is not applied predictable. It needs to be reviewed and refined so that it is completely predictable. Also, rounding down at each step results in unfair calculations.		
Form-Based Zoning			Not appropriate

**STAKEHOLDER RESPONSE #3**

	<b>Class 1 - Tools That Work for Teton County</b> <i>Please explain why the tool is appropriate for Teton County.</i>	<b>Class 2 - Tools that could be Modified to Fit Teton County</b> <i>Please describe the modifications needed to make the tool to fit Teton County.</i>	<b>Class 3 - Tools That Don't Work for Teton County</b> <i>Please explain why the tool is <u>not</u> appropriate for Teton County.</i>
<b>Active Stewardship</b>			
Donated Conservation Easements	Yes. Required ongoing strength of holding organization		
Private Land Trust	Yes. See above.		
Public Land Trust	Yes. Maintain rather than expand.		
Stewardship Requirements	Yes. Must be made clear and coincide with regs.		
Conservation Plan		Guide/Plan needs development.	
Green Infrastructure Plan		ITP	
Dedicated Funding Source for Purchase of Open Space		Yes. Real estate transfer tax	
<b>Agricultural Resource Protection</b>			
Agricultural Allowance		?	
Agricultural Assessment		?	
Agricultural Exemptions		Yes.	
Agricultural Accessory Uses		Yes to ensure continuing ag use.	
Agricultural Resource Overlay		?	
Agricultural Support Organization		?	
<b>Conservation Design</b>			

Subdivision PRD (Conservation Subdivision)		Regulations need to be improved to ensure public benefit.	
Non-subdivision (Family Compound) PRD		Ditto above.	
Conservation and limited development projects		Yes	
Conservation- oriented planned development projects		Yes	
Open Space or Cluster Zoning		Yes	
<b>Financial Land Protection Incentives</b>			
Conservation Easement Assessment			No. Will give land owners leverage to take advantage
Purchase of Development Rights (PDR)		Sure.	
Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES)		Yes.	
<b>Growth Management</b>			
Urban Growth Boundary		Yes.	
Sprawl Index		Yes.	
Urban Service Area		Yes	
Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO)		Maybe. May not be necessary. Are we backdoor zoning?	
<b>Individual Resource Protection</b>			

Natural Resources Overlay (NRO) (LDR Sec. 3270)		Yes. Modify for greater objectivity/reduced subjectivity	
Scenic Resources Overlay (SRO) (LDR Div. 3300)	Yes. As is.		
Vegetative cover types (LDR Sec. 3211)		Not sure what the strong value in this is.	
Water body, 10-year floodplain and wetland buffers (LDR Sec. 3220)		Yes. There needs to be a more comprehensive effort to map this in rural areas.	
Environmental Assessment (LDR Sec. 3140.A)		Yes. Eliminate the County selection process.	
Mitigation Requirements		Yes. Provide greater opportunity and flexibility	
Stormwater Management (LDR Div. 4900)		Yes. Achieve greater environmental benefit.	
Resource Conservation		Isn't that what the rural zoning is supposed to do?	
Restoration & Mitigation Banking		Potential exists. Difficult to regulate.	
<b>Performance Standards</b>			
Maximum House Size	Yes. Right size now.		
Maximum Density		Needs to reflect market conditions	
Bulk and Scale		Develop effective form based requirements.	
Site Coverage		Yes	
Use Allowance		Yes	

Use Performance Standards			? What are you talking about ?
Natural resources performance standards			Self-regulating
<b>Transfer of Development Rights</b>			
Noncontiguous PRD		Yes.	
TDR Bank		Only possible way it could work.	
Enhanced TDR		See above.	
Permanent Protection Linkage Plan (PPLP)		Yes. Sounds good.	
<b>Wildlife-friendly Design and Management</b>			
Wildlife Friendly Fencing (LDR Sec. 49220)	Of course.		
Wild Animal Feeding (LDR Sec. 3230)	Yes.		
Vegetation Management Standards (LDR Sec. 4130, 4140)	Yes.		
Outdoor Noise and Lighting Standards (LDR Table 43370.A.2)		Lighting needs better standards.	
Bear conflict prevention and mitigation			We don't need it.
Domestic animal controls			That should be an ordinance not a zoning issue
Wildlife Crossings		Yes.	

Zoning			
Character Based Zoning	Design Review?		
Acknowledgment Zoning		?	
Euclidean Zoning		Industrial and heavy impact uses need to be segregated. Parks/schools in residential areas are okay; mixed-use developments are okay.	
Performance Zoning		Yes	
Base Site Area (Calculation of Potential based Natural Features)		Yes.	
Form-Based Zoning		Yes.	

**STAKEHOLDER RESPONSE #4**

	<b>Class 1 - Tools That Work for Teton County</b> <i>Please explain why the tool is appropriate for Teton County.</i>	<b>Class 2 - Tools that could be Modified to Fit Teton County</b> <i>Please describe the modifications needed to make the tool to fit Teton County.</i>	<b>Class 3 - Tools That Don't Work for Teton County</b> <i>Please explain why the tool is <u>not</u> appropriate for Teton County.</i>
<b>Active Stewardship</b>			
Donated Conservation Easements	X		
Private Land Trust	X		
Public Land Trust	X		
Stewardship Requirements		Tool would be more effective it was voluntary and incentivized	
Conservation Plan			
Green Infrastructure Plan			With all of the public land in Teton County, this would seem to be a lower priority.
Dedicated Funding Source for Purchase of Open Space		Possible cash donation from developers.	
<b>Agricultural Resource Protection</b>			
Agricultural Allowance	X		
Agricultural Assessment	X		
Agricultural Exemptions	X		
Agricultural Accessory Uses		It seems that if the purpose is to promote continuation for ag, the uses should require association with ag.	
Agricultural Resource Overlay	X		

Agricultural Support Organization			X
<b>Conservation Design</b>			
Subdivision PRD (Conservation Subdivision)			
Non-subdivision (Family Compound) PRD			
Conservation and limited development projects			
Conservation-oriented planned development projects			
Open Space or Cluster Zoning			
<b>Financial Land Protection Incentives</b>			
Conservation Easement Assessment	X		
Purchase of Development Rights (PDR)		This program would be difficult to effectively establish with the high land values in Teton County. Perhaps in conjunction with partial donation of the value of development rights. (bargain purchases)	
Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES)			Not enough landscape scale degradation in Teton County currently for this tool to make sense.
<b>Growth Management</b>			
Urban Growth Boundary			I've only seen this in larger cities but would be interested in seeing how Steamboat used this tool.

Sprawl Index			
Urban Service Area			X
Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO)			X
<b>Individual Resource Protection</b>			
Natural Resources Overlay (NRO) (LDR Sec. 3270)	X		
Scenic Resources Overlay (SRO) (LDR Div. 3300)	X		
Vegetative cover types (LDR Sec. 3211)	X		
Water body, 10-year floodplain and wetland buffers (LDR Sec. 3220)	X		
Environmental Assessment (LDR Sec. 3140.A)	X		
Mitigation Requirements	X		
Stormwater Management (LDR Div. 4900)	X		
Resource Conservation	X		
Restoration & Mitigation Banking	X		
<b>Performance Standards</b>			
Maximum House Size	X		

Maximum Density	X		
Bulk and Scale	X		
Site Coverage	X		
Use Allowance	X		
Use Performance Standards	X		
Natural resources performance standards	X		
<b>Transfer of Development Rights</b>			
Noncontiguous PRD			
TDR Bank			
Enhanced TDR			
Permanent Protection Linkage Plan (PPLP)			
<b>Wildlife-friendly Design and Management</b>			
Wildlife Friendly Fencing (LDR Sec. 49220)	X		
Wild Animal Feeding (LDR Sec. 3230)	X		
Vegetation Management Standards (LDR Sec. 4130, 4140)	X		
Outdoor Noise and Lighting Standards (LDR Table 43370.A.2)	X		

Bear conflict prevention and mitigation	X		
Domestic animal controls		Combination of winter closures and educating the public on the effects of domestic pets on wildlife enough in most places. Possible mandatory restraint/ constraint in areas of extremely important wildlife areas - better to deter residences in those areas.	
Wildlife Crossings		Mandate wildlife friendly design in new development areas.	
<b>Zoning</b>			
Character Based Zoning	X		
Acknowledgment Zoning	X		
Euclidean Zoning	X		
Performance Zoning	X		
Base Site Area (Calculation of Potential based Natural Features)	X		
Form-Based Zoning			This doesn't appear to take into account many of the important resources in Teton County.

**STAKEHOLDER EXERCISE #5**

	<b>Class 1 - Tools That Work for Teton County</b> <i>Please explain why the tool is appropriate for Teton County.</i>	<b>Class 2 - Tools that could be Modified to Fit Teton County</b> <i>Please describe the modifications needed to make the tool to fit Teton County.</i>	<b>Class 3 - Tools That Don't Work for Teton County</b> <i>Please explain why the tool is <u>not</u> appropriate for Teton County.</i>
<b>Active Stewardship</b>			
Donated Conservation Easements	This is a very effective tool with little to no cost to the community		
Private Land Trust	This has been an effective tool but there needs to be options for landowners. The goals and objectives of a private land trust do not necessarily align with the planning objectives of the community regulations		
Public Land Trust	See above. This option for landowners should be maintained.		
Stewardship Requirements			Not necessary and too heavy handed. One size does not fit all
Conservation Plan		This is certainly an option but given the past pattern of private voluntary donations not sure this would be the best use of public funds. Perhaps certain specific parcels that might not be prone to a voluntary donation could be identified and funded through public funds.	
Green Infrastructure Plan			As described the main difference between this concept and the current focus of interconnected open space is the introduction of the concept of public use of the open space. This would be disincentive for the voluntary donation.

Dedicated Funding Source for Purchase of Open Space		See above. Perhaps targeted for specific parcels and one time funding sources.	
<b>Agricultural Resource Protection</b>			
Agricultural Allowance	It helps to acknowledge the use in the LDR's but I am doubtful that it will be effective by itself going forward as land ownership changes. Minimum size might be reduced to provide a broader reach.		
Agricultural Assessment	This is helpful and cost effective		
Agricultural Exemptions	This is helpful and cost effective.		
Agricultural Accessory Uses	This is helpful but a number of the current uses that have been implemented are not necessarily considered part of traditional agriculture uses and can create conflicts		
Agricultural Resource Overlay		Perhaps useful for planning but without the economic support structure and available skilled workforce it would be cumbersome on landowners to implement	
Agricultural Support Organization		See above. Perhaps could help with connecting landowners with a skilled workforce	
<b>Conservation Design</b>			
Subdivision PRD (Conservation Subdivision)	Although the value of this has been debated I think it has been an effective tool with a relative cost effectiveness.		
Non-subdivision (Family Compound) PRD	Effective tool with little to no cost to the community.		

Conservation and limited development projects		Could perhaps be applied but not sure what difference this would affect beyond the current voluntary donation program.	
Conservation-oriented planned development projects	I think the PUD is a very effective tool for large land owners and the community to come together and plan for development of large tracts. It might need to be retooled or limited to address concerns of unpredictability to adjacent land owners but with a better defined comprehensive plan and character district maps this clarity can be provided.		
Open Space or Cluster Zoning			Too heavy handed.
<b>Financial Land Protection Incentives</b>			
Conservation Easement Assessment	Effective as currently used		
Purchase of Development Rights (PDR)		Could be effective but question the degree of need and the use of public funds.	
Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES)		Could be useful in conjunction with the current mitigation standards in the LDR's	
<b>Growth Management</b>			
Urban Growth Boundary			Too heavy handed.
Sprawl Index			Too cumbersome to individual parcels. What would it mean if a parcel received a low score. How would you compensate the owner for the reduced development potential

Urban Service Area		Seems like we already have this. Perhaps could be adapted as a planning boundary as oppose to service boundary as currently used	
Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO)		Could be adapted for Teton County	
<b>Individual Resource Protection</b>			
Natural Resources Overlay (NRO) (LDR Sec. 3270)	Generally works but mitigation standards need to be revisited to provide more clarity and options for offsite mitigation		
Scenic Resources Overlay (SRO) (LDR Div. 3300)	Generally works some of the specific standards should be revisited as they seem counter productive to the intent of the regulation. Skyline alternative site analysis could use some calrification		
Vegetative cover types (LDR Sec. 3211)	Generally works.		
Water body, 10-year floodplain and wetland buffers (LDR Sec. 3220)		Needs some work. Overlapping county level regulatory control with other state and federal agencies creates contradictions and confusion.	
Environmental Assessment (LDR Sec. 3140.A)	Generally works but the movement to measuring cumulative impacts is a slippery slope.		
Mitigation Requirements		Needs work. Particularly off site mitigation opportunities	
Stormwater Management (LDR Div. 4900)		Needs clarification as to requirements for various lot sizes. Larger lots tend to not be an issue with runoff given the amount of land and thus should not be subject to the same standards as dense small lots	

Resource Conservation			Not needed
Restoration & Mitigation Banking		Worth exploring.	
<b>Performance Standards</b>			
Maximum House Size		Generally works but needs some work. I think this standard could be better coordinated with the Non S/D PRD. Basement definition needs better clarification.	
Maximum Density	Generally works.		
Bulk and Scale	Generally works		
Site Coverage	Generally works		
Use Allowance	Generally works but needs to be looked at for any updating required		
Use Performance Standards	See above		
Natural resources performance standards		See comments on 10 year floodplain above	
<b>Transfer of Development Rights</b>			
Noncontiguous PRD	Although limited use over the past this is a tool that is there and can have important benefit for select parcels moving forward		
TDR Bank			Too cumbersome
Enhanced TDR			Too cumbersome
Permanent Protection Linkage Plan (PPLP)			Too cumbersome.
<b>Wildlife-friendly Design and Management</b>			
Wildlife Friendly Fencing (LDR Sec. 49220)		Needs to be updated for fence types and special situations that require wildlife management due to impacts on vegetation.	

Wild Animal Feeding (LDR Sec. 3230)	Generally works		
Vegetation Management Standards (LDR Sec. 4130, 4140)		Should be revisited.	
Outdoor Noise and Lighting Standards (LDR Table 43370.A.2)		Should be revisited. Particularly energy mitigation standards as they relate to outdoor lighting	
Bear conflict prevention and mitigation	Generally works.		
Domestic animal controls	Generally works. Don't think cats need to be included.		
Wildlife Crossings		Something to look at for Teton County	
<b>Zoning</b>			
Character Based Zoning	Generally works		
Acknowledgment Zoning	Generally works		
Euclidean Zoning	Generally works		
Performance Zoning	Generally works		
Base Site Area (Calculation of Potential based Natural Features)		In terms of protecting natural resources or shifting development location not sure that this has much function beyond resource protection standards that already exists in the code.	
Form-Based Zoning		Perhaps this could be effective in the town	



**STAKEHOLDER EXERCISE #6**

	<b>Class 1 - Tools That Work for Teton County</b> <i>Please explain why the tool is appropriate for Teton County.</i>	<b>Class 2 - Tools that could be Modified to Fit Teton County</b> <i>Please describe the modifications needed to make the tool to fit Teton County.</i>	<b>Class 3 - Tools That Don't Work for Teton County</b> <i>Please explain why the tool is <u>not</u> appropriate for Teton County.</i>
<b>Active Stewardship</b>			
Donated Conservation Easements	Yes, have been used in Teton County effectively		
Private Land Trust	Yes, have been used in Teton County effectively		
Public Land Trust	Yes, have been used in Teton County effectively		
Stewardship Requirements			Costly- complex- not realistic- not opportunistic
Conservation Plan			Costly- complex- not realistic- not opportunistic
Green Infrastructure Plan			Costly- complex- not realistic- not opportunistic
Dedicated Funding Source for Purchase of Open Space		Has potential, depending on details	
<b>Agricultural Resource Protection</b>			
Agricultural Allowance	Yes, should be 35 acres to match state statue		
Agricultural Assessment	Yes, county should adopt state definition		
Agricultural Exemptions	Yes, should exempt everything AG related		
Agricultural Accessory Uses	Yes, should expand		
Agricultural Resource Overlay			Costly, complex, more regulations are not helpful

Agricultural Support Organization			Costly, complex, more regulations are not helpful, if county wants to know info they can ask
<b>Conservation Design</b>			
Subdivision PRD (Conservation Subdivision)	Yes, has been effective		
Non-subdivision (Family Compound) PRD	Yes, has been effective		
Conservation and limited development projects			Draconian, not respectful of landowner stewardship
Conservation-oriented planned development projects			This is not likely to work in the current not growth environment
Open Space or Cluster Zoning		Will work on 3/35	Will not work on 1/35
<b>Financial Land Protection Incentives</b>			
Conservation Easement Assessment			State and Federal issues
Purchase of Development Rights (PDR)			Costly, complex, not opportunistic
Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES)			Costly, complex, not opportunistic
<b>Growth Management</b>			
Urban Growth Boundary			Draconian- not opportunistic
Sprawl Index		In part have been done in comp plan	
Urban Service Area		In part have been done in comp plan	

Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO)			Infrastructure should not be used as a growth control mechanism
<b>Individual Resource Protection</b>			
Natural Resources Overlay (NRO) (LDR Sec. 3270)			Costly, subjective, not site specific for best siting of development Not meant to be hard line
Scenic Resources Overlay (SRO) (LDR Div. 3300)			Costly, subjective, not site specific for best siting Not meant to be hard line of development
Vegetative cover types (LDR Sec. 3211)			Costly, subjective, not site specific for best siting of development Not meant to be hard line
Water body, 10-year floodplain and wetland buffers (LDR Sec. 3220)		Adopt, Corp. regulations for wetlands- FEMA for floodway and flood plains	
Environmental Assessment (LDR Sec. 3140.A)		Should not be done by government, but by experts and good science without regulatory agenda	
Mitigation Requirements		Should adopt Fed and State as applicable. Not in addition to. Problem for NC and BC.	
Stormwater Management (LDR Div. 4900)	Is town stormwater still flowing into Flat Creek?		
Resource Conservation			Costly, complex, makes no sense. Does not work for agriculture
Restoration & Mitigation Banking			Costly, complex, makes no sense. Does not work for agriculture
<b>Performance Standards</b>			
Maximum House Size			Dose not work for agriculture

Maximum Density		More density= more tax credits= more conservation easement= more open space	
Bulk and Scale			Draconian
Site Coverage			Draconian
Use Allowance		Subjective -open to interpretation - open to abuse	
Use Performance Standards		Subjective -open to interpretation - open to abuse	
Natural resources performance standards			Subjective, open to regulatory abuse
<b>Transfer of Development Rights</b>			
Noncontiguous PRD	Proven to work		
TDR Bank			Costly, complex
Enhanced TDR			Costly, complex
Permanent Protection Linkage Plan (PPLP)			Costly, complex
<b>Wildlife-friendly Design and Management</b>			
Wildlife Friendly Fencing (LDR Sec. 49220)		Exempt AG	
Wild Animal Feeding (LDR Sec. 3230)		Yes. Who controls wildlife on private property?	
Vegetation Management Standards (LDR Sec. 4130, 4140)	Exempt Ag		

Outdoor Noise and Lighting Standards (LDR Table 43370.A.2)	Ok		
Bear conflict prevention and mitigation		Control bears or people?	
Domestic animal controls	Include for recreational uses		
Wildlife Crossings			Costly, complex, WYDOT
<b>Zoning</b>			
Character Based Zoning			Zoning will not protect open space
Acknowledgment Zoning			Zoning will not protect open space
Euclidean Zoning			Zoning will not protect open space
Performance Zoning			Zoning will not protect open space
Base Site Area (Calculation of Potential based Natural Features)			Base Site Area should be eliminated , should look at total acreage
Form-Based Zoning	Good for urban areas.		

**STAKEHOLDER EXERCISE #7**

	<b>Class 1 - Tools That Work for Teton County</b> <i>Please explain why the tool is appropriate for Teton County.</i>	<b>Class 2 - Tools that could be Modified to Fit Teton County</b> <i>Please describe the modifications needed to make the tool to fit Teton County.</i>	<b>Class 3 - Tools That Don't Work for Teton County</b> <i>Please explain why the tool is <u>not</u> appropriate for Teton County.</i>
<b>Active Stewardship</b>			
Donated Conservation Easements	Can work in some situations, should never be required May not work for me, but a good tool to keep		
Private Land Trust	Can work in some situations, should never be required yes		No
Public Land Trust	Can work in some situations, should never be required yes		no
Stewardship Requirements			Interferes with ag – each piece of land is unique and the market dictates crop value and viability Ag operators already follow stewardship – no need for government interference Not necessary, left to land owner I don't feel these would work on agricultural land operation in Alta
Conservation Plan			Interferes with ag – each piece of land is unique and the market dictates crop value and viability Ag operators already follow stewardship – no need for government interference Interferes with ag I don't feel these would work on agricultural land operation in Alta

Green Infrastructure Plan			Interferes with ag – each piece of land is unique and the market dictates crop value and viability Ag operators already follow stewardship – no need for government interference Not necessary I don't feel these would work on agricultural land operation in Alta
Dedicated Funding Source for Purchase of Open Space		Maybe, but 97% public land and 25,000 acres already protected	Can't see a tool that accomplishes this without adding tax burden on existing ag landowner Not in favor, already too much with Land Trust, etc. 97% of county is already protected plus 25,000 acres in trust, etc.
<b>Agricultural Resource Protection</b>			
Agricultural Allowance		Needs to be modified to match 35 acre Farm operation as part of 35 acres or less Needs to be 35 acres instead of 70	
Agricultural Assessment	Yes		
Agricultural Exemptions	All ag related operations should be exempt Include ag building and all aspect of ag operations		
Agricultural Accessory Uses	Yes Can be taken advantage of but keep it		No
Agricultural Resource Overlay			Additional regulations and oversight on ag is bad Don't need this kind of government interference or restriction Too vague and complex. More regs too much More regulations are not good. Not in Alta

Agricultural Support Organization		Could be possible if you had a division between a farm support group or ranch group real ag people who make living off the land Needs to be specific to livestock and crop production	Farmers and dude/guest ranches have very different priorities Leave it up to elected officials or separate ranch and farm operations
<b>Conservation Design</b>			
Subdivision PRD (Conservation Subdivision)	Yes Keep existing/used in combination with noncontiguous pieces Allow max of 9/35 acres		
Non-subdivision (Family Compound) PRD	Yes Keep existing/used in combination with noncontiguous pieces		
Conservation and limited development projects			No Already too much
Conservation-oriented planned development projects		maybe	No Not applicable Especially not in Alta
Open Space or Cluster Zoning			No Not in our county
<b>Financial Land Protection Incentives</b>			
Conservation Easement Assessment			no
Purchase of Development Rights (PDR)		Complex Can be a useful tool May work in certain situations	No. Already in conservation easements
Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES)			Not our local issue – may compromise ag No benefit No
<b>Growth Management</b>			

Urban Growth Boundary			No Not a problem for Alta Not applicable to Alta
Sprawl Index			n/a
Urban Service Area			n/a
Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO)			No n/a A Jackson issue
<b>Individual Resource Protection</b>			
Natural Resources Overlay (NRO) (LDR Sec. 3270)			Vulnerable to expansion without local control Too subjective/moves to apply restrictions without logic input from those affected – such as bear proof garbage containers that are not needed Bear proof containers – too much control Existing, but too much regulation on agriculture
Scenic Resources Overlay (SRO) (LDR Div. 3300)			Vulnerable to expansion without local control Too subjective/must not restrict ag buildings or operations No control of where and when Existing, but too much regulation on agriculture
Vegetative cover types (LDR Sec. 3211)			Too expensive No May damage farming operation in the wrong place Existing, but too much regulation on agriculture

Water body, 10-year floodplain and wetland buffers (LDR Sec. 3220)		Be consistent with federal guidelines	
Environmental Assessment (LDR Sec. 3140.A)		Needs to be weighed and reasonable – not a crushing financial burden for a common guy Need to have a balance so that not only the super wealthy have the means to qualify Maintain a balance so the process doesn't become too expensive	Too expensive
Mitigation Requirements		Already in play Expensive and doesn't make a lot of sense	2:1 is not balanced
Stormwater Management (LDR Div. 4900)		Already in play	
Resource Conservation		Not for ag	Can hobble and threaten ag – access for crops and livestock Should not apply to farms and ranches Does not work for agriculture
Restoration & Mitigation Banking		Not for ag	Should not apply to farms and ranches
<b>Performance Standards</b>			

Maximum House Size		Ok for residential Ag buildings no. hay barn to protect the cor til the market is ready, equipment buildings needed to protect equipment in harsh environment, bigger equipment = more floor area needed. For ag to succeed must have economy of scale Not for ag Agriculture buildings and granaries, hay shed, etc. need to be exempt	
Maximum Density		OK	Not applicable to ag buildings
Bulk and Scale		OK	Not applicable to ag buildings
Site Coverage			Not applicable to ag buildings Not for ag
Use Allowance	Ag		Can be too subjective for Ag
Use Performance Standards	Ag only		Can be too subjective for Ag
Natural resources performance standards			Can be too subjective for Ag No
<b>Transfer of Development Rights</b>			
Noncontiguous PRD	Should be allowed It works, need to allow this as an option		
TDR Bank		Not sure how to implement	Too costly
Enhanced TDR		Not sure how to implement	Costly
Permanent Protection Linkage Plan (PPLP)		Not sure how to implement	costly
<b>Wildlife-friendly Design and Management</b>			

Wildlife Friendly Fencing (LDR Sec. 49220)	Ag exempt. OK	Ok in places Cannot apply to ag- pasture move/crop and pasture rotation and some cows require different fences Ag must be specifically exempt Ag must be exempt I require net fencing for my livestock	
Wild Animal Feeding (LDR Sec. 3230)			Already the law
Vegetation Management Standards (LDR Sec. 4130, 4140)			Ag producers ate the true definitions of vegetation manager - profession versus sideline Not applicable for ag Farming is already vegetation management Don't apply to agriculture
Outdoor Noise and Lighting Standards (LDR Table 43370.A.2)	Ok		Exempt ag - farming 24/7, need plenty of light for livestock and facilities Yard lights a must for ag Farming/ranching requires tractors, motores at times. Lights for security
Bear conflict prevention and mitigation		Good in very selective zone - not reasonable today	Cannot just blanket the county for instance requirement bear proof containers for all of Alta was excessive Bear proof containers are a take and should be done away with Don't impact all of the county when not an issue
Domestic animal controls		Yes next to Park, no in ag areas Only where logical Dogs on leash only Yes	
Wildlife Crossings		Signage and alerts, overpasses are costly Not on ag	Leave to Game and Fish and WYDOT

Zoning			
Character Based Zoning		Must support sustainable ag operations Need to be sensitive to ag including the incentives that exist Not for ag Just don't negatively impact agriculture	
Acknowledgment Zoning			
Euclidean Zoning			
Performance Zoning			
Base Site Area (Calculation of Potential based Natural Features)			
Form-Based Zoning			

**STAKEHOLDER EXERCISE #8**

	<b>Class 1 - Tools That Work for Teton County</b> <i>Please explain why the tool is appropriate for Teton County.</i>	<b>Class 2 - Tools that could be Modified to Fit Teton County</b> <i>Please describe the modifications needed to make the tool to fit Teton County.</i>	<b>Class 3 - Tools That Don't Work for Teton County</b> <i>Please explain why the tool is <u>not</u> appropriate for Teton County.</i>
<b>Active Stewardship</b>			
Donated Conservation Easements	Must have policy.		
Private Land Trust	Must have policy.		
Public Land Trust	Must have policy.		
Stewardship Requirements			Sounds like they would either be too vague to make a difference or too hard to enforce if they were specific enough to make a difference.
Conservation Plan	Should have.		
Green Infrastructure Plan	Should have. Doing reasonably well on this front so far. Could bump up against costly ROW purchases.		
Dedicated Funding Source for Purchase of Open Space		Land prices might be too high for this to ever be effective, but evaluating a sliding scale surcharge on property taxes on non-agricultural private parcels in the unincorporated county might be possible: start low on small lots, increase with lot size.	
<b>Agricultural Resource Protection</b>			
Agricultural Allowance	Sounds helpful		
Agricultural Assessment	Helpful to reduce the cost of maintaining land as open space/agricultural use; doesn't sound too costly.		

Agricultural Exemptions		Similar to above: In general asking for temporary or permanent restriction on development in return for tax benefits, exemptions from special assessments and cash payments out of an environmental protection fund, might all make effective tool. Lacks transfer of density to complete communities.	
Agricultural Accessory Uses		Useful but will need to avoid large impact on community character. Could be mitigated by clearly spelling out the uses so that future land owners in the proximity are well aware of how neighboring ag parcels could be used.	
Agricultural Resource Overlay	Shouldn't be too hard and would be needed to identify where many of these tools would apply.		
Agricultural Support Organization			Not sure how this would help, and adds admin that must be funded, though it sounds easy to set up.
<b>Conservation Design</b>			
Subdivision PRD (Conservation Subdivision)	Yes with higher open space requirements, but doesn't accomplish transfer of density to complete communities.		
Non-subdivision (Family Compound) PRD	Yes w/ higher os requirements (or payment in lieu that goes into Environmental Protection Fund)		
Conservation and limited development projects		Shouldn't go too far with tax incentives unless there is a clear transfer of development rights into/next to complete communities.	
Conservation-oriented planned development projects	Should be looked at near/next to complete communities and should require substantial percentage of dedicated open space in return.		

Open Space or Cluster Zoning	Worth looking at.		
<b>Financial Land Protection Incentives</b>			
Conservation Easement Assessment			Don't see this as being effective since conservation easement brings with it substantial reduction in taxes (to ag land level), and might impact important source of revenue.
Purchase of Development Rights (PDR)	This sounds attractive. I wish payment for the extinction of development rights in the unincorporated county could be linked with the purchase of development right in town. Another way to look at this, beyond the purchase of development rights, is that developers in town (or other complete communities) would receive higher levels of development if they mitigate their impact through payments that can be shown to directly preserve open space/wildlife habitat/other natural resources. Perhaps in the latter sense, an Environmental Protection Fund could be used.		
Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES)	Again could be effective when linked with extinguishment of development rights commensurate with bonuses in development rights in complete communities, made possible via an environmental protection fund? Possible to partially fund through higher mill levies on parcels in unincorporated county?		
<b>Growth Management</b>			

Urban Growth Boundary			Seems we have this vis a vis character districts and seems more urban in nature.
Sprawl Index			Somewhat accomplished through monitoring of county/town development ratio. Seems more urban in nature.
Urban Service Area	Might be worth considering		
Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO)	Should be included.		
<b>Individual Resource Protection</b>			
Natural Resources Overlay (NRO) (LDR Sec. 3270)	Important, and should include wildlife overlay. Challenge appears to be adequate funding for the creation of detailed overlays, for monitoring and updating. Environmental Protection Fund?		
Scenic Resources Overlay (SRO) (LDR Div. 3300)	Important to have, but the level of mitigation or regulatory oversight shouldn't be as rigorous as for natural resources overlay.		
Vegetative cover types (LDR Sec. 3211)	Worth including		
Water body, 10-year floodplain and wetland buffers (LDR Sec. 3220)	Existing setbacks seem appropriate from my perspective		
Environmental Assessment (LDR Sec. 3140.A)	Worth having		

Mitigation Requirements	Should be included and linked with natural resource overlay and vegetation mapping to include mitigation for critical forage/habitat.		
Stormwater Management (LDR Div. 4900)	Include		
Resource Conservation	Should be included in EA		
Restoration & Mitigation Banking		Worth having if not too hard to establish/monitor/maintain/staff. Link to Environmental Protection Fund?	
<b>Performance Standards</b>			
Maximum House Size	Should be maintained. Houses larger than 10,000 sq. ft. considered in return for fee that goes into environmental protection fund.		
Maximum Density	Continue with existing/ tweak existing		
Bulk and Scale	Use FAR		
Site Coverage	LSR adequate		
Use Allowance	Maintain and amend as necessary		
Use Performance Standards	Maintain but always look for ways to simplify, clarify		
Natural resources performance standards	Should be included		
<b>Transfer of Development Rights</b>			
Noncontiguous PRD	Should be included.		
TDR Bank	Appears to be the most effective tool for truly transferring density, though it is more complicated than other tools and requires some administration. Could be linked with Environmental Protection Fund.		

Enhanced TDR	This could be critical for adding the flexibility required for a TDR program to work in Teton County.		
Permanent Protection Linkage Plan (PPLP)			Sounds attractive in some regards, but it's unclear where the start-up funding would come from. In the long run, perhaps an Environmental Protection Fund could provide necessary funding.
<b>Wildlife-friendly Design and Management</b>			
Wildlife Friendly Fencing (LDR Sec. 49220)	Yes		
Wild Animal Feeding (LDR Sec. 3230)	Yes		
Vegetation Management Standards (LDR Sec. 4130, 4140)	Yes		
Outdoor Noise and Lighting Standards (LDR Table 43370.A.2)	Yes		
Bear conflict prevention and mitigation	Yes		
Domestic animal controls	Yes: should be increased, though won't be popular.		
Wildlife Crossings	As funding allows		
<b>Zoning</b>			
Character Based Zoning	Yes		
Acknowledgment Zoning	Seems to be required. Any way to phase it out?		

Euclidean Zoning	Seems necessary		
Performance Zoning	Required and should be linked with other tools		
Base Site Area (Calculation of Potential based Natural Features)	Required and should be linked with other tools		
Form-Based Zoning			Too urban.

**STAKEHOLDER EXERCISE #9**

	<b>Class 1 - Tools That Work for Teton County</b> <i>Please explain why the tool is appropriate for Teton County.</i>	<b>Class 2 - Tools that could be Modified to Fit Teton County</b> <i>Please describe the modifications needed to make the tool to fit Teton County.</i>	<b>Class 3 - Tools That Don't Work for Teton County</b> <i>Please explain why the tool is <u>not</u> appropriate for Teton County.</i>
<b>Active Stewardship</b>			
Donated Conservation Easements		Somewhat between one and two. Easements for tax shelter/estate planning purposes may or may not mesh with community objectives or smart growth goals. "phantom" extinguishments. Not necessarily strategic	
Private Land Trust		Ditto on first item. Effective in large transactions, but not always in right location for Comp Plan goals	
Public Land Trust	s/b strategic, focused, not knee jerk		
Stewardship Requirements	Future oriented model to achieve multiple measurable objectives		
Conservation Plan	If connected/Related to Public LT, Dedicated funding source		
Green Infrastructure Plan	Include ecological service provision in equation		
Dedicated Funding Source for Purchase of Open Space	See comment on Public LT and Conservation Plan		
<b>Agricultural Resource Protection</b>			
Agricultural Allowance		Improve definition of agriculture activity and alter land area	
Agricultural Assessment		This functions as double dipping at public expense	An effective analysis to prevent sole utility as a tax dodge would move this over to Cat 2. Helpful to have tax law/estate planner on board. Probably state level

Agricultural Exemptions			Practice of not requiring the environmental assessment is questionable. Analysis of env impact across TC needed
Agricultural Accessory Uses		Serious impacts and inconsistent with ag definition and req'd land area	Not useful if not tied to bonafide, defined agriculture use
Agricultural Resource Overlay		Devil in details and execution	
Agricultural Support Organization		“^^”	
<b>Conservation Design</b>			
Subdivision PRD (Conservation Subdivision)	CSU evaluation available for this entire section??		
Non-subdivision (Family Compound) PRD	“		
Conservation and limited development projects	“	x	
Conservation-oriented planned development projects	“	x	
Open Space or Cluster Zoning	“	x	
<b>Financial Land Protection Incentives</b>			
Conservation Easement Assessment			Public subsidy too high combined with federal tax breaks esp given unintended market consequences of removing land from inventory
Purchase of Development Rights (PDR)	X - tie in to Active Stewardship section		

Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES)	Innovative and may align neatly w/ NRTAB work products		
<b>Growth Management</b>			
Urban Growth Boundary	Fiscal equality and stewardship		
Sprawl Index			2 <sup>nd</sup> home inventory could skew
Urban Service Area	Needs to be paired with higher standards for private infrastructure provisions (weeds, road/septic)		
Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO)	As above, LDS would be key		
<b>Individual Resource Protection – Overall recommendation – Utilize an integrated systems approach to improve these tools for desired outcome</b>			
Natural Resources Overlay (NRO) (LDR Sec. 3270)	Overall, use systems approach to improve	“ Revise based on lessons learned	“
Scenic Resources Overlay (SRO) (LDR Div. 3300)		Revise based on lessons learned	
Vegetative cover types (LDR Sec. 3211)		Revise based on lessons learned (NRTAB)	
Water body, 10-year floodplain and wetland buffers (LDR Sec. 3220)		-Wetland banks/manmade not a 1:1 offset wetland loss or degradation -Wetland protection needs bolstering	
Environmental Assessment (LDR Sec. 3140.A)		Needs strengthening and fewer exemptions	
Mitigation Requirements		Needs strengthening and fewer exemptions	
Stormwater Management (LDR Div. 4900)		Needs strengthening and fewer exemptions NPDES water quality BMP	

Resource Conservation		Needs strengthening and fewer exemptions	See Kittitas County WA
Restoration & Mitigation Banking		See above, BMP analysis of efficacy in practice	
<b>Performance Standards</b>			
Maximum House Size		Basement loophole needs addressing	
Maximum Density		WY legislation adopted by other counties?	
Bulk and Scale			
Site Coverage			
Use Allowance		Way too many	
Use Performance Standards		Categories favors, spot zones	
Natural resources performance standards			
<b>Transfer of Development Rights</b>			
Noncontiguous PRD		Careful management, viewed w/ suspicion	
TDR Bank		X	
Enhanced TDR			
Permanent Protection Linkage Plan (PPLP)		X	
<b>Wildlife-friendly Design and Management</b>			
Wildlife Friendly Fencing (LDR Sec. 49220)		If it was applied, no specially exempted and enforced	
Wild Animal Feeding (LDR Sec. 3230)			

Vegetation Management Standards (LDR Sec. 4130, 4140)		Although, how effective is a 200 envelope? Vanity landscaping	
Outdoor Noise and Lighting Standards (LDR Table 43370.A.2)	Revise on BMP		
Bear conflict prevention and mitigation			Enforcement evaluation or records?
Domestic animal controls			Predator status for domestic dogs and cats
Wildlife Crossings			
<b>Zoning</b>			
Character Based Zoning	As long as affordable housing is part of character		
Acknowledgment Zoning			No further development of expansion
Euclidean Zoning	Hybrid will have best chance		MHP spot zoning. Euphemism for exclusionary or unfair housing
Performance Zoning	Hybrid will have best chance	Man-made water features or vanity site design should be included in site area of calculations.	
Base Site Area (Calculation of Potential based Natural Features)	Hybrid will have best chance		
Form-Based Zoning	Hybrid will have best chance		

**STAKEHOLDER EXERCISE #10**

	<b>Class 1 - Tools That Work for Teton County</b> <i>Please explain why the tool is appropriate for Teton County.</i>	<b>Class 2 - Tools that could be Modified to Fit Teton County</b> <i>Please describe the modifications needed to make the tool to fit Teton County.</i>	<b>Class 3 - Tools That Don't Work for Teton County</b> <i>Please explain why the tool is <u>not</u> appropriate for Teton County.</i>
<b>Active Stewardship</b>			
Donated Conservation Easements	Works. Includes tax oriented donation and donations with development agreements		
Private Land Trust	Ditto		
Public Land Trust	Limited to donations with development agreements		
Stewardship Requirements		What is "public open space"? Stewardship and management responsibilities should be worked out with private land trust or as part of the development agreement. Keep the fox and the hen house separate.	
Conservation Plan			Hasn't this been done via the Comp Plan?
Green Infrastructure Plan			Ditto
Dedicated Funding Source for Purchase of Open Space		Nice to think about. Public funds for public benefit. Not through exactions?	

Agricultural Resource Protection			
Agricultural Allowance	Seems OK		
Agricultural Assessment	Seems OK		
Agricultural Exemptions	No evidence that not working.		
Agricultural Accessory Uses		Rethink in the course of zoning.	
Agricultural Resource Overlay		Integrate with NRO and SRO	
Agricultural Support Organization			
Conservation Design			
Subdivision PRD (Conservation Subdivision)		Could be important in "conservation" areas under the Comp Plan where there are no real "complete neighborhood" options.	
Non-subdivision (Family Compound) PRD			
Conservation and limited development projects			Seems redundant.
Conservation-oriented planned development projects		Could be important in "conservation" areas under the Comp Plan where there are no real "complete neighborhood" options.	
Open Space or Cluster Zoning			Hard to see if the objective is to transfer development off designated parcels.
Financial Land Protection Incentives			

Conservation Easement Assessment	Continue.		
Purchase of Development Rights (PDR)			Isn't this what land trusts are already doing? Problem is finding the \$.
Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES)		Relate to stewardship responsibilities and costs	
<b>Growth Management</b>			
Urban Growth Boundary			Hard to see how UGB works with conservation area zoning called for by Comp Plan
Sprawl Index			Are we really looking at sprawl? Yet, sprawl index might be used to evaluate development plans.
Urban Service Area			Too late!
Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO)			Too late.
<b>Individual Resource Protection</b>			
Natural Resources Overlay (NRO) (LDR Sec. 3270)	Critical. Need individual EA in conjunction with development plans		
Scenic Resources Overlay (SRO) (LDR Div. 3300)	Define "foreground"!		

Vegetative cover types (LDR Sec. 3211)	Need individual EA in conjunction with development plans		
Water body, 10-year floodplain and wetland buffers (LDR Sec. 3220)	Should lead to stewardship requirements.		
Environmental Assessment (LDR Sec. 3140.A)	Stewardship requirements		
Mitigation Requirements	"Unavoidable" seems tricky.		
Stormwater Management (LDR Div. 4900)			
Resource Conservation		Address in development plan approval process	
Restoration & Mitigation Banking			Don't fully understand.
<b>Performance Standards</b>			
Maximum House Size	Societal purpose: no McMansions. Avoid by building on a hill.		
Maximum Density	Okay		
Bulk and Scale		Lot size not particularly relevant when much of the site is in permanent open space	
Site Coverage		Ditto	
Use Allowance		Protecting character is pretty subjective	

Use Performance Standards			
Natural resources performance standards		Good idea	
<b>Transfer of Development Rights</b>			
Noncontiguous PRD	Adds flexibility		
TDR Bank		Hard to imagine fundraising	
Enhanced TDR		How does Pitkin County work. Maybe a 3.	
Permanent Protection Linkage Plan (PPLP)			Don't understand
<b>Wildlife-friendly Design and Management</b>			
Wildlife Friendly Fencing (LDR Sec. 49220)	Okay		
Wild Animal Feeding (LDR Sec. 3230)	Okay		
Vegetation Management Standards (LDR Sec. 4130, 4140)	Okay		
Outdoor Noise and Lighting Standards (LDR Table 43370.A.2)		Lighting: shouldn't see the light source. Directing downward won't always work. Put lights in bushes, trees.	
Bear conflict prevention and mitigation	Okay		

Domestic animal controls		Don't know about cats. Physical restraint of dogs with exceptions for working dogs.	
Wildlife Crossings		Funding?	
<b>Zoning</b>			
Character Based Zoning		Need more sophistication	
Acknowledgment Zoning		Reconsider PUD	
Euclidean Zoning		Encourage "spot zoning" rather than CUP	
Performance Zoning		Be careful as Base Site Area is reduced not to be too harsh with site coverage outside of open space	
Base Site Area (Calculation of Potential based Natural Features)		Ditto	
Form-Based Zoning		Don't fully understand.	

**STAKEHOLDER EXERCISE #11**

	<b>Class 1 - Tools That Work for Teton County</b> <i>Please explain why the tool is appropriate for Teton County.</i>	<b>Class 2 - Tools that could be Modified to Fit Teton County</b> <i>Please describe the modifications needed to make the tool to fit Teton County.</i>	<b>Class 3 - Tools That Don't Work for Teton County</b> <i>Please explain why the tool is <u>not</u> appropriate for Teton County.</i>
<b>Active Stewardship</b>			
Donated Conservation Easements	This has worked Extremely well in Teton County		
Private Land Trust	same		
Public Land Trust	Some question as to ability to steward		
Stewardship Requirements	Teton Conservation District already provides free advice on stewardship on private and public lands		
Conservation Plan		State statute authority to tax for openspace	
Green Infrastructure Plan	This has been achieved thorough out the 2.5 % of private lands in Teton County		
Dedicated Funding Source for Purchase of Open Space		Taxing authority for transfer tax from State.	
<b>Agricultural Resource Protection</b>			
Agricultural Allowance	Allowance for ag. improvements in LDRs allow the remaining ranches to continue more economically. Size should match the State 35 acres so as to reduce confusion.		
Agricultural Assessment	This benefit may be the only reason agriculture and the openspace it provides continues to exist in the county		

Agricultural Exemptions	This has helped by allowing the use to continue without the time and cost expense of working through the LDR		
Agricultural Accessory Uses		These could be made more user friendly	
Agricultural Resource Overlay			This would chase the remaining ag users not in conservation out of the county
Agricultural Support Organization	Conservation District could do more if the ag community asked for more help but they are an independent bunch.		
<b>Conservation Design</b>			
Subdivision PRD (Conservation Subdivision)		The cost, delay, brain damage of the regulation process together with the high value because of demand for parcels exceeding 4 acres has resulted in limited use of the PRD SD	
Non-subdivision (Family Compound) PRD	This has worked well to constrain development to a limited portion of a site.		
Conservation and limited development projects	Since the majority of the un-subdivided land in the county is zoned 35 acre minimum on unit per 35 acres is a limited development conservation solution. See PRD SD above		
Conservation-oriented planned development projects			The community has discouraged this type of growth and development. Shooting Star took years and hundreds of thousands of dollars to get approved inside south park loop has been rejected again and again.
Open Space or Cluster Zoning		The tools are not acceptable and today's perceived benefit may be tomorrow's problem.	Decreases property values and provides little protection. Make existing sites more valuable but then hypocrisy is the life blood of Teton County

Financial Land Protection Incentives			
Conservation Easement Assessment	This has proven to be a great incentive to land owners.		
Purchase of Development Rights (PDR)	The JHLT has used this to great benefit of the community. The County pitched in on the South Hardeman project.		
Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES)		This could prove useful. Just pull out your wallet.	
Growth Management			
Urban Growth Boundary	We have it in current regulations and certainly in the new plan		
Sprawl Index			Un necessary in a resort community that only has less than 3% private lands especially since 35 acre parcels are now the norm.
Urban Service Area	Exist in the current regulations. More service needs to be given to those developments approved prior to 94 and especially before 1979. Nethercott, Wilson, South Park Village, High Country Sd.....		35 acre parcels are now the norm.
Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO)	Exists		
Individual Resource Protection			
Natural Resources Overlay (NRO) (LDR Sec. 3270)			Baloney overlay used to generate feed for planning staffing. What is in and what is out is unjustifiable using truly objective principles.
Scenic Resources Overlay (SRO) (LDR Div. 3300)		Poorly written	

Vegetative cover types (LDR Sec. 3211)		And what are we going to prioritize where and why. (moose browse along highway corridors?)	
Water body, 10-year floodplain and wetland buffers (LDR Sec. 3220)	This is all currently administrated. Since there is no mapping of ten year and it is always in the Floodway or water body set back there is no need except to get in the landowners face.		
Environmental Assessment (LDR Sec. 3140.A)	Great mechanism to create jobs for consultants, surely a growth industry		
Mitigation Requirements	Exist	Poorly written and administrated often unnecessary.	
Stormwater Management (LDR Div. 4900)	SWP and the G&E control permits work now. More need to be done in the urban areas and along water bodies to filter runoff		
Resource Conservation		Energy/water conservation measures in building codes perhaps adopt new toilet standards to reduce waste water energy demand for processing	
Restoration & Mitigation Banking		A mitigation banking program should be adopted so some of the large land owners could benefit by keeping openspace.	
<b>Performance Standards</b>			
Maximum House Size	Current regulations scale to the parcel size about right.	Your house is too big! Mine is too small!	
Maximum Density		One per 35 with 2 per 35 if clustered. Maybe reduce home density in existing areas. Incentivize people to tear-down and move to somewhere else.	
Bulk and Scale	Current regulations appear to work well		
Site Coverage	Working well	Reduce fire requirements to reduce coverage	

Use Allowance	This need point by point analysis most non-commercial zones working OK	Commercial areas need new zoning types to encourage more services localized.	
Use Performance Standards	Conditional uses standards can work well but they need a rewrite to encourage what the community needs		
Natural resources performance standards		Which wild life do YOU value? The ebb and flow of media attention brings public attention and outrage. Save the ????	
<b>Transfer of Development Rights</b>			
Noncontiguous PRD	Worked well at Stillson SD		Generally not economical because of housing , density, market, infrastructure requirements and time.
TDR Bank		This is a distractor. It is not generally successful unless very high density and otherwise area incentive exist. Can be used to reduce overall density and build-out by creating the perception of balance, while in reality a unused tool.	
Enhanced TDR		See above, times two	
Permanent Protection Linkage Plan (PPLP)		Ha Ha Ha Ha and maybe we can put the density in south park or next to the Aspens once the rest of Wyoming gives up the value to us because we are so under privileged.	
<b>Wildlife-friendly Design and Management</b>			
Wildlife Friendly Fencing (LDR Sec. 49220)	Regulations adopted,. Needs more encouragement (carrots) and oversight of fencing contractors.		
Wild Animal Feeding (LDR Sec. 3230)		I try to feed them as much as possible, because it makes them taste better	

Vegetation Management Standards (LDR Sec. 4130, 4140)	Regulations in place but they create some of the problem because the local animals have adapted to eat the local plants.		
Outdoor Noise and Lighting Standards (LDR Table 43370.A.2)	Lighting poorly administrated. (Flat Creek Motel) Proposal to light state hwy. 390?		
Bear conflict prevention and mitigation	This is an example of a requirement that should be county wide or not at all		
Domestic animal controls		Neutering of animals and their owners should be mandatory.	
Wildlife Crossings		Just takes enormous amounts of money	
<b>Zoning</b>			
Character Based Zoning		Very difficult to administrate. "every neighborhood should have a Captain Bob" or did you mean architecture same thing really. Shake roofs forever!	
Acknowledgment Zoning	The NC SF and BC districts were a cop-out to get the last plan approved rather than adopt zones to meet and direct the existing neighborhoods towards build out. The PUDs have worked well to achieve just this		
Euclidean Zoning	NC districts follow this and it will be a big fight to change especially where there are strict CC&Rs	Limited light industrial discourages new businesses because of high cost for space incentivizes shift to Teton Valley or Lincoln County	
Performance Zoning			Deemed undesirable in JH in the 92 plan

Base Site Area (Calculation of Potential based Natural Features)	This is used as a way to reduce densities and restrict building works well if that is the goal.		
Form-Based Zoning		Could work in complete neighborhoods not applicable to rural areas	

**TECHNICAL TEAM RESPONSE**

<p align="center"><b>Class 1 - Tools That Work for Teton County</b></p> <p align="center"><i>Please explain why the tool is appropriate for Teton County.</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Class 2 - Tools that could be Modified to Fit Teton County</b></p> <p align="center"><i>Please describe the modifications needed to make the tool to fit Teton County.</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Class 3 - Tools That Don't Work for Teton County</b></p> <p align="center"><i>Please explain why the tool is <u>not</u> appropriate for Teton County.</i></p>	
Active Stewardship			
<p>Donated Conservation Easements</p>		<p>This tool would be effective in Teton County if there were provisions for the long-term monitoring and management of the easement properties. Easements should be associated with management plans that identify conservation objectives. The degree to which these objectives are being met must be assessed through monitoring to ensure that easements are in fact providing these benefits. Often, easements are monitored only for legal compliance. Although this may ensure the protection of rural character, agricultural lands and scenic views, it is less likely to achieve other objectives of the comprehensive plan such as the conservation of wildlife habitat (Kiesecker et al. 2007). The need for biological monitoring and management has been strongly endorsed by many scientists and practitioners and will probably require a long-term funding source (see <i>dedicated funding for the purchase of open space</i>) (Merenlender et al. 2004). Finally, donated conservation easements are likely to provide the greatest benefits if they are selected strategically as part of a county-wide conservation plan (see <i>conservation plan</i>).</p>	

Private Land Trust		<p>Private land trusts play an important role in land conservation by accepting donated conservation easements. The same concerns raised above in regard to setting conservation objectives and monitoring those objectives (see <i>donated conservation easements</i>) apply to Land Trusts. In addition, land trusts should be integrally involved in a county-wide conservation plan so that they can make strategic choices about what land to prioritize for easements or purchase. This will help avoid piecemeal land conservation that does not take relative importance of the parcel into account (see <i>conservation plan</i>).</p>	
Public Land Trust		<p>See <i>private land trust</i> for comments that also apply to public land trusts.</p>	
Stewardship Requirements		<p>Most requirements associated with managing developed land are associated with the development stage rather than ongoing stewardship (see <i>environmental assessment</i> and <i>mitigation requirements</i>). Existing ordinances in other counties related to active stewardship are primarily incentive-based rather than required. For example, King County offers optional stewardship planning programs for various land uses. If landowners enroll, they receive free technical advice and some flexibility on standard regulations. Teton county may want to consider incentive-based stewardship as an alternative approach to requiring particular stewardship activities.</p>	

Conservation Plan		<p>A conservation plan can be a powerful tool for prioritizing areas for protection as well as development. We foresee some overlap between this tool and the NRO (see <i>NRO</i>) which is currently being updated. However, a conservation plan is proactive rather than restrictive. A conservation plan also provides a platform for active cooperation and shared decision-making between various organizations involved in land use decisions such as the county, cities and towns, land trusts (see <i>public and private land trust</i>), and conservation-oriented developers.</p>	
-------------------	--	---	--

<p>Green Infrastructure Plan</p>			<p>A green infrastructure plan addresses both natural (ecological) and social (community) values. These plans often include objectives beyond those applicable to rural open space conservation, such as energy conservation through green roofs, local food production, linking communities through greenways and creating pocket parks. This tool is usually applied in much larger metropolitan areas such as New York City and Chicago that encompass high density urban areas. A green infrastructure plan is often essentially a spatial expression of the comprehensive plan. We suggest, however, that a conservation plan (see <i>conservation plan</i>) would be a more effective and appropriate tool for strategic conservation of Teton County's rural lands.</p>
--------------------------------------	--	--	--

<p>Dedicated Funding Source for Purchase of Open Space</p>		<p>This is a very promising and important tool for private land conservation. Innovative programs exist in places such as Sonoma County, California. Sonoma County has a ¼ cent sales tax (residents and tourists) which raises \$15-\$18 million/year. This funding source could also be used to contribute to the costs of active stewardship and monitoring of conservation easements (see <i>donated conservation easements</i>), as well as the stewardship of purchased open space. A conservation plan (see <i>conservation plan</i>) could be used to prioritize how these funds are spent.</p> <p>Another tool for raising funds for open space purchase and preservation is the “land-cash donation ordinance” (Kendall County, IL) which simply requires the developer of every new development to donate either 5-15 acres/1000 residents of land or an equivalent cash value to the county for protection of open space for ecological and/or community benefit (e.g. small parks for recreation). Similarly, Riverside County, CA has adopted a development impact fee ordinance which collects fees from new development to protect open space and wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Finally, additional funds for purchase and stewardship of open space are often raised through private donations and non-profit partners.</p>	
--	--	---	--

Agricultural Resource Protection			
Agricultural Allowance			
Agricultural Assessment	<p>Agricultural assessments for property taxes promote agricultural preservation in Teton County and help to achieve the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. In general, tax relief programs are reported to be the most acceptable type of land preservation tool among farmers. (Zollinger &amp; Krannich 2001).</p> <p>In order to evaluate the continued effectiveness of the tool, we recommend that properties receiving agricultural assessments be mapped and monitored over time.</p>		
Agricultural Exemptions	<p>Exemption of agricultural uses from grading permits, environmental analysis, and other land development regulations promote agricultural preservation in Teton County and help to achieve the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>In order to evaluate the continued effectiveness of the tool, we recommend that properties receiving agricultural exemptions be mapped and monitored over time.</p>		

<p>Agricultural Accessory Uses</p>		<p>Allowing accessory uses that are generally compatible with agricultural uses – such as agricultural employee housing, outdoor recreational uses, and dude ranches – promotes agricultural preservation in Teton County and helps to achieve the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. In order to evaluate the continued effectiveness of the tool, we recommend that properties receiving permits for agricultural accessory units be mapped and monitored over time.</p> <p>Agricultural properties that include accessory uses could be further encouraged to meet other Comprehensive Plan objectives – such as conserving open space for wildlife habitat and scenic character – if those uses were subject to additional guidelines and incentives regarding design and stewardship (for example, see <i>stewardship requirements, subdivision PRD, and natural resources performance standards</i>).</p>	
--	--	--	--

<p>Agricultural Resource Overlay</p>		<p>Analogous to the <i>natural resources overlay</i> and <i>scenic resources overlay</i> currently in effect in Teton County, an agricultural resources overlay could be designated to identify important areas for protection of agricultural lands and operations. This tool could be used to address two major objectives of agricultural resource protection: (1) Limit non-agricultural land uses that are incompatible with or may negatively impact agricultural operations; and/or (2) Systematically identify and strategically protect prime farm and ranch lands.</p> <p>For example, Park County, WY, addresses the first objective by identifying important agricultural areas of the county for application of special development requirements designed to promote the continuation of agriculture. Specifically, the Board of County Commissioners or Planning &amp; Zoning Commission review all discretionary development applications within Park County's agricultural overlay district and adjoining lands to identify potential negative impacts to commercial agriculture.</p> <p>An agricultural resources overlay could also help Teton County to incentivize strategic conservation of agricultural lands by purchase of land or development rights, or transfer of development rights, from priority lands within the overlay district (see <i>purchase of development rights, payments for ecosystem services, or transfer of development rights</i>).</p>	
--------------------------------------	--	--	--

<p>Agricultural Support Organization</p>		<p>An agricultural support organization, defined as a group that supports farmers and ranchers and promotes the continuation of agriculture in a community, is an additional tool that could help Teton County to achieve the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>For example, Eastern Summit County, UT, appoints an Agricultural Protection Advisory Board, which advises county officials regarding designation of agricultural protection areas and promotion of agricultural production. Additional activities of such an organization could include enhancing the profitability of agriculture by sponsoring marketing efforts and promoting the educational and recreational services provided by farmers (Freedgood 1997).</p>	
--	--	---	--

<p>Subdivision PRD (Conservation Subdivision)</p>		<p>Conservation subdivisions have the potential to meet many comprehensive plan objectives such as encouraging development that includes quality open space (Pejchar et al. 2007). However, the few studies that have compared the value of the open space on these properties to conventional development suggest that these objectives will probably only be met if the following provisions, which could be added or strengthened in the current LDR for Teton County, are adopted for current and future PRD projects (Reed et al. in review): 1) Ecological site analysis must occur prior to development to locate homes away from important ecological areas. This analysis should fundamentally drive decisions on configuration of homes in the subdivision and should occur prior to the design stage of development. This analysis will also provide the information needed to develop a management plan for the protected area. 2) The open space portion of these projects should be continuous with adjacent public or private open space to allow movement of wildlife. 3) The development should be designed to minimize habitat fragmentation by excluding linear clusters of homes. Ecological studies have demonstrated that houses have a “halo” effect on birds and mammals – resulting in a net increase in human adapted species and decrease in sensitive species (Odell and Knight 2001). 5) Long-term monitoring and stewardship of the protected area (see <i>donated conservation easements</i>).</p>	
---	--	---	--

Non-subdivision (Family Compound) PRD		See <i>Subdivision PRD</i> for similar recommendations in regard to the design and stewardship of the open space portion of these development projects.	
Conservation and limited development projects		Because these projects are built out at well under the allowable density, they would probably be initiated by a conservation minded landowner or a land trust seeking to expand their portfolio of conservation lands in a way that offsets some of the costs of conservation (Milder 2007). The county could choose to provide incentives such as a stream-lined permitting process to encourage such clustered, low-density development.	
Conservation-oriented planned development projects		Mixed residential/commercial conservation development projects are no longer permitted in the County. However, several were built under previous development regulations. Our recommendation is to encourage active stewardship of open lands on the existing properties using some of the mechanisms outlined above (see <i>donated conservation easements</i> and <i>dedicated funding for the purchase of open space</i> ).	

<p>Open Space or Cluster Zoning</p>			<p>Cluster zoning mandates clustered development within a portion of a county. It is not clear that cluster zoning would add much benefit beyond existing Teton County tools such as subdivision PRD, and existing zoning regulations. The most important difference is that cluster zoning would require rather than encourage clustering. We emphasize that cluster development alone is not enough to meet the conservation objectives in the comprehensive plan. In order to protect these wildlife, scenic, water and agricultural resources, provisions for ecological site assessment, stewardship and monitoring must be in place. We suggest that PRD (with the additional provisions suggested above) would be a stronger tool for meeting these objectives.</p>
<p>Financial Land Protection Incentives</p>			

<p>Conservation Easement Assessment</p>		<p>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. Landowners could receive tax benefits on a sliding scale according to the conservation value and ongoing stewardship of the resources on the open space portion of their property. This is another way to incentivize good stewardship without requiring it and these benefits could be dependent on the landowner completing a stewardship plan in order to receive proper technical advice (see <i>stewardship requirements</i>). Pima County uses metrics such as wildlife habitat quality for species of concern, and maintaining movement corridors (adjacency to open space).</p>	
<p>Purchase of Development Rights (PDR)</p>		<p>This is a viable mechanism for protecting open space if funds are available (see <i>dedicated funding source for purchase of open space</i>). Conservation benefits will only accrue with appropriate stewardship and monitoring (see <i>donated conservation easements</i>). PDR is often a mechanism for transfer of development rights (see <i>TDR</i>).</p>	

<p>Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES)</p>		<p>A PES program in Teton County could act as a performance-based incentive system that funds resource management practices that result in beneficial environmental outcomes. The county and other stakeholders would play an important role in identifying resources that the community wants to protect and restore and in raising funds (see <i>dedicated funding for open space</i>) to support the program. In other counties, PES programs have or will focus on access to private land for rare plant or animal surveys, “carbon ranching”, or the expansion of suitable habitat for species of concern.</p>	
<p>Growth Management</p>			

<p>Urban Growth Boundary</p>		<p>An urban growth boundary (UGB) identifies and separates land that will be available for future growth from land that is designated to be protected. To achieve the Comprehensive Plan objectives of directing development toward complete neighborhoods and reducing development potential in rural areas, Teton County could designate the boundaries of Stable and Transitional neighborhoods as UGBs, assuming that their capacity is sufficient to accommodate the County’s anticipated future housing growth and economic development. Determining the capacity of these areas would require completing a population growth projection, taking an inventory of existing public facilities and their capacity, and assessing the community’s needs for different land uses and facilities in the future.</p> <p>In other communities (e.g., Cochise County, AZ), however, UGBs have had the undesirable effect of contributing to rural sprawl. Specifically, establishment of UGBs has led to “spillovers,” or the spatial shifts of population growth and development from growth-controlled localities to adjoining jurisdictions with few or no growth controls (Byun &amp; Esparza 2005). This challenge would potentially limit the effectiveness of UGBs for reducing development potential in the rural county and managing local growth with a regional perspective.</p> <p>To meet that challenge, UGBs could be integrated with tools that simultaneously address development in rural areas – for example, designated as receiving areas in a TDR program (see <i>transfer of development rights</i>).</p>	
------------------------------	--	---	--

Sprawl Index		<p>Various measures are used to quantify the degree of sprawl, “ecological footprint,” or the location efficiency of development in terms of land and energy consumption. Sprawl indices commonly include measures of development density, the proximity of jobs and services, and the accessibility of transportation and other infrastructure.</p> <p>Sprawl indices are typically used to evaluate entire communities and compare them to one another (e.g., Riverside, CA, was the most sprawling metropolitan area surveyed in 2002) and to relate development pattern to human health, social interaction, and ecological integrity (e.g., Ewing et al. 2006).</p> <p>A similar approach 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 and reducing development potential in rural areas. For example, a sprawl index could be used as a performance measure for determining density or to delineate sending versus receiving areas in a TDR program (see <i>enhanced TDR</i>).</p> <p>However, we are not aware of any examples of a sprawl index being implemented as a tool in a local community. Potential downsides for Teton County are that this tool is untested in other communities and may be complex to design and administer.</p>	
--------------	--	---	--

Urban Service Area		An urban service area (USA) defines the area beyond which a municipality will not provide public infrastructure such as roads, sewer, and water lines. The boundary of a USA may be the same as that of a UGB, or it may be within the boundary of a UGB. The purpose of a USA is to restrict development to areas with existing services or for which the addition of services is planned. Thus, establishment of USAs has many of the same potential benefits and challenges for Teton County as designation of UGBs (see <i>urban growth boundary</i> ).	
Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO)			
<b>Individual Resource Protection</b>			
Natural Resources Overlay (NRO) (LDR Sec. 3270)		The NRO is currently being updated to incorporate tiered mapping of ecological values. With updated and tiered information on important areas for wildlife habitat and movement, NRO will be a powerful tool for limiting the impacts of development on wildlife in these areas. NRO should be used in tandem with other tools (see <i>conservation plan, TDR, PDR, dedicated funding for open space, PES, natural resource performance standards and stewardship requirements</i> ).	
Scenic Resources Overlay (SRO) (LDR Div. 3300)	SRO is an appropriate tool for protecting scenic resources. This is an explicit objective of the comprehensive plan which includes policies for maintaining natural skylines, expansive hillsides and foreground vistas.		

<p>Vegetative cover types (LDR Sec. 3211)</p>	<p>Mapping vegetation cover classes is a useful tool for protecting wildlife (see <i>NRO</i>), prioritizing land for protection (see <i>donated conservation easements, PDR, TDR, conservation plan</i>) and for informing mitigation if disturbance is unavoidable. It may be useful to use sensitivity analysis to assess the degree to which ranking vegetation types in this manner results in various development and conservation decisions.</p>		
---	--	--	--

<p>Water body, 10-year floodplain and wetland buffers (LDR Sec. 3220)</p>	<p>Existing buffer distances are consistent with published literature which suggests that buffers around streams and wetlands be at least 15-30m under most conditions (Castelle et al. 1994). However, up to 200m buffers may be necessary to meet some objectives. Buffer widths at the lower end of this range are likely to protect physical and chemical characteristics of stream resources; larger buffer widths may be necessary to protect the biological components of these systems. For example, a review found that core habitat for reptiles and amphibians generally ranges from 150-290m from aquatic sites (Semlitsch and Bodie 2003). This information is also relevant to the effective use of other tools (see recommendations for <i>PRD</i> and other types of rural development, <i>conservation plan</i>, <i>NRO</i>, <i>stewardship requirements</i>, and <i>environmental assessment</i>). We suggest that the county spatially map current buffers around these resources and use this information to assess the degree to which current buffers are functionally protecting streams/rivers, wetlands, and lakes and associated biological communities of interest.</p>		
---	--	--	--

<p>Environmental Assessment (LDR Sec. 3140.A)</p>	<p>The existing environmental assessment tool addresses many of the objectives of the comprehensive plan. Other characteristics of areas proposed for development that could be assessed include wildlife corridors (connectivity to open space and development on landscape scale; see <i>conservation plan</i>). Other tools (<i>NRO, buffers, vegetation cover types</i>) interact with this tool to provide information needed, where relevant, for conservation design (see <i>PRD</i>) and mitigation (see <i>mitigation requirements and restoration and mitigation banking</i>). This information could also be used to make decisions on priorities for <i>donated conservation easements</i> or <i>PDR</i> and <i>TDR</i>. We suggest evaluating whether EA has been effective in avoiding and mitigating threats to valued natural resources in Teton County to date – and if, and to what extent, projects exempted from EA requirements have led to a net loss of these resources.</p>		
---	---	--	--

Mitigation Requirements	Existing tool is quite strong and includes most components of wetland mitigation that are most likely to result in achieving the goals of the comprehensive plan (BEST 2001). Decisions on whether to do on-site or off-site mitigation should be made based on the current conditions of the site and the characteristics of the watershed (see <i>conservation plan</i> ). In addition, long-term stewardship and monitoring is crucial to ensuring that wetland mitigation is self-sustaining. Also see <i>restoration and mitigation banking</i> for a third-party compensation approach that could compliment the county's primary focus on on-site wetland mitigation.		
Stormwater Management (LDR Div. 4900)	Existing tool is consistent with several policies in the comprehensive plan including "require filtration of runoff".		
Resource Conservation		This approach seems reasonable but is difficult to evaluate because we have not found model ordinances that address water resource issues beyond <i>stormwater management</i> and <i>buffers</i> for new development. Most other water conservation efforts seem to focus on education, technical assistance and incentive based programs targeting landowners.	

Restoration & Mitigation Banking		<p>This tool is only relevant if there is development pressure on wetlands or some other habitat or resource that could be mitigated off site. Frequently cited benefits of mitigation banking are: 1) developers (who probably don't have the proper expertise) are no longer responsible for the design, construction, monitoring and maintenance of wetlands on or off-site, 2) this approach is preferred by the developer. It is usually more cost-effective because of the high land values and extensive time associated with permitting on-site mitigation, and 3) wetland mitigation results in strategic rather than piece-meal conservation and restoration of wetlands (see conservation plan). In contrast, several recent studies report that wetland mitigation banks are not more successful in achieving ecological objectives compared with individual mitigation efforts. Most studies conclude that to date wetland mitigation has not proven to be an effective conservation tool and at a national scale is resulting in a net loss (up to 80% of acres and function) of wetlands (Kihslinger 2008). . Strict performance standards (see mitigation) could help overcome some of these shortcomings.</p>	
----------------------------------	--	--	--

Performance Standards

<p>Maximum House Size</p>	<p>Limitations on the Maximum Scale of Development help Teton County to buffer natural water bodies from development, protect scenic resources, and maintain rural character. Additional objectives of the Comprehensive Plan that are addressed by this tool include reducing consumption of non-renewable energy and increasing energy efficiency in buildings.</p> <p>As house size increases, a greater proportion of land is occupied, resource use for construction increases, increased impervious surface results in more surface water runoff, and energy consumption increases. Increased floor area per household will increase energy use and material demand disproportionately to population growth (Kaye et al. 2006). A smaller house built to only moderate energy-performance standards uses substantially less energy for heating and cooling than does a larger house built to very high energy-performance standards (Wilson &amp; Boehland 2005). On the other hand, when wood building materials are used, increasing house size results in a greater amount of carbon storage in residential landscapes (Churkina et al. 2010).</p> <p>We are not aware of any studies that specifically relate house size to other Conservation Plan objectives, such as protecting wildlife from the impacts of development or designing for wildlife permeability.</p>		
---------------------------	---	--	--

<p>Maximum Density</p>		<p>The Rural zoning district of Teton County has a maximum density of 1 unit per 35 acres. Large-lot zoning is a tool commonly used by communities to discourage development or reduce development potential in areas that are less environmentally suitable for development or are priorities for protection of open space, wildlife habitat, or rural character.</p> <p>Large-lot zoning does reduce development densities, but with expanding transportation and communications infrastructure, it has not slowed rural land conversion. In the conterminous U.S., the area occupied by low-density residential (i.e., exurban) development has increased five-fold since 1950 (Brown et al. 2005) and is expected to expand by an additional 14 percent by 2020 (Theobald 2005). Exurban development increases per capita land consumption and spreads the potential negative impacts of development – including impacts to open space, wildlife habitat, and agricultural resources – over a larger area (Hansen et al. 2005).</p> <p>Although maximum density standards may continue to be an important technique for regulating development potential in rural areas of Teton County, they should be applied in conjunction with other planning tools to achieve the Conservation Plan objectives of protecting wildlife habitat and scenic resources and maintaining rural character (see <i>subdivision PRD, purchase of development rights, and transfer of development rights</i>).</p>	
------------------------	--	--	--

Bulk and Scale	<p>Floor Area Ratio (FAR) standards address the Comprehensive Plan objectives of buffering natural water bodies from development, protecting scenic resources, and maintaining rural character. Typically adopted to address concerns regarding impervious surface coverage and surface water runoff, FAR standards are a much more common means to regulate the scale of development than establishment of a maximum house size. However, unlike a maximum house size, FAR standards typically do not address concerns regarding energy use and material demand for construction (see <i>maximum house size</i>).</p>		
Site Coverage	<p>Maximum Site Development standards address the Comprehensive Plan objectives of buffering natural water bodies from development and protecting wildlife habitat and scenic resources. Typically adopted to address concerns regarding impervious surface coverage and surface water runoff, site coverage standards do not address concerns regarding energy use and material demand for construction (see <i>maximum house size</i>). The current regulation exempts a portion of the driveway area from the calculation if an improved design better preserves scenic resources and natural vegetation and minimizes impacts on wildlife habitat.</p>		
Use Allowance			
Use Performance Standards			

<p>Natural resources performance standards</p>		<p>Additional performance standards could be established 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.</p> <p>Most available examples of design and stewardship standards for wildlife habitat and other natural resources are regulatory rather than performance-based. For example, the Protection of Wildlife Habitat Areas section of the Gunnison County, CO, Land Use Resolution applies additional site analysis and review requirements on development proposals that occur within or near Gunnison sage-grouse habitat. Similarly, Resource Protection Standards in the City of Fort Collins, CO, apply to developments located within 500 feet of an area identified as a natural habitat or feature, require an ecological characterization study and establishment of buffer zones in the site design, and restrict development activities within the buffer zones.</p> <p>These examples could be adapted as performance standards linked to development potential or other benefits (e.g., as in the Growth Management Quota System of Pitkin County, CO; also see <i>performance zoning</i>). Alternately, they could be implemented through the design and stewardship requirements of other planning tools under consideration (for example, see <i>natural resources overlay</i> and <i>wildlife-friendly design and management</i>).</p>	
<p>Transfer of Development Rights</p>			

<p>Noncontiguous PRD</p>		<p>A noncontiguous planned residential development (PRD) helps to meet the Comprehensive Plan objectives of directing development toward complete neighborhoods and reducing development potential in rural areas. However, the tool is used very infrequently (i.e., in only one transaction), suggesting that there is not demand for the tool in Teton County, incentives are not sufficient, or it is too complex to administer.</p> <p>If Teton County chooses to retain noncontiguous PRD as a tool for transferring development potential, then we suggest incorporating additional guidelines and incentives for design and stewardship to ensure that the resulting projects are encouraged to meet other Comprehensive Plan objectives – such as conserving open space for wildlife habitat and scenic character (see <i>subdivision PRD</i>).</p>	
--------------------------	--	--	--

<p>TDR Bank</p>		<p>Establishing a transfer of development rights (TDR) program, supported by a TDR bank, 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.</p> <p>Research has shown that in communities that have implemented effective TDR programs, the key factors for success include: (1) Sufficient demand for bonus development; (2) Definition of adequate receiving areas; (3) Strict sending-area development regulations; (4) Few alternatives to TDR for achieving additional development; (5) Market incentives; (6) Certainty in the approval process; (7) Strong public support for preservation; (8) Simplicity; (9) TDR program promotion and facilitation; and (10) Establishment of a TDR bank.</p> <p>Some of these factors are already in place in Teton County (e.g., 1, 2, 7), and many others could be addressed through the Land Development Regulations update (e.g., 3, 4, 5, 6, 8). A TDR bank can play multiple roles in a community (e.g., 9, 10), and communities that have created TDR banks are among the most successful in the U.S., accounting for more than half of the land preserved by all leading programs combined (Pruetz &amp; Standridge 2008).</p> <p>Additionally, according to municipal planners who direct and operate TDR programs, TDR is more successful in communities that also have purchase of development rights (PDR) programs (Kaplowitz et al. 2008). Possible</p>	
-----------------	--	--	--

<p>Enhanced TDR</p>		<p>In enhanced transfer of development rights (TDR) program, the amount of transferable development is subject to certain performance standards, such as the habitat, scenic or agricultural value of land preserved in the sending area, or on the merits of the proposed development in the receiving area. The performance criteria for new development could be related to impacts on public services and infrastructure or environmental resources (e.g., Growth Management Quota System in Pitkin County, CO).</p> <p>Possible limitations of this approach are that it 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 (Pruetz &amp; Standridge 2008). Potential development of an enhanced TDR program in Teton County 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 (for example, see <i>stewardship requirements</i>, <i>natural resources overlay</i>, and <i>natural resources performance standards</i>).</p>	
---------------------	--	---	--

<p>Permanent Protection Linkage Plan (PPLP)</p>		<p>It appears that this program would function similarly to a standard transfer of development rights (TDR) program, in which development potential is transferred from areas that are a high priority for preservation (i.e., rural areas) to areas where growth is desirable and infrastructure and services already exist (i.e., complete neighborhoods). However, in a typical TDR program, the development rights are transferred directly from sellers in the sending area to buyers in the receiving area; in the PPLP program, it appears that the development rights would be allocated by the Town on a performance basis to individual projects (see <i>enhanced TDR</i>), although specific performance standards are not described. It 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.</p>	
<p>Wildlife-friendly Design and Management</p>			

<p>Wildlife Friendly Fencing (LDR Sec. 49220)</p>		<p>According to Hanophy (2009) the following modifications to the existing code would be beneficial to wildlife:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ALL fences should be no higher than 40 inches</li> <li>2. bottom wire should be at least 16 inches up from ground</li> <li>3. top wire should be designed to be permanently visible</li> <li>4. loose wires should not be permitted</li> <li>5. fences should not be constructed on steep slopes</li> <li>6. fences should allow access to riparian areas and other important habitat</li> <li>7. woven wire fence is highly lethal and should be prohibited</li> <li>8. adjacent landowners should not have two fences in close parallel to each other</li> </ol> <p>We also recommend that the county assess current wildlife mortality due to fencing. If significant, perhaps some old fencing should be replaced.</p>	
<p>Wild Animal Feeding (LDR Sec. 3230)</p>	<p>We think the existing tool meets the objectives of the comprehensive plan of limiting human-wildlife conflict. The current language in the LDR is better conceived than most other ordinances we have found on this topic.</p>		

<p>Vegetation Management Standards (LDR Sec. 4130, 4140)</p>	<p>The existing tool is likely to help achieve the comprehensive plan objective of protecting wildlife from the impacts of development. Incentives and/or education programs to encourage wildlife-friendly native landscaping within 200ft of homes could also be beneficial to wildlife. Alternatively, model ordinances do exist for requiring 30-100% of all private property to be landscaped with native species, native trees, and/or waterwise species (Florida Native Plant Society Handbook). However, there may need to be language in the comprehensive plan specifically calling for native landscaping in order to justify such a change to the code.</p>		
<p>Outdoor Noise and Lighting Standards (LDR Table 43370.A.2)</p>	<p>Important restrictions on outdoor lighting and noise, such as downward directed light, are already in place. The degree to which light and noise levels impact wildlife is dependent on the species/taxa, the intensity/frequency of the noise or light source, background or natural noise and light and topography (Longcore and Rich 2004; Barber et al. 2010). Specific recommendations would follow from a discussion of species or groups of species of concern and may be relevant to the NRO (see <i>NRO</i>).</p>		

Bear conflict prevention and mitigation	We think the existing tool meets the objectives of the comprehensive plan of limiting human-wildlife conflict. It may be useful to track the location and nature of bear conflict incidents in the county to detect trends and consider whether additional provisions are necessary.		
Domestic animal controls		Many studies have shown that free-ranging dogs and cats can have devastating impacts on wildlife (Lepczyk et al. 2004; Lenth et al. 2008). These data argue for restraining dogs outside homes and for including provisions for reporting and correcting situations where dogs and cats are observed to be harassing wildlife.	
Wildlife Crossings		Facilitating the safe crossing of wildlife across roads benefits both wildlife and human well-being (Foster and Humphrey 1995). We suggest that the NRO should highlight those areas which appear important for wildlife movement and where conflicts have occurred most often (if these data are available), in order to minimize additional development/roads in these areas. The NRO combined with a conservation plan tool should be used to identify and enable projects to design, permit and build structures to minimize encounters between motorists and wildlife (see King County, WA critical areas ordinance).	

<p>Character Based Zoning</p>		<p>The Rural zoning district of Teton County has a minimum lot size of 35 acres. Large-lot zoning is a tool commonly used by communities to discourage development or reduce development potential in areas that are less environmentally suitable for development or are priorities for protection of open space, wildlife habitat, or rural character.</p> <p>Large-lot zoning does reduce development densities, but with expanding transportation and communications infrastructure, it has not slowed rural land conversion. In the conterminous U.S., the area occupied by low-density residential (i.e., exurban) development has increased five-fold since 1950 (Brown et al. 2005) and is expected to expand by an additional 14 percent by 2020 (Theobald 2005). Exurban development increases per capita land consumption and spreads the potential negative impacts of development – including impacts to open space, wildlife habitat, and agricultural resources – over a larger area (Hansen et al. 2005).</p> <p>Although minimum lot sizes may continue to be an important technique for regulating development potential in the Rural zoning district of Teton County, they should be applied in conjunction with other planning tools to achieve the Conservation Plan objectives of protecting wildlife habitat and scenic resources and maintaining rural character (see <i>subdivision PRD, purchase of development rights, and transfer of development rights</i>).</p>	
-------------------------------	--	--	--

Acknowledgment Zoning		This tool applies to existing PUDs in Teton County. See <i>conservation-oriented planned development projects</i> for recommendations on how to steward the open space portions of these projects in ways that will help achieve objectives of the comprehensive plan such as protecting wildlife habitat.	
Euclidean Zoning			
Performance Zoning		Performance zoning, which allocates development potential on the basis of performance metrics, 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 (see <i>natural resources overlay</i> and <i>natural resources performance standards</i> ).	
Base Site Area (Calculation of Potential based Natural Features)			
Form-Based Zoning			

**STAFF RESPONSE**

	Pros	Cons	Questions/Ideas
<b>Active Stewardship</b>			
Donated Conservation Easements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-development conservation is encouraged by the Comp Plan</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Comp Plan calls for conservation to protect habitat scenery and open space. Easements for the sake of prohibiting future rezoning are not a goal of the Comp Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the balance between allowing development to encourage easement donation of a conservation buyer and allowing the development to occur?</li> <li>• How do we encourage conservation buyers to invest in Teton County?</li> <li>• How do we encourage easements on existing lots of record in Conservation Subareas?</li> </ul>
Private Land Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides public benefit without public cost.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the JHLT need new easements each year to sustain?</li> <li>• Stewardship fees deter some landowners from donating easements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What Teton County/JHLT partnerships can be developed to incorporate Comp Plan policy into JHLT mission?</li> <li>• What can the County do to support the health of the JHLT?</li> </ul>
Public Land Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public subsidy of stewardship reduces financial burden on easement donator</li> <li>• TCSPT could also implement other tools listed below with direct tie to Comprehensive Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TCSPT would have to be restaffed and refunded to provide the benefit of active stewardship</li> <li>• TCSPT should not take easements that do not achieve goals of the Comprehensive Plan</li> <li>• Standards (Division 4300) for TCSPT easements should be updated based on difficulties will past “donut” easements and “backyard” easements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
Stewardship Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achieves desired conservation without having to obtain conservation easement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requiring action is difficult to monitor and enforce</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What best practices from conservation easement stewardship can be incorporated into LDRs</li> <li>• Or potential turned into TCSPT or TCD programs?</li> </ul>

Conservation Plan	•	•	• How can the mapping of relative habitat value, the SRO, and agricultural lands guide conservation efforts without “targeting” specific landowners?
Green Infrastructure Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Comp Plan identifies this type of idea for town – a green network connecting parks and trailheads</li> <li>• The Comp Plan also calls for active recreation opportunities to be provided responsibly in order to relieve pressure on public lands.</li> </ul>	•	•
Dedicated Funding Source for Purchase of Open Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows for active stewardship, without necessarily having to purchase development rights.</li> <li>• Might be a role for the TCSPT or perhaps a partnership with the JHLT</li> <li>• Funds could also be used for public – private partnership purchases of development rights</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional funding is not readily available</li> </ul>	•
<b>Agricultural Resource Protection</b>			
Agricultural Allowance	• Works well	• 70 acre requirement might make more sense for exemptions than for actual agriculture use	•
Agricultural Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Works well to encourage continued agriculture which is a goal of the Comp Plan</li> <li>• Requirement to prove ag production could be used in conjunction with other tools</li> </ul>	•	• What can be done locally given statutory requirements?
Agricultural Exemptions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work well to keep agriculture active</li> <li>• Questions with regard to definition of agriculture (70 acres and proof of production) most often stem from exemption requests</li> <li>• Need to make sure sited</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exemptions for additional development have potential to create post-agriculture nonconformities than process exemptions</li> <li>• Wildlife Friendly Fencing exemption</li> </ul>	• Are there any regulations that are impeding agriculture at this point?

	development and floor area exemptions are enough	should be reviewed to balance Comp Plan goals	
Agricultural Accessory Uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow agriculture operations to supplement their ag operation and keep it viable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regulations should be clarified regarding requirements for uses that are actually accessory to ag vs. uses that are ag in character</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
Agricultural Resource Overlay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seems like it would work well for areas adjacent to ag that are impacting the ability for continued ag</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For lands in ag, a zoning classification catering to those needs is an alternative consistent with Comp Plan goal of predictable base zoning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there areas where adjacent land uses are impacting ag and additional protections are needed?</li> </ul>
Agricultural Support Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Might be able to identify suitable ag land not in production and conglomerate such pieces</li> <li>• The County might be able to meet with such an organization to monitor the utility of the above tools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is this support desired by ranchers farmers?</li> <li>• What support services would be helpful?</li> </ul>
<b>Conservation Design</b>			
Subdivision PRD (Conservation Subdivision)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comp Plan calls for clustered development with a better development pattern than 1/35</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allowing division of a 22.3 acre property does not achieve better clustering than 1/35</li> <li>• Need better clustering requirements, need better definition of desired open space that is tied to landscape level analysis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do you make cluster subdivision more enticing than selling 35s?</li> <li>• Could you allow provision of housing for descendants as incentive, maybe with allowance for transferable deed restriction?</li> </ul>
Non-subdivision (Family Compound) PRD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has resulted in a number of conservation easements by allowing more development, but not functionally increasing units</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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rewards 35 acre division</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there value in a larger guest house that will produce easements either by quid-pro-quo or donation, without the possibility for additional units?</li> </ul>
Conservation and limited development projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1/35 base zoning does not promote this paradigm. Goal can be achieved through PRD design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

Conservation-oriented planned development projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PUDs/large PRDs create communities separated from our Complete Neighborhoods</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
Open Space or Cluster Zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistent with Comp Plan goals of achieving cross lot clustering.</li> <li>Should be based on wildlife information and design best practices to identify best clustering in an area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decisions of neighbors impact the "last person in"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Financial Land Protection Incentives</b>			
Conservation Easement Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy in place does give local incentive for the presence of a conservation easements</li> <li>Tying the incentive to the goals of the Comprehensive Plan might incentivize higher quality open space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Current low quality easements such as "backyard" easement make assessment difficult without providing community benefit</li> <li>Changing current rules would require work at the state level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
Purchase of Development Rights (PDR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Achieves goal of reducing development potential in rural areas</li> <li>Might have application in Conservation Subareas where the Comp Plan goal is reducing the amount of development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The money required per unit, might preclude any public PDR work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are landowners looking to sell development rights in order to keep their land?</li> </ul>
Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May be a way to encourage landowners to "do the right thing" in relation to findings from the habitat connection study</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding would have to be identified</li> <li>Many possible uses are already regulated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Growth Management</b>			
Urban Growth Boundary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would be a codification of the Complete Neighborhood/Rural idea</li> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May not be necessary if zoning matches Comp Plan, the policy is already in place it's a matter of implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

Sprawl Index	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not predictable as a case-by-case evaluation tool, but could be useful in front end planning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
Urban Service Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Might be a consideration if annexation pressure becomes an issue</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not applicable to our paradigm given lack of County utilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requiring/encouraging community water and sewer might improve natural resource conservation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May not be applicable to our paradigm given lack of County utilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
Quota System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Directly addresses the location of growth targets in the Comp Plan</li> <li>• Comp Plan states that our economic sustainability should not rely on growth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires either first come/first serve program or scoring system that would add complexity</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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Individual Resource Protection</b>			
Natural Resources Overlay (NRO) (LDR Sec. 3270)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 and should be considered in relation to other tools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specifics should be left to NRTAB process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
Scenic Resources Overlay (SRO) (LDR Div. 3300)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specifics should be left to SRO discussion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
Vegetative cover types (LDR Sec. 3211)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specifics should be left to NRTAB process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does vegetative cover matter outside the context of habitat? What are the other considerations?</li> </ul>
Water body, 10-year floodplain and wetland buffers (LDR Sec. 3220)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 year floodplain is not defined by FEMA. Goal would be better achieved by protection of riparian vegetation.</li> <li>• Specifics should be left to NRTAB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

		process	
Environmental Assessment (LDR Sec. 3140.A)	•	• Specifics should be left to NRTAB process	•
Mitigation Requirements	•	• Specifics should be left to NRTAB process	•
Stormwater Management (LDR Div. 4900)	•	• Specifics should be left to NRTAB process or other discussion	•
Resource Conservation	•	• Specifics should be left to another discussion	•
Restoration & Mitigation Banking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could be part of valuing conservation easements, consistent with the relative value of habitats</li> <li>• A program similar to the EMP that placed fees on non essential habitat alternations could fund mitigation work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specifics should be left to NRTAB process</li> <li>• Requires monitoring and implementation resources</li> </ul>	•
<b>Performance Standards</b>			
Maximum House Size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important for protecting against housing and environmental impacts.</li> <li>• Should include basements based on justification upheld by the supreme court</li> <li>• Comp Plan calls for a look into incentive for conservation easements be created by allowing additional floor are in exchange</li> </ul>	•	•
Maximum Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 per 35 maximum density is consistent with Comp Plan goals for rural areas - new lots at lesser density is not</li> <li>• Allowing multiple units on a single parcel at 1/35 density should be examined as means to avoid 35s</li> </ul>	•	•
Bulk and Scale	• In the rural areas form may not need	• Should be organized by district, not	•

	any more regulation than the FAR and max building size	use. The FAR/LSR, etc shouldn't change by use within a district.	
Site Coverage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape surface versus impervious surface should be evaluated from a wildlife standpoint to determine which standard make most sense in rural areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See above.</li> <li>• Impervious surface is easier to administer and comprehend for the general public</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
Use Allowance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use allowances should be reviewed to determine which are really appropriate in rural areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use should be consolidated</li> <li>• Institutional/commercial uses other than those of an ag character should not be located in remote rural areas according to the Comp Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
Use Performance Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure goals of a district are addressed by each use – these standards could be district specific</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be limited to protecting character and don't need to be so use specific – they could be district specific as well</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
Natural resources performance standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basing allowed development on natural constraints is consistent with Comp Plan policy</li> <li>• Base site area and net site area makes sense to most people</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determining allowed development through a sites specific EA might not achieve the desired predictability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Transfer of Development Rights</b>			
Noncontiguous PRD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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</li> <li>• Enhanced TDR concepts of tying multipliers to natural value of land conserved might be applicable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
TDR Bank	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good in theory</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demand for development in receiving areas is lower than sending areas</li> <li>• Allowed development in receiving areas is not higher than</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Won't work financially, demand for development in receiving areas is not high enough</li> <li>• Good in theory</li> </ul>

Enhanced TDR	•	•	• Combination of noncontiguous PRD and TDR comments
Permanent Protection Linkage Plan (PPLP)	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addresses upzoning in complete neighborhoods more than conservation of rural areas</li> <li>• Restricts achievement of complete neighborhood goals based on purchase or donation of conservation easements</li> </ul>	• Upzoning more than is eliminated through conservation easement is not the Plan nor the past trend
<b>Wildlife-friendly Design and Management</b>			
Wildlife Friendly Fencing (LDR Sec. 49220)	• Leave to NRTAB to enhance, can complement any base zoning provisions	•	•
Wild Animal Feeding (LDR Sec. 3230)	• Leave to NRTAB to enhance, can complement any base zoning provisions	•	•
Vegetation Management Standards (LDR Sec. 4130, 4140)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leave to NRTAB to enhance, can complement any base zoning provisions</li> <li>• Look at native species that are also attractants</li> </ul>	•	•
Outdoor Noise and Lighting Standards (LDR Table 43370.A.2)	• Leave to NRTAB to enhance, can complement any base zoning provisions	•	•
Bear conflict prevention and mitigation	• Leave to NRTAB to enhance, can complement any base zoning provisions	•	•
Domestic animal controls	• Leave to NRTAB to enhance, can complement any base zoning provisions	• Pet enforcement is difficult	•
Wildlife Crossings	• Leave to NRTAB to enhance, can complement any base zoning provisions	•	•
<b>Zoning</b>			

Character Based Zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be the focus based on the Comp Plan</li> <li>• Multiple Rural zones based on desired character are called for by the Comp Plan and will allow many of the ideas above to be implemented predictably through base zoning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could a character zone be placed under/ over a PUD so that revisions and amendments to PUDs have direction?</li> </ul>
Acknowledgment Zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regulations should be designed to achieve future, not allow the past. Good regulations from the past should be carried forward</li> <li>• Nonconformities should be treated as such with an appropriate policy regarding their mainenance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
Euclidean Zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perhaps protection of specific uses and allowance for public uses in rural areas could be handled through overlays</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zoning should be character based per the Comp Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
Performance Zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comp Plan calls from movement away from this toward more predictability.</li> <li>• Use performance criteria/ data to form districts up front not case-by-case</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
Base Site Area (Calculation of Potential based Natural Features)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See above</li> </ul>
Form-Based Zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More of a Town application, in rural areas relation of building to landscape is more important than relation of building to public realm</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>