



Joint Planning Commission Meeting Agenda Documentation

PREPARATION DATE: October 9, 2009

SUBMITTING DEPARTMENT: Town & County Planning

MEETING DATE: October 15, 2009

DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS: Tyler Sinclair & Jeff Daugherty

PRESENTERS: Tyler Sinclair & Jeff Daugherty

SUBJECT: Draft Comprehensive Plan Review

STATEMENT/PURPOSE

The purpose of this item to continue joint review by the Town and County Planning Commissions of the draft Comprehensive Plan dated April 3, 2009.

BACKGROUND/ALTERNATIVES

The specific topics to be addressed at this meeting are as follows:

- o Theme 2 – Manage Growth Responsibly

Public Comment on Agenda Items

Public comment received on Theme 2 since the October 8, 2009, staff report is also attached. Staff has previously provided all other public comment on Theme 2; if you would like an additional copy please let us know.

Planning Commission Comments/Discussion Points

Following are the directives from the County Planning Commission from their June 29, 2009 meeting on Theme 2:

- 10) Rewrite the “Statement of Ideal” for Theme 2 to read: “Manage buildout and the rate of growth based on preservation of the community values of character, wildlife protection and quality of life”.
- 11) Reduce the total potential build-out allowed by the 2009 Plan to the total build-out under the 1994 Regulations without any density bonuses:
 - a) Beyond that base build-out consider: (for the purpose of encouraging conservation easements)
 - i) Limiting the PRD to a maximum bonus of 3 units per 35 acres with these conditions:
 - (1) that should the IRS remove the deduction for conservation easements the maximum density will revert to 1/35
 - (2) that there be 85% easement-dedicated open space with a 3X bonus; and

- ii) Investigating the possibility of enacting a Transfer of Development Rights program aimed at mandating and facilitating the shift of development potential from rural lands to appropriate locations within the town and county. A possible program would mandate clustering at a 1/35 gross density for on-site development and encourage transfer of development rights into appropriate locations by providing a multiplier allowing the conversion of one development right in the Rural zone to 2 or 3 TDR's in a receiving area. Use of these multipliers would be an exception to the capping of buildout at the base densities allowed by the 1994 Regulations.
 - b) Remove all "nodes" from the draft plan. Large areas should not be generally described as appropriate for increased development potential. Areas for increased development potential should be more site specific, but can be located next to existing services and infrastructure if it respects the existing development character of the area.
- 12) Remove all increases in commercial development rights (from the 1994 regulations) and prohibit any and all expansion of the resort zones and the establishment of any new resorts.
 - 13) Legislate predictability by removing all incentive-based development mechanisms except for those that encourage conservation easements as discussed in directive 11)a). Workforce housing will not be used to justify zoning changes other than those areas needed to address existing shortages as discussed in Directive 17.
 - 14) Set a growth rate cap or a growth management quota system for commercial and residential development and define what historic growth rates have been.

Following are the directives from individual Town of Jackson Planning Commissioners regarding Theme 2:

Theme 2: Manage Growth Responsibly

Overall: REALLY NEED A TRANSPORTATION/COMPLETE STREETS EMPHASIS THROUGHOUT.

- p. 30. Policy 2.1.a. Conservation easements?
- P. 30 Policy 2.1.b. Complete streets mentioned, Hoback not – remove from node discussion or include Hoback consistently.
- P. 33. Policy 2.3.b. First place really talk about conservation easements, but have been contradicted in other places (e.g., if down-zone). NEED TO EDIT FOR CONSISTENCY/LINKAGES.
- P. 34. Policy 2.4.b. Good place to mention GYCC efforts.
- P. 36. Strategy 2.1. Need to reconcile zoning and conservation easements.
- P. 36. Indicators. Include acres in conservation easement.

Stakeholders Advisory Group (STAG) Recommendations

Additional STAG comments specific to the identified County nodes have been added since the October 1, 2009 staff report.

Theme 2 – Manage Growth Responsibly

- The group discussed the viability, practicality, and necessity of a growth rate cap or overall growth cap. Some members of the group felt the market will control the rate of growth and the current rate is manageable. Others felt that triggers, overall caps, 5 year caps, infrastructure triggers, or rate caps are necessary for managing growth. However, concern regarding implementation and a lack of successful examples in other communities was identified in the discussion. The greater concern is the total number of persons that could be housed in the valley at the expense of diminishing the quality of life. Annual monitoring of the indicators does a good job of providing benchmarks for the community to evaluate.

- The consensus of the group was to leave in incentives/density bonuses for open space and workforce housing where appropriate if they are directly tied to those community benefits; however, there was no agreement on who should pay for this.
- Consensus of the group was that incentives should not be discretionary. They should be performance based. Incentives that are currently discretionary that were specifically discussed were the PMUD, PRD, and AH-PUD development options. There was further discussion of eliminating the PMUD all together or at least amending the tool to reflect the FLUP.
- The group recommended including language about bulk and scale for nonresidential buildings to maintain community character.
- Some of the group suggested that a policy be added in this theme that controlling growth is needed as a part of protecting wildlife, natural resources, and open space; however, others felt that the market would control the rate of growth and the current rate is manageable.
- Members of the group recommended inserting an indicator about the planning process and whether the length of the application process is effective and efficient.

District #9 – Teton Village

- Group discussed balance of additional local convenience commercial with need to complete Hwy 390 infrastructure improvements before additional development.

District #10 – Aspens

- The majority of the group felt that Aspens should remain a node because it has the components of a node today. However, additional development potential should not be allowed until Hwy 390 is redesigned and the transportation impacts of additional development are understood. The Future Land Use Map should be revised to address this change.

District #11 – Wilson

- The majority of the group felt that Wilson should remain a node because it has the components of a node today. However, a more realistic development potential should be developed based on Fish Creek, wetlands, existing CC&Rs, community character, and Highway 22. The Future Land Use Map should be revised to incorporate this additional level of detail.

District #12 – South Park

- The consensus of the group was that this was an appropriate place for expansion of the town development pattern, but no consensus was reached on how much development should occur. Some in the group felt that the increase in density should be similar to the Cottonwood Park area. Some members of the group believed that the whole district should be planned comprehensively. Some believed the district should be broken into a node district (north) and a rural district (south).
- The group recommended a statement about connectivity of pathways and roadways to existing and future neighborhoods. Consensus was reached about highlighting future north-south and east-west thoroughfares in the north half of the district.

Staff Follow Up and Discussion Points

At the meeting, Staff will provide a general presentation on Transferable Development Rights (TDR's), Growth Rates and Growth Caps. The presentation will focus on the concepts inherent to each of these tools that are relevant to high level land use planning decisions; however, specific development regulation options will not be presented. The purpose of the presentation is to equip the Planning Commission to discuss whether these tools should be enabled by the Plan and further developed as part of rewriting the Land Development

Regulations. Staff will also go through the recommendations made to date on Theme 2 and give a short presentation on its rationale for including the nodes.

Based on discussion at the October 8, 2009 meeting staff prepared the following table for consideration in the discussion of residential associated Accessory Residential Units (ARUs) in the County.

Projected County Residential Associated ARUs at Buildout		
	Forrest McCarthy Method	Adjusted Buildout Taskforce
2000 Planning Department existing guesthouse high estimate	750	
post-2001 New residential associated ARU permits	226	
2009 Existing residential associated ARU estimate	976	
2009 Buildout Taskforce existing dwelling units	4,696	
2009 Percentage of dwelling units with an ARU	20.8%	n/a
2009 Buildout Taskforce base potential dwelling units	3,567	3,567
2009 Projected base potential residential associated ARUs	741	6,887
2009 Buildout Taskforce PRD potential dwelling units	3,651	3,651
2009 Projected PRD potential residential associated ARUs	759	3,651
2009 Buildout Taskforce base + PRD potential dwelling units	7,218	7,218
2009 Projected base + PRD potential residential associate ARUs	1,500	10,538

In the draft Plan locating development in Town is mentioned in Theme 2, but the proposed land use policies for Town are contained in Theme 3. Discussions of the specific location and amount of development in Town can be deferred to review of Theme 3. The Theme 2 discussion of Town can be limited to the general concept of whether it is an appropriate place for growth.

Please find below a list of possible Theme 2 discussion points prepared by staff based upon the discussion at the October 1, 2009 meeting.

- The draft plan identifies the following as possible County nodes for increased development potential.

- Teton Village,
- the Aspens,
- Wilson,
- northern South Park

How should each location be treated moving forward?

- As a node appropriate for increased development potential
- As a node possibly appropriate for increased development potential pending further information or action regarding identified issues
- Removed as a node
- Other

- For any nodes identified for increased development potential, where should the additional density come from?
 - Density bonuses for affordable housing or nonresidential conversion, with down-zoning in rural areas of the County

- Direct transfer of units allowed to be otherwise built in rural areas (ie non-contiguous PRD)
 - Density bonuses beyond a direct transfer, for the extinguishing of development rights in rural areas (i.e. TDR)
 - All of the above
 - Other
- Are there any areas in unincorporated Teton County outside of the identified nodes that should be considered as receiving areas for additional development potential? If so where? And for each location where should the additional density come from?
- What is the preferred development pattern in unincorporated Teton County outside of the identified nodes or growth areas?
 - Less than 1 unit per 35 acres in rural areas
 - 1 unit per 35 acres everywhere – would include down-zoning NC-SF properties
 - 1 unit per 35 acres in the Rural zone
 - On-site Planned Residential Development (PRD) to gain conservation easements in exchange for additional unit(s) on a 35 acre parcel
 - On-site PRD to gain conservation easements and cluster development on a larger site in exchange for additional units
 - Other
- Should a Future Land Use Map be included in the Plan?
- Is redevelopment and infill development in the Town of Jackson preferred over greenfield development in Teton County? If yes, how should this be implemented or encouraged
- Should ARUs be allowed in the unincorporated County?
 - At all
 - As guesthouses only
 - As rentals
 - As both
- If so where?
- Everywhere
 - Outside NRO
 - Only in Nodes
 - Other
- How should ARUs be considered in buildout calculations for the unincorporated County?
 - As base residential units?
 - As incentive units for workforce housing?
 - As a separate entity?
 - Other

ATTACHMENTS

- Theme 2 Public Comment received since 10/2/09
- Theme 2 Recommendations made to date
- Draft Agenda for October 22, 2009 Meeting

LEGAL REVIEW

Staff notes that Town and/or County legal representation will only be provided on an as needed basis and legal counsel will not be attending every meeting. If commissioners have questions for the Town and/or County attorneys or would like to request that they be present at a meeting please let staff know in advance.

SUGGESTED MOTIONS

Town Planning Commission

I move to continue Item 09-030 to October 22, 2009 at 5:30 pm at the Teton County Board of County Commissioner Chambers.

Teton County Planning Commission

I move to continue Item AMD 09-0017 to October 22, 2009 at 5:30 pm at the Teton County Board of County Commissioner Chambers.

Public Comment

10/2/09 – 10/8/09

Theme 2: Manage Growth Responsibly

No Comments Were Received from the Website

Additional Comments Submitted

- Brooke Walles – 10/8/09
- Gail Jensen – 10/5/09
- Marion Hudnall – 10/4/09

Alex Norton

Subject: Feedback regarding Nodes & Density Bonuses for tonight's meeting please read

From: Brooke Walles

Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2009 5:03 PM

Dear Planners,

I understand that Nodes and density bonuses within them are going to be discussed at tonight's meeting. I am glad that they are finally on the agenda as these concepts are at the heart of what is wrong with this plan revision as written. Nodal development patterns may work in larger areas such as the suburbs of Salt Lake. Nodes are probably discussed in the textbooks planning staff may have studied recently in school. Jackson Hole is a special place and planning tools from Anytown USA simply do not apply to our special valley unless that is what we wish to become.

First what is a node? What are the nodes meant to accomplish? My understanding is that a node is an area that has sufficient services in a pedestrian friendly environment so that people may work and live in an area. I would assume that the main goal of nodal development would be to reduce traffic. There are only three areas that remain as "nodes" that are targeted for high density housing which are the Aspens, Wilson, and the northern portion S. Park. The first two areas simply do not fit any reasonable definition of a "node". With Highway 22 bisecting the town of Wilson will it ever be pedestrian friendly? Anyone who lives in Wilson knows that the answer is no. No one coming from Idaho obeys the posted speed limit. Maybe a traffic light would solve the problems? Do you want to be sitting in a line of traffic when a tractor trailer is speeding off Teton Pass? Every year there are multiple runaway trucks. Adding more pedestrians and traffic at the base of Teton Pass is not only bad planning but it would be irresponsible. It is a serious public safety issue that must be taken into consideration. Neither area has or ever will have a sufficient commercial core to reduce traffic trips to town enough to justify any additional density. If you were to allow density bonuses in these two areas you would be putting dense islands of housing in areas that by necessity people would be taking their vehicles to town to Albertsons, Smiths, work, kid's school, soccer practice etc. People may occasionally pick up a gallon of milk at Hungry Jack instead of making the trip to town but the vast majority will not be working in Wilson. In the real world people simply do not ride public transportation. The current ridership in Teton County is 1.96%. If you put thousands of more people on these islands and even assume that ridership increases by 500% (not going to happen) you would be putting substantially more cars on the already strained roads of Highway 22 and 390. It is time we start planning for the real world that we live in; not some utopia that will never exist. Increasing traffic not only would impact our wildlife in the short term but in the long term the nodes would increase the pressure to expand Highway 22 and 390 to 4 to 5 lanes which would kill even more of our wildlife in the long term.

The nodes will not only have disastrous impacts upon our wildlife but will impact our quality of life. The people of Wilson have dealt with this issue for over seven years through the mixed use village planning process and I am shocked that this nodal concept is even up for discussion. In the Fall of 2007 the planning staff offered the people of Wilson the choice of a Density neutral Option "A" sub area plan that would allow for Wilson to grow to roughly twice the size within the development rights of the current zoning. They also offered option "B" which was proposing an additional 98 units in Wilson. The people of Wilson "overwhelmingly chose option "A". They chose option "A" for sound reasons. Wilson and the Westbank already had accepted the majority of up-zones since the 94 plan. The additional housing proposed in option "B" would negatively impact the character and quality of life in Wilson. Traffic, noise pollution, light pollution, and degradation of critical wetlands/ wildlife properties such as the Waldron Property were all valid reasons to allow Wilson to only grow to twice the current size. Staff said that option "A" was Wilson's preferred subarea plan with the caveat that it

could change during the Comprehensive Plan Revision Process. Change it did as they are proposing up to 500 additional homes making Wilson 4 times the current size. I attended nearly comprehensive plan meeting. I read the data provided by the surveys etc. There was little support for the nodal concept and zero support from the citizens of Teton County for the type of up-zones the planners are proposing. Just as the planning staff had done throughout the Wilson Mixed Use Village Planning process they failed to listen to the feedback provided. If they were not listening to the people who have they been listening to? They have been listening to a handful of special interests including commercial interests, affordable housing advocates, certain elected officials, and large land owners. While the above interests are part of the fabric of Teton County they do not represent the will of the majority of the people. I do not envy the position that this has put the town and county planners. You have to reconcile the irreconcilable. You are not getting the feedback you once were because people have been worn down by this lengthy process. The public comment you received in May is just as valid as the comment you are receiving today. If this plan moves forward to the County Commissioners with the nodal concept/density bonuses for the Aspens and Wilson areas the people of this county will see this process as the illegitimate farce it has been thus far. You have the power to make recommendations for responsible growth that reflect the people's will and are good for our quality of life into the future. I applaud the concept of a growth cap and I think that you are on the right track. My opinion is that the only reasonable areas for "receiving areas" are the north of South Park near the High School and the town of Jackson. The reasons are simple. The majority of the schools are in walking distance. Smith's and Albertson's are readily available. The highway is already four lanes. You have a blank slate to create the pedestrian friendly environment that is critical to a "node". The vast majority of jobs are available in the town. The numbers that the planners are proposing for either area are not justified and should be lowered. There should be language assuring South Park and Teton County that there will be no up-zones allowed outside of these two areas in the future. Thank you for all you hard work and taking the time to read my letter.

Sincerely,

Brooke Walles

Wilson

Alex Norton

Subject: Written coments on Theme 2

From: Gail Jensen

Sent: Monday, October 05, 2009 10:57 AM

Dear Commissioners,

Thank you for all of the time and effort each of you have spent on the Plan in addition to the regular duties of a planning commissioner. The committment to participate at your level is beyond reasonable for volunteer boards.

Though the discussion of Theme 2 last Thursday was to be held to the 40K level, I really feel the density bonus and incentive tools need to be analyzed much more closely. The community has been and is very concerned with including any of these in the Comprehensive Plan. Predictability is of utmost importance. If included in the Plan, none of the tools, especially in their present form, can offer the growth limits and buildout numbers with absolute certainty that the community has demanded.

The discussion on growth cap (total buildout number) was very discouraging. I feel that many of you, had forgotten what the community has said. Jackson Hole is at a very critical turning point. The numbers of humans is of greatest concern as this drives all of the following: increased traffic, loss of open space, deminished quality of life, losing community character, wildlife impacts, etc. Yes, with proper planning and regulation one can hope to control some the negatives of growth but let's not kid ourselves - it is the numbers of humans. The numbers task force did an excellent job of showing where the concerns were and again confirming the base entitled building potential.

I do feel that the rate of growth will be more economy driven. A rate of growth number that averages the last 10 years of growth and also takes into account an averaging of maybe 2 years at a time for regulating this could be more acceptable. The concept and this tool should be a part of this plan so that there is a mechanism to do something if we can not keep up with infrastructure needs as development occurs, as is currently happening.

Please consider my comments I read at last Thursday's meeting and pasted below. The mechanics of each tool need to be seriously analyzed to really evaluate the true value verses potential impacts.

Sincerely,
Gail Jensen

October 1, 2009 - Joint Planning meeting.
Gail Jensen comments

After reviewing the buildout report presented at last weeks meeting, it is clear that one of the most significant issues affecting potential growth, especially in the County, is the PRD tool. The 3651 additional residential units possible due to the PRD tool would double our current base residential buildout number. If the PRD tool is kept, a major down zoning of many entitled properties via the 1994 Plan would need to occur just to keep within the buildout numbers we have been discussing. If the only reason to keep this tool in place is to incentivize more conservation easements, then how can we justify this? The pluses and minuses with respect to public benefit need to be weighed. I feel actual scenario's need to be reviewed that show the true reality of whether there is a real significant gain to the donor via tax credits and/or whether real benefit to the community is accomplished using the tool verses just keeping the base zoning of 1 unit per 35 acres without the PRD.

Is the PRD tool still a real motivating factor for donations of conservation easements? What is the real value in Tax \$'s that someone receives who gives a conservation easement. I feel the real net \$ amount of tax credit minus the costs to go through the planning process, etc., may be insignificant and will not influence the decision

for someone to give an easement. Why should we include the PRD tool unless the numbers (\$) really add up to a motivating factor. I know the JHLT has said they do, however, let's do the math to prove this is the case. The most recent easements may have been donated anyway without the tax credits the PRD tool helps to establish.

With our current rural zoning structure, how do you get around only offering the PRD tool to only conservation easement situations without endangering the viability of a donor to receive tax deductions? Could creating a new, different zoning classification which includes an incentive tool just for specifically targeted potential conservation properties make more sense?

Transfer of Development Rights. We need to do the math on what potential receiving areas per unit values could be. The highest and best use via the market value approach in many rural areas is 1/35. I question how the math can possibly work when the value of a 35 acre Parcel is so high (current MLS average of \$5 Million). This would mean a 10x increase in density for the receiving area if one used a generous \$500,000/unit value to achieve an equal value swap. TDR's appear to be an interesting idea, yet the huge 1/35 acre value surely can not match up with higher density, lower valued nodal development. Where in Teton County are there receiving areas capable of accepting such additional densities above 1994 base zoning? The Rock Springs/Stilson swap worked however, you had the same owner moving density around their property - which is a unique scenario.

I believe a better way to retain open space on the rural zoned properties of 35+ acres could be to limit the size of the potential building envelope and restrict to specific types of uses on the remaining property on each parcel. Many existing conservation easements are already structured this way – allowing a minimal building site or sites and sometimes agricultural or other none structure use on the remaining part of the property. Why not take this example and require similar restrictions on development permits within the rural zone? Essentially that is what has to be done in order to develop with our current regulations that are in the rural zones and also have a Natural Resources Overlay. Why not eliminate the PRD and just use development restrictions on the 35 acre parcels?

Yes, not having a conservation easement may allow the potential rezoning of the property in the future; however, are we not planning now to control that potential event? A maximum buildout number (growth cap) could protect us from the up zones if density is reduced somewhere else in the Town or County.

Thank you for considering my thoughts. There are no easy or simple ways to manage and limit growth. I thank each of you for all of the time and energy you have given to us!

Gail Jensen

Alex Norton

Subject: Last meeting

From: Marion Hudnall

Sent: Sunday, October 04, 2009 9:14 AM

It amazes me that the powers that be feel they can bulldoze public opinion with no repercussions. One meeting I hear about is all positive and you are actually listening to the public. The next meeting you reverse your vote and go with what the planning commission set forth.

Why would this happen?? Why would you allow density to be higher with incentives for that??

The only answers I can come up with are not pretty and lead me to think that the public, let alone wildlife and the environment, are not the consideration. The vote is only influenced by what the moneyed people want and it follows that somehow you as elected or employed officials will also benefit.

I sincerely hope I am not right and that the public and the environment and their well-being will finally be the major consideration. We, the "common" citizens are confused and bewildered by the process. It seems to me that's the way you want us. Drag it out as long as we can and they'll give up so we can do what we planned to do all along. Not a pretty picture, is it?

Marion Hudnall
Cottonwood Resident
Bewildered Voter

Jackson/Teton County Comprehensive Plan Update
All Preliminary Recommendations Through 10/8/09
Topic: Theme 2: Manage Growth Responsibly

Passed Jointly

Rec. #	Recommendation	County	Town	Date	Status
121	Limit development in the County to current base (by right) zoning with allowance for as yet to be determined incentives for conservation easements through acquisition and the use of PRDs and TDRs	4 - 1	3 - 1	9/24/2009	Prelim
124	There should be density bonuses for community values	5 - 0	6 - 0	10/1/2009	Prelim
125	There should be density bonuses to incentivize conservation easements for wildlife habitat	5 - 0	6 - 1	10/1/2009	Prelim
126	There should be density bonuses to incentivize conservation easements to protect scenic resources	5 - 0	7 - 0	10/1/2009	Prelim
127	There should be density bonuses to incentivize conversion of nonresidential use into residential use	4 - 1	7 - 0	10/1/2009	Prelim
129	There should be density bonuses for the provision of affordable housing	4 - 1	5 - 2	10/1/2009	Prelim
130	Density bonuses should be performance based incentives	5 - 0	7 - 0	10/1/2009	Prelim
132	The concept of regionalism should be considered in the Plan pertaining to the impacts our decisions have on transportation, natural resources (air, water, wildlife), workforce housing, and waste management in the greater region	5 - 0	6 - 0	10/1/2009	Prelim

Passed County

Rec. #	Recommendation	County	Town	Date	Status
123	Determine an end state buildout and implement it through a defined land use plan	3 - 2	0 - 7	10/1/2009	Prelim
133	As a concept, include a rate of growth cap in the Plan	3 - 2	0 - 6	10/1/2009	Prelim

Passed Town

Rec. #	Recommendation	County	Town	Date	Status
122	Create a predictable land use plan based on community values with buildout numbers compiled to determine consistency between community goals and land use policies	2 - 3	7 - 0	10/1/2009	Prelim
131	Density bonuses should be discretionary incentives	1 - 4	4 - 3	10/1/2009	Prelim

Failed Jointly

Rec. #	Recommendation	County	Town	Date	Status
128	There should be density bonuses for the provision of workforce housing	2 - 3	3 - 4	10/1/2009	Prelim
134	As a concept, include a cumulative growth cap in the Plan	2 - 3	0 - 6	10/1/2009	Prelim

AGENDA
JACKSON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
TETON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 22, 2009 – SPECIAL JOINT MEETING
5:30 P.M.

The meeting will be held in the Teton County Board of County Commissioners Chambers.
Agenda for the meeting is as follows:

PLEASE TURN OFF ALL CELL PHONES AND PAGERS DURING THE MEETING

CALL TO ORDER – Town of Jackson Planning Commission

ROLL CALL

CALL TO ORDER – Teton County Planning Commission

ROLL CALL

PUBLIC COMMENT (maximum 45 minutes)

OLD BUSINESS

1. Draft Comprehensive Plan Discussion/Recommendations
 - o Review of Theme 2 recommendations to date
 - o Theme 2 – Manage Growth Responsibly

NEW BUSINESS

1. Draft Comprehensive Plan Discussion/Recommendations
 - o Theme 3 rationale presentation by staff
 - o Theme 3 – Uphold Jackson as “Heart of the Region”

MATTERS FROM STAFF (8:45)

1. Data Requests Update
2. Set Agenda, Date and Time for Next Joint Meeting(s)
3. Identify experts that should be contacted for future meetings
4. Other

MATTERS FROM COMMISSION

ADJOURN – TOWN OF JACKSON PLANNING COMMISSION

ADJOURN – TETON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION