MINUTES OF THE CITY OF DRIGGS
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
September 1, 2026

Pursuant to adjournment of the City Council meeting held August 18, 2026, at 6:00 p.m., and the call of the Mayor, the Driggs City Council met **Tuesday, September 1, 2026**, at 6:00 p.m. A roll call was taken and present were: Mayor August Christensen, Council Members: Miles Knowles, Jason Popilsky, and Sarah Johnston; City Attorney Sam Angell, City Administrator Doug Self, Public Works Director Jay Mazalewski, and Planning and Zoning Administrator Jade Krueger. Those present took part in the Pledge of Allegiance.

COMMUNITY INPUT
Anna Trentadue asked the Council to require presenters, experts and staff, to take an oath to tell the truth in quasi-judicial hearings.

Kathleen Haar stated she was a detailed person and felt that if the "details were correct, the results were solid." However, if the details were incorrect the results were flawed. She stated Council should ask questions and "judge" the work of staff and the attorney.

CONSENT AGENDA
City Council Minutes 8/4/26
City Council Minutes 8/18/26
Claims 8/19/26 – 9/1/26

Mayor Christensen requested the invoice for the airport runway repair (#121090) to be removed from the claims at this time.

Council Member Knowles moved to approve the consent agenda with the omission of item #121090. Council Member Johnston seconded the motion. The motion passed with all in favor.

LHTAC PRESENTATION OF ROAD SCHOLAR
Lisa Popoff, from LHTAC, explained the training obtained for this award and presented Tanner Roberts with the Road Scholar Award.

PUBLIC HEARING: PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR CORONA VALLEY
Mayor Christensen reviewed the items in which the Council requested further information for this hearing and stated discussion should be regarding Criteria 3, 4 and 5.

Jade Krueger, Planning and Zoning Administration, explained the mitigations the applicant was proposing should be included in a development agreement, if the Council chose to approve the application. She explained these mitigations were financial contributions to the school district and the sheriff's department, and traffic mitigation sign on Cowboy Trail.

Council Member Popilsky questioned how much park space was being dedicated, stating it was listed three different times with different amounts. Ms. Krueger stated the dedicated park space was confusing because there was more than required, but not all of it was being dedicated to the city.

DRAFT

Council Member Knowles questioned if the new lighting plan addressed the non-conforming lighting. Ms. Krueger stated the information had been corrected.

Mayor Christensen asked Council Members if there was any information that was received outside of the staff packet information. Mayor Christensen stated she had a brief conversation about wording in the Land Development Code. All others stated they did not have further conversations or information.

Council Member Popilsky questioned if they school district respond to this application. Ms. Krueger stated there was no formal comment received, but the development information was shared with the district offices.

Michael Knight, with Connect Engineering, presented information to the Council. He stated a narrative was provided for the Traffic Impact Study and explained how mitigations would take place. The master plan was revised to delineate the phasing.

Mr. Knight explained the standard criteria (#3) for the improvement plans and stated a full improvement set was submitted as requested. He stated DEQ review was still pending until a will serve was provided after approval by Council.

For the phasing criteria (#4), Mr. Knight presented a detailed plan with unit count by phase in a color-coded map. He explained phase 1 was reduced to 48 units versus 85 units for both Phase 1 and II. He further stated there was no direct access on to Ross Avenue or Booshway Street.

Mr. Knight reviewed criteria #5 which included mitigations with traffic. He explained the proportionate shares that were determined by the 2025 travel-demand model provided by Keller Associates. He further stated the existing pathway would be removed and replaced as requested by Public Works. He explained there would be no driveways on collector roads and lighted crosswalks would be added but were not part of the requirements.

Cowboy Trail would be a minor road collector, allowing Booshway to revert and no longer be classified as a collector road. Mr. Knight explained bulb outs would be added to Cowboy Trail to reduce cut-through traffic.

Mr. Knight explained the mitigations to water rights, stating they would be transferred as phases were improved. He stated the sewer collection system was currently able to handle the capacity for all 180 units according to Keller Associates. Mr. Knight explained the parks requirements were met, and exceeded, and areas not dedicated to the city would be maintained by the HOA. Housing requirements were for 5 deed-restricted units and the development had 9 units with no impact fee waivers assumed. Mr. Knight explained the fees, stating the FIA estimate was $1,297,754.

Mr. Knight concluded stating staff had found that the application conformed and thanked the staff for the effort to help get the application to where it was.

Council Member Johnston questioned the lot sizes on a few lots. Mr. Knight stated staff had reviewed the plat for lot size requirements and once the application was approved the county surveyor would also review for accuracy.

Council Member Johnston questioned the ownership of the property. Ms. Krueger stated the property was owned by LLKM, LLC and they have submitted proof of ownership, and the registered agent had submitted letters of authorization for Connect Engineering to be the representative.

Council took a brief recess from 6:48-6:51pm.

Council Member Johnston stated there was no updated technical memo from Keller Associates and questioned if the plans met the recommendations. Jay Mazalewski, Public Works Director, stated it did and phase 1 could be served by the existing infrastructure.

Council Member Johnston questioned if Cowboy Trail could have connecting driveways. Mr. Mazalewski stated it could, but the code requests they be minimized. He reminded the Council that the applicant had removed the majority of driveways from collector roads.

Mayor Christensen opened the public hearing.

Brad Simonson, Evan Howard, and Phillip Hanamaikai all spoke in favor of the application, stating the application would provide needed housing for the valley.

David Haar spoke in opposition and discussed the census and demographics of the valley in regards to the proposed application.

Kathleen Haar spoke in opposition and discussed the standards for engineer credentials and the use of the word "primarily" as it relates to the requirements in the Land Development Code. She concluded that the school contribution would only be about 10% of what was needed.

Anna Trentadue spoke in opposition and stated the Council was not bound by staff reports or staff interpretation of the law. She stated there was only enough water for phase 1, and felt it did not comply with the RS7 zoning requirements or the Transportation Master Plan.

Mark Law spoke in opposition and felt the developer had stretched the requirements and the citizens would be left with the impacts.

Tom Braun spoke in opposition, and stated the Council should follow criteria and felt some criteria were based on judgements, that should also be fact-based and regardless of the staff's direction.

Carol Smith spoke in opposition, discussing affordable housing and stated the 9 deed-restricted units would not provide for the valley. She also did not feel the application conformed to the RS7 zoning.

Jen Calder spoke in opposition, stating the Council was the ultimate decision makers.

Susan Pence spoke in opposition. She felt that allowing developers to submit new information limits "meaningful engagement." She stated the Council must take into account the word "primarily."

DRAFT

Amy Coving spoke in opposition, stating the traffic issues remain unresolved and it was premature to approve this development.

Christina Heilman spoke in opposition, and stated the development should honor the Land Development Code and was concerned about the size of the development being proposed.

Dawn Smith spoke in opposition. She stated she wasn't opposed to development of the parcel, but was opposed to the upzoning and non-compliance of this parcel.

Patty Leasure spoke in opposition, stating she agreed with the other comments and felt mitigation measures for Booshway had not been adequately figured into the costs for residents.

Lindsey Edmonds spoke in opposition and was concerned the infrastructure that was needed for phases beyond phase 1.

Kim Bailey spoke in opposition, stated the bulb outs and signs would not help with the traffic issues.

Sherry Petrovich spoke in opposition and was concerned about the definition of "affordable housing."

Dirk Leasure spoke in opposition and discussed the traffic impacts and reviewed the Keller Associates letter regarding traffic.

Vickie Vandreaser spoke in opposition and stated she was not against the development but was opposed to the density and non-compliance.

Tracy Hall, Katie Schensky and Kelly Waller spoke in opposition and agreed with previous comments.

Brian Vanwinkle spoke in opposition and was concerned with the water supply for the development.

Robert Anderson spoke in opposition and stated the roads could not support the development.

Robbie Crouch spoke in opposition and agreed with previous comments.

Jay Pence spoke in opposition and stated he did not feel the development met the RS7 zoning and requested traffic calming measures on Cowboy Trail be required.

Ron Pfeiffer spoke in opposition and requested the definition of "primarily" be added to the Land Development Code. He also spoke about winter conditions and the density that would be added.

There were no further comments and the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Knight rebutted and stated there were water rights for the entire project and all phases. He further explained the development would update the transmission line prior to the development of phase 3, 4 and 5.

DRAFT

Jared Flukinger, attorney for the applicant, addressed the housing comments stating that if there was more supply, the inventory would improve prices. He further stated the staff and the Planning and Zoning Commission found that the application did conform to the zoning requirements. He stated opposition to the application should not be considered as a criteria and if a denial was issued, it must be based on the criteria and findings of the disputable facts. He concluded by reminding the Council a previous development in the RS7 zone had duplexes on every lot within the subdivision, which implied the city was not applying the code consistently.

Ben Davis, with Keller Associates, stated the traffic impact study was done by HLE and reviewed for general conformance by Keller. He stated Keller did prepare the original proportionate share analysis based off the 2022 study. However, the updated proportionate share and impacts was based on the 2025 traffic model.

Council Member Johnston asked if Keller checked the inputs. Mr. Davis stated they did spot checking, which was standard practice. Council Member Johnston then asked if the original TIS identified mitigations. Mr. Davis stated it did and was reviewed again with the updated 2025 traffic model.

Council took a recess from 8:18 to 8:23pm.

Council Member Johnston moved to deny the proposed Corona Valley Subdivision Preliminary Plat Phase 1 and Master Plan, based on the finding the proposal does not meet the criteria number 1,2 4, 5 or 6 for approval as listed in the staff report and in Article 14.5.6 of the Driggs Land Development Code. Council Member Knowles seconded the motion.

Council Member Johnston stated she chose not to discuss the application with staff prior to the meeting. She further explained her reasoning for denial, stating for criteria number 1, a name and address of the owner must be on the plat, which was not indicated at this time.

Council Member Popilsky stated he speaks to staff when allowed and has never felt his decision was swayed by staff.

Council Member Johnston went on to state she did not see an owner's certificate on the plat as required in criteria number 2. She further stated the phasing must clearly be shown on the master plan. She believed the preliminary plat was labeled as a master plan.

Council Member Johnston stated regarding criteria number 5, she was unable to make a finding that the traffic impacts had been mitigated and that it would not impose expenses on the residents.

Council Member Johnston stated she did not believe the criteria complied and she was willing to amend her motion to remove criteria number 1 because it was also required within criteria number 6. She further stated the lot sizes and parking did not comply.

Mayor Christensen asked Ms. Krueger if the now was the time to determine if the driveways met code. Ms. Kreuger stated the Council should determine if the size of the lot conforms and the lot layout would be determined and approved at the time a building permit was issued. Ms. Krueger also explained the lack of a preliminary plat for phase 1 and suggested it could be a condition of approval or be seen at the time of the final plat was approved.

Council Member Knowles asked Mr. Angell if his position had changed on the definition of "primarily." Mr. Angell stated he was happy to explain but did not feel it was part of the motion on the table.

Council Member Knowles stated the two questions he was hinging on were, "Is this the appropriate use of RS7?" and "Is the traffic impact study correct in that we have infrastructure to support the development?" He further stated he believed the findings from Keller were correct. He further stated he did not want to confuse anyone in that he supported Council Member Johnston's motion, but wanted a second to continue with deliberation.

Council Member Popilsky questioned if we could require a timeline that ensures a safe development process. Ms. Krueger stated the Land Development Code did allow it, but the specific impact would need to be tied to a specific phase. Mr. Angell reminded the Council to avoid arbitrary requirements.

Council Member Johnston stated some of the issues she brought up were easily fixed with the exception of criteria 5. She felt the application should be denied based on the traffic impact, which she felt was not mitigated.

Mr. Angell stated if the Council approved the denial, it would be important to also state the actions the applicant can take to gain approval, according to State Statute 67-6519.

Council Member Popilsky asked Mr. Mazalewski if he felt the city was capable of serving the development. Mr. Mazalewski stated based on the traffic study, the mitigations, and the Transportation Master Plan, he believed the network was able to handle the traffic in this area.

Council Member Knowles moved to approve the proposed Corona Valley Subdivision Preliminary Plat Phase 1 and Master Plan, based on the finding that the proposal as presented meets the criteria for approval, as listed in the staff report and in Article 14.5.6 of the Driggs Land Development Code with the following conditions:

1. All remaining technical public works comments be addressed and resubmitted in the improvement plans prior to submission to DEQ for review.
2. An avigation easement agreement be executed and referenced on the final plat
3. Developer to provide 1 additional ADA parking slot to be ADA compliant for the park space.
4. Staff incorporate the additional mitigations measurers into the development agreement:
    a. Developer agrees to voluntarily contribute $158,852 to offset direct capacity impacts to Teton County School Districts. This will be proportionate by phase/unit and padi to the school district prior to recordation of each phase's final plat.
        i. Phase 1 units: (14 detached = 34 attached) = $45,988
        ii. Phase 2 units: (36 attached) = $29,808
        iii. Phase 3 units: (8 detached and 24 attached) = $30,064
        iv. Phase 4 units: (32 attached) = $26,496
        v. Phase 5 units: (32 attached) = $26,496

DRAFT

b. Developer agrees to contribute $45,000 annual for five years from the first building permit to the Teton County Sheriff Department. A separate agreement will be negotiated and executed.

Council Member Popilsky seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken: Council Member Knowles, aye; council Member Popilsky, aye; Council Member Johnston, nay. The motion passed.

WILL SERVE: SPUD DRIVE-IN

Council Member Johnston recused herself from the discussion and vote. Again, there was no quorum and the item was moved to the next agenda.

PROPOSAL SELECTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES FOR WASTEWATER FACILITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

Doug Self, City Administrator, presented information stating this was for administrative services for the wastewater facility improvement project. Two proposals were received with a committee of three to review them and each agreed Altura was higher ranked on project experience and approach.

Council Member Johnston asked if either of the firms have a relationship with Victor. Mr. Self stated Altura had and may provide services to Victor regarding funding and grants. Council Member Johnston felt that there was a conflict in working with Altura.

Council Member Knowles moved to select Altura Community Consulting as the preferred consultant with which to negotiate a contract for administrative services for the wastewater treatment facility improvement project, as described in the published request for proposal. Council Member Popilsky seconded the motion.

Council Member Knowles stated the city had worked with Altura in the past and had a positive experience. Council Member Johnston stated she would rather work with someone who hasn't worked with the City of Victor and felt there may be a conflict of interest.

Council Member Johnston moved to table the item until the next meeting so staff can include the criteria and scoring and Council Member Michalski can be present. Council Member Knowles seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

DEPOT SQUARE UNIT 108-MAHOGANY CREEK ACRE DBA EWE AND I FIBERS

Council Member Johnston moved to authorize execution of the Lease Agreement with Mahogany Creek Acre, LLC for Depot Square Unit 108 as proposed. Council Member Popilsky seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken: Council Member Knowles, aye; council Member Popilsky, aye; Council Member Johnston, aye. The motion passed.

JOINT GRAND TARGHEE EIS OBJECTION RESOLUTION REQUEST LETTER WITH TETON COUNTY, WY

Mayor Christensen explained this was a request from a Board of County Commissioner in Teton County, Wyoming to request a meeting with the Forest Service to review the object and proposed mitigation regarding Grand Targhee.

DRAFT

Council Member Johnston moved to authorize the mayor or city administrator to add the City of Driggs to the attached letter in support of convening an in-person support meeting. Council Member Popilsky seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken: Council Member Knowles, aye; council Member Popilsky, aye; Council Member Johnston, aye. The motion passed.

AMENDMENT TO HALL ANGELL & ASSOCIATES CITY ATTORNEY RETAINER AGREEMENT-RATE INCREASE

Mr. Angell explained he was not changing the retainer fee and hadn't since he started 5 years ago. He stated he was increasing the rate for additional work outside of the retainer from $250 to $275, so he could remain competitive to pay his associate attorneys. He explained if he didn't use his law firm for this work, the city would need to use an outside law firm that would charge up to $500/per hour.

Council Member Johnston requested the Council discuss at a future meeting due to the late hour.

Council Member Johnston moved to table the item until the next meeting. Council Member Knowles seconded the motion. The motion passed with all in favor.

MAYOR AND COUNCIL UPDATES

Mayor Christensen stated the Liberty Bell would be visiting Driggs next week and would stop at the high school. She also reminded the Council to check emails on a regular basis.

Council Member Popilsky stated a graduate researcher from the University of Idaho was gathering information on river access in the lower Teton to understand what the public wanted for a future management plan. He felt it was a good opportunity to influence the use of the river.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Council Member Knowles moved to go into Executive Session at 9:45pm pursuant to Idaho State Code 74-206 for legal reasons. Council Member Popilsky seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken: Council Member Johnston, aye; Council Member Knowles, aye; council Member Popilsky, aye. The motion carried unanimously.

The Council came out of Executive Session at 9:59pm.

ADJOURNMENT

Council Member Knowles made a moved to adjourn. Council Member Popilsky seconded. The motion carried unanimously with the meeting adjourned at 10:00pm.

ATTEST:

_____ _____

Kreslyn Schuehler, City Clerk August Christensen, Mayor

DRAFT