

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Revised 11/13/2015

<i>Section</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction.....	1
A. Setting.....	1
B. Purpose and Scope.....	2
C. Private Property Rights.....	4
D. Plan Structure.....	6
E. Plan Adoption and Review.....	8
II. Population.....	9
A. Existing Conditions.....	9
1. 1990 Census Characteristics.....	10
a. Geographic Distribution.....	10
b. Age.....	10
c. Race and Hispanic Origin.....	12
d. Mobility Characteristics.....	13
2. 1990 to 1995 Population Change.....	13
a. Migration.....	14
b. Age Distribution.....	15
B. Analysis.....	16
1. Population Forecasts.....	16
2. Future Age Groups.....	17
3. 1990 and 2015 Age Comparison.....	18
C. Issues and Concerns.....	19
D. Goals, Objectives, and Actions.....	19
III. Environment.....	20
A. Natural Resources.....	20
1. Existing Conditions.....	20
a. Geology.....	20
b. Water Availability and Quality.....	24
c. Air Quality.....	26
d. Vegetation and Wildlife Resources.....	26
e. Geothermal and Mineral Resources.....	27
2. Analysis.....	28
3. Issues and Concerns.....	30
4. Goals, Objectives, and Actions.....	31
B. Hazardous Areas.....	35
1. Current Conditions.....	35
a. Soil Erosion.....	35

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

<i>Section</i>	<i>Page</i>
b. Slope	35
c. Seismic.....	35
d. Airport Clear Zones	36
e. Floodplains.....	36
f. Pollutant Sources	36
2. Analysis	39
3. Issues and Concerns.....	40
4. Goals, Objectives, and Actions.....	40
IV. Public Facilities and Services	42
A. Public Facilities	42
1. Existing Conditions	42
a. Fire and Safety	42
b. Water and Sewer.....	44
c. Health Care Facilities.....	44
d. Solid Waste Management	44
e. Utilities.....	45
f. Other County Facilities.....	45
2. Analysis	45
a. Fire and Safety	45
b. Water and Sewer.....	47
c. Health Care	47
d. Solid Waste Management	47
e. Utilities.....	47
3. Issues and Concerns.....	48
4. Goals, Objectives, and Actions.....	48
B. Transportation.....	49
1. Existing Conditions	49
a. Roads and Highways.....	49
b. Transit	49
c. Air Travel.....	52
d. Rail.....	52
2. Analysis	52
a. Increased Volume.....	52
b. Transportation Plan Map	53
c. Planned Future Development and Transportation	53
d. Alternative Modes	55
e. Bicycle Pedestrian System	55
f. Public Transit	55
g. Airports	57
h. Goods Movement.....	57

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

<i>Section</i>	<i>Page</i>
3. Issues and Concerns.....	58
a. Roads and Highway	58
b. Air and Rail.....	58
c. Alternative Transportation	59
4. Goals, Objectives, and Actions.....	59
C. Schools.....	62
1. Existing Conditions	62
a. Educational Attainment	62
b. Inventory	62
c. Curriculum and Programs	64
2. Analysis	65
a. Enrollment Trends	65
b. Student Overcrowding	66
c. Enrollment Forecasts.....	66
d. Budget and Student Expenditure	67
3. Issues and Concerns.....	67
a. Education Programs	68
b. Education Facilities	68
c. Higher Education	69
4. Goals, Objectives, and Actions.....	69
V. Land Use and Future Growth.....	71
A. Land Use.....	71
1. Existing Conditions	71
2. Analysis	74
3. Issues and Concerns.....	76
4. Goals, Objectives, and Actions.....	78
B. Housing.....	82
1. Existing Conditions	82
a. 1980 - 1990 Trend.....	82
b. 1990 Housing Characteristics	83
c. Housing Conditions	84
d. Owner-Occupied Housing Units.....	84
e. Renter-Occupied Housing.....	86
2. Analysis	88
3. Issues and Concerns.....	88
4. Goals, Objectives, and Action	89
C. Recreation	90
1. Existing Conditions	90
2. Analysis	94
3. Issues and Concerns.....	98

<i>Section</i>	<i>Page</i>
4. Goals, Objectives, and Actions.....	99
D. Special Sites/Community Design	103
1. Existing Conditions	103
a. Background	103
b. Historic Resources	103
c. Special Areas.....	108
d. Community Design	109
2. Analysis	109
a. Special Sites	109
b. Community Design	109
3. Issues and Concerns.....	111
4. Goals, Objectives, and Action	111
E. Economic Development.....	112
1. Existing Conditions	112
a. Employment.....	112
b. Wages and Salary.....	115
c. Jerome County Employers	118
d. Unemployment Rate	118
e. Household and Per Capita Income.....	119
f. Poverty.....	121
2. Analysis	122
a. Employment Forecasts	122
b. Per Capita Income Forecasts.....	124
c. Focus Areas.....	124
3. Issues and Concerns.....	126
4. Goals, Objectives, and Actions.....	126
VI. Implementation	128

TABLES

<i>Table</i>	<i>Page</i>
II.A-1	1970, 1980, and 1990 Jerome County Population9
II.A-2	1980 - 1990 Jerome County Population by Area10
II.A-3	1980 - 1990 Jerome County Age Distribution11
II.A-4	1990 Jerome County and State of Idaho Age Distribution12
II.A-5	1980 - 1990 Jerome County Race and Hispanic Origin.....13
II.A-6	1990 Jerome County Mobility Characteristics.....13
II.A-7	1990 - 1995 Jerome County Population by Area14
II.A-8	1990 - 1995 Jerome County Age Distribution15
II.B-1	Jerome County Population Forecast16
II.B-2	2000, 2005, 2010, and 2015 Jerome County Population by Age Group17
II.B-3	1990 - 2015 Jerome County Population by Age Groups18
III.A-1	Characteristics of Soils Found in Jerome County.....22
IV.C-1	1990 Jerome County Educational Attainment62
IV.C-2	1990 - 1994 Jerome County Student Enrollment Trend65
IV.C-3	1996 - 1998 Jerome County Student Enrollment Forecast66
IV.C-4	1996 - 2000 Jerome County Resident Enrollment at College of Southern Idaho67
V.A-1	Percentage of Land Use within Jerome County72
V.A-2	Land Ownership within Jerome County72
V.B-1	1980 - 1990 Jerome County Housing Units.....83
V.B-2	1990 Jerome County Age of Housing Stock.....84
V.B-3	1990 Jerome County Housing Value85
V.B-4	1990 Jerome County Mortgage Costs85
V.B-5	1990 Jerome County Owner Housing Costs as a Percent of Income.....86
V.B-6	1990 Jerome County Monthly Rents86
V.B-7	1990 Jerome County Renter Costs As a Percent of Income87
V.B-8	1990 - 1994 Jerome County Residential Building Permits.....87
V.B-9	Jerome County Housing Unit Forecast88
V.C-1	Recreation Sites Within Jerome County95
V.C-2	Other Recreation Sites Within the City of Jerome.....96
V.D-1	Inventory of Jerome County Historic Resources105
V.E-1	1970 - 1990 Jerome County Employment113
V.E-2	1990 - 1993 Jerome County Employment114
V.E-3	1993 Jerome County and State of Idaho Employment Sector Comparison.....115
V.E-4	Jerome County Wages and Salary by Employment Sector116
V.E-5	1993 Jerome County and State of Idaho Wages and Salary Comparison117
V.E-6	1994 Jerome County and Idaho Wages Paid by Employment Sector118
V.E-7	1980 - 1990 Jerome County Income Characteristics119
V.E-8	1990 Household Income Distribution Comparison120
V.E-9	1990 - 1995 Jerome County Household Income Change.....121
<i>Table</i>	<i>Page</i>

V.E-10	1980 - 1990 Jerome County Poverty Indicators	122
V.E-11	1995 - 2105 Jerome County Employment Forecasts	123
V.E-12	1990 - 2015 Jerome County Per Capita Income	124
VI-1	Implementation Actions, Responsibilities, and Priorities	130

FIGURES

<i>Figure</i>	<i>Page</i>	
I.A-1	Jerome County Land Ownership.....	3
III.A-1	Jerome County General Soil Map.....	23
IV.A-1	Jerome County Fire Districts	43
IV.A-2	Jerome City and County Major Utilities	46
IV.B-1	Jerome County Highway Districts	50
IV.B-2	1994 Average Daily Traffic for Jerome County	51
IV.B-3	Jerome County Transportation Plan Map	54
IV.B-4	Bicycle/Pedestrian Route Phased Improvements for Jerome County	56
IV.C-1	Jerome County School District Boundaries	63
V.A-1	Jerome County Existing Land Use Map	73
V.A-2	Jerome County Generalized Future Land Use Map	77
V.C-1	Jerome Recreation District Boundaries.....	91
V.C-2	Regional Recreation Sites	93
V.C-3	Recreation Areas in Jerome County.....	97

I. INTRODUCTION

A. SETTING

Situated amidst the vast, rolling plains of south-central Idaho, Jerome County is a land of abundant agricultural and natural resources. The county has a rich heritage in agriculture and related cultural and economic activities. Irrigation waters from the Snake River, which serves as the county's southern boundary, combined with fertile volcanic soils, have long provided a diversity of agricultural opportunities for county residents. Substantial public and private open space lands reinforce the strong-rural character and quality of life of the county.

Jerome County has experienced consistent population growth over the past 25 years, from a total population of around 10,000 people in 1970, to over 16,000 in 1995. Much of this growth can be attributed to the unique quality of life the county has to offer. The city of Jerome is the population and economic center of the county, with nearly 7,000 residents. Eden and Hazelton are the only other incorporated areas of the county, with populations of 300 and 400, respectively.

The county's economy is based largely on agricultural production and related industries. Dairy farming has recently become the leading industry in the county. The availability of land and feed make the county an ideal location for dairy operators. Other agricultural activities include irrigated crop production and livestock grazing. Major cash crops include beans, potatoes, and sugar beets.

Federally owned lands account for more than 25% of the county's 383,936 acres (Figure I.A-1). Most of this land is managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) as grazing and open space land. These open spaces offer a number of recreational activities including hunting, fishing, hiking, and wildlife observation. The Snake River canyon, several sections of which are BLM owned, is the premier recreational and scenic corridor of the county. The Snake River is not only an invaluable local natural and recreational resource, but serves as a major source of tourism as well.

Two major transportation corridors traverse the county. Interstate 84 crosses the southern portion of Jerome County, linking the pacific coast to destinations east. This route is a source of substantial commercial activity at a national level. U.S. Highway 93 passes through central Jerome County connecting I-84 with major tourist destinations such as Sun Valley and the Sawtooth Mountains.

B. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of the Jerome County Comprehensive Plan is to integrate the concerns and expressions of county residents into a comprehensive statement of how the county should grow and develop. Furthermore, this statement must meet all legislative requirements, specifically the Idaho Local Planning Act. Through an extensive public involvement effort, Jerome County residents developed goal statements which are used in this comprehensive plan document to guide future development. The plan uses maps and narrative to describe the county, provide a vision of a desired future, and recommend a series of steps to reach that future.

Section 67-6508 of the Idaho Code (the Local Planning Act) provides for a planning process as follows:

Prepare, implement, and review and update a comprehensive plan, hereafter referred to as the plan. The plan shall include all land within the jurisdiction of the governing board. The plan shall consider previous and existing conditions, trends, desirable goals and objectives, or desirable future situations for each planning component. The plan with maps, charts, and reports shall be based on the following components unless the plan specifies reasons why a particular component is unneeded.

The components specified in Idaho Code include: population, economic development, school facilities and transportation, land use/mapping, natural resources, hazardous areas, public services, facilities, and utilities, transportation, recreation, special areas or sites, housing, community design, implementation, and any other component which may be necessary.

The comprehensive plan is not a zoning ordinance; however, it provides direction for land use regulations, including zoning, as well as other implementation strategies. Idaho Code, Section 67-6511, specifies the following:

Each governing board shall, by ordinance adopted, amended, or repealed in accordance with the notice and hearing procedures provided under Section 67-6509, Idaho Code, establish within its jurisdiction one or more zones or zoning districts where appropriate. The zoning districts shall be in accordance with the adopted plans (emphasis added).

This plan applies outside the urbanized portions of the of impact areas and to lands outside those federally or state owned. While the plan discusses all lands within the county's borders, it emphasizes those areas where the county has planning authority. The federal, state, and municipal lands, while discussed and considered, do not receive the same attention as those lands which are regulated solely by the board of county commissioners.

Figure I.A-1 (11 x 17)

C. PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS

The Jerome Joint Agency Comprehensive Plan citizen committees prepared these documents with the intent of protecting private property rights and values. In developing the policies (actions) contained within these plans, it was not their intent to create unnecessary regulations that would negatively affect private property rights or values. These plans strive to balance the needs of the community in a broad spectrum of issues.

In 1994, the Idaho State Legislature amended Section 67-6508 of the Idaho Code to include “an analysis of provisions which may be necessary to insure that land-use policies, restrictions, conditions and fees do not violate private property rights, adversely impact values or create unnecessary technical limitations on the use of property . . .”[67-6508 (a)]

The Office of the Attorney General of the State of Idaho has prepared the following checklist in reviewing the potential impact of regulatory or administrative actions upon specific property. This information is included in this plan to apprise the reader of this requirement.

1) Does the regulation or action result in a permanent or temporary physical occupation of private property?

Regulation or action resulting in a permanent or temporary physical occupation of all or a portion of private property will generally constitute a “taking.” For example, a regulation that required landlords to allow the installation of cable television boxes in their apartments was found to constitute a “taking.” (see Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp., 458 U.S. 419 [1982]).

2) Does the regulation or action require a property to dedicate a portion of property or to grant an easement?

Carefully review all regulations requiring the dedication of property or grant of an easement. The dedication of property must be reasonably and specifically designed to represent or compensate for adverse impacts of the proposed development. Likewise, the magnitude of the burden placed on the proposed development should be reasonably related to the adverse impacts created by the development. A court will also consider whether the action in question substantially advances a legitimate state interest. For example, the United States Supreme Court determined in Nollan v. California Coastal Commission 483 U.S. 825 (1987) that compelling an owner of waterfront property to grant a public easement across his property that does not substantially advance the public’s interest in beach access, constitutes a “taking.” Likewise, the United States Supreme Court held that compelling a property owner to leave a *public* green way, as opposed to a private one, did not substantially advance protection of a floodplain, and was a “taking” (Dolan v. City of Tigard, 114 U.S. 2309 [June 24, 1994]).

3. Does the regulation deprive the owner of all economically viable uses of the property?

If a regulation prohibits all economically viable or beneficial uses of the land, it will likely constitute a “taking”. In this situation, the agency can avoid liability for just compensation only if it can demonstrate that the proposed uses are prohibited by the laws of nuisance or other pre-existing limitations on the use of the property. (see Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Coun., 112 S. Ct. 2886 [1992]).

Unlike 1 and 2 above, it is important to analyze the regulation’s impact on the property as a whole, and not just the impact on a portion whether there is any profitable use of the remaining property available. (See Florida Rock Industries, Inc. v United States, 18 F.3d 1560 [Fed. Cir. 1994]). The remaining use does not necessarily have to be the owner’s planned use, a prior use, or the highest and best use of the property. One factor in this assessment is the degree to which the regulatory action interferes with a property owner’s reasonable investment-backed expectations.

Carefully review regulations requiring that all of a particular parcel of land be left substantially in its natural state. A prohibition of all economically viable users of the property is vulnerable to a takings challenge. In some situations, however, there may be pre-existing limitations on the use of property that could insulate the government from takings liability.

4. Does the regulation have a significant impact on the landowner’s economic interest?

Carefully review regulations that have a significant impact on the owner’s economic interest. Courts will often compare the value of property before and after the impact of the challenged regulation. Although a reduction in property value alone may not be a “taking,” a severe reduction in property value often indicates a reduction or elimination of reasonably profitable uses. Another economic factor courts will consider is the degree to which the challenged regulation impacts any development rights of the owner. As with 3, above, these economic factors are normally applied to the property as a whole.

5. Does the regulation deny a fundamental attribute of ownership?

Regulations that deny the landowner a fundamental attribute of ownership -- including the right to possess, exclude other and dispose of all or a portion of the property -- are potential takings.

The United States Supreme Court recently held that requiring a public easement for recreational purposes where the harm to be prevented was to the flood plain was a “taking.” In finding this to be a “taking,” the Court stated:

The city never demonstrated why a public green way, as opposed to a private one, was required in the interest of flood control. The difference to the petitioner, of course, is the loss of her ability to exclude others . . .

[T]his right to exclude others is “one of the most essential sticks in the bundle of rights that are commonly characterized as property.”

Dolan v. City of Tigard, 114 U.S. 2309 (June 24, 1994). The United States Supreme Court has also held that barring the inheritance (an essential attribute of ownership) of certain interest in land held by individual members of an Indian tribe constituted a “taking.” Hodel v. Irving, 481 U.S. 704 (1987).

6. Does the regulation serve the same purpose that would be served by directly prohibiting the use or action; and does the condition imposed substantially advance that purpose?

A regulation may go too far and may result in a takings claim where it does not substantially advance a legitimate governmental purpose. (Nollan v. California Coastal Commission, 107 S. CT. 3141 [1987]; Dolan v. City of Tigard, 114 U.S. 2309 [June 24, 1994]).

In Nollan, the United States Supreme Court held that it was an unconstitutional “taking” to condition the issuance of a permit to land owners on the grant of an easement to the public to use their beach. The court found that since there was not indication that the Nollan’s house plans interfered in any way with the public’s ability to walk up and down the beach, there was no “nexus” between any public interest that might be harmed by the construction of the house, and the permit condition. Lacking this connection, the required easement was just as unconstitutional as it would be if imposed outside the permit context.

Likewise, regulatory actions that closely resemble, or have effects of a physical invasion or occupation or property, are more likely to be found to be takings. The greater the deprivation of use, the greater the likelihood that a “taking” will be found.

D. PLAN STRUCTURE

This plan is organized into seven chapters that encompass the 13 components required by state law. These chapters allow for the grouping of similar components and provide some ease to the reader in following the county’s key issues. As allowed under Idaho Code, some components have been merged including Schools and Transportation, which is subsumed under Schools, and Special Areas and Sites, which has been combined with Community Design.

The plan chapters are as follows:

- **Chapter I** introduces the plan by briefly describing the county, the purpose of the plan, and its contents.
- **Chapter II** describes the people of Jerome County and presents future population figures. This chapter represents the population component.
- **Chapter III** discusses the county's environment encompassing the natural resources and hazardous areas components.
- **Chapter IV** is entitled "**Public Facilities**" and includes the public facilities, utilities, and services; and transportation and schools components.
- **Chapter V, "Land Use and Future Growth,"** includes the land use, housing, recreation, community design/special areas, and economic development components.
- **Chapter VI, "Implementation,"** summarizes the steps necessary to implement the policies presented in all previous chapters.

Each chapter is divided into the components described above. For the most part, components include a definition of the component, a description of current conditions; an analysis of future trends; a presentation of issues and concerns; and the associated goals, objectives, and policies.

- **DEFINITION OF THE COMPONENT** - introduces the component by defining what the resource area is (i.e., transportation describes all roads, highways, air, and rail facilities), and the purpose and contents of the chapter. These definitions were largely derived from the Idaho Code.
- **EXISTING CONDITIONS** - describes the resource within the county as it exists today. This was written utilizing existing plans and the information gathered in the data collection process. No new inventories or studies were conducted; rather, existing information was analyzed and applied to the resource.
- **ANALYSIS** - envisions the resource within the county in the future. To prepare this analysis the population forecasts performed (and described fully in chapter II) were applied to the various resources. The effect of the forecasted changes on each resource are then described.
- **ISSUES AND CONCERNS** - inventories public input. The list was derived from the work of the steering committee and subcommittees.
- **GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND ACTIONS** - outlines a future vision and course of action. The list was developed by the steering committee and subcommittees.

E. PLAN ADOPTION AND REVIEW

A public hearing by the Jerome County Planning and Zoning Commission was held on February 26, 1996. At their hearing, the commission agreed to review the plan over the course of several meetings. The Commission conducted three workshop sessions before they recommended adoption of the plan with numerous changes. A subsequent hearing was held on November 27, 1996 before the Board of Jerome County Commissioners. The board adopted the plan at that time as recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commissioners. This document represents the final plan as adopted.

In order to maintain the currency and effectiveness of the comprehensive plan, periodic review is essential. Therefore, the County Planning and Zoning Commission should meet twice annually for the sole purpose of reviewing the plan. These meetings would occur as follows:

- Winter: meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commissioners to coordinate with public service providers, city representatives, and other planning entities. The objective of this meeting is to assess progress on implementation and direct necessary actions.
- Summer: meeting of Planning and Zoning Commissioners to prepare a report to the Board of Jerome County Commissioners on the status of the plan and implementation. The objective of this meeting is to present a report to the board in conjunction with the fiscal year budgetary planning process.

II. POPULATION

An analysis of county population is included in the comprehensive plan to provide an estimate of the demand for future public facilities and services. Population forecasts are used to design the capacity of roads and sewage treatment plants, as well as to determine the level of law enforcement and fire protection. Population information also is used by the private sector to determine the need for additional retail or service activities.

This chapter begins with a discussion of past population trends in Jerome County. A presentation of population information from the 1990 census follows the past trend analysis.

A 1995 population estimate for the county was prepared based on residential building permit activity and a comparison to other data sources. That estimate was prepared for age groups and geographical units within the county. Jerome County population was forecast for 2000, 2005, 2010, and 2015; those forecasts were also done for age groups.

A. EXISTING CONDITIONS

The entire Jerome County population was last counted by the U.S. Census Bureau in 1990. At that time, slightly more than 15,100 persons resided in the county (Table II.A-1).

Table II.A-1: 1970, 1980, and 1990 Jerome County Population

<i>Year</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Numerical Increase</i>	<i>Percentage Increase</i>	<i>Annual Increase</i>
1970	10,253	-	-	-
1980	14,840	4,587	44.7%	4.5%
1990	15,138	298	2.0%	0.2%

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
U.S. Department of Commerce

Population changes in Jerome County have not been consistent over time. From 1970 to 1980, population increased by more than 4,500 persons, or at an annual rate of 4.5 percent. In the 1980 to 1990 decade, the county only gained about 300 persons, or 0.2 percent annually.

1. 1990 Census Characteristics
a. Geographic Distribution

In 1980, nearly equal portions of this population lived in either Jerome City or the unincorporated county (Table II.A-2). By 1990, the single largest share of total county population was in the unincorporated county. All three incorporated cities in the county lost population from 1980 to 1990.

Table II.A-2: 1980 - 1990 Jerome County Population by Area

<i>Area</i>	<i>1980 Population</i>	<i>1990 Population</i>	<i>Numerical Change</i>	<i>Percentage Change</i>
Eden	355	314	-41	-11.5%
Hazelton	496	394	-102	-20.6%
Jerome	6,891	6,529	-362	-5.3%
Remainder County	7,098	7,901	803	11.3%
TOTAL	14,840	15,138	298	2.0%

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
 U.S. Department of Commerce

b. Age

Median age of county residents increased from 28.5 in 1980 to 32.6 in 1990. A shift in the age structure of the county population also occurred during that time frame (Table II.A-3). There was a lower percentage of persons in the under five age group, and a higher percentage of persons in the 85 and older age bracket. A net out-migration of persons occurred in the 20 to 24 and 25 to 29 age groups. People in those two age groups were the most likely to move, especially in response to declining local economic conditions.

Table II.A-3: 1980 - 1990 Jerome County Age Distribution

<i>Age Group</i>	<i>1980 Population</i>	<i>Percent Total</i>	<i>1990 Population</i>	<i>Percent Total</i>
Under 5	1,615	10.9%	1,239	8.2%
5 - 9	1,331	9.0%	1,453	9.6%
10 - 14	1,242	8.4%	1,432	9.5%
15 - 19	1,222	8.2%	1,092	7.2%
20 - 24	1,157	7.8%	723	4.8%
25 - 29	1,190	8.0%	1,015	6.7%
30 - 34	1,054	7.1%	1,204	8.0%
35 - 39	817	5.5%	1,129	7.5%
40 - 44	705	4.8%	956	6.3%
45 - 49	703	4.7%	785	5.2%
50 - 54	695	4.7%	671	4.4%
55 - 59	747	5.0%	656	4.3%
60 - 64	757	5.1%	648	4.3%
65 - 69	583	3.9%	669	4.4%
70 - 74	432	2.9%	600	4.0%
75 - 79	286	1.9%	424	2.8%
80 - 84	176	1.2%	264	1.7%
Over 84	128	0.9%	178	1.2%
TOTAL	14,840	100.0%	15,138	100.0%

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
U.S. Department of Commerce

Jerome County's 1990 median age (32.6) was about one year more than Idaho's median age (31.5). The 20 to 24 year old age group showed the largest discrepancy between the county (4.8 percent of total population) and the state (6.5 percent). Jerome County also had a greater percentage of its population in the 55 to 79 year old age groups (Table II.A-4).

Table II.A-4: 1990 Jerome County and State of Idaho Age Distribution

<i>Age Group</i>	<i>Jerome County</i>	<i>Percent Total</i>	<i>State of Idaho</i>	<i>Percent Total</i>
Under 5	1,239	8.2%	80,193	8.0%
5 - 9	1,453	9.6%	90,043	8.9%
10 - 14	1,432	9.5%	90,186	9.0%
15 - 19	1,092	7.2%	80,438	8.0%
20 - 24	723	4.8%	65,792	6.5%
25 - 29	1,015	6.7%	72,067	7.2%
30 - 34	1,204	8.0%	80,733	8.0%
35 - 39	1,129	7.5%	79,894	7.9%
40 - 44	956	6.3%	69,274	6.9%
45 - 49	785	5.2%	54,547	5.4%
50 - 54	671	4.4%	44,360	4.4%
55 - 59	656	4.3%	39,407	3.9%
60 - 64	648	4.3%	38,550	3.8%
65 - 69	669	4.4%	37,986	3.8%
70 - 74	600	4.0%	31,769	3.2%
75 - 79	424	2.8%	24,529	2.4%
80 - 84	264	1.7%	15,583	1.5%
Over 84	178	1.2%	11,398	1.1%
TOTAL	15,138	100.0%	1,006,749	100.0%

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
U.S. Department of Commerce

c. Race and Hispanic Origin

The number of white residents remained constant from 1980 to 1990 and was the largest racial component of total county population (Table II.A-5). The Hispanic portion of the population increased from 603 residents (4.1 percent of total persons) in 1980, to slightly more than 1,000 residents (6.7 percent of total population) in 1990. County population may not total in Table II.A-5 because persons of Hispanic origin may be of any race, according to census bureau definitions.

Table II.A-5: 1980 - 1990 Jerome County Race and Hispanic Origin

<i>Race/Origin</i>	<i>1980 Population</i>	<i>Percent Total</i>	<i>1990 Population</i>	<i>Percent Total</i>
White	14,312	96.4%	14,304	94.5%
Black	0	0.0%	9	0.1%
Indian	74	0.5%	115	0.8%
Asian	99	0.7%	54	0.4%
Other	355	2.4%	656	4.3%
Hispanic	603	4.1%	1,018	6.7%
TOTAL	15,443	104.1%	16,156	106.8%

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
U.S. Department of Commerce

d. Mobility Characteristics

About three-fourths of 1990 residents older than age five had lived in Jerome County since 1985 (Table II.A-6). The origin of residents moving into the county was about evenly split between other Idaho counties and other states in the United States.

Table II.A-6: 1990 Jerome County Mobility Characteristics

<i>1985 Residency</i>	<i>Number Persons</i>	<i>Percentage Total</i>
Jerome County	10,344	74.4%
Other Idaho County	1,799	12.9%
Other State	1,634	11.8%
Other Country	128	0.9%
TOTAL	13,905	100.0%

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
U.S. Department of Commerce

2. 1990 to 1995 Population Change

From 1990 to 1995, Jerome County was gaining population once again, adding more than 1,700 residents (Table II.A-7). The county-wide 2.3 percent average annual population gain was more than double the national average. It also was six times the amount of population increase seen in the county from 1980 to 1990.

Table II.A-7: 1990 - 1995 Jerome County Population by Area

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

<i>Area</i>	<i>1990 Population</i>	<i>1995 Population</i>	<i>Numerical Increase</i>	<i>Percentage Increase</i>
Eden	314	335	21	6.7%
Hazelton	394	404	10	2.5%
Jerome	6,529	7,264	735	11.3%
Balance County	7,901	8,891	990	12.5%
TOTAL	15,138	16,894	1,756	11.6%

Source: Intermountain Demographics

The unincorporated county gained nearly 1,000 persons, an average annual increase of 2.5 percent. Population also increased in each of the incorporated cities, reversing the 1980 to 1990 trend.

The 1995 population estimate was based on residential building permit activity occurring within the county. The number of residential building permits issued from 1990 through 1994 was factored for completion and occupancy rates. The resulting total, or number of new households, was multiplied by a persons-per-household rate to determine the population change since 1990. Housing units vacant in 1990 also were assumed to be occupied. Those two indicators of population change were added to the 1990 base population to estimate the 1995 population. That estimate compared favorably with independent estimates prepared by the Idaho Power Company, several private data vendors, and an extrapolation of the 1990 to 1994 population estimate prepared by the census bureau.

a. Migration

Information available from the Internal Revenue Service for 1991 and 1992 indicated that more than 27 percent of all in-migrants to Jerome County came from Twin Falls County. (That same data showed the highest percentage of people leaving Jerome County moved to Twin Falls County.) Another 30 percent of newcomers moved from other counties in Idaho. About 26 percent of all newcomers were from other western states.

b. Age Distribution

Age distribution (or the percentage of persons in an age group) of the 1995 population generally is similar to the 1990 population (Table II.A-8). However, there are several notable exceptions. An actual decrease in the number of persons in the five to nine year old age group occurs, due in part to the low birth rate in the early 1990s.

There is a substantial increase in the number and percentage of persons in the 20 to 24 year old age group. People that age are either staying in Jerome County or moving in from other areas. An increase in that age group indicates positive economic conditions. However, a decline in the 25 to 29 year old age group shows mixed signals about the local economy.

Population increases take place in the two oldest age groups. The 80 to 84 age group shifted from 1.7 percent of the total 1990 population to 2.4 percent of the 1995 population. The oldest age segment of the population doubled from 1.2 percent to 2.4 percent in the same time frame.

Table II.A-8: 1990 - 1995 Jerome County Age Distribution

<i>Age Group</i>	<i>1990 Population</i>	<i>Percent Total</i>	<i>1995 Population</i>	<i>Percent Total</i>
Under 5	1,239	8.2%	1,378	8.2%
5 - 9	1,453	9.6%	1,278	7.6%
10 - 14	1,432	9.5%	1,487	8.8%
15 - 19	1,092	7.2%	1,468	8.7%
20 - 24	723	4.8%	1,174	6.9%
25 - 29	1,015	6.7%	801	4.7%
30 - 34	1,204	8.0%	1,079	7.4%
35 - 39	1,129	7.5%	1,248	7.4%
40 - 44	956	6.3%	1,160	6.9%
45 - 49	785	5.2%	978	5.8%
50 - 54	671	4.4%	498	4.7%
55 - 59	656	4.3%	679	4.0%
60 - 64	648	4.3%	662	3.9%
65 - 69	669	4.4%	652	3.9%
70 - 74	600	4.0%	657	3.9%
75 - 79	424	2.8%	585	2.3%
80 - 84	264	1.7%	407	2.4%
Over 84	178	1.2%	403	2.4%
TOTAL	15,138	100.0%	16,894	100.0%

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
U.S. Department of Commerce

Age distribution of the 1995 county population is based on 1990 population by age group, number of births and deaths from 1990 to 1995, and age of in-migrants. The number of 1990 people surviving in a five year age group was aged to the next five year age group in 1995. Births from 1990 to 1994 are based on the number of females in child-bearing years and past

trend data. The aged population, plus the number of births, provides the 1995 resident population.

Total in-migration is determined by subtracting the resident population from the control total of 16,894. The age of in-migrants is based on a census bureau survey of people moving to the western region of the United States

B. ANALYSIS

1. Population Forecasts

Seven alternative population forecasts were prepared for 2000, 2005, 2010, and 2015. Each alternative was based on different assumptions about the future. The final selection was made by the Jerome Joint Agency Planning Committee (Table II.B-1).

Table II.B-1: Jerome County Population Forecast

<i>Year</i>	<i>Population</i>
1990	15,138
1995	16,894
2000	18,853
2005	21,040
2010	23,480
2015	26,204

Source: Intermountain Demographics

The short-term population forecast for 2000 is based on the assumption that 1990 to 1995 level of economic, building, and in-migration activity will continue until 2000. It also is assumed that the birth rate or ratio to child bearing females will be more consistent with the trend in the late 1980s, rather than the early 1990s. Population forecasts for 2005, 2010, and 2015 are based on similar assumptions. The short-term trend was also chosen because it closely resembles the long-range, or 1970 to 1990, trend. It also reflects the change in the number of births occurring from the late 1980s to the 1990s.

2. Future Age Groups

Future levels of the Jerome County population are divided into age groups (Table II.B-2). The methodology to divide future population into age groups is similar to the methodology to place the 1995 population into age groups. Number of births (the under 5 age group) is based on the number of females in their child-bearing years. Each five year age group is aged to the next five year group, based on mortality rates for Jerome County. In-migration is determined by subtracting the resident population from the control total population. Age of in-migrants is based on a census bureau mobility survey.

Table II.B-2: 2000, 2005, 2010, and 2015 Jerome County Population by Age Group

<i>Age Group</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2015</i>
Under 5	1,453	1,742	1,929	2,115
5 - 9	1,432	1,507	1,806	2,005
10 - 14	1,324	1,478	1,561	1,871
15 - 19	1,535	1,373	1,535	1,630
20 - 24	1,578	1,646	1,504	1,692
25 - 29	1,279	1,682	1,770	1,653
30 - 34	888	1,365	1,785	1,892
35 - 39	1,140	949	1,437	1,870
40 - 44	1,291	1,182	1,001	1,498
45 - 49	1,190	1,320	1,218	1,044
50 - 54	996	1,206	1,340	1,244
55 - 59	810	1,006	1,219	1,356
60 - 64	689	818	1,016	1,231
65 - 69	669	695	826	1,025
70 - 74	643	659	687	816
75 - 79	642	628	645	674
80 - 84	562	616	604	621
Over 84	734	1,167	1,598	1,966
TOTAL	18,855	21,039	23,481	26,203

Source: Intermountain Demographics

3. 1990 and 2015 Age Comparison

From 1990 to 2015, Jerome County's population increases by more than 11,000 persons (Table II.B-3). The largest population gain occurs in those persons aged 84 and older. That age group increases by 1,788 persons, a ten-fold increase from 1990. It was 1.2 percent of the total population in 1990 and is forecast to increase to 7.5 percent of the 2015 population.

The three youngest age groups gain population numerically, but become smaller portions of total county population. The under five age cohort increases by 877 persons, but slips from 8.2 percent to 8.1 percent of total population.

Percentage declines in the five to nine year old and ten to fifteen year old age groups are much greater. The five to nine year old age group decreases from 9.6 percent of the 1990 population to 7.7 percent of the 2015 population. The ten to fifteen year old age group declines from 9.5 percent to 7.1 percent of total county population those same years.

Table II.B-3: 1990 - 2015 Jerome County Population by Age Groups

<i>Age Group</i>	<i>1990 Persons</i>	<i>Percent Total</i>	<i>2015 Persons</i>	<i>Percent Total</i>	<i>Number Change</i>
Under 5	1,239	8.2%	2,116	8.1%	877
5 - 9	1,453	9.6%	2,005	7.7%	552
10 - 14	1,432	9.5%	1,871	7.1%	439
15 - 19	1,092	7.2%	1,630	6.2%	538
20 - 24	723	4.8%	1,692	6.5%	969
25 - 29	1,015	6.7%	1,653	6.3%	638
30 - 34	1,204	8.0%	1,892	7.2%	688
35 - 39	1,129	7.5%	1,870	7.1%	741
40 - 44	956	6.3%	1,498	5.7%	542
45 - 49	785	5.2%	1,044	4.0%	259
50 - 54	671	4.4%	1,244	4.7%	573
55 - 59	656	4.3%	1,356	5.2%	700
60 - 64	648	4.3%	1,231	4.7%	583
65 - 69	669	4.4%	1,025	3.9%	356
70 - 74	600	4.0%	816	3.1%	216
75 - 79	424	2.8%	674	2.6%	250
80 - 84	264	1.7%	621	2.4%	357
Over 84	178	1.2%	1,966	7.5%	1,788
TOTAL	15,138	100.0%	26,204	100.0%	11,066

Source: Intermountain Demographics

C. ISSUES AND CONCERNS

The following issues and concerns regarding these population data have been identified:

- Changes in population have not been consistent over time, and cause difficulty predicting future population.
- From 1970 to 1980, the population increased by more than 4,500 persons.
- Total county population increased by about 300 persons in the 1980 to 1990 decade.
- Population is increasing more rapidly again, gaining about 1,700 persons from 1990 to 1995.
- One of the highest population forecasts was chosen for the future. Any significant downturn in the local or national economies may have an impact on that forecast.
- Age distribution of the population will shift over time.
- Persons aged 80 and older were about 3 percent of the 1990 population. By 2015, they will be nearly 10 percent of the total population.
- Corresponding percentage decrease will occur in the younger segments of the population. Those decreases will primarily be in the five to fifteen year old age groups.

D. GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND ACTIONS

Goal: Accommodate orderly growth while maintaining the rural lifestyle of Jerome County
Objective: Provide public facilities and services for an increasing and varying population, including the elderly
Actions: Annually monitor population forecasts Revise forecasts as base conditions change Adopt zoning regulations which direct residential development activity to areas of impact

III. ENVIRONMENT

Jerome County's environment has provided the area with its economic livelihood for nearly a century. Jerome County's flat topography, soil condition, and, most importantly, water resources form the basis of the existing agricultural development. The documentation of these natural resources, as well as possible areas of hazard, provide the groundwork in which informed planning decisions can be made.

A. NATURAL RESOURCES

This component provides a brief introduction to the natural resources found in Jerome County. These resource elements include: geology and soils; surface and groundwater availability and quality; air quality; and vegetation and wildlife. Other natural resources include minerals and geothermal sites which both have potential economic importance. Following a discussion of the existing conditions, an analysis of the impact of future growth on these resources is presented. Specific issues and concerns are identified as well as goals, objectives, and policies.

1. Existing Conditions

a. Geology

The geology of an area is used to describe the natural features that characterize the outdoor setting, as well as the physical elements that make up that setting. This section provides a description of the geologic setting, as well as the soil attribute.

Jerome County lies within the Snake River Plain Sub-Region of the Columbia Plateau Physiographic Province. This region is characterized by a broad, slightly undulating basalt plateau used primarily for agriculture. The lava flows and sedimentary deposits are dominated by Quaternary basalt of the Snake River Group (Idaho Department of Water Resources [IDWR] 1993). The oldest rocks in the area are the Idavada Volcanics which underlie most of the Snake River basalts. A sequence of Tertiary and Quaternary basalt flows with interbedded sediments overlies the Idavada Volcanics. Basalt outcrops are common in the Jerome County region. In northeastern Jerome County, on BLM managed land, the remnants of the ancient basalt lava flow predominate the area.

Snake River Canyon

The Snake River Canyon, which borders Jerome County, provides the most scenic and dramatic geologic feature of the county. The Snake River may have begun cutting its present canyon about 500,000 years ago (Covington, 1976). The Snake River below Milner Dam has cut a canyon 400 feet deep. At Shoshone Falls, the river drops another 212 feet. Scab-land topography near the falls is associated with the ancient Bonneville Flood. Approximately 15,000 years ago, overflow from the Pleistocene Lake Bonneville scoured the Snake River Canyon. The flood water swept the canyon and adjacent uplands of rock debris, eroding alcoves and scab lands, and depositing huge bars of sand and gravel with boulders. Most rapids in the area are a

result of a large number of boulders deposited at or below a slight widening of the canyon during the Bonneville Flood (IDWR 1993). Area erosion features formed by glacial floodwaters include the Devil's Washbowl, Devil's Corral, and Blue Lakes areas along the Snake River.

Due to its spectacular beauty and recreation opportunities, the river canyon corridor provides a unique element that contributes to the county's quality of life. The river canyon provides hiking, fishing, wildlife viewing, and cultural resources in a spectacular rugged environment. Much of the land along the Snake River is in private ownership, where development along the cliffs and in the canyon itself has occurred. The Bureau of Reclamation controls releases from Milner Dam and a small amount of land along the corridor. Idaho Power also controls a small area of land along the river corridor. Other public land is managed by the BLM and the state of Idaho, through the Idaho Department of Lands

Since much of the land is in private ownership, access to and in the Snake River Canyon is restricted (refer to Figure I.A-1). The Middle Snake River Recreation Work Group (formerly the Access committee) under the Region IV Recreation Forum and with assistance by the Rivers, Trails, Conservation Assistance Program (of the National Park Service) is developing a program to look at recreation issues along the Snake River Canyon Corridor. The objective of the project is to develop a series of recommendations on recreation issues such as resource management, access, future facilities and opportunities, as well as preservation of cultural and historical resources. The project area includes all resources along or within the Snake River Corridor from Three Island State Park east to Massacre Rock State Park. Recommendations will be developed through a series of community and region-wide meetings. The project was initiated in Fall, 1995 and is expected to conclude in Winter, 1996. The committee is currently in the process of developing a recreation inventory map of the Snake River Corridor. This map will identify land ownership and access trails, as well as other types of recreation along the Snake River Canyon Corridor.

Soils

The soil is the layer of material over bedrock that supports life. Besides providing a medium for plant growth, it stabilizes wastes and purifies water, and serves as the foundation for buildings and roads. Soil is grouped into classes based on a number of considerations, including the parent material, depth, chemical composition, particle size, and manner of deposition and erosion of the parent material. Each soil class has identifying characteristics, such as good drainage (high permeability) or high shrink-swell potential. These inherent traits must be taken into account prior to development of property. Slow permeability of a soil or high water table can cause septic tank filter fields to fail. Soils with high shrink-swell or corrosivity should be avoided when installing underground utilities, pipes, or cables. Highly erodible or fragile soils are not suited for intense recreational use. Failure to take into account the soil's characteristics can create personal hardship (foundation or leach field failure), excessive land development and maintenance costs, and public health and safety hazards.

The soils found in Jerome County are of sedentary origin and consist mainly of loess and eolian sands. Soil depths vary greatly over the undulating basalt bedrock. Loess is a windborn deposit

composed chiefly of silt, but also includes fine sand (Friedman and Sanders 1978). Eolian sands are also windborn particles. Most soils in the county are silty except in the southwestern part of the county where sandy soils predominate. The sandy soils in the southwestern portion of the county are favored for dairies because of their excellent drainage properties. The soil found in Jerome County has been classified into general soil units which consist of one or more major or minor soil types. These six general soil units have been mapped for Jerome County and are shown on Figure III.A-1. The information presented on the figure indicates the dominant soil unit characteristics, but does not eliminate the need for on-site investigation necessary for specific engineering practices. Characteristics of these soils are presented in Table III.A-1.

Table III.A-1: Characteristics of Soils Found in Jerome County

<i>Soil Unit</i>	<i>Erodibility</i>	<i>Permeability</i>	<i>Shrink/Swell</i>
Portneuf	Erodible	Moderately Slow	Low
Power-McCain-Paulville	Slightly Erodible	Moderately Slow	Moderate
Kecko-Tauton-Harsan	Highly Erodible	Moderately Slow To Moderately Rapid	Low To Moderate
Rock outcrop-Banbury-Paulville	Slightly Erodible	Moderate To Moderately Slow	Low To Moderate
Chuska-Colthorp	Slightly to not erodible	Moderately Slow	Low To Moderate
Rock outcrop-Xerorthents	NA	NA	NA

Note: Information presented is the overall characteristics of the soil; some of these traits may vary slightly with depth.

Prime Agricultural Land

Agricultural activity occurs throughout Jerome County. With a long growing season, good soils, and a viable water supply, agriculture has flourished, providing a strong economic base for Jerome County. Prime farmland soils, as defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, are soils that are best suited to producing food, seed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops. Such soils have properties that are favorable for the economic production of sustained high yields of crops. Approximately 94 percent of Jerome County land qualifies as prime agricultural land. Prime farmland soil types identified in Jerome County include Portneuf, Power-McCain-Paulville, and Kecko-Tauton-Harsan soil complexes. These soils types are based on the availability of an adequate and

Figure III.A-1

dependable supply of irrigation water. If water were not available for irrigation, the soil types would not be considered prime farmland.

Sewage Disposal

Properties of soil for good subsurface sewage disposal systems include permeability, depth to water table, hard pan or rock, and susceptibility to flooding. While silt loam soils are generally good for sewage disposal systems, problems within Jerome County include a shallow depth to bedrock layer and soil permeability. The uneven basalt bedrock causes difficulties when siting septic systems; however, careful siting and specific engineering can be made to overcome this problem. Septic systems must also be sited at a distance to avoid periodic flooding of the numerous irrigation canals and laterals crossing through the county. Information and septic system permits can be obtained from the South Central District Health Department.

b. Water Availability and Quality

The Snake River plays a key role in Jerome County. As the primary source of irrigation water, the historic livelihood of the residents of Jerome County have relied on this river since the turn of the century. The North Side Canal Company (NSCC) has delivered water from the Snake River to agricultural fields in Jerome since 1907. The Snake River continues to receive national attention due to concerns related to threatened and endangered species; wild and scenic rivers; and water rights, availability, and quality.

Availability

The second largest groundwater system in the United States, the Snake River Plain Aquifer, underlies Jerome County. The eastern portion of this aquifer extends across southern Idaho and is about 170 miles long, 60 miles wide, and 10,800 square miles in area. Water in storage is estimated to exceed 200 million acre-feet. The aquifer provides the largest inflow of water to the Snake River from Milner Dam to King Hill, discharging approximately 5,700 cubic feet per second (cfs) of water (IDWR 1993). The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has designated the Snake River Plain Aquifer as a sole source aquifer. Therefore, stringent groundwater regulations apply. Groundwater from the aquifer is used as a source of domestic, irrigation, and municipal water supplies.

The primary source of recharge to the Snake River Plain groundwater system is from seepage of surface water used for irrigation. Within the last 100 years, the amount of groundwater recharge has varied as agriculture practices have changed. In the early 1900s, with the inception of surface water irrigation, groundwater recharge increased. However, due to increased groundwater pumping and increased efficiencies in surface water irrigation applications since the mid-1950s, recharge has slowly been declining. The water level in the aquifer is expected to continue to decline under the current conditions of withdrawal exceeding recharge (Garabedian 1992). The IDWR reported that groundwater aquifers are being stressed by a reduction in natural recharge due to the drought, by changes in diversion and irrigation practices, and by increased pumping to augment surface water use (IDWR 1993).

All surface and groundwater resources and uses in the Magic Valley, which includes Jerome County, are being examined by a lengthy legal process known as the Snake River Basin General Water Adjudication. The general adjudication is a court case that will result in a decree deciding all rights to water from the water system. In November of 1987, the Judicial District Court issued a Commencement Order, which began the general adjudication of water rights from the Snake River Basin Water system in Idaho. Idaho Code, Section 42-1409, required all holders to file a Notice of Claim to a water right for each water right (BLM 1994).

As a result of eight years of drought in Idaho, and the uncertainty concerning available groundwater supplies, the IDWR has imposed a moratorium on the development of new water right permits for consumptive uses of groundwater from the Eastern Snake River Plain Aquifer. Limited groundwater permits are being issued; however, existing water rights can be purchased.

Quality

All Idaho rivers are subject to the water quality standards set forth in the Federal Clean Water Act and administered through the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). Section 313 of the Act requires all federal agencies to comply with state water quality standards. Idaho's water quality standards describe beneficial uses, define minimum criteria for protecting beneficial uses, and describe the way that land use activities must be conducted to protect or enhance beneficial uses of water. Beneficial uses have been designated for a 94-mile reach of the Snake River from Milner Dam to King Hill. These beneficial uses are contained in IDAPA 16.01 *General Water Quality Criteria*. Beneficial uses covered include agricultural water supply, cold water biota, salmon spawning, and primary and secondary contact recreation.

The Snake River from Shoshone Falls to King Hill has been listed as water quality-limited. A water quality-limited segment is any segment where water quality does not meet applicable water quality standards for beneficial uses. Water quality along the Snake River has been impaired by numerous point and non-point sources so that it no longer meets its beneficial uses. Concentrations of nitrate plus nitrite nitrogen and total phosphorus, and water temperature exceed guidelines or adopted water quality criteria for the designated beneficial uses in the main stem of the Snake River (Brockway and Robinson 1992). In addition, flow alteration brought about by hydrologic modifications hinder waste assimilation and flushing which also exacerbates the algae and macrophyte problems. Due to extremely low flows in Snake River in the last few years, the ability of the river to absorb the nutrient and sediment inflows has been severely hampered (IDWR 1993). Point source pollution includes municipal wastewater treatment plants, aquaculture, and food processors. Major non-point sources include runoff from irrigated agriculture returns and some confined animal feeding operation runoff (DEQ 1995).

The IDWR, in conjunction with the DEQ, has prepared a draft *Mid-Snake River Nutrient Management Plan (1995)* to prevent further decline in water quality and improve water quality for those listed beneficial uses. The Mid-Snake River Nutrient Management Plan identifies goals and strategies for improving the water quality of the Snake River. The plan also contains management actions and implementation procedures to monitor the progress and effectiveness of

the program. While the time frame for the plan covers a 10-year period, some goals and strategies are anticipated to be met within five years.

As discussed, groundwater is used throughout the county for domestic and municipal water supply. The protection of the public water supply and its source from contamination has come under close scrutiny of federal EPA. Nationwide, EPA has mandated that each state must prepare a county protection plan for public water supplies. Broadly defined, a public water system provides piped water for 15 connections or serves 25 or more people, 60 days per year. Examples of public supply systems range from trailer parks and campgrounds to city water systems. The state of Idaho prepared a draft county protection plan and submitted it to EPA for review (Personal communication, Andersen 1995). Individual water supply systems within counties are not required to prepare a plan but are encouraged to do so by DEQ. The city of Jerome has prepared such a county protection plan. Ordinance 759, is the legal mandate describing the Well-head Protection Plan.

c. Air Quality

Healthy air quality almost goes unnoticed in areas such as Jerome where the air is clean and visibility is only cut short by small hills or basalt outcrops. While air quality within Jerome County is considered good, field and silage burning during certain times of the year has raised the awareness of the importance of good air quality. Smoke from seasonal burning poses a health hazard for the young, elderly, and those with respiratory problems such as asthma or emphysema. The smoke can become localized, causing reduced visibility and health-related risks during periods of little or no wind.

Described by the concentrations of various pollutants in the atmosphere, air quality, is determined by the type and amount of pollutants emitted into the atmosphere, the size and topography of the air basin, and the meteorological conditions related to the prevailing climate. Federal standards for criterion pollutants have been established by the EPA and termed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). These standards include concentrations for ozone (O₂), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀), and lead (Pb).

According to EPA guidelines, an area with air quality better than the NAAQS is designated as being "in attainment," while an area with air quality worse than the NAAQS is classified as a "non-attainment" area. A non-attainment designation means that a primary NAAQS has been exceeded more than three discontinuous times in three years, in a given area. Currently, Jerome County is in attainment with all NAAQS.

d. Vegetation and Wildlife Resources

Vegetation

Jerome County lies within the Intermountain Shrub Region (BLM 1994). Typical plant communities found in Jerome County are composed of a sagebrush overstory with an understory of bunchgrass and forbs. Major vegetation sagebrush-grassland communities include:

- Wyoming big sagebrush over mixed grasses
- Basin big sagebrush over Bluebunch wheatgrass
- Basin big sagebrush over Indian ricegrass
- Idaho Three-tip over Bluebunch wheatgrass

These vegetation communities provide valuable habitat for birds and other small mammals and provide hunting grounds for birds of prey.

Wildlife

Mule deer, elk, and antelope are the predominant big game species found in Jerome County. The county has been identified as providing crucial deer winter range and pronghorn antelope winter range. A wide variety of game and non-game birds inhabit the county.

The Snake River provides important waterfowl habitat and nesting sites for raptors. A variety of raptors utilize the area centered on the Snake River. The Middle Snake River (from Milner Dam to King Hill) also has a varied fish population. Rainbow trout is the most abundant game fish in the area. However, other game fish common to the Snake River include cutthroat trout, channel catfish, smallmouth bass, largemouth bass, yellow perch, white sturgeon, and mountain whitefish.

An Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) has been proposed by the BLM within Jerome County. Located in the Snake River, approximately 5 miles west of Eden, this area was proposed for the protection of threatened or endangered aquatic species and to preserve its unique spring ecosystem alcove.

Two sections of the middle Snake River bordering Jerome County has been proposed by the BLM as a scenic river under the Wild and Scenic River Act. These areas are known for their scenic, recreational, and historical features.

e. Geothermal and Mineral Resources

While several geothermal resources are located along the Snake River, few developed resources exist in Jerome County. Thermal water at 43 degrees Celsius (110 degrees Fahrenheit) is discharged from a well located along the Snake River west of Highway 93. No other thermal water has been tapped in Jerome County and the potential for further prospects is unknown (IDWR 1993).

To date, there has been no oil and gas production in Jerome County (BLM, 1994). The lithology, structural, and environmental conditions of deposition are generally unfavorable for finding or producing source rocks or reservoir sites for oil or gas. Sand and gravel resources are readily available along the Snake River and in Jerome County. The primary influencing factors for the location of the pits are ease of access and proximity to market. Therefore, many pits are located alongside roads. In Jerome County, numerous sand and gravel pits are located near the

intersection of I-84 and Highway 93. Gold has been mined along the Snake River; however, no major gold mining operations have occurred along the Mid-Snake River reach since the early 1930s (IDWR 1993).

2. Analysis

The natural resources of Jerome County lie in a delicate balance between agriculture, population growth, water resources, and wildlife habitat. With this projected growth, long-term detrimental impacts to this balance will be inevitable unless steps are taken to manage the growth in an environmentally sound manner. Already detrimental effects to the land and water and wildlife habitat have been experienced in this area. While the county appears to have ample land areas available to accommodate growth, pressure to encroach on the natural resources is expected. The effects of growth and population on the county's natural resources are further described below.

- *Soil Erosion.* A century of agricultural activities has taken its toll on the land. Erosion of the soil has been caused by years of farming. The resulting sedimentation into the Snake River is recognized as a problem. Recognizing the valuable soil resource and its impact with regard to sedimentation, conservation has become of utmost importance to the citizens of Jerome County. These concerns are reflected in their goals, objectives, and policies developed for this comprehensive plan. By developing and practicing conservation methods of farming, the soil resource can be conserved for future generations.
- *Water Quality.* While water resources drawn from wells are considered of good quality, the Snake River is currently not meeting the water quality criteria for beneficial uses during certain times of the year. This is due to a combination of diminished stream flows, nutrient inflows, and sediment. While numerous point and non-point sources meet state water quality standards or NPDES discharge limits on an individual basis, the cumulative impacts of these sources negatively impact water quality on a whole. The Mid-Snake River Nutrient Management Plan has goals and objectives that are expected to improve the water quality of the region within the next five years.
- *Water Availability.* Water rights and availability within Jerome County and the entire Snake River Basin continues to be a source of lengthy legal debates with no immediate resolution in sight. With the IDWR moratorium imposed on new appropriations, water is a limited commodity within the county. Water rights can still be purchased from an existing user. Idaho water law provides that senior water rights holders have priority over junior water rights holders. In 1994, the A & B Irrigation District (ABID) initiated a "call" on junior water rights. ABID claims a priority date of 1948, therefore ABID is senior to water rights holders with priorities after 1948. While no water has been refused to any junior holder, this case is before IDWR for review. With anticipated water requirements expected for new growth, the issue of water being delivered to senior versus junior water rights holders may become more of an issue with the outcome unknown.
- *New Development.* The land is also receiving increased pressure from a growing population and subsequent development. Where once there were productive fields, there are now

subdivisions for a burgeoning population. The characteristics that define prime agricultural lands are also attractive to developers for construction purposes. Areas with rock outcrops or shallow soil mantle provide problems with foundations, septic systems, or with laying utility pipelines. Overcoming these problems are usually quite expensive. With a projected increase in population, the trend is to continue to develop lands at the cost of prime agricultural lands.

A water and sewer district (depicted on Figure III.A-2) has recently been established to connect and to service the I-84 and Highway 53 area of city impact with city facilities. The water and sewer district will provide potential for development within its boundaries.

- *Wildlife habitat preservation and development.* Many opportunities for creation and enhancement of wildlife habitat exist within the county, especially areas associated with the canals, ditches, and windbreaks. Over the last 15 years, Jerome County has lost some of the most productive wildlife habitat due to urban encroachment. Utility pipelines have been laid in ditches, hedge rows removed for expansion of fields, and general residential development has caused a decrease in wildlife habitat available. Programs for encouraging and enhancing the preservation and creation of habitat have been developed. The NSCC has taken a leadership role in wetland creation and Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) has created much valuable habitat through its Habitat Improvement Program (HIP), cost-sharing wetlands, ponds and windbreaks.
- *Snake River Canyon.* Public and private land ownership occurs along the river canyon corridor. While public access to the canyon exists, some lands necessary for public access to the canyon are held by private landowners. The Middle Snake River Recreation Group has initiated a program to identify and review recreation areas and opportunities along the Snake River Canyon Corridor. Through the group's effort, recommendations for resource management, access, and future facilities should be developed.
- *Snake River Habitat.* As more development occurs along the Snake River, more animal habitat and riparian areas are lost, as well as public access for hiking and wildlife viewing. While some private landholders allow public access, a change in ownership, pressures from developers, or abuse by visitors could change that status. Protection of these areas for wildlife habitat, and gaining or keeping access to the public, will depend on purchases of the land by the county or by close cooperation with other land agencies.
- *Fugitive dust and smoke.* An increase in particulate matter can also be expected with growth. Temporary increases during construction activities, coupled with annual burning, could potentially decrease the good air quality of Jerome County. Fugitive dust from construction, as well as farming activities, can be controlled by best management practices.

3. Issues and Concerns

Water

- Preserve and enhance quality of surface waters
- Preserve and enhance quality of groundwater
- Assure long-term water supplies - ground and surface
- Conserve existing water

Land

- Preserve integrity of range and agricultural lands - public and private
- Preserve canal system and rights-of-way and maximize wildlife and recreational benefits without compromising water delivery functions
- Joint planning for federal, state, and county lands (ecosystem management)
- Preserve and acquire critical canyon rim lands

4. Goals, Objectives, and Actions

<p>Goal: Preserve and enhance the quality of surface water to support beneficial uses</p>
<p>Objectives: Promote best management practices (BMPs) on agricultural land Improve management of storm water run-off</p>
<p>Actions: Work with resource agencies to develop and promote education and incentive programs Encourage programs that study areas of water resources Develop an incentive and education program for using agricultural BMPs Require new developments to include surface drainage plans with runoff controlled on-site or integrated into natural drainage Encourage the construction of ponds to clean up agricultural return flows; this also creates wildlife habitat Encourage hydropower development on canals Develop standards and a program to contain runoff from confined animal operations, and to limit over-application of fertilizer, animal and commercial waste to agricultural lands Encourage composting of manure, and develop a program to assist livestock confinement and aquaculture operations in adopting this technology Support water quality laws and regulations Develop standards and a program to ensure that there are no adverse impacts to surface water</p>

<p>Goal: Protect soil resources in Jerome County</p>
<p>Objective: Promote BMPs on agricultural land</p>
<p>Actions: Develop standards and a program to contain run-off to ensure that there are no adverse impacts to surface and/or groundwater Encourage the use of BMPs for all agricultural activities Develop an incentive and education program for using agricultural BMPs Work with soil conservation districts, Idaho Department of Agriculture, USDA, and University of Idaho Extension Service to educate farmers regarding use of BMPs</p>

<p>Goal: Preserve and enhance wildlife habitat</p>
<p>Objective: Prevent or discourage the loss of existing wildlife habitat where economically feasible</p>
<p>Actions: Encourage the use of BMPs to provide and protect wildlife habitat Develop an ordinance to protect riparian vegetation and raptor nesting habitat in Snake River Canyon Encourage using agricultural areas which are marginally productive to provide wildlife habitat Protect riparian and wetland areas along natural water courses Investigate regulating development in critical habitat and migratory areas Discourage development of hydropower on rivers and springs Encourage hydropower development on canals</p>
<p>Objective: Encourage prevention measures which control infestation and the spread of noxious weeds</p>
<p>Actions: Implement a program to identify and eradicate noxious weeds Seek funding for noxious weed control programs Encourage state and federal governments to eradicate noxious weeds on their property</p>

<p>Goal: Protect groundwater quality</p>
<p>Objectives: Preserve and enhance the quality of groundwater Preserve and encourage the development of riparian and wetlands area to improve water quality Consider standards and a program to ensure there are no adverse impacts to groundwater</p>
<p>Actions: Promote BMPs on agricultural land Work cooperatively with the IDWR in their well-head protection education program Enforce existing groundwater protection laws and regulations Discourage use of injection wells Discourage individual septic systems in areas with inadequate soils Encourage well-head protection implementation strategies</p>

Goal: Maintain long-term surface and groundwater supplies
Objective: Assure that water supplies are protected
Actions: Analyze all agricultural and commercial development for impact on water supplies Develop a county water use policy in conjunction with Mid-Snake River Water Resource Commission Encourage cooperation between local building officials and South Central District Health Promote groundwater recharge

Goal: Increase the number of residential and commercial development connections to municipalities sewer systems and water systems or to developments own community sewer and water systems. *amended 08/05/2013
Objective: Promote conservation of ground and surface water
Actions: Encourage canal company to develop a water conservation policy and education program Encourage multiple use technologies to reuse water including irrigation systems that use graywater, treated sewage, etc. Encourage use of surface water, rather than groundwater, for irrigation

Goal: Prevent the loss of range and agricultural lands
Objective: Preserve the integrity of range and agricultural lands
Actions: Develop zoning policies that maintain contiguous blocks of agricultural and range land Guide new housing and commercial development into areas where it is already in existence Encourage compliance with Idaho Code regarding Use of Surface and Ground Water Encourage Irrigation Districts, Canal Companies or other irrigation delivery entities to establish and/or maintain delivery systems and to apportion or allocate surface water rights to new land use applicants when available (Amended 4-27-2006)

Goal: Coordinate joint agency planning for federal, state, and county lands
Objective: Develop a joint agency planning process for the county
Actions: Encourage formation of a joint agency planning group to coordinate with state and federal plans and projects

Goal: Preserve and acquire canyon rim land
Objective: Establish county policies that encourage the preservation of canyon rim land
Actions: Appoint a county canyon rim preservation committee Consider canyon rim committee recommendations to establish canyon rim setback guidelines that protect cultural and natural resources, provide for recreational activities, and recognize individual property rights
Objective: Acquire or secure development rights to canyon rim lands
Actions: Establish county zoning provisions that protect the aesthetic qualities of the Snake River Canyon from urban development Negotiate with Twin Falls County and city regarding issues and concerns on the Snake River Canyon

Goal: Protect and improve air quality
Objective: Protect existing air quality by ensuring that particulate matter (PM ₁₀) meets or does not exceed state and federal standards
Action: Ensure that commercial development meets environmental quality standards

B. HAZARDOUS AREAS

Hazardous areas are those areas which currently may, or have the potential to threaten human health, property, and/or wildlife. It is important to identify these areas to prevent development in potentially hazardous areas. Hazardous areas can be natural phenomenon (seismic hazards, slope, erosion hazards, and floodplains), as well as man-made (landfills or waste disposal areas and airport clear zones).

1. Current Conditions

a. Soil Erosion

Exposed surface soil materials are prone to erosion by wind and water. Ground-disturbing activities such as construction, quarrying, and tillage increase soil erosion. Soil erosion occurs from run-off, irrigation, and wind. Properties such as slope and climate affect erosion. For instance, soils on the greatest slopes have higher erosion hazards than soils on more level terrain. The amount of vegetative cover also affects erodibility. Soils in Jerome County are susceptible to both wind and water erosion. Surface irrigation is the largest contributor to erosion.

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) conducts a National Resources Inventory (NRI) every five years that includes information on soil erosion by water and wind throughout Idaho. Results from the NRI show that, overall, Idaho had decreased in sheet and rill erosion by 0.8 tons per acre since 1987 as a result of using BMPs (NRCS 1994). Wind erosion on cropland has increased slightly by 0.3 tons per acre since 1987. This increase may be attributed to more acres of low residue crops being grown using tillage methods that often result in a high amount of surface disturbance with low levels of residue being left on the soil surface to protect it from wind erosion (NRCS 1994).

b. Slope

Slope hazards occur predominately in the Snake River Canyon. Rock falls have occurred and continue to occur due to the freeze/thaw action within the cracks of the canyon walls. Although development has occurred along the Snake River, limitations have been placed on construction below the rim.

c. Seismic

Besides the Snake River Corridor, few known zones are located in the county. The distribution of seismic activity near Jerome County shows that the Snake River Plain area has a low rate for earthquakes. Field evidence taken on the Snake River Plain indicate that the existing faults are probably inactive (IDWR 1993). Jerome County is considered to be in a moderate seismic zone for Idaho. Most risk of seismic activity comes from events that happen outside the county, generally to the northeast and southwest, and including Utah (personal communication, Gillerman 1995).

d. Airport Clear Zones

Within airport areas, noise and vibrations generated from aircraft has been determined to have an adverse affect on humans who live or work continuously under these conditions. The Department of Housing and Urban Development have set specific limitations on noise and safety at 65 dBA. Jerome County has two private airports: one is located east of the city of Jerome and the other is south of Hazelton. Operations at these airports is limited to general aviation (refer to Figure I.A-1).

e. Floodplains

The principal flood problems for Jerome County are low-lying areas subject to periodic flooding caused by overflow of numerous stream and canal systems located throughout the county (Federal Emergency Management Agency 1984). The major surface-water bodies in the county include “K”, Hazelton Butte, “J”, and Skeleton Butte coulees and laterals. These areas are controlled and managed by the NSCC. Floodplain hazards are also found along other canals and laterals.

The smaller drainage areas of the county are also subject to flooding from severe thunderstorms. These occur frequently, but historically do not inflict as much damage as the winter storms. Flooding from these intense rainfalls usually occurs only in local areas and is very short in duration. Streets become flooded and transportation activities are hampered, but flooding at homes and businesses is quite limited (FEMA 1984).

To protect residents throughout the U.S., the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) has been established. Currently, Jerome County is a member of this program (personal communication, Eisenbarth 1995). By participating in the NFIP, the county is eligible for federal financial support for flood insurance and development grant programs. The county’s latest floodplain maps are from September 1985, which depict where regulated flood development should take place (personal communication, Eisenbarth 1995).

The state of Idaho, through the IDWR, has worked with Jerome County to develop the floodplain program. Encroachment on flood plains, such as structures and fill, reduces flood-carrying capacity, increases flood heights and velocities, and increase flood hazards in areas beyond the encroachment itself. One aspect of floodplain management involves balancing the economic gain from floodplain development against the resulting increase in flood hazard by using floodways (FEMA 1984).

f. Pollutant Sources

The majority of information provided below was obtained from the Comprehensive State Water Plan, Appendix B, developed by the IDWR (1993). More explicit information regarding these pollutant sources is located in that document. According to both this document and the DEQ 1995 *Draft Middle Snake River Nutrient Management Plan*, the primary sources of water quality degradation in the mid-Snake River area are aquaculture facilities, confined animal feeding operations, public wastewater treatment plants, and irrigation return flows.

Landfills

No active landfill is located in Jerome County. Jerome County belongs to the Southern Idaho Regional Solid Waste District and uses the Milner Butte Landfill located approximately 12 miles west of Burley. This landfill meets all federal and state construction and operation standards and regulations. It is also capable of disposing of “special wastes including asbestos, petroleum contaminated soils, cars wash and shop sump wastes, and septic/grease trap wastes (personal communication, Schultz 1995).

Jerome County transfers its solid waste at the Gap Transfer Station located 6 miles east of the intersection of Highway 75 and 24. This facility is capable of processing 250 tons of solid waste per day. Currently, slightly less than 100 tons per day are located into trailers and transported to the Milner Butte Landfill (personal communications, Schultz 1995). A private contractor is used to transport the solid waste to the regional landfill.

Other types of waste management occurring at the Gap Transfer Station include clean wood waste processing, waste tire recycling, construction and demolition waste diversion, and scrap metal recovery (personal communications, Schultz 1995).

Fish Hatcheries

Approximately 114 fish hatcheries are located along the entire Mid-Snake River (which includes Jerome County) and its major tributaries (Idaho Dept. of Agriculture). Hatcheries range in size from large modern fish farms with advanced waste management programs to small, farm ponds with more primitive waste management systems. Two production hatcheries lie within the Snake River Canyon in Jerome County. Wastes generated by all of these facilities include dissolved nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorous) and total suspended solids (TSS). Suspended solids and dissolved nutrients are derived from metabolic by-products and waste feed that are not captured in rearing units or off-line waste capture (settling) basins. Fish hatcheries are regulated by the EPA National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). EPA permitted discharge allows for 5 mg/L TSS (detection limit is 4 mg/L), which, when extrapolated to all fish farms in the region, equates to about 81,000 pounds per day permitted discharge. The Idaho DEQ, in the Mid-Snake River Nutrient Management Plan, estimates that total waste contributions for the industry are approximately 30,000 TSS pounds per day and about 1,600 pounds of phosphorous per day. The difference between permitted and actual discharge is attributed to efficient waste management systems. The Mid-Snake River Nutrient Management Plan declares that fish hatcheries will reduce their phosphorous waste by 40% within five years of the plan’s implementation. The industry proposes to reduce phosphorous in their effluent through improvements in waste management and modifications in feed technology.

Livestock Operations/Confined Animal Feeding Operations

Jerome County Livestock Confinement Operations (LCOs) Ordinance establishes location and operating standards for livestock confinement operations. The requirements of the ordinance attempt to minimize potential surface and groundwater contamination sources, as well as incompatibility of LCOs with neighboring land uses. LCOs in existence prior to enactment of the ordinance in 1991 were "grandfathered." All county exempted LCOs are still subject to all applicable state and federal water quality standards.

A number of dairies and confined animal feeding operations are located in Jerome County. Dairy cattle produce an estimated 85 pounds of manure (feces and urine) per day per 1,000 pounds of live weight. In one year, a 500 cow herd of 1,000 pound cows can produce about 7,750 tons of manure containing 85 tons of solids, with 34 tons of nitrogen, 6 tons of phosphorus, and 25 tons of potassium. In addition to the manure wastes, the washing tanks, pipelines, equipment, cows, and parlor and milk-house floors can produce 735 to 2,600 gallons per day of additional liquids (IDHW 1993).

Due to the amount of waste generated, Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFO) and smaller confined feeding operations are subjected to EPA NPDES Permits. Waste and wastewater must be captured, treated, and stored on site of CAFOs. Collection or sewage lagoons must be constructed to contain all wastewater and contaminated runoff from a 25-year, 24-hour rainfall event for the site locations. The facility must also be designed, operated, and maintained to contain all runoff from winter precipitation. Animals confined in the CAFO must not be allowed direct contact with canals, streams, lakes, or other surface waters.

Jerome County Sewage

Municipal sewage treatment plants discharge directly or indirectly into "J" canal of the NSCC system. Average daily treated effluent discharge from the Jerome City Treatment Plant is approximately 1,150,000 gallons per day (personal communication, Taylor 1995).

Irrigation Return Flows

Irrigation return flows carry sediments, nutrients, and accompanying agricultural chemicals into the Snake River. Sediment is the largest single pollutant of surface drainage water in southern Idaho (Brown et al., 1981). The quality of water spilled into the Snake River from irrigation canals vary depending on the time of year and the water flow discharge rate. For example, at the onset of irrigation, the irrigation water tends to have higher total suspended solids (sediments) and organics have accumulated in the canals during the off-season. Catch basins or sediment basins are being used by the NSCC to prevent excessive sedimentation and to control irrigation return flows.

Underground Storage Tanks and Above-ground Storage Tanks

Most underground storage tanks (USTs) in the county are located within the cities and their areas of impact. These USTs are generally used for storage of liquids (wastes, petroleum products, and bulk chemicals). USTs in other parts of the county are mostly limited to service station petroleum and waste oil storage tanks. In any location, however, the main concern with USTs is leakage or rupture and potential groundwater contamination. All USTs are, therefore, regulated under appropriate DEQ structural, contamination, and remediation requirements.

Above ground storage tanks (ASTs) are also used to store flammable and combustible liquids and gases within the county. Fuels used for farming practices and propane gas are typically stored in ASTs. While leakage and rupture of ASTs are still a concern, they are less of a groundwater contamination concern than USTs. This is particularly true for ASTs with secondary containment. Spills from an AST will usually only contaminate the soil surrounding the spill. However, in areas with a high water table, ASTs pose a risk to groundwater contamination as well.

Hazardous Materials Transportation

Hazardous materials are commonly transported by truck and rail. Most hazardous materials typically found or used in Jerome County, are flammable combustible liquids and gases, including gasoline, diesel, ammonium nitrate, ammonium hydroxide, propane, acetylene, phosphoric acid, and anhydrous ammonia. Some mixing of pesticides occurs at the local airport which also presents a possible spill hazard.

Transporting hazardous materials by truck and rail presents a risk of spillage or accidents while in transit. Highest exposure areas for an incident to occur are at major highway interchanges along Interstate 84, Highway 93, and Highway 25. Increasing traffic congestion raises the likelihood of tanker truck accidents and vehicle-train collisions and derailments.

2. Analysis

Throughout the county, residents and workers face potential threats from both natural and manmade sources. Current setback and building restrictions help to reduce conflicts; however, with anticipated growth, areas such as the Snake River Canyon corridor face increased pressure from development. Sloped areas and land along edges of the canyon rim are not always environmental hazards, but they pose significant development and land management challenges that could result in property damage and death if not properly addressed. Erosion and stability problems in these areas are of primary concern.

While some pollutant sources, such as fish hatcheries are not directly linked to population growth, water quality problems from increased effluent from sewage treatment plants could compound existing water quality problems.

Groundwater is used throughout the county for domestic and public water supply. The protection of the public water supply and its source has come under close scrutiny of the federal EPA.

Nationwide, the EPA has mandated that each state must prepare a well-head protection plan for public water supplies. Individual public water supply systems within counties are not required to prepare a plan but are encouraged to do so by DEQ. The city of Jerome has prepared and adopted a well-head protection ordinance (#759) which applies within the city limits.

Projected flooding within the Snake River Basin is not likely to occur from a single storm, but from warm or rainy weather and heavy snowmelt that would fill existing reservoirs to capacity and force excessively high release rates into Jerome County.

Permanent or transient sites of hazardous chemicals and compounds may pose a risk to residents and workers in many locations throughout Jerome County.

3. Issues and Concerns

Based on extensive discussions with residents and local officials, the following issues have been identified:

- Recycling of all materials on a large scale, with strategic locations throughout the county
- Pollutants entering water resources
- Containing and treating agricultural wastes on site
- Development along the Snake River Canyon
- Develop more control over water quality in the local area
- Controlling development in flood prone areas
- Hazardous material in surface water and groundwater
- Identify areas with high groundwater vulnerability
- Identify sink holes - These collapsed lava tubes may be susceptible to receive drainage from irrigation or CAFOs
- Residential waste and waste treatment
- Chemical containment and mixing areas
- Railroad and highway transportation of hazardous materials
- Well-head protection

4. Goals, Objectives, and Actions

Goal: Protect county residents from existing and potential environmental health hazards

Objectives:

- Coordinate well-head protection plans and ordinances with other local and state agencies
- Ensure proper location of facilities that can handle hazardous material
- Minimize the risk associated with geologic hazards
- Reduce the amount of waste being disposed of in landfills or incinerators
- Limit containment/storage of hazardous materials
- Identify transportation routes used by hazardous material carriers
- Support community education regarding hazardous materials
- Meet or exceed EPA air quality standards
- Meet or exceed EPA noise pollution control standards

Actions:

- Identify proper drop-off points for non-hazardous/non-toxic waste and for proper handling of hazardous/toxic waste
- Endorse “reduce-reuse-recycle” educational programs
- Develop zones where businesses with hazardous materials are grouped
- Discourage use of injection wells and devise a program to identify and review injection wells within the county
- Determine alternative land uses for flood prone areas
- Protect flood retention areas
- Coordinate with local, state, and federal agencies regarding management of hazards (landfills, toxic waste, air pollutants, noise pollutants, natural disasters, human-caused disasters)
- Coordinate any actions relative to NSCC with NSCC
- Develop an ordinance regulating proper mixing, handling, loading and unloading of all chemical pesticides at local airports
- Evaluate the need to develop and adopt a well-head protection ordinance for Jerome County

IV. PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

A. PUBLIC FACILITIES

Public facilities consist of those services, programs, and capital projects that meet the immediate needs of the public at large, and could generally not otherwise be provided by individual residents acting in isolation. The provision, location, and efficiency of public facilities are strong determining factors for the quality of life and development for the entire county. Public facilities discussed in this section include fire and safety protection, public and private health services, and privately operated utilities. Schools, highways, and parks are also considered public facilities and are discussed separately in their respective chapters of this document.

1. Existing Conditions

a. Fire and Safety

Fire protection in Jerome County is provided by two independent fire districts: Jerome Rural Fire District (RFD) and First Segregation Rural Fire District (Figure IV.A-1). All emergency calls are received and dispatched through the 911 service at the county sheriff's office. Operating revenues for both districts are generated largely through county property taxes assessed based on district of residence. The extreme east and north ends of the county have cooperative arrangements for fire services with districts in neighboring counties. BLM provides fire service assistance only for brush fires that originate on BLM lands. Jerome and Hazelton city fire departments do not service unincorporated areas of the county but are available for emergency support. Mutual aid agreements for fire service exist outside of this district.

The Jerome RFD is located at 145 East Avenue A in Jerome and provides services for most of the west and south portions of the county. All 13 staff members are volunteers. The district has five pumpers, with volumes ranging from 1,000 to 3,000 gallons, and two service vans.

First Segregation RFD is located at 235 East Wilson Avenue in Eden, providing service for rural areas of most of the eastern part of the county. Department staff consists of 8 volunteers. Fire equipment includes 3 trucks with 1,300, 1000, and 350 gallon capacities.

Emergency medical services for the entire county are provided by the county EMS department. The department consists of 24 certified emergency medical technicians; 7 full-time paid and 8 part-time paid. Three ambulances are available to provide stabilization, transport, and transfer services. Medical treatment is coordinated locally with St. Benedict's or Magic Valley Medical Centers. Arrangements for life flight services to Boise and other locations are also coordinated by the department. Operating revenues are generated by county property taxes and user fees.

Figure IV.A-1

The county Sheriff's Office is located at the 300 North Lincoln Street in Jerome, adjacent to the County Courthouse, and provides services for the entire unincorporated county. Department staff include 65 sworn officers (34 full-time), 2 detectives, and 7 administrative personnel. The current jail capacity is 35.

b. Water and Sewer

The county does not provide any water or sewer services. **Not all** existing water and sewer lines are located within areas of city impact. Residents of the unincorporated county rely on private wells and septic systems. **The goal of the designation of city impact areas is for the city to provide water and sewer services.** *amended 08/05/2013

The South Central Health District reviews septic permit applications. Any structure proposing a subsurface sewage disposal system must be situated on a site of no less than one acre. Permit applications are evaluated based on soil properties, depths to groundwater and bedrock, proximity to canals and surface water, test hole drilling, and on-site inspections. The county building department cannot issue building permits until a septic permit has been granted. Plats and subdivisions are also subject to sanitary restrictions under Idaho Code requirements for prior approval of sewer and water plans by the director of the department of health.

c. Health Care Facilities

St. Benedict's Family Medical Center, located at 709 North Lincoln, is the main primary and specialty health care facility for the county. Hospital staff consists of nine full-time physicians, numerous affiliated physicians available on call, and a professional support staff of over 150. The facility is licensed for 40 beds including intensive care, birthing, surgery, and kidney dialysis units. Outpatient and general family health care services are offered on-site and at two other hospital-operated locations in Jerome. More extensive emergency and specialty medical services are available at the Magic Valley Regional Medical Center in Twin Falls.

d. Solid Waste Management

Landfill services are provided by the Southern Idaho Regional Solid Waste District in Burley. Solid wastes are disposed of at the Milner Butte Landfill, located about 12 miles west of Burley off U.S. Highway 30. Bulk waste transfer is available at the Gap Transfer Station located 6 miles east of Highway 75 on Highway 24 in Lincoln County. Other services provided by the district include recycling programs for construction and demolition wastes, and neighborhood bins for newsprint, paper, and aluminum recyclables.

e. Utilities

Electric power is available to all county residents through Idaho Power Company. Hydroelectric facilities along the Snake River owned by Idaho Power, generate electricity at much lower than the national average; 4.7 cents per kilowatt hour compared to over 8 cents.

Telecommunications services are provided by U.S. West; lines generally coincide with major electrical transmission lines. Intermountain Gas Company operates gas fuel distribution lines in more densely populated portions of the county. Figure IV.A-2 displays the locations of main utility transmission lines for the county.

Irrigation waters are provided by the NSCC, serving around 1,200 users in Jerome County. Annual water supplied by the canal system ranges between 500,000 and 800,000 acre feet. The primary flow right of 400 cfs is diverted from the Snake River at Milner Dam. The main Jerome County canal runs to the northwest from Milner Dam, passing about 3 miles north of the city of Jerome.

f. Other County Facilities

County administrative offices are located at the County Courthouse at 300 North Lincoln Street in Jerome. These offices include the county clerk, auditor, treasurer, assessor, prosecuting attorney, district court, county EMS services, planning, zoning and building departments, and the University of Idaho county extension service.

2. Analysis

Population projections for the city and county of Jerome, as depicted in Chapter II, indicate that demand for all county services should increase to some extent. This increase in demand will likely require expansion or improvements of most public facilities. The recent expansion of the Jerome Area of City Impact opens a new area for more intensive residential and commercial development.

Some improved or expanded services will obviously be city provided and financed, such as water and sewer expansion. Other services will be financed primarily through county property taxes. In the long-term, the additional tax revenues generated by more recently developed properties may not cover the costs of service provision and maintenance. In which case, voter-approved tax increases will become necessary unless alternative means of revenue generation can be developed.

a. Fire and Safety

Rural fire districts will continue to experience an increase in the number of structures and, thus, potential fires located within their service areas. Existing concerns for response time will increase as well. For First Segregation RFD, a lack of funding has prohibited staff expansion and

Figure IV.A-2

upgrading of fire fighting equipment. Jerome RFD does have adequate staff and facilities at the present time; however, extensive growth within district boundaries has brought about speculation for the need for a second facility. There has been some discussion of a joint rural/city fire station that would be located closer to high growth areas.

Crime numbers reported by the County Sheriff's Office has increased by around 7 percent annually over the past 3 to 5 years. Jail facilities are consistently booked beyond capacity and the county prosecutor has cases on hold for months at a time. Juvenile detention facilities are leased from other agencies. The need for new detention facilities, both adult and juvenile, has been an issue of continued discussion throughout the county. Citizen committees have been formed to consider the issue and options. One possible resolution of the problem involves the construction of a facility large enough to lease space from other agencies to house prisoners. Leasing fees could generate substantial revenues to recoup construction costs.

b. Water and Sewer

High growth rates in unincorporated areas would result in increases in the number of individual wells and septic systems. If such growth is not monitored cautiously, contamination or depletion of already diminishing groundwater resources could occur. Approval of development in the county planning area should, therefore, be continually coordinated with the state departments of health and water resources. A water and sewer district has been established to provide water and sewer service within that area.

c. Health Care

Population growth, particularly among aging segments of the population, will heighten demand for health care services. St. Benedict's Medical Center is planning to accommodate this increased demand by expanding its emergency, outpatient, and general family health care services. Calls for county EMS services have increased dramatically from roughly 500 in 1990, to over 2,100 in 1994. Expansion of EMS facilities, staff, training, and transport capabilities is planned for the near future.

d. Solid Waste Management

Factoring in annual population growth estimates of 1.5 percent, the projected site capacity of Milner Butte landfill will last approximately 115 years. Even if unprecedented levels of growth are experienced, plans for a new landfill will not need to be explored until the middle of the next century.

e. Utilities

Both Idaho Power and U.S. West Communications will continue to offer services to all developed portions of the county, as needed. Despite regional growth trends, consumption of electrical power is actually declining due to enhanced technological efficiency in transmission and distribution. Irrigation water rights are already utilized to capacity and any new agricultural waters will likely need to be purchased from industry.

3. Issues and Concerns

Most issues involving public facilities are related to either growth or fiscal concerns. The extent of growth establishes demand for facilities and services, while the location of growth determines the efficiency of service provision. Fiscal constraints drive all public facility/service decisions. Such decisions, thus, require a coordinated decision-making effort between all county and city administrative, planning, and service providing offices. Other specific public facilities/service concerns identified by citizens and committee members include the following:

- Impacts of growth on quality and costs of service provision
- County’s ability to finance public facility/service improvements
- Need for expanded correctional facilities
- Long-term quantity and quality of water resources
- Emergency response time in rural areas (partly due to highway addressing and signage)
- Prioritizing public facility needs

4. Goals, Objectives, and Actions

Goal: Provide county facilities that are adequate for needs of citizens
<p>Objectives: Develop broad-based social programs for community-wide development and involvement Explore alternatives for financing public facilities other than property tax increases Maintain emergency services for present and future needs</p>
<p>Actions: Form committees to implement existing and initiate new public service programs Determine present and projected community needs Form citizen committees to promote necessary funding of services Encourage state legislature to enact legislation that would allow county impact fees Encourage community well and septic systems with development Encourage development of programs that provide services and activities for all members of the community including the disabled Encourage new residential, commercial, and industrial development within areas of city impact Determine present and future needs of all members of the community including the disabled Connect all sewer and water systems within the Jerome area of city impact to the city sewer and water systems, if it is practical and/or is available *amended 08/05/2013 Pursue well-head protection implementation strategies Pursue new correctional facility for adults and juveniles</p>

B. TRANSPORTATION

This component discusses the county transportation system and issues related to the needs of both existing and future development throughout Jerome County. The county's road network includes a system of roads, arterials, and highways that crisscross the county and are owned and operated by municipalities, Jerome Highway District, Hillsdale Highway District, and the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD). Figure IV.B-1 identifies the boundaries of the two highway districts. Because the predominant form of transportation in Jerome County is the automobile, this plan focuses on the thoroughfare network while providing directives for developing alternate modes of transportation for the county.

1. Existing Conditions

a. Roads and Highways

The county of Jerome is bisected by Interstate Highway 84 and U.S. Highway 93. These two systems are the major east-west and north-south transportation routes through the region. State Highway 25 connects the cities of Jerome, Eden, and Hazelton; State Highway 79 and 50 are short segments off of I-84. The county's roadway network is generally laid out on a one-mile grid following the section lines of each township. Figure IV.B-2 lists the 1994 average daily traffic figures in Jerome County and its six I-84 freeway interchanges.

Highway management and planning responsibilities in Jerome County are divided among two independent highway districts and the cities of Jerome, Eden, and Hazelton. No centralized highway authority within the county government exists, although the highway districts operate under the larger authority of the ITD. Local financing is supported through state and federal funds and by the county tax assessor on the basis of individual assessment rates for the two highway districts.

All roadways within Jerome County are classified under the Highway Functional Classification System. The Jerome and Hillsdale Highway Districts have developed and adopted Highway Standards and Development Procedures for the construction, by developers, of public roads within their boundaries. A public road constructed by a developer, in accordance with these Standards and Procedures, will be included in the highway districts' road system and will be eligible for permanent maintenance and repair. The highway districts also have adopted the Idaho Standards for Public Works Construction.

b. Transit

TRANS IV provides a limited, on-call transit system to Jerome County. A park and ride lot is located at the intersection of U.S. 93 and Highway 25 for commuters headed for Twin Falls.

Figure IV.B-1

Figure IV.B-2

c. Air Travel

Commercial airline passenger service for the region and beyond is available at the Twin Falls Municipal Airport south of Twin Falls. The Jerome County Airport is located on the northwest corner of U.S. 93 and State Highway 25 intersection. The airport supports general aviation with the principal traffic being agriculture and business related. The airport is managed by the Jerome County Airport Board. The facility has one east-west paved runway that is 5,200 feet long and 60 feet wide and provides private hangers for 35 planes and 15 tie-downs. A 1,000 foot clear zone is located at each end of the runway. For safety and noise consideration, the Airport Board has adopted an airport overlay zone around the airport. Area 1, a distance of 5,000 feet from the runway, would limit the number of dwellings and allow light industrial, commercial, and agricultural uses. Area 2 would cover an additional 4,000 feet and restrict one dwelling per 10 acres and include light industrial, commercial, agriculture, and churches. Adjacent development should not conflict with airport use, safety, federal, state and county resolutions. Another small, general aviation airport is located near Hazelton.

d. Rail

The Eastern Idaho Railroad Company provides national freight service on the North Side Branch which travels east-west through Jerome County. The branch line goes through the north side of Hazelton and Eden and travels along the south side of the city of Jerome, paralleling I-84.

2. Analysis

Jerome County recognizes the significant economic investment the county possesses in its road network and the need of its cities, highway districts, and ITD to continue placing a high priority on preventative and restorative road maintenance. Much of the transportation infrastructure developed over the past thirty years will require maintenance and rehabilitation. Ensuring adequate funding for maintenance of county roads will be a critical issue in the new century. The condition of the transportation system impacts the quality of life and economic vitality of Jerome County. The future trends anticipated for transportation are as follows:

a. Increased Volume

Growth may lead to worsening traffic problems as workers are forced to commute increasing distances to reach their jobs. To reduce congestion, land use policies should encourage mixed use development with more housing near jobs. By integrating land use policies and transportation planning, future development could emphasize mixed use developments aimed at increasing the number of people who live within walking distance of their jobs.

The growth of the region, combined with congestion of Twin Falls' Blue Lakes Boulevard, will lead to a new bridge crossing on the Snake River Canyon. Planning for a new bridge corridor should be initiated. A conceptual location lines up U.S. 93 with 3200 West, south of the canyon. A new bridge crossing will have a positive impact on Jerome County and put the city of Jerome in a stronger central position to serve the region. Continued congestion will lead the public to demand a new canyon crossing.

Information technology also has the potential to offer an alternative to commuting and alleviate traffic congestion. It is estimated that 39% of all workers in the United States are potential tele-commuters. Access to, and advancement in, personal computers have greatly increased the potential for working at home through tele-commuting. Its benefits would reduce the number of work trips by solo drivers and ultimately less traffic congestion.

b. Transportation Plan Map

The Transportation Plan Map, illustrated in Figure IV.B-3, should provide a guideline for development of the transportation system throughout the county. The map enhances the county's ability to plan for future development of both roadways and land. The thoroughfare system depicted on the map includes I-84, U.S. 93, State Highways 25, 79, and 50, and arterial and collector level roadways. Roadways designed to a lower function, new collector, and local roads are generally planned and built by developers according to the standards laid out in the districts' Highway Standards and Development Procedures. Maintenance and improvements of these roadways, however, is the responsibility of the highway districts.

c. Planned Future Development and Transportation

There is a strong relationship between transportation and land use. For example, encouraging neighborhood commercial areas within residential developments will support walking to nearby retail facilities and shorten and reduce vehicular trips. Likewise, creating communities with housing, employment, and recreation uses within walking distance of one another will reduce vehicular trips.

As the county expands, there is a need to coordinate roadway systems and protect rights-of-way for future system improvements. The county has a grid road system on section lines that should be maintained and extended to give continuity and ease of circulation. New development needs to protect street and road corridors so that they can mesh with the existing grid system to accommodate future transportation demands. New development and streets are to be designed to encourage walking and bicycling.

In order to protect the capacity of the highway road system, direct access from adjacent development should be limited and directed to frontage roads and the local road system. Large development proposals that are likely to generate significant traffic would be required to prepare a transportation study so that their impact on the transportation system and surrounding land uses can be assessed. In addition, the study should examine ways of encouraging all forms of transportation such as transit, walking, and cycling.

Figure IV.B-3

d. Alternative Modes

Though the automobile is the dominant form of transportation in Jerome County, other modes are expected to play a role in the county's transportation system. As construction and maintenance to the county's road system occur, improvements would ensure the integration of bicycle and walkway systems into the design of transportation facilities.

e. Bicycle Pedestrian System

It is the policy of the plan to recognize the importance of cycling and walking as a form of transportation and to establish a bicycle/pedestrian network. Given Jerome County's growing population, flat terrain, and mild weather, the county recognizes that the bicycle is a viable mode of transportation for daily utilitarian and recreation trips. Jerome County proposes to link traffic generators, such as major employers, the city of Jerome, schools, residential areas, parks and the Snake River Canyon through a system of bike and pedestrian facilities. Safe, convenient, and adequate facilities are needed to encourage walking and bicycle riding.

The Jerome Recreation District has formed a partnership (Jerome Area Path System Committee) with several other entities in Jerome County to develop a proposed Jerome Area Path System. The committee includes representatives from the city of Jerome, the Jerome School District, the JHD, and the Jerome Recreation District. The committee has designed a seven phase path system for pedestrian, bicycles, equestrian, and other recreational use, as illustrated on Figure IV.B-4.

Phase I calls for bike lanes along 100 East connecting Horizon Elementary School, Forsyth Park, and Jerome High School to the Bird Farm and then connecting to the Jerome Recreation Center via bike lanes on 100 South Road or a separated bike path. Phase II connects bike lanes on Lincoln Street to trails on the Snake River Canyon. Phase III will provide an additional recreation and tourism opportunity for the region by establishing trails along the north side of the Snake River Canyon. Phase IV connects Twin Falls and the Perrine Bridge to I-84. The other three phases will form loop options back to the city of Jerome.

To facilitate the system, a county bicycle/pedestrian plan should be prepared to refine routes, adopt design standards, and identify funding opportunities.

f. Public Transit

Transit relies on high ridership typically associated with urban areas. Jerome County's low-density development and reliance on the automobile do not foster transit use. Despite this, a continuing effort is needed to expand public transit. Transit will not only help reduce vehicular traffic, but also provide transportation access to jobs and services for all residents and employees, including the young, the elderly, the physically challenged, and those who do not have access to a private vehicle. The provision of a transit system is also an important component of an economic strategy to encourage business to locate in Jerome County. Transit services need to cross

Figure IV.B-4

municipal boundaries in order to serve travel demands. Twin Falls is an employment center, and offers educational opportunities at the College of Southern Idaho (CSI). To accomplish this, a coordinated regional transit system has become a necessity. All major communities within the region should be linked together with transit. An integrated and coordinated transit system should be able to serve most of the travel needs of potential riders at a reasonable cost.

Providing for, and promoting the provision of, parking and drop-off facilities will help reduce vehicle trips and congestion. Other park-and-ride lots for commuters in appropriate locations and as close as possible to commuter trip origins should be encouraged. Likewise, the county and large employers should encourage ride sharing.

g. Airports

The airport is considered a vital element of the transportation system that can be used to further the economic development efforts of the county. Opportunities exist for an airport-related industrial park. To accomplish this and other improvements, the airport board would continue to upgrade the Jerome County Airport Long Range Plan.

Convenient access to modern air travel facilities is essential for residents and businesses in Jerome County. Because the plan recognizes the importance of airport facilities as an integral part to the county's infrastructure system, a site bounded by the Snake River canyon on the south, Interstate 84 on the north, and U.S. Highway 93 on the west is under consideration for a new regional airport. All jurisdictions in the region should be encouraged to investigate alternatives for securing a fully functional regional airport. A detailed identification and prioritization of airport facilities and services needs to be prepared in a regional airport plan. If constructed, the regional airport can be expected to alleviate any air freight and passenger problems that may exist.

h. Goods Movement

The safe and efficient movement of goods by a rail and road network is an important component of the county's economic strategy. Industrial parks on the south side of the city of Jerome are located adjacent to Interstate-84, making them easily accessible to heavy truck traffic. The county should encourage the location of activities that require heavy truck traffic to areas near or adjacent to I-84 or U.S. 93. The county also supports the growth and development of rail services for industrial areas. Rail improvements would include spurs to new industry and reduce conflicts between train and automobile traffic.

Recent developments in the telecommunication industry (such as fiber optics), along with the demand for timely information, have contributed to the need for high-volume communication corridors and facilities. Development of new sites requires planning for the physical needs of business served by telecommunications facilities and lines. The future location of communications and transmission facilities, as well as any expansion to existing facilities, can have a significant impact on both the natural and man-made environment. It is important that the location and design of these facilities have a minimum visual impact on the surrounding area.

3. Issues and Concerns

The following issues and concerns were developed by citizens and transportation officials.

a. Roads and Highway

- I-84/U.S. 93 intersection is a central point for the entire state highway system
- U.S. 93 safety concerns; width, lack of turning lanes, excessive speed, heavy thru-traffic
- State Highway 25: role as the main county highway; rural to urban service
- U.S. 93 and Highway 25: Lack of funding for improvements
- Interstate 84/ U.S. 93 interchange: safety and congestion concerns
- Need for a U.S. 93 alternative bridge crossing of the Snake River canyon: regional and through traffic, existing safety and congestion concerns, regional impacts on local travel
- Need for transportation infrastructure from I-84 interchange to Crossroads; accommodate new economic core
- 200 East and 500 South at I-84: accommodate development on both sides of the interstate
- Ongoing need for short-term road and highway improvements
- Need for improvements to State Highway 25 due to traffic associated with the refuse transfer station and the Sugar Loaf beet dump
- Retaining State Highway 25 as a state highway

b. Air and Rail

- Development of a Jerome regional airport: accommodate economic, tourism, and general travel demand
- Maintenance and development of Jerome County and Hazelton airports
- Safety and land use compatibility concerns at Jerome County and Hazelton airports
- Possible decline in future rail service for the county
- Need for railway spurs in areas not currently serviced by existing rail systems

c. Alternative Transportation

- Development of bicycle/pedestrian paths:
 1. Jerome/Canyon loop with Twin Falls system connector (also equestrian uses)
 2. Jerome-Eden-Hazelton path
 3. Eden-Hazelton school to community paths
 4. Highway 25 to Cauldron Linn

- Lack of county mass transit service

4. Goals, Objectives, and Actions

Goal: Maintain and develop state and federal highways to provide sufficient access and ensure safety for all areas of the county.

Objectives:

Widen and/or reconstruct U.S. 93 to state/federal standards
 Maintain State Highway 25 on state highway system for future improvements
 Obtain ITD priority status in order to obtain necessary funding
 Capitalize on the I-84/U.S. 93 intersection's potential for development of commercial, distribution, technological, and tourism related services
 Construction of a new bridge at 300 West to alleviate local traffic burden. (Possible on/off ramps at Interstate 84 with re-routed U.S. 93)
 Need for continuous frontage road from Crossroads Ranch to I-84 and west Jerome interchanges.
 Develop a Cloverleaf at I-84 and U.S. 93 that will maximize traffic movement and safety
 Accommodate development along U.S. 93 corridor from I-84 to Sun Valley, including 93/25 interchange. (Commercial/tourism related services and agricultural related industries)
 Explore alternatives for financing of new transportation projects (in lieu of impact fees)
 Construction of a truck/slow vehicle climbing lane on U.S. 93 from Barrymore North to Landfill Road (1/2 mile north of interchange)
 Maintain major intersections to accommodate new commercial development
 Identify potential park-and-ride locations along major commuter routes
 Develop overpasses or underpasses to cross I-84 where new development is likely to occur
 Consider design standards and beautification projects for main corridors, particularly U.S. 93

Actions:

Support the North Side Transportation Advisory Committee to plan for coordinated transportation and development decisions throughout the county.
 Establish local planning and development review guidelines in conjunction with the county and city planning departments for all the region's transportation agencies
 Acquire right-of-ways for necessary future road development
 Establish regional coordination and planning efforts for the proposed Snake River Canyon bridge

Goal: Maintain and develop county roads and highways to provide sufficient access and service to all areas of the county.

Objectives:

Establish corridor development plans for roads not eligible for federal funding
Identify and plan for specific county road improvements

Action:

Support highway district efforts to improve county roads
Coordinate all development, land use planning and zoning with appropriate highway districts

Goal: Support the concept and need for regional and local airport service

Objectives:

Evaluate existing air travel service to meet current and future needs
Continue to adequately fund Jerome County and Hazelton airports for corporate, agricultural, and general aviation uses
Ensure compatibility of neighboring land uses near airports, such as tower and lighting standards
Encourage compatible development near airports (commercial, industrial, tourism)

Actions:

Support the North Side Transportation Advisory Committee to plan for coordinated transportation and development decisions throughout the county
Locate alternative funding sources for airport development and maintenance
Evaluate zoning standards and easements for airport areas, including clear zones

Goal: Develop and maintain rail service availability for all areas of the county

Objectives:

Develop a county intermodal freight system based on rail spur linkages
Establish plans for siting and development of rail spurs

Action:

Support the North Side Transportation Advisory Committee to plan for coordinated transportation and development decisions throughout the county

Goal: Develop a comprehensive system of bicycle and pedestrian paths throughout the county

Objectives:

Preserve corridors and acquire right-of-ways for path in residential, commercial, and open space areas
Ensure safety of bike/pedestrian traffic by separating paths from vehicle traffic

Actions:

Support the North Side Transportation Advisory Committee to plan for coordinated transportation and development decisions throughout the county
Establish local planning and development review guidelines in conjunction with the county and city planning departments for all county transportation agencies
Locate funding to implement existing plans for development of paths
Adopt right-of-way dedication standards within county subdivision ordinance, recognizing private property rights
Coordinate any policies relating to NSCC with NSCC

Goal: Develop and expand regional/local mass transit service

Objective:

Establish local public and economic support for TRANS IV service

Action:

Support the North Side Transportation Advisory Committee to plan for coordinated transportation and development decisions throughout the county
Establish local planning and development review guidelines in conjunction with the county and city planning departments for all county transportation agencies
Coordinate transit system with service providers

C. SCHOOLS

The purpose of the plan's school component is to present and analyze educational opportunities available to Jerome County residents by the local school districts and CSI. The school component discusses county educational attainment, current facilities and programs, past enrollment trends, a comparison of school capacity to student enrollment, and student enrollment forecasts.

1. Existing Conditions

a. Educational Attainment

Table IV.C-1 represents the highest grade of school completed or the highest degree received by the general populace. For instance, those people with bachelor's degrees also are high school graduates. That information was gathered for all Jerome County residents including those who have moved into the county and were educated elsewhere.

More than one-half of all county residents had finished high school according to the 1990 census (Table IV.C-1). Nearly 17 percent had continued their education beyond the high school level. More than one-fourth of the total population had not completed high school.

Jerome County's percentage of high school graduates was slightly greater than the state percentage. However, the county percentage of persons not completing high school was higher than the state's. Jerome County also had a lower percentage of residents with advanced degrees.

Table IV.C-1: 1990 Jerome County Educational Attainment

<i>Educational Attainment</i>	<i>County Percentage</i>	<i>State Percentage</i>
No high school degree	27.6%	20.3%
High school graduate	55.8%	54.5%
Associate degree	5.6%	7.5%
Bachelors degree or more	11.0%	17.7%

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
U.S. Department of Commerce

b. Inventory

Jerome County contains two school districts (Figure IV.C-1). Students living in the western portion of the county attend school in Jerome School District # 261. Students residing in the eastern end of the county attend school in Valley School District # 262.

Figure IV.C-1

Jerome School District has three elementary schools. Central Elementary, constructed in 1921, is located at 311 North Lincoln Street. It contains 19 classrooms with an enrollment of 509 in 1995.

Jefferson Elementary, constructed in 1956, is located at 600 N. Fillmore Street. It had 17 classrooms and 420 students in 1995. Horizon Elementary, completed in 1994, is located at 934 Tenth Avenue East. It houses 26 regular classrooms with an enrollment of 600 in 1995.

The district's middle school, containing seventh and eighth grades, was built in 1949 at 116 3rd Avenue West. It had an enrollment of 521 in 22 classrooms for the 1995 to 1996 school year. The high school, constructed in 1976, is located at 104 Tiger Drive. It has 33 classrooms with 892 students in the 1995 to 1996 school year.

The Valley School District education facility is a single building serving grades kindergarten through twelfth grades, located on Valley Road, midway between Eden and Hazelton. The single school concept is unique to Idaho and works well in a rural area. The school was constructed in 1994, and contains 30 classrooms. Its enrollment was 746 students in the 1994 to 1995 school year.

c. Curriculum and Programs

Jerome and Valley School Districts

The school districts offer a broad-based curriculum including basic skills and extension of each curriculum area. Curriculum guides are developed by staff, patrons, and parents, and are approved by the Board of Trustees. The school districts' curriculum is composed of a large variety of curriculum materials such as textbooks, hands on manipulators, audio-visual material, and technology equipment and software. Other enhancement programs such as extra-curricular activities (both athletic and academic) also are provided.

Regular and academic programs are supplemented with special programs including Jerome Early Education Program, English as a Second Language, Migrant Education, Talented and Gifted, Title I Disadvantaged, Vocational Programs, college preparation, fine arts programs, school to work, programs for children with special needs, and substance abuse awareness and counseling.

College of Southern Idaho

CSI is located in Twin Falls, Idaho, and offers course work in an eight county region including Jerome County. The college provides learning opportunities in traditional academic education, vocational training, and continuing education.

The college meets two needs with academic education: academic education may either provide the first two years of a four year degree, or it may provide an associate degree for those desiring no further education.

The college's vocational training provides opportunities for those desiring training, retraining, or upgrading their current occupation. Vocational training is primarily designed as occupational training to place people into the workforce. It also provides training to businesses within the service area.

A program of continuing education is offered. Off-campus courses sometimes are offered through interactive telecommunications. Television cameras, monitors, and microphones provide instant communications between instructors and students at the main campus and students at the off-campus sites. Interactive communications courses will be offered in Jerome County in the spring of 1996, as soon as local facilities are available.

2. Analysis

a. Enrollment Trends

County-wide student enrollment increased by more than 400 students, a gain of nearly 12 percent from 1990 to 1994 (Table IV.C-2). District # 261 gained more than 310 students, a 12 percent increase. District # 261 recorded large enrollment gains in the ninth and twelfth grades, and moderate gains in the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and tenth grades. Enrollment declined in the first, second, and third grades.

District # 262 enrollment increased by nearly 100 students, a 15 percent gain. It showed large increases in kindergarten, fifth grade, seventh grade, tenth grade, and eleventh grade. Small enrollment losses were recorded in the fourth, sixth, and twelfth grades.

Table IV.C-2: 1990 - 1994 Jerome County Student Enrollment Trend

<i>Year</i>	<i>District # 261</i>	<i>District # 262</i>	<i>Total</i>
1990 - 1991	2,768	617	3,385
1991 - 1992	2,799	632	3,431
1992 - 1993	2,894	695	3,589
1993 - 1994	2,961	676	3,637
1994 - 1995	3,078	709	3,787

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
Idaho Department of Education

b. Student Overcrowding

Overcrowding in the schools is the relationship between student enrollment and the number of classrooms available for student education. It may be measured by maximum student enrollment by grade, minimum square footage per student in a classroom, modern classroom standards, and the number of classrooms needed to teach the required curriculum.

Jerome School District

Overcrowding at the elementary grade level has been alleviated with the addition of 26 classrooms at Horizon Elementary in the Jerome School District. However, several indications of overcrowding are present in the elementary grades due to increased enrollment. At Central Elementary, seven of twenty classrooms (35.0%) contain less than 900 square feet, the standard for modern classrooms. Two-thirds (four of the six) third grade classrooms at Horizon Elementary have reached the state maximum class size of 26 students. At Jefferson Elementary, 15 of 20 classrooms (75.0%) contain less than 900 square feet and two kindergarten classes exceed state maximum enrollment standards.

Jerome Middle School is so overcrowded that nearly 20 percent of its enrollment (95 students) is housed in the metal building at Central Elementary. Two of the classrooms in the metal building exceed state student per classroom standards. Additionally, 18 out of 22 classrooms contain less than 900 square feet.

Jerome High School is the most crowded facility. Thirty-six classes per day contain more students than the state maximum number of students per classroom. Two-thirds of the classrooms (22 out of 33) contain less than 900 square feet. To offer all required core curriculum courses, and still meet student per classroom guidelines, the district would need to construct an additional 22 classrooms for the 1995-1996 school year.

c. Enrollment Forecasts

County School Districts

County school enrollment is forecasted to increase slightly from the 1996 - 1997 to 1998 - 1999 school year (Table IV.C-3). Total enrollment is expected to increase by 280 students, a 1 percent gain.

Table IV.C-3: 1996 - 1998 Jerome County Student Enrollment Forecast

<i>School Year</i>	<i>District # 261</i>	<i>District # 262</i>	<i>Total</i>
1996 - 1997	3,192	808	4,000
1997 - 1998	3,286	840	4,126
1998 - 1999	3,383	897	4,280

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
Idaho Department of Education

Enrollment gains are predicted for most of the grade levels in District # 261. Slight enrollment decreases are forecast in sixth through ninth grades.

Enrollment forecasts in District # 262 show a different pattern. Enrollment gains occurred in all kindergarten through high school grades, except for the sixth and eighth grades which remained constant.

Enrollment forecasts for District # 261 are based on recent changes in enrollment by grade for the first through twelfth grades. Kindergarten forecasts are based on age group data, birth rates, migration rates, and kindergarten enrollment to age ratios. More details about the forecasting methodology can be found in that school district's strategic plan.

The Idaho Department of Education provided enrollment forecasts for School District # 262. Those forecasts may appear low, and may underestimate the number of school aged children moving into the district.

County Residents at College of Southern Idaho

CSI is predicting a steady increase in Jerome County resident enrollment. Jerome County resident enrollment is expected to increase from 495 students in 1996, to 762 students in 2000 (Table IV.C-4). That enrollment increase is a gain of about 11 percent annually.

Table IV.C-4: 1996 - 2000 Jerome County Resident Enrollment at College of Southern Idaho

<i>School Year</i>	<i>District # 261</i>
1996	495
1997	551
1998	614
1999	684
2000	762

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
College of Southern Idaho

d. Budget and Student Expenditure

The Jerome School District budget was almost \$10.2 million for the 1993 - 1994 school year. The district spent \$2,783 per student (on an average daily attendance basis), and ranked 100th out of 113 districts in expenditure per student.

Valley School District's 1993 - 1994 school year budget was slightly more than \$3.1 million. It spent \$3,353 per student, ranking 61st in the state.

3. Issues and Concerns

County-wide education issues were raised by the Jerome Education Citizens Committees as a part of the overall comprehensive planning process. Those issues were grouped under education programs, education facilities, and higher education. The following issues were identified:

a. Education Programs

- Any new programs would require new facilities, or better use of existing facilities.
- Vocational education programs must be expanded.
- Programs should be expanded for talented and gifted students. Those programs could include offering college credit courses to high school students by using the telecommunications network at CSI.
- The feasibility of an alternative school should be examined.
- The school districts will have to comply with federal school mandates programs.
- CSI should accept credits for similar courses offered by other colleges.
- Improved access should be provided to educational technology.
- More parents should be involved in providing education to students.
- Partnerships should be developed between students and parents, and between teachers and the business community.

b. Education Facilities

- The physical and functional adequacy of all current facilities should be assessed.
- Re-configuration of the current middle school alignment (seventh and eighth grades) to a junior high school alignment (including the ninth grade) should be analyzed.
- A new facility would be needed if the junior high school concept is adopted. The district currently does not have the funds to construct any new schools.
- Current facilities must be upgraded to offer courses in high technology.
- Current facilities also should be expanded to offer more courses for talented and gifted students.
- Facilities should be designed for student safety, with special emphasis on safety regarding drug use.
- Facilities for special programs may be shared at the high school level or with CSI.
- Classrooms must be added to maintain or improve current student to teacher ratios.

- The timing of proposed bond issues and tax levels should be coordinated with other taxing entities.
- The property tax assessment for CSI should be examined.
- A feeling of community concern for school district issues must be generated.

c. Higher Education

- Communication about the availability of current courses needs to be improved.
- Support must be continued for CSI to broker with four-year institutions to bring bachelors and graduate level courses and degrees into the valley.
- Higher education mentorship to disadvantaged students should be encouraged.
- Articulation with alternative schools should be continued.
- Articulation with private schools should be explored.
- Telecommunications classes and courses should be offered, especially for higher education level courses.
- An expanded middle school or junior high school would be needed to make room for college level courses in the high school.
- College level courses taught in high school should be articulated with CSI for college credit, to assist the talented and gifted student program.
- Vocational and technical programs should be articulated with CSI, so that students do not have to start over in college.
- Vocational and technical education programs are needed at the high school level.

4. Goals, Objectives, and Actions

In addition to identifying goals, objectives, and actions, the Jerome Education Citizens Committee also drafted a mission statement for education in Jerome County. Their mission is to: *Provide excellent educational opportunities for all county citizens to allow them to be self-sufficient and contributing members in society.* Goals included the following:

- Provide facilities that will meet the educational excellence desired by parents and community
- Increase parental involvement in all sectors of society

- Make education relevant
- Accommodate individual differences
- Increase opportunities for high school students to take advanced course work through tech-prep and advanced placement
- Continue to work with 4-year institutions to bring bachelors and graduate-level degree programs to the valley
- Increase student awareness of higher education opportunities and access

Objectives and actions were developed for each goal and are presented in the *Jerome Education Specific Plan*. They are not presented in this plan since Jerome County cannot directly implement goals under the school district's or CSI's jurisdiction. However, they can support the district's and college's goal implementation program. Therefore, Jerome County's education goal is: *To assist the school district and CSI in fulfilling its mission statement and implementing its goals, objectives, and actions.*

V. LAND USE AND FUTURE GROWTH

This chapter presents a discussion of the various land uses within the county and the potential for future growth. This chapter includes five components: land use, housing, recreation, community design/special sites, and economic development. These components describe the built environment within the county and goals for future development.

A. LAND USE

This section discusses and analyzes existing land use and the suitability for future uses of all unincorporated lands of Jerome County. The identification of the most appropriate uses of these lands establishes the foundation for city land use regulations. The physical suitability of designated land uses and the compatibility of such uses with those of other affected properties determine the functional and physical character of the county as a whole. Further, county decisions regarding land use must, by state law, consider private property rights and values in order to avoid unnecessary regulations influencing such matters.

1. Existing Conditions

Jerome County land uses have historically been rural and agricultural by nature. Moderate and high density residential areas are located mainly in incorporated areas, and in developing subdivisions to the south of the city of Jerome. Commercial and industrial uses are generally isolated to the city of Jerome and along main transportation corridors. The vast majority of the county thus consists of agricultural or open lands, and rural, low-density residential development (Table V.A-1).

Agricultural lands are concentrated in southern and central portions of the county where irrigation water is most readily available as depicted on Figure V.A-1. The northern part of the county is largely BLM owned and is dominated by lava beds and rock outcroppings. Some BLM lands are suitable for grazing and are utilized accordingly under federal multiple use management practices. These lands represent approximately one-quarter of the county area as depicted on Table V.A-2.

Current county land use regulations reflect similar existing conditions with agricultural zoning being most prevalent. A-1 zoning areas are exclusively agricultural and only incidental residential structures are permitted. A-2 zoning does provide for some residential development in agricultural areas through special permits, subdivisions, and planned unit developments. Figure V.A-1 illustrates existing land uses outside the areas of city impact.

Table V.A-1. Percentage of Land Use within Jerome County

<i>Category</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Acreage</i>
Agricultural	52.3%	200,798.50
Barren Land	28.0%	107,502.00
Rangeland	18.3%	70,260.00
Urban Land	0.8%	3,071.50
Water	0.7%	2,687.50

Source: Idaho Department of Commerce 1994

Table V.A-2. Land Ownership within Jerome County

<i>Status</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Acreage</i>
Private	71.2%	273,362.50
Federal	26.2%	100,591.00
BLM	(22.6)	(86,769.50)
Other	(3.6)	(13,821.50)
State	1.9%	7,295.00
County	0.65%	2,495.50
Municipal	0.005%	19.00

Source: Idaho Department of Commerce 1994

Urban land uses such as commercial, dense residential, and industrial are prevalent within the three incorporated areas of the county: Jerome, Eden, and Hazelton. In accordance with Section 67-6526 of the Idaho Code, *areas of city impact* have been established for lands bordering city boundaries. Most of the land in this area presently agricultural land, with some commercial, industrial, and residential lands following main transportation corridors. Proposed zoning for the areas of impact would, however, accommodate greater diversity in land uses in certain locations. This is particularly the case in the Jerome area of city impact. * amended 01/15/2013

All three impact areas have recently been adopted and reflect each incorporated area’s anticipated growth area. The Jerome impact area has been drawn to nearly double its size to encompass the recently adopted water and sewer district and the site of the proposed Crossroads Ranch.

Crossroads Ranch is a proposed mixed use development at the intersection of Interstate 84 and U.S. 93, for which an existing county special use permit has been granted. The proposed development would center on a commercial and retail services core that would capitalize on the site’s prime location at one of the state’s most significant intersections. The water and sewer district that has been established to connect Crossroads with Jerome city facilities will open a new

Figure V.A-1 (11 x 17)

corridor for development. This corridor will follow the new sewer line located along the north side of I-84 between U.S. 93 and Highway 79. The net effect of providing public services in this area will be a gradual shift in city development toward the south and east.

2. Analysis

The natural landscape of Jerome County involves flat and rolling plains with minimal physical barriers to development. Even undeveloped portions of the northern county, which are commonly considered barren, could accommodate development with proper excavation. Hence, the primary physical limitation for future development throughout the county is the availability of water. For this reason, existing and proposed development, both urban and agricultural, tends to focus on south and central locations where water is available. The Snake River, which forms the south boundary of the county, and the Snake River aquifer ultimately determine the locations where water can be made available for new development.

The desired extent and location of growth are the overlying concerns that will likely influence future county land use decisions. It is anticipated that most growth will occur in city impact areas, specifically within Jerome's impact area. The provision of city public services in and beyond the area of impact will be a controlling factor in growth-related land use decisions. Such decisions will obviously need to be well coordinated with city planning and public services.

Also associated with growth issues is a vital concern for the county's rural agricultural base. Regardless of where new development occurs, some productive agricultural lands will be consumed in the process. Along with this loss of prime agricultural land, come risks to the traditional rural character of the county. This raises even further concerns regarding the compatibility of new land uses with existing agricultural uses. Livestock containment operations, for example, have proven to be somewhat incompatible with nearly all urban land uses.

BLM-owned lands of the county will eventually be managed under a proposed Resource Management Plan (RMP) for the Bennett Hills region, which includes BLM land in 4 other neighboring counties. A supplemental draft RMP is expected to be issued by the summer of 1996, in conjunction with a draft environmental impact statement for 5 land management alternatives discussed in the RMP. These alternatives include variations on amounts of land which BLM would seek to exchange for certain state and privately owned critical environmental areas. The majority of those lands which may be subject to exchange are located in south-central Jerome County, extending from the Lincoln County line north of I-84 to an area near the U.S. 93 intersection. Although most of this land is not suitable for agriculture, other forms of development could consume some of the existing open space and recreation opportunities associated with these lands.

State-owned lands consist of some canyon rim areas and state endowment lands. A management plan, which is being developed for the canyon rim area, will focus on preservation, recreation, and related commercial and tourism uses. The Idaho Board of Land Commissioners participated in

the Jerome Joint Agency Comprehensive Plan process and will consider recommendations on the future use of endowment lands in Jerome County. In January, 1996, the Idaho Department of Lands issued a draft Perrine Bridge Block Land Use Plan. This plan will affect approximately 1,650 acres in Sections 27, 34, 35, and 36 of Township 9 South, Range 17 East inside the Jerome area of city impact.

These projected trends have resulted in the preparation of a revised land use map. Figure V.A-2 reflects desired land use categories and their location within the county. The areas depicted on the map are conceptual and, therefore, will require further analyses prior to the creation of a zoning map. Furthermore, this map does not preclude the development of other more specific zones such as those which might encompass outstanding natural, cultural, or recreational resource areas.

The future land use map was designed by the planning committee to reflect their desire to protect prime agricultural land and the rural character of the county. The committee also believes that all urban and suburban development should be focused within the county's ample areas of city impact. Since public services could be provided within these areas, they are the best-suited to absorb new population growth. However, an area for smaller lot residential development had also been defined to encompass existing development outside the areas of city impact. Furthermore, any commercial or industrial development not located within the impact areas should be situated in key transportation supported areas. In order to depict these concepts graphically, the committee developed the following land use categories and delineated them on Figure V.A-2.

- *Agricultural*: to protect the open spaces of Jerome County. Uses may include production of crops, other agricultural operations, and small lot residential uses only in association with agricultural operations, otherwise, one dwelling unit on large acreage. Potential density would be one dwelling unit per 40 acres. Special permits may allow public uses or agricultural support activities. (Amended 4-27-2006)
- *Rural Residential*: to allow residential development within specific areas which have already experienced residential development. Uses may include residential development at a potential density of one dwelling unit per one acre or greater if required by permitting agencies. Intensive agricultural establishments would not be permitted. Special permits for uses that may conflict with residential development would be discouraged, while uses that support residential development may be considered.
- *Commercial*: to promote commercial or industrial activity surrounding transportation routes. Residential development would not be permitted. A range of commercial and light industrial activities might be permitted with special permits.

- *Canyon:* to protect and preserve the Snake River Canyon. Uses may include those permitted in the agricultural zone. Development standards may specify limitations for building height and location.
- *Areas of City Impact:* to provide for future growth areas of the cities of the county with development consistent with the county's and of the cities' comprehensive plans and development standards. The areas of city impact will provide for the major development areas of the cities outside of the current city limits, leaving the majority of the county, outside areas of city impact, for agricultural uses. **It is the county's intention to provide orderly development and regulations of land within the areas of city impact. It is also the county's intention to minimize potential water, sewer, and access problems common to scattered rural residential development and assure that the layout of any such developments will compatible with urban standards when eventually annexed.** The specifics of these provisions will be outlined in the official area of city impact agreements.
*amended 08/05/2013

3. Issues and Concerns

Most issues and concerns involving future county land use decisions fall into 3 general categories: growth management, agriculture and natural resource preservation, and land use compatibility. These issues reflect concerns identified during public meetings, as well as research involving county offices and existing data and literature.

Growth Management. As expressed above, the extent and location of growth will likely determine the most pressing concerns associated with new development. Certainly, much or most of the projected growth will occur within city limits and impact area boundaries. This is not, however, without consequence to the remainder of the unincorporated county. Some of these more specific concerns are identified below.

- Potential for new growth to threaten existing rural community character
- Consumption of undeveloped land and associated natural resources
- Possible urban levels of growth in the south county and north of Twin Falls
- Capacity for existing infrastructure to accommodate new growth
- Modifications to impact areas or annexations which might accommodate unplanned growth
- Need for buffer zones to isolate developing areas from rural areas
- Need for revisions to zoning ordinance in order to establish designated growth areas, rather than relying on site by site or "spot" zoning decisions

Agricultural and natural resource preservation. Agricultural and natural resource lands establish the predominant rural character of the county and serve as a cornerstone of the local economic base. These issues are, therefore, inherent to both quality of life concerns and economic sustainability.

- Preservation of prime agricultural and range lands
- Preservation or acquisition of Snake River canyon rim and bottom lands

Figure V.A-2 (11 x 17)

- Impacts of development on water quantity and quality
- Need for coordinated planning between federal and local agencies

Land Use Compatibility. These issues deal with the compatibility of the uses of neighboring parcels of land. The main intention of land use regulations and individual zoning decisions is to ensure that such compatibility exists among all properties located within the city planning area. Suggestions for managing these issues tend to emphasize isolation or buffering of incompatible uses.

- Compatibility of new residential and commercial development with rural and agricultural areas
- Impact of new development on recreational and open space areas
- Compatibility of livestock confinement operations with residential areas
- Incrementally phased zoning of contiguous parcels of new commercial land along main transportation corridors to avoid unplanned strip development

4. Goals, Objectives, and Actions

Goal: Preserve Snake River Canyon Rim and bottom
<p>Objectives: Prevent the loss of range and agricultural lands Protect the natural areas associated with the river environment Maintain the historic and aesthetic quality of the Snake River Canyon area</p>
<p>Actions: Locate areas worthy of preservation Establish Preservation Zones where appropriate Work with public and private institutions to encourage the purchase for preservation of identified and available areas Monitor public and private development plans and proposals Coordinate with other programs and entities associated with the Snake River, canyon, and rim</p>

Goal: Encourage and continue the use of land for agriculture to preserve the rural quality of life in the county

Objectives:

Prevent the loss of range and agricultural lands
Discourage the unrestrained consumption of prime farming lands by non-agricultural uses

Actions:

Identify and classify various lands in the county with regard to suitability for agricultural or other uses (reference USDA-NRCS publication: *Jerome - Twin Falls County Soil Survey*)
Review this publication and its applicability to the land use plan
Encourage urbanization in areas already designated as A-2 or city impact zones and maintain remainder of the county in large agricultural parcels
Amend the current ordinance to allow non-agricultural uses to locate on land parcels not suitable for farming (reference USDA-NRCS publication: *Jerome - Twin Falls County Soil Survey*), even if those parcels are not designated with the appropriate zone (Amended 4-27-2006)
Adopt a zoning map and ordinance in accordance with this plan

Goal: Maintain land use compatibility

Objectives:

Encourage like uses of land to locate in the same areas
Prevent incompatible uses from coming into conflict
Discourage development of lands not suited for development

Actions:

Amend zoning ordinance and map to reflect adopted comprehensive plan
Discourage spot zoning
Create buffer areas between various uses which may be deemed incompatible
Encourage new developments in areas where the same or compatible land uses are already in existence
Consider natural resources and prevailing land use to limit further development
Consult with the NRCS and the soil and water conservation districts in developing zoning ordinances or amendments, as needed

Goal: Ensure adequate infrastructure is present to accommodate new development
Objectives: Proper sewer, water, power, and roads must be available for any new development Natural resources and prevailing land uses should be considered in any new development
Actions: Continue existing and/or develop county requirements for all development including, but not limited to, industrial parks, subdivisions, and planned unit developments Cooperate with public works entities (e.g., canal, highway and utilities) to place development where planned expansion of services will occur Consult with the NRCS and the soil and water conservation districts in developing new zoning ordinances or amendments Encourage new residential, commercial, or industrial development to occur within areas of city impact

Goal: Maintain applicability of county regulations
Objective: Ensure that county regulations are appropriate for existing conditions
Actions: Adopt zoning map and ordinances in accordance with the plan Remove outdated regulations Consult with the NRCS and the Soil and Water Conservation District in developing new zoning ordinances and any amendments Consider natural resources and prevailing land use in any new regulations Consider reviewing regulations that elapsed 5 years to maintain applicability to prevailing conditions in the county and to eliminate conflicting statements Appoint a committee to complete the zoning ordinances review, amendment, and adoption process

Goal: Prevent the “dewatering” of agricultural lands
Objective: Maintain agricultural land uses by preserving the water that goes with that land Retain the region’s water resources within the region
Action: Encourage the wise use of water resources in Jerome County Comply with Idaho Code regarding Use of Surface and Ground Water (Amended 4-27-2006)

Goal: Maintain and/or enhance economic opportunity on lands managed by the federal government and/or state-owned lands within Jerome County

Objectives:

- Continue multiple use management of public lands
- Manage recreation and traditional economic uses of lands and resources of the county
- Encourage responsible use and development of renewable resources in the county
- Ensure the economic integrity of private property intermingled with public lands
- Use ecosystem management concepts to assure compatibility of management efforts while protecting private property rights

Actions:

- Appoint a public lands committee to review state and federal land programs
- Encourage state and federal management agencies to coordinate management plans with Jerome County
- Coordinate planning activities with adjoining counties to assure compatible regional land use

B. HOUSING

The purpose of the housing component is to analyze the past and current housing markets to ensure that county residents have adequate housing. The housing component discusses portions of housing needs such as vacancy, structural condition, and portion of income paid for housing.

This housing component begins with a comparison of certain housing conditions from 1980 to 1990. Housing information from the 1990 census is the next portion of the housing component. That section includes characteristics of the owner-occupied and renter-occupied segments of the market. Residential building permit activity from 1990 to 1995, as well as the number of housing units needed for the 2000, 2005, 2010, and 2015 population are also included in the housing component analysis.

1. Existing Conditions

a. 1980 - 1990 Trend

The number of year-round housing units increased from 5,432 to 5,849 during the decade from 1980 to 1990, a gain of nearly 8 percent (Table V.B-1). However, there was a shift in the composition of the housing market during that time.

A 1.4 percent decrease in the number of owner-occupied housing units occurred, while rental units increased by nearly one-fourth. Owner-occupied housing units decreased from about 75 percent of the 1980 housing stock to about 70 percent of the 1990 housing units. Renter-occupied units increased from 25 percent of the housing stock in 1980 to 30 percent of the 1990 housing market.

The vacancy rate increased from 6.4 percent in 1980 to 9.0 percent in 1990, a gain of more than 50 percent. Nearly 300 additional housing units were vacated from 1980 to 1990. The 1990 homeowner vacancy rate was 2.1 percent, while the rental vacancy rate was 7.1 percent

Those changes in the housing market may have corresponded with the decrease in manufacturing jobs in the same time frame. People leaving the county may not have been able to sell their houses, and put them into the rental market. An increase in vacant units also was an indication that people were moving out of the county.

Table V.B-1: 1980 - 1990 Jerome County Housing Units

<i>Housing Characteristic</i>	<i>1980</i>	<i>1990</i>	<i>Numerical Change</i>	<i>Percent Change</i>
Total Units	5,531	5,886	355	6.4%
Total Year-Round Units	5,432	5,849	417	7.7%
Occupied Units	5,084	5,325	241	4.7%
Owner Units	3,805	3,751	-54	-1.4%
% Total	74.8%	70.4%		
Renter Units	1,279	1,574	295	23.1%
% Total	25.2%	29.6%		
Vacant Units	348	524	176	50.6%
% Total	6.4%	9.0%		

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
U.S. Department of Commerce

b. 1990 Housing Characteristics

Structure Type

More than three-fourths of Jerome County's housing stock was the traditional single-family, detached housing units. Mobile homes accounted for another 15 percent of all housing units. Attached housing, mainly apartments, represented the remaining 10 percent of the housing stock.

Year Structure Built

Nearly one-third of the county housing stock was constructed from 1970 to 1980 (Table V.B-2). That also was the decade when the population increased by 4,500 persons or 45 percent. More than 20 percent of all county housing units were greater than 50 years old in 1990.

Table V.B-2: 1990 Jerome County Age of Housing Stock

<i>Year Built</i>	<i>Number Units</i>	<i>Percentage Units</i>
1989 - March, 1990	25	0.4%
1985 - 1988	188	3.2%
1980 - 1984	544	9.2%
1970 - 1979	1,848	31.5%
1960 - 1969	541	9.2%
1950 - 1959	826	14.0%
1940 - 1949	726	12.3%
Before 1940	1,188	20.2%
TOTAL	5,886	100.0%

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
U.S. Department of Commerce

c. Housing Conditions

The 1990 census relied on individual responses to its sample questionnaire to determine selected housing and related environmental conditions. The following items do not represent a complete housing survey, but are some indicators of housing conditions in 1990. (Housing unit statistics were not cumulative, as one unit may have several deficiencies.)

- 57 housing units were not connected to a public sewer or septic tank
- 56 housing units lacked complete plumbing facilities
- 56 units lacked complete plumbing facilities
- 28 housing units' source of water was not from the public system or a well
- 7 housing units did not use any form of heating fuel

d. Owner-Occupied Housing Units

Housing Value

More than 60 percent of Jerome County's housing units was valued at less than \$50,000 in 1990 (Table V.B-3). Almost another one-third of the units was valued between \$50,000 and \$100,000. Jerome County's median housing value was \$42,100, while the state's median value was 40 percent greater at \$58,200.

Table V.B-3: 1990 Jerome County Housing Value

<i>Value</i>	<i>Number Units</i>	<i>Percent Units</i>
Under \$50,000	1,534	62.7%
\$50,000 - \$99,999	774	31.6%
\$100,000 - \$149,000	112	4.7%
\$150,000 - \$199,000	18	0.7%
Over \$200,000	10	0.3%
TOTAL(Specified units)	2,448	100.0%

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
U.S. Department of Commerce

Monthly Mortgage Costs

Over one-half of all Jerome County monthly mortgage costs were between \$300 and \$499 in 1990 (Table V.B-4). Another one-fourth of all county mortgage payments were between \$500 and \$699. The 1990 median mortgage payment was \$441, compared to the state median of \$561. Slightly more than 1,000 county households did not have a mortgage payment in 1990.

Table V.B-4: 1990 Jerome County Mortgage Costs

<i>Mortgage Amount</i>	<i>Number Units</i>	<i>Percent Units</i>
Under \$300	143	9.9%
\$300 - \$499	781	54.3%
\$500 - \$699	348	24.2%
\$700 - \$999	148	10.3%
Over \$1,000	19	1.3%
TOTAL (Specified Units)	1,439	100.0%

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
U.S. Department of Commerce

Mortgage Costs as a Percent of Income

A household paying less than 25 percent of its income for housing is considered to be paying an affordable amount. Almost 75 percent of Jerome County households were affordably housed, according to the 1990 census (Table V.B-5).

According to U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, a household spending more than 30 percent of its income is paying an excessive amount for housing. Slightly more than 12 percent of all owner households were paying an excessive portion of their income for housing in 1990.

Table V.B-5: 1990 Jerome County Owner Housing Costs as a Percent of Income

<i>Percent of Income</i>	<i>Number Units</i>	<i>Percent Total</i>
Under 20 Percent	1,516	61.2%
20 - 24 Percent	339	13.7%
25 - 29 Percent	200	8.1%
Over 30 Percent	408	12.4%
Unknown	14	0.6%
TOTAL (Specified Units)	2,477	100.0%

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
U.S. Department of Commerce

e. Renter-Occupied Housing

Monthly Rental Costs

More than 60 percent of all Jerome County renters paid between \$200 and \$500 monthly rent in 1990 (Table V.B-6). More than 16 percent of the renters did not pay any cash rent. Jerome County's median rent was \$275, compared to Idaho's median of \$330 in 1990.

Table V.B-6: 1990 Jerome County Monthly Rents

<i>Monthly Rent</i>	<i>Number Units</i>	<i>Percent Units</i>
Under \$200	260	19.5%
\$200 - \$299	416	31.1%
\$300 - \$499	391	29.3%
Over \$500	51	3.8%
No Rent	218	16.3%
TOTAL (Specified Units)	1,336	100.0%

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
U.S. Department of Commerce

Rental Cost as a Percent of Income

Housing cost-to-income ratios for renters were the same as for owners. As depicted in Table V.B-7, nearly one-half of all Jerome County renters were paying less than 25 percent of their income for monthly rent in 1990. However, more than 20 percent were paying in excess of 30 percent for rent.

Table V.B-7: 1990 Jerome County Renter Costs As a Percent of Income

Monthly Rent	Number Units	Percent Units
Under 20 Percent	504	37.7%
20 - 24 Percent	150	11.2%
25 - 29 Percent	164	12.4
30 - 34 Percent	44	3.3%
Over 35 Percent	237	17.7%
Unknown	237	17.7%
TOTAL (Specified Units)	1,336	100.0%

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
U.S. Department of Commerce

1990 - 1994 Residential Activity

More than 400 residential building permits were issued in all of Jerome County from 1990 through 1994 (Table V.B-8). That number of permits issued was greater than the 1980 to 1990 net change in housing (355 housing units).

The level of residential building permit activity increased in the latter part of the 1990 to 1994 time frame. In 1990, 39 permits were issued in the entire county. By 1994, more than 150 permits had been issued.

Table V.B-8: 1990 - 1994 Jerome County Residential Building Permits

<i>Year</i>	<i>Single Family Permits</i>	<i>Mobile Home Permits</i>	<i>Total Permits</i>
1990	15	24	39
1991	25	23	48
1992	50	32	82
1993	40	67	107
1994	66	86	152
TOTAL	196	232	428

Sources: Intermountain Demographics, Jerome County, cities of Eden, Hazelton, and Jerome

Mobile homes were becoming a greater portion of the total housing inventory. They represented more than 50 percent of residential permits issued from 1990 through 1994. In 1990, they were 15 percent of all housing units.

2. Analysis

Housing unit forecasts were prepared at the county level for 2000, 2005, 2010, and 2015 (Table V.B-9). Slightly more than 3,600 housing units will be added to the 1995 inventory to reach a total of 9,942 housing units by 2015, representing more than a 50 percent gain.

Housing information for 1990 was from the census. The 1995 estimate was based on 1990 through 1994 permit activity.

Table V.B-9: Jerome County Housing Unit Forecast

<i>Year</i>	<i>Housing Units</i>
1990	5,886
1995	6,317
2000	7,080
2005	7,932
2010	8,882
2015	9,942

Source: Intermountain Demographics

Housing unit forecasts were based on population forecasts prepared in the population component of the comprehensive plan. The methodology was to divide the five-year population increase by a persons per household ratio to determine the change in households. (The 1990 county persons per household rate was forecast to decline 1 percent annually to 2000, and then remain constant.)

The five-year household forecast was factored down by 1 percent to allow for deteriorated housing to drop out of the housing inventory. That total was factored by another 5 percent to allow for vacant housing units. Net change in housing units was added to the previous inventory to calculate the forecast. (The net change in housing units from 1995 to 2000 was added to the 1995 inventory to produce the 2000 forecast.) The 5 percent vacancy rate used was a theoretical rate to allow for mobility and housing choice. That rate may vary and affect the actual number of housing units in place at a particular time.

3. Issues and Concerns

Issues and concerns related to housing may be grouped in several topic areas. They are further discussed below:

Achieve a better understanding of housing issues

- Define affordable and low cost housing

- Consider offering incentives for the private development of affordable housing
- Consider additional housing regulations

Improve quality and quantity of housing

- Identify the location of future housing units
- Some housing units were deficient, lacking kitchen, plumbing, or heating facilities
- Mobile homes were becoming a larger portion of the housing inventory
- An additional 3,600 housing units will be needed to house Jerome County's 2015 estimated population

Stabilize the cost of housing

- A slight shift in housing tenure, from owner to renter occupancy, occurred from 1980 to 1990
- Some households were paying an excessive portion of their income for housing
 - More than 12 percent of all owners were paying in excess of 30 percent of their income for housing
 - Nearly 18 percent of all renters were paying more than 30 percent of their income for housing

4. Goals, Objectives, and Actions

<p>Goal: Provide adequate affordable housing</p>
<p>Objectives: Develop and implement a county housing plan Eliminate substandard housing</p>
<p>Actions: Appoint a citizens committee to address housing issues and concerns and to develop a plan which considers all housing issues, especially concerns related to housing the low-income and migrant population Encourage mobile home parks within city limits or areas of city impact Direct small lot, single-family residential and multi-family residential development within city limits or areas of city impact</p>

C. RECREATION

Located in the heart of the Magic Valley, Jerome County offers a rural lifestyle with unstructured or undeveloped recreation opportunities. Fishing, float-boating, and hunting, particularly game birds, are available throughout the area. Forming the southern border of Jerome County, the Snake River Canyon also offers undeveloped recreation in a spectacular, primitive canyon setting. The Jerome County Fairgrounds provides the only developed recreation offered by the county. Figure V.C-1 shows the Jerome Recreation District (JRD) boundaries.

This recreation component is a summary of the county recreation discussion found in the *Jerome Recreation District Specific Plan*. The county does not have a recreation program; rather, it relies on the JRD to provide recreation programs and developed facilities to the residents of Jerome. For a more detailed discussion of overall recreation found in Jerome, refer to the *Jerome Recreation District Specific Plan*.

Because the Snake River Canyon corridor borders Jerome County, a summary of the existing conditions; future trends; and goals, objectives, and actions are also included in this element.

1. Existing Conditions

Recreation Influences

Influences that affect recreation include regional attributes such as land ownership, natural features, and location in relationship to other recreation resources. Other service providers and planning programs, and participant and population characteristics, are also important in recreation development and management. This section briefly describes these influences and their effect on recreation in Jerome County.

Natural features and public land ownership and management have a profound effect on recreation in the area. The scenic Snake River Canyon, which borders the district, provides undeveloped recreation within the county. Private landowners along this corridor hold land necessary for public access to the canyon. Without this access, recreation to the canyon is limited. With the threat of development and restricted access, the county and JRD are looking at ways to preserve this area or provide a way for multiple use, allowing development and access to coexist.

The historic development of the area also influences recreation development and planning. Pioneers traveled through this area, settling the west in the late 1800s. Portions of the Oregon Trail cross through Jerome County and ruts from the numerous covered wagons are still visible. These areas are currently unprotected. Limited knowledge of these ruts has prevented damage from occurring; however, this cultural resource provides a unique opportunity for viewing an essential part of Jerome County and Idaho history.

Figure V.C-1

Regional recreation resources, services, and facilities in the surrounding region also influence recreation management in Jerome County (refer to Figure V.C-2). Travelers visit Jerome and other local attractions during their stay in the region and on their way to other recreation destinations. For example, regional attractions near Jerome include Hagerman Fossilbeds National Monument, the Snake River Canyon, Idaho Farm and Ranch Museum, Shoshone Falls, Sun Valley, and Silent City of Rocks National Reserve. As part of a Department of Commerce study, in 1993, the University of Idaho conducted a traveler survey to determine the economic importance of tourism to rural communities. Results showed that a substantial number of tourists (over 2 million) visited Region IV (Jerome, Cassia, Gooding, Minidoka, Lincoln, and Twin Falls counties) in 1993 and spent \$97 million.

The BLM, as the second largest landholder in the county, also plays a key role in local outdoor recreation, as well as affecting the local economy. The BLM controls approximately 25 percent of Jerome County land. Undeveloped recreation, such as hunting, fishing, and hiking, occurs on these lands as well as some cattle grazing. Public lands under BLM management are managed under resource management plans (RMPs). In Jerome County, as a result of numerous public comments, the BLM has extended their current planning process and comment period for the proposed RMP. A second draft RMP is expected to be issued by January of 1996, in conjunction with a draft environmental impact statement for 5 land management alternatives. These alternatives include variations on amounts of land that BLM would seek to exchange for certain state and privately owned lands in the Bennett Hills Resource Area. The purpose of the exchange is to consolidate critical habitat areas. While some of this land is not suitable for agriculture, other forms of development could consume some of the existing open space and recreation opportunities associated with these lands. Figure I.A-1 depicts BLM and other land ownership within the county.

A Jerome regional bicycle and pedestrian path system has been proposed which would connect the city of Jerome with the Snake River canyon rim and other areas of the county (refer to Figure IV.B-4). Planning and development of the path system will be coordinated by the North Side Transportation Advisory Committee and the county economic development office. The projected timeframe for development of the entire path system is 10 to 15 years, although certain sections may be completed sooner.

Other influences in recreation and county planning include planning efforts by other agencies. These agencies, including the Idaho Department of Commerce, NPS, BLM, NSCC, Idaho Power, Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation, Region IV Recreation Forum, Twin Falls County, and the city of Jerome, were reviewed and presented in the JRD Specific Plan. The planning issues and future trends of these planning efforts have been accounted for and are reflected in the goals, objectives, and policies generated for the overall recreation planning efforts.

Figure V.C-2

Recreation Facilities, Programs, and Amenities

Recreation facilities or opportunities, located throughout the county, but not necessarily under the jurisdiction of the county or JRD, are presented in Tables V.C-1 and V.C-2. Figure V.C-3 shows recreation areas within Jerome County.

The Snake River Canyon corridor is a natural resource treasure in the Magic Valley. Forming the southern border of Jerome County and the JRD, this area provides hiking, fishing, wildlife viewing, and cultural resources in a spectacular, rugged environment. Formed from glacial floodwaters, the Snake River is relied upon by Jerome County, as well as neighboring counties, for water and wildlife resources and recreational opportunities.

The Snake River Canyon Corridor is also known for its cultural sites. Several sites and ancient trails, such as the Oregon Trail, used during the gold rush days, can be found bordering the Snake River Canyon Corridor. These trails used by the pioneers are part of the Oregon Trail system that crosses southern Idaho. Many of these ruts are still visible yet have not been marked.

Much of the land along the Snake River is in private ownership and development along the cliffs and in the canyon itself has caused concern. Figure I.A-1 shows land ownership along the Snake River corridor. The Bureau of Reclamation controls releases from Milner Dam, as well as a small amount of land along the corridor and along canals and laterals within the North Side Canal Company District. Idaho Power also controls a small area of land along the river corridor. Other public land is managed by the BLM and the state of Idaho.

Since much of the land is in private ownership, access to and in the Snake River Canyon is restricted. The Region IV Recreation Forum and Middle Snake River Recreation Workgroup, are developing a plan of natural and recreation resources along the Snake River Canyon Corridor. The objective of the plan is to develop a series of recommendations on recreation issues such as resource management, access, future facilities and opportunities, as well as preservation of cultural and historical resources. Recommendations will be developed through a series of community and region-wide meetings. A recreation inventory map identifying recreation resources along the Snake River Canyon Corridor has already been developed by the Access Subcommittee Recreation Forum's Access Subcommittee.

2. Analysis

Jerome County has experienced population growth in the last five years (1990-1995) of 2.3 percent, more than double the national average. This growth has put pressure on the existing recreation and natural attributes that undeveloped recreation rely on. Also, with the east end of the county already short on available structured recreation programs, this population increase will exacerbate this condition.

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Table V.C-1

Recreation Sites Within Jerome County

<i>Recreation Site/Resource</i>	<i>Activities</i>	<i>Facilities</i>	<i>Ownership</i>
Snake River Canyon Corridor	Undeveloped recreation: Hiking, nature enjoyment, explore cultural resource sites, float boating, swimming, fishing	Picnic sites, boat launch, put-in/take-out points, trails	Federal, State, Private
Oregon Trail	View of historic Oregon Trail	Undeveloped	BLM, State, Private
Scott's Pond	Fishing, hunting, hiking	Undeveloped	State (Fish and Game)
Blue Lakes Country Club	Golf Course, tennis, swimming	Developed Recreation Facilities	Private
Devil's Corral	Hiking, nature enjoyment	Undeveloped	Private, BLM Access
Vineyard Lake	Nature enjoyment	Undeveloped	Private
Greenwood Park	Rodeo, picnicking, equestrian activities	Corrals, benches, picnic tables	School District
Clay Caves	Spelunking	Undeveloped	Public (BLM)
Wilson Lake	Swimming, boating, fishing, picnicking	Tables, boat ramp, docks, restrooms	Public, private
Cauldron Linn/ Star Falls	Visiting historic site, nature enjoyment, hiking	Undeveloped	Public (BLM)
Shoshone Falls Power Plant Park Caretaker's House	Visiting historic house on National Register	Undeveloped	Idaho Power
Shoshone Falls Overlook, Preacher Rock	Visiting scenic overlook, historic flag pole, and gravesite	Undeveloped	Idaho Power, BLM, Private
Jerome Rod and Gun Club	Target practice	Targets, restrooms	Private
Jerome Country Club	Golf, cross-country skiing	Restaurant, restrooms	Private
I-Farm Museum	Agricultural museum	Museum	BLM (Lease to County)
Milner Dam	Boating, fishing, kayaking, swimming, picnicking, hunting, viewing wildlife, spelunking, and visiting historic resources	Docks, boat ramps, restrooms	Idaho Power

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Table V.C-2

Other Recreation Sites Within the City of Jerome

<i>Site</i>	<i>Activities</i>	<i>Ownership</i>	
Jerome City			
Camozzi Park	Grassy area, tennis, picnicking, playgrounds	Tables, restrooms, tennis courts, playground	City
Jerome County Fairgrounds	Agricultural and stock exhibits, horse racing	Exhibition halls, restrooms, stockyards, race track	Jerome County
Shepherd Park	Swimming, picnic area, tennis, playground	Tables, swimming pool, restrooms, playground, tennis courts	City
North Park	Picnic area,	Tables, shelter, Bar-B-Q, open space	City
South Park	Grassy area, picnic area	Benches, restrooms, open space	City
Water Tower	Picnic area, horseshoes	Tables, horseshoe pits, open space	City

Figure V.C-3

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The age structure of the future population is also expected to change. Both the county and city face an older population. Persons aged 80 and older were about 3 percent of the population in Jerome County. By 2015, they will be nearly 10 percent of the total population. county-wide, they will be the fastest growing and largest age group. Programs and facilities to accommodate this population will be needed to provide adequate services for these citizens.

With the active role taken by the Idaho Department of Commerce, both the city of Jerome's and Jerome County's roles in recreation development within the Magic Valley will increase. While specific destinations within Jerome County are limited, the county provides services for travelers passing through the area. As previously discussed, over 2,000,000 nonresident motor vehicle travel parties visited Region 4 (Jerome, Minidoka, Gooding, Lincoln, and Cassia counties) in 1993. Planning efforts should focus on how to serve this transient recreating population.

Preservation or multiple use of the Snake River Canyon Corridor is a critical issue which will only increase in importance. As population increases, development pressure is placed on scenic areas particularly the Snake River Canyon Corridor. While some private land owners currently allow the public to use their land for access, some abuse of this privilege has occurred. The Region IV Recreation Forum is developing a plan which addresses management protection, and multiple use of this unique area. Recreation opportunities have already been identified along the Snake River Canyon Corridor from Massacre Rocks to Three Island Crossing State Park. The plan will include recommendations for enhancing and promoting public access and enjoyment, while protecting other resource values. This plan will make recommendations regarding development, preservation, and management and assist decision makers from cities, counties, and land owners along the Snake River in making informed decisions on the course of management of this unique and precious area. The plan is anticipated to be completed in the winter of 1996.

3. Issues and Concerns

The following provides a summary of the issues and concerns raised during the planning process.

Jerome County

- *More recreation facilities in the east end of the county.* The east end of the county lacks easily accessible recreation facilities. Most recreation facilities are located in the west end, centered in the city of Jerome. A new park that provided ball fields, picnic areas, restrooms, and playgrounds was suggested.
- *Greenwood Park.* This park is currently under the management of the Valley School District. Currently, it provides a corral for equestrian type recreation and is in poor condition. Suggestions were made to approach the school district regarding management possibilities such as letting a club or organization sponsor this park.
- *New programs.* As discussed, most recreation facilities are in the west end of the county. This creates difficulties in driving children to programs. The east end lacks sports programs,

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

to accommodate this side of the county. The east side of the county also lacks easy access to a library.

- *Review of pool condition.* Both the City of Jerome and JRD own and manage a pool facility for local residents. The aquatics program and open swim at the JRD support the majority of residents needs. However, the city pool is conveniently located for some residents. Cost evaluation of both pools was suggested. A study for enclosing the JRD pool facility for year-round swimming was also discussed.

Snake River Canyon

- *Preserve Oregon Trail and Charlie Walgamott's stagecoach trail.* Since ruts still exist on the north side of the river, much discussion was focused on preserving these remains of the areas historic past.
- *Provide right of way to canyon.* Numerous footpaths and trails were discussed that either were in disrepair or crossed private lands. Discussion focused on obtaining right-of-ways or easements and identifying existing trails.
- *Disposition of public lands.* The BLM had prepared a draft RMP and Environmental Impact Statement which discussed the possibility of a land exchange along the Snake River Canyon Corridor. As a result of numerous public comments on the proposed land exchange, the BLM has extended the planning and public comment period. A revised draft is expected in the spring of 1996.
- *Review of various plans affecting the Snake River Canyon.* Numerous plans exist which address uses along the Snake River Canyon. Review of these plans to identify needs or special concerns were discussed.

4. Goals, Objectives, and Actions

Issues and concerns identified during the planning process established the basis for goals, objectives, and policies. The following represents the goals, objectives, and polices developed specifically for Jerome County and the Snake River corridor.

Goal: Maintain and enhance public use of old school property (Eden and Hazelton) and Greenwood Park, Wilson Lake

Objectives:

Find public service group or other sponsor to adopt parks

Action:

Initiate public meetings for both cities and school boards to find long-term solutions for management and operation of old school property, particularly Greenwood Park and Wilson Lake

Determine feasibility of forming an East End Recreation District or combining with the existing district
--

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Goal: Identify more facilities to support recreation use
Objectives: Identify long-term solution for meeting facility and program needs Incorporate pedestrian/bike path and trail system development into roadway and open space planning Coordinate with school district to develop facility use agreements
Actions: Identify potential skateboard/rollerblade area, volleyball courts Investigate possibilities of developing greenbelt corridors Encourage joint use of school facilities for public recreation

Goal: Develop programs for the East End of the County
Objective: Identify and develop programs for East End residents
Actions: Enhance library or library service (i.e., Bookmobile) Develop kids' sports programs Develop leisure services as needed to meet demand

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Goal: Manage, enhance, and preserve the natural, cultural, aesthetic, and recreational resources and their associated values

Objective:

Support the preservation and enhancement of historical trails, sites, and architectural resources
Ensure that actions related to the canyon corridor are coordinated with plans of related entities, agencies, and organizations
Pursue public access to canyon rim through the use of negotiated easements, purchases, gifts, etc.
Preserve and provide enhanced public access to public lands in the Snake River corridor

Actions:

Inventory and identify trails and establish a data base
Study condition of Oregon Trail within Jerome County
Coordinate with state and local historical societies to access information regarding historic routes and trails
Obtain right-of-way or easements for Oregon Trail, particularly on state lands (Perrine Bridge block)
Identify specific blocks of public lands which require access such as:
 a. County road into canyon (west end of golf course - South Lincoln) - Determine responsibility for maintenance and type of use
 b. Scott's Ponds - preserve access
 c. Devils Corral - private land - obtain for public use
 d. Footpath just east of Perrine Bridge - into canyon and up to Pillar Falls - identify ownership of land, recommend continued access, and responsibility for maintenance
 e. Canyon rim east of 93 to Shoshone Falls - maintain public access
Obtain easements to support a cities-to-canyon path system and a contiguous canyon rim path through Jerome County
Provide input and coordinate access and development with recommendations of the Region IV Recreation Forum
Recommend Planning and Zoning Commission develop, adopt, and enforce ordinances that ensure long-term maintenance of the Snake River corridor

Objective:

Encourage cooperative interpretive educational program to foster understanding and appreciation of the Snake River Canyon corridor

Actions:

Recommend appropriate, coordinated interpretive signage which meets identified standards
Recommend an educational curriculum to educate residents and visitors about the canyon's resources and opportunities

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

<p>Objective: Preserve the aesthetic and other natural qualities of the Snake River Canyon corridor</p>
<p>Action: Recommend Planning and Zoning Commission develop, adopt, and enforce ordinances that ensure long-term maintenance and support of the natural, cultural, aesthetic, and recreational resources of the Snake River Canyon corridor</p>
<p>Objective: Create a local land trust organization Encourage a comprehensive and coordinated management effort to preserve and protect the canyon rim's natural and economic resources</p>
<p>Actions: Develop a Jerome County Canyon Rim Advisory Committee to review existing plans and proposed actions including the Snake River Canyon corridor Develop plans to address site-specific issues Encourage efforts of other entities and agencies to ensure water quality/availability for recreation purposes Provide input and coordinate with recommendations of the Region IV Recreation Forum and RTCA project Support and participate in the development and management of a local land trust Support BLM Burley District/Cassia County development of environmental education center at Milner Dam (Note: Cassia/Jerome County will be involved in river management/enforcement) Support Planning and Zoning ordinances that result in development along the canyon rim that do not detract from the values of the canyon</p>

<p>Goal: Acquire land and easements for future open spaces, facility development, and public access</p>
<p>Objectives: Identify needs for open space, facility development, and public access Identify available land Identify funding Create a local land trust organization Create a local park foundation</p>
<p>Actions: Prioritize needs/acquisition Coordinate efforts with other related agencies and entities Endorse and encourage coordination of contributions through the local land trust</p>

D. SPECIAL SITES/COMMUNITY DESIGN

Jerome County has a rich heritage. This legacy is evident in a variety of special sites, including, Oregon Trail ruts, the Wilson Butte Cave, a world known archeological site, and the North Side Canal, a large Carey Act irrigation project

Indeed, the county's history has shaped the form and design of its landscape. This component concerns itself with Jerome County's identity and the design features that present an attractive appearance for the county. A brief background on the county's formation, a presentation of the existing condition of special sites, an analysis of future impacts on these sites and the county's design and character, are all presented in this component. Community design addresses the need for landscaping, building design and signs, as well as suggested patterns and standards for design, development and beautification. A list of issues and concerns as well as goals, objectives, and policies conclude this component.

1. Existing Conditions

a. Background

Jerome County was created by the Legislature on February 8, 1918, taking parts of Lincoln, Gooding and Minidoka counties. The area came to life when Milner Dam was built on the Snake River in 1905 and diverted water to the North Side Canal. This gravity system, unmatched in size in national reclamation development, irrigates land in Jerome County and feeds miles of watercourses.

Jerome County possesses a unique collection of masonry structures made of basalt. Lava rock was plentiful in the county and the indigenous rock was utilized by pioneers to build rock homes and other needed buildings. Rocks were regarded as a 'necessary evil' when the farmers would keep turning new crops of rocks in their spring or fall plowing. They would be piled up in the field on a high piece of ground or hauled off to one side and eventually, the ground became free of them. Most lava rock structures were built between 1908 through 1930 and include houses, schools, barns, bunkhouses, water tanks, well houses, potato cellars, walls, and outbuildings. One of the best is the Jacob B. Van Wagoner Barn located along U.S. 93, southeast of Jerome. The three-story rock barn was built in 1912 and, for many years, was a favorite site for community barn dances.

During World War II, Jerome County became the site of the Minidoka War Relocation Center. Located at Hunt, 9,400 Japanese Americans from the western states were forced to live in the barbed wire camp during the war years. Despite hatred and discrimination encountered by the evacuees, they supported the war effort by performing agricultural labor on a work-release program. In 1979, the site was placed on the National Register of Historic Places, and for the Idaho Centennial, the site was honored with a memorial plaque.

b. Historic Resources

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The North Side Alternate Route of the Old Oregon Trail travels across the southern part of Jerome County. Outstanding pristine wagon ruts extend for several miles between Devil's Corral and the Jerome Country Club. These trail remnants are unique to this area because the multitude of iron clad wagon wheels have in many places worn deep grooves in the rock outcroppings crossed by the trail. The most prominent of these rock ruts are located between Shoshone Falls and Devil's Corral on BLM land, between Highway 74 and Blue Lakes on State land, and west of Blue Lake to the Jerome Country Club, on private property. White carsonite markers were placed along the trail in 1989 by the BLM and the Oregon California Trail Association. Unfortunately, several of the markers have been vandalized in recent years.

Jerome County has a number of archeological sites. The best known is Wilson Butte Cave, a lava blister formed by gas expansion within the cooling lava during the Pleistocene. In 1959, the Peabody Museum financed an excavation and Idaho State University provided support and guidance. The cave contained five major deposits. The lower three strata were water-laid, the upper two were deposited by wind. The lowest and oldest deposit contained bones of two extinct forms of camel and one horse. The middle layer yielded bones of a modern form of bison, and the upper strata contained the bones of bison, deer, and antelopes, as well as some coarse pottery, arrowshafts, notched arrowheads, and a moccasin. Study of the deposits and the types of animals associated with them concluded that the climate was cooler and more moist 15,000 years ago than at present. The plains around the butte were grassland interspersed with marshes or lakes. About 6,800 years ago, the climate began to grow warmer and drier, a phase that continues.

The Jerome County Historical Museum, located in Jerome, was established in 1981 by the Jerome County Historical Society. The museum is under the care of society volunteers, and displays include a pictorial gallery and exhibit of the Hunt Project during World War II. The Idaho Farm and Ranch Museum, now in its 11th year, is located on a 100-acre site near Petro II. The museum is working to recreate a live working farm and ranch depicting development of the North Side track and how irrigation breathed life into the desert. Exhibits include a Prove Up Shack and farm machinery. In June, the site hosts Live History Day, an annual event that is a snapshot of pioneer life.

In 1983, the Idaho State Historical Society did an inventory called Lava Rock Structures in South Central Idaho. This inventory led to forty-seven lava rock structures in Jerome County being placed on the National Register of Historic Places. An inventory of Jerome County's historic resources is listed in Table V.D-1.

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Table V.D-1: Inventory of Jerome County Historic Resources

(Page 1 of 3)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Location</i>
Wilson Butte Cave		Archaeological Site
Mecham Cave		Archaeological site
Indian Blinds		Archaeological Site
Pence Deurig Cave		Archaeological Site
Clay Cave		
Visual Remnants - Cataclysmic Great Bonneville Flood		
Caldron Linn (NR)	1811	T11S, R20E, Section 5
N. Side Alternate Route of the Oregon Trail	1852-80	
Walgamott-Sullaway/ Shoshone Falls Road	1883	Parallels US. 93
Milner Dam	1905	Snake River
Milner Gooding Canal		
North Side Canal System	1905-1912	
Shoshone Falls Grade	1915	Snake River Canyon
Shoshone Falls Ferry Landing & Approach		Snake River
Shoshone Falls Power Plant	1900,07	Snake River
Shoshone Falls Overlook, Preacher Rock		
North Blue Lakes Grade	1892	
Devils' Corral		
Kinsey Fish Farms		Devil's Coral
Springtown	1870	
Vineyard Lake		
Minidoka Relocation Center (Hunt) (NR)	1942-45	T8S, R19E Section 32/33
Perrine Family Cemetery		Blue Lakes Country Club
Brook Lodge	c.1900	
Blue Lakes Country Club		
G. Saunders/O. Severance Barn	1916	Hwy. 25 and Valley Rd.
N. Senson/J. Shawver Barn	1917	844 S. Eden Rd.
Lava rock structures listed on the National Register of Historic Places:		
Falls City School House	1919	T8S, R17E, Section 35
Canyonside School	1920	T9S, R16E, Section 1
Sugarloaf School	1934	T8S, R18E, Section 33
North Side Canal Co. Slaughter House	c. 1910	T8S, R17E, Section 7
Shoshone Power Plant Caretaker's House	c. 1907	T9S, R17E, Section 36
Lulu Graves Farm	1929	T7S, R16E, Section 2

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Table V.D-1: Inventory of Jerome County Historic Resources

(Page 2 of 3)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Location</i>
Charles Bower House	1917	T7S, R16E, Section 13
Thomas J. Kehrer, House	1917	T7S, R16E, Section 13
James Bothwell Water Tank House	c. 1926	T7S, R16E, Section 31
Hugh and Susie Goff House	c. 1921	T7S, R17E, Section 16
E. Spencer House, Garage & F. Nelson Barn	1918,22,41	TS7, R17E, Section 18
George V. Doughty House & Garage	c. 1914	T7S, R17E, Section 28
Don Tooley House	1922	T7S, R17E, Section 33
William Weigle House & Water Tank	1919	T8S, R16E, Section 4
Carl Blessing Outbuildings	1918	T8S, R16E, Section 9
Arnold Stevens House	1918	T8S, R16E, Section 16
Jessie Osborne House	1919	T8S, R16E, Section 17
G.H. Erdman House	c. 1920	T8S, R16E, Section 17
W. H. Silbaugh House	c. 1920	T8S, R16E, Section 21
John Stickel House	1931	T8S, R16E, Section 21
Archie Webster House	c. 1924	T8S, R16E, Section 24
Jay Van Hook Potato Cellar	c. 1922	T8S, R16E, Section 25
Merritt Fry Farm	1916,26,30	T8S, R16E, Section 29
Clarence Keating House	1917	T8S, R17E, Section 3
E. V. Cooke House	1919	T8S, R17E, Section 4
Huer Well House/Water Tank	1929	T8S, R17E, Section 3
Greer & Jennie Quay House	1911-12	T8S, R17E, Section 5
Jacob B. Van Wagener Barn	1912	T8S, R17E, Section 34
Jacob B. Van Wagener Caretakers House	1912	T8S, R17E, Section 34
Julian T. Ricketts House	1928	T8S, R17E, Section 36
Rice Thomas Barn	1930	T8S, R18E, Section 29
Bethune-Ayres House	1920	T8S, R18E, Section 32
William & Clara Veasie House	1912	T9S, R16E, Section 3
O. J. Daniels House	c. 1928	T9S, R16E, Section 12
William H. Cook Water Tank House	c. 1915	T9S, R17E, Section 1
George Epperson House	1912,29	T9S, R17E, Section 4
Edward M. Gregg Farm	1914-30	T9S, R17E, Section 5
Dick Callen House	1917	T9S, R17E, Section 6
Edgar Johnson House	1917	T9S, R17E, Section 6
Tom Barnes Barn	1930	T9S, R18E, Section 1
George Lawshe Well House	c. 1920s	T9S, R18E, Section 2
J.W. & R. Newman Ranch & Bunkhouse	c. 1920	T9S, R18E, Section 2
Ben Laughlin Water Tank House & Garage	1927	T9S, R18E, Section 6

Table V.D-1: Inventory of Jerome County Historic Resources

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

(Page 3 of 3)

<i>Name</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Location</i>
Bert & Fay Havens House	1927	T9S, R20E, Section 32
Fay L. Shepard House		T10S, R16E, Section 4
Charles Vinyard House	1920	T10S, R18E, Section 3
Wilson Lake Reservoir	1908-1912	T9S, T19E

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

c. Special Areas

Special areas of Jerome County include the individual cities of Jerome, Eden, and Hazelton, the Snake River Canyon, the North Side Canal system, the Jerome County Fairgrounds, Idaho Farm and Ranch Museum, the public lands of the BLM, and Interstate-84 interchanges and highway corridors. Information on the cities of the county are located in the individual city comprehensive plan documents. The significant landscapes of the Snake River Canyon are reviewed in Recreation (Section V.C.). The BLM oversees all natural resource management activities and establishes management standards for the federal land in Jerome County.

North Side Canal & Wilson Lake Reservoir --Two special natural and man-made features of Jerome are the North Side Canal and the Wilson Lake Reservoir. The canal was opened in 1909 and is controlled by the North Side Canal Company. The prime purpose of the canal is that of distributing water over the entire north side tract. The North Side Main Canal travels through the county feeding the Milner Gooding Canal, Wilson Lake Reservoir, and myriad of canals, ditches, and laterals. In addition to irrigation, the canal corridors offer an opportunity to create trails for walking and cycling.

Jerome County Fairgrounds --The Jerome County Fairgrounds, located on the west side of the city of Jerome, offers a large public site that can continue to serve the county. Held in early August, the fair is a showcase for Jerome County agriculture. Activities include 4-H, crop displays, livestock exhibits, rodeo, carnival, and a parade. The opportunity exists for year-round youth and cultural events, as well as space for recreation. Consideration is being given to acquiring more land along Main Street for additional open space and a new fairgrounds entrance.

Idaho Farm and Ranch Museum -- The Idaho Farm and Ranch Museum (IFARM) is located on a 100-acre site at the I-84 and U.S. 93 interchange. Started in 1984, the museum is working to re-create a live working farm and ranch depicting development of the North Side track and how irrigation breathed life into the desert. Currently, exhibits include a Prove Up Shack and antique farm machinery including tractors, threshing machines, and a windmill. The facility is operated by the Jerome County Historical Society, as a non-profit enterprise. In June, the site hosts Live History Day, an annual event that is a snapshot of pioneer life. Plans are underway to expand its facilities, collections, and exhibits which tell the story of Idaho's agriculture. IFARM's freeway location makes it accessible to a large number of visitors. The facility will bring economic, educational, and cultural benefits to Jerome County. The museum has state-wide significance and has the potential to become one of Idaho's key visitor attractions.

Interstate-84 Interchanges -- There are seven interchanges along Interstate 84 that define points of accessibility to Jerome County. These include interchanges 164, West Jerome; 168, Highway 79; 173, U.S. 93 to Sun Valley and Twin Falls; 182, Highway 50 and Eden; 188, Valley Road and 194, Ridgeway Road to Hazelton, and Paul/County line. As the vehicular lifeline to Jerome County, these seven gateways allow travelers to reach destinations conveniently. These interchanges will have a great impact on the shape of county development and it is critical that future land uses be well planned and designed. For example, industrial development along the south side of the city of Jerome is occurring because the proximity of freeway interchanges are a necessity where goods are transported by truck. The interchanges also define the character of

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Jerome County and it is important that they be attractive and informative. Any development adjacent to any off-ramp shall do a traffic study to indicate the developments impact on traffic movement and design issues. The cost shall be that of the developer.

d. Community Design

Citizens of Jerome County emphasize the need to maintain an attractive community. Jerome County is based not only on how it is laid out, but on how people interact and the quality of life they enjoy. Within the county, there are landscapes that are significant not only for the views and vistas offered but also because they provide a sense of place to residents. As discussed above, special areas include the agricultural and rural lands, the Snake River Canyon, and the highway corridors. Aesthetically pleasing views from major roadways in the county are also an important part to the natural beauty offered in Jerome County.

Governments can influence community design by three basic means: direct government ownership and/or design, private development incentives, and land use regulations. (Idaho Planning Association 1991) Currently, Jerome County Planning and Zoning Commission reviews land use through zoning regulations, but does not have design standards or a design review committee to review design issues.

2. Analysis

Special care is necessary in protecting the rural atmosphere of Jerome County. This requires conserving natural vegetation, open space, and significant topographic features that exist in the county. To maintain these characteristics requires careful consideration of the visual impact of all new development.

a. Special Sites

Much of the character of Jerome County lies with its historic sites. These sites enhance the quality of life and give the county a special sense of place. It is important to continue to re-use these buildings to maintain historic continuity and continue a link with the past. Unless historically significant sites that lend character to Jerome County are not protected, they may be subject to insensitive restoration or demolition. As Jerome County nears its 100th birthday, more effort is needed to rehabilitate and preserve sites of architectural or historic importance.

b. Community Design

Additional growth and desire for recreational activities can be expected to increase the demand for open space. To maintain and enhance the livability and rural character of the county, natural and historic resources will require protection. County growth and increased traffic levels on U.S. 93 and Highways 25 and 79 will stimulate demand for new development along these corridors and interstate interchanges. The result is that potential aesthetic inconsistencies will occur without review and standards for design. If the county does not fully utilize its design review authority, poor new visual elements will ultimately degrade the general aesthetic quality of the county, as a whole.

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

This plan recognizes that there is a connection between the physical design of Jerome County and the quality of life. Excellence in community design is essential to creating a physical place where people have the opportunities and choices required to lead rewarding lives.

Design Standards

With the county growing, now is the time to create design review standards that will encourage and improve the county's physical environment. County policies and ordinances necessary to encourage attractive building designs and landscaping need to be established. Sign regulations should provide equitable standards to all business, as well as to maintain high aesthetic values that both residents and visitors desire. Commercial signs should be integrated into the architecture of buildings. Billboards that detract from the county's rural character should be discouraged.

Highway Corridors

Highway corridors entering and passing through the county introduce both visitors and residents to Jerome County. One of the most important characteristics of the county is the attractive views seen from its highway corridors. Presently, the highway corridors of U.S. 93 and Highway 25 are enjoyed for their attractive rural atmosphere. Major corridors in Jerome County include Interstate 84, U.S. 93, and State Highways 25, 79, and 50. These highway corridors and the interstate interchanges will experience new development and will require new standards to protect the visual resources of the county.

Efforts to enhance corridors include the recent planting of street trees along Highway 79/S. Lincoln Street. Enhancement funds have been requested from the ITD by the city of Twin Falls to plant trees along U.S. 93 from the Snake River Canyon to Interstate-84.

This plan delineates these highway corridors and interstate interchanges as a special element of the comprehensive plan Map. The plan encourages the enhancement of the scenic character of the views from these roads. The corridors include all development wholly or partially adjacent to highway corridors within the county. Within these corridors, design review procedures will be implemented through planning ordinances that will provide a means of guiding future development, and redevelopment of existing uses. The design review process will afford the opportunity to address the special features of each property and facility on a case-by-case basis.

Design standards are needed to preserve and enhance the highway corridors natural and scenic appearance. An example might include a landscaped setback along U.S. 93 featuring natural xeriscape vegetation (wheat grass rescue) and crushed cinders. In some areas, more extensive landscaping, fewer points of access, or greater concern for building character may be required. Planning for these special corridors, along with the appropriate review of new development, will help maintain Jerome County's quality of life.

3. Issues and Concerns

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Based on discussions with residents and local officials, the following issues have been identified:

- Protect and preserve historic buildings and sites
- Maintain rural character
- Beautification for U.S. 93 and I-84 interchange

4. Goals, Objectives, and Action

Goal: Maintain a visual quality and theme consistent with the historic rural nature of the county

Objectives:

Preserve area's special sites

Strongly discourage unsightly and distracting development from occurring

Allow for future development, including infrastructure, in appropriate areas

Preserve property values by maintaining a consistent quality of development in any particular area

Cooperate with developers to establish site-specific design criteria

Enhance the entryways to the county

Actions:

Establish design review standards for mobile homes and manufactured housing

Develop/maintain a sign ordinance

- Consult with community leaders and businesses to develop adequate and acceptable standards
- Public safety must be considered
- Establish setbacks and height standards

Encourage common area requirements for new developments

Recommend "growth space" (i.e., wider roads, phased developments) requirements through easements or other mechanisms

Coordinate with highway districts to establish highway corridor standards

Encourage landscaping standards and weed control

Establish/review standards for building height and lighting

Enforce zoning regulations

E. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The purpose of the plan's economic development component is to analyze the local economy for strengths and weaknesses. This component begins with a discussion of past trends in employment sectors of the Jerome County economy. Both number of employees and wages paid by employment sector, as well as changes in income levels and poverty status, are examined in the past trends data.

Employment (number of employees by sector) and wages paid information is presented in the existing conditions section of the component. Income characteristics for 1995 are also discussed in that section.

Detailed employment forecasts, including number of workers by sector and per capita income forecasts, are predicted for the county. Both sets of forecasts began with a 1995 inventory and forecast conditions for 2000, 2005, 2010, and 2015. Focus areas for economic development efforts are also presented in this component.

1. Existing Conditions

a. Employment

1970 - Past 1990 Trends

Jerome County employment increased by more than 2,300 employees from 1970 to 1980, an average annual gain of more than 5 percent (Table V.E-1). The largest employment gain was recorded in manufacturing, which increased by more than 900 employees. Wholesale trade and services also showed significant employment increases. The farming sector lost nearly 100 employees, a 6 percent decrease.

The 1980 to 1990 decade was a reversal from the previous one. Total county employment decreased slightly in that time-frame. The single largest decrease was in the manufacturing sector, which lost more than 500 jobs, representing a 46 percent decrease. Tupperware closed its production plant in 1986 and laid off nearly 700 full and part-time employees. Other slight declines were recorded in farming, wholesale trade, and financial services.

In spite of the impact of losing a major employer, some sectors of the economy gained employment. Agricultural services and transportation and public utilities employment each gained more than 200 employees and nearly doubled in size from 1980 to 1990. Employment in construction, retail trade, and services remained constant even with the layoff.

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Table V.E-1: 1970 - 1990 Jerome County Employment

<i>Employment Sector</i>	<i>1970</i>		<i>1980</i>		<i>1990</i>	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Farming	1,704	37.6%	1,606	23.2%	1,498	21.8%
Agricultural Services	133	2.9%	266	3.9%	479	7.0%
Mining	11	0.2%	7	0.1%	3	-
Construction	178	3.9%	316	4.6%	314	4.6%
Manufacturing	185	4.1%	1,086	15.8%	584	8.5%
Transportation Utilities	169	3.7%	286	4.2%	470	6.9%
Wholesale Trade	198	4.4%	457	6.6%	383	5.6%
Retail Trade	580	12.8%	847	12.3%	898	13.1%
Financial	238	5.3%	326	4.7%	293	4.3%
Services	592	13.1%	1,015	14.7%	1,127	16.4%
Government	544	12.0%	672	9.8%	809	11.8%
TOTAL	4,532	100.0%	6,884	100.0%	6,858	100.0%

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
U.S. Department of Commerce

Farming employment has declined over time, but still remained the single largest employment sector in the local economy. In 1990, it contained nearly 1,500 workers, and was more than 20 percent of Jerome County employment. The farming and agricultural services accounted for almost 30 percent of total county employment. The next largest employment sectors were services, with 16 percent, and retail trade with nearly 12 percent of total employment.

1990 - 1993 Change

Jerome County employment increased by nearly 450 employees from 1990 to 1993, an average annual gain of about 2.2 percent (Table V.E-2). The government sector increased the most, adding nearly 100 employees. The greatest percentage gains occurred in construction (14.0), manufacturing (15.1), and transportation and public utilities (14.0). Farming employment continued to decline, but only lost five employees.

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Table V.E-2: 1990 - 1993 Jerome County Employment

<i>Employment Sector</i>	<i>1990 Employment</i>	<i>1993 Employment</i>	<i>Number Change</i>	<i>Percent Change</i>
Farming	1,498	1,493	-5	-0.3%
Agricultural Services	479	501	22	4.6%
Mining	3	3	0	0.0%
Construction	314	358	44	4.9%
Manufacturing	584	672	88	15.1%
Transportation Utilities	470	536	66	14.0%
Wholesale Trade	383	430	47	12.3%
Retail Trade	898	958	60	6.7%
Financial	293	305	12	4.1%
Services	1,127	1,142	15	1.3%
Government	809	907	98	12.1%
TOTAL	6,858	7,305	447	6.5

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
U.S. Department of Commerce

1993 Jerome County and State of Idaho Comparison

Jerome County's employment base differed from Idaho's employment structure (Table V.E-3). Farming and agricultural services formed the largest share of Jerome County's employment, with more than 27 percent of all employees. Those two sectors represented slightly more than 8 percent of total state employment. Jerome County's share of transportation and public utilities and wholesale trade workers also was higher than the state.

Jerome County's percentage of employment in the retail trade, financial, and services sectors were considerably lower than the state percentages. That may be due, in part, to the predominance of nearby Twin Falls City. Local residents may be shopping and using other services in the larger trade market.

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Table V.E-3: 1993 Jerome County and State of Idaho Employment Sector Comparison

<i>Employment Sector</i>	<i>Jerome County</i>	<i>Percent Total</i>	<i>State of Idaho Percent Total</i>
Farming	1,493	20.4%	5.9%
Agricultural Services	501	6.9%	2.3%
Mining	3	0.0%	0.5%
Construction	358	4.9%	6.7%
Manufacturing	672	9.2%	12.2%
Transportation Utilities	536	7.3%	4.3%
Wholesale Trade	430	5.9%	4.6%
Retail Trade	958	13.1%	17.4%
Financial	305	4.2%	6.1%
Services	1,142	15.6%	23.6%
Government	907	12.4%	16.5%
TOTAL	7,305	100.0%	100.0%

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
U.S. Department of Commerce

b. Wages and Salary

1970 - 1990 Past Trends

Another useful method of looking at the local economy is to analyze wages and salary paid by employment sector (Table V.E-4). The farming sector and agricultural services sectors provided nearly 50 percent of all Jerome County wages in 1990. Services and manufacturing sectors were a distant second place in wages paid, with each accounting for about 10 percent.

Changes in wages paid by sector also have not been consistent over time. While the farming sector accounted for about 45 percent of all wages in 1970 and 1990, it only paid 25 percent of county wages in 1980.

Manufacturing wages have increased from 4.3 percent of the 1970 total wages, to 9.1 percent of total wages in 1990. However, that sector had not reached its 1980 level of nearly 20 percent of all wages.

Wages paid to retail workers decreased from 11.5 percent of all wages in 1970, to 8.3 percent in 1990. That sector had a gain in jobs over that same time, indicating that wages paid to retail workers have declined over time.

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Table V.E-4: Jerome County Wages and Salary by Employment Sector

<i>Employment Sector</i>	<i>1990 Wages</i>	<i>Percent Total</i>	<i>1980 Percent</i>	<i>1970 Percent</i>
Farming	\$ 67,157,000	45.0%	24.8%	44.3%
Agricultural Services	\$ 4,455,000	3.0%	2.2%	2.2%
Mining	\$0	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%
Construction	\$ 4,072,000	2.7%	6.1%	5.1%
Manufacturing	\$ 13,592,000	9.1%	19.3%	4.3%
Transportation Utilities	\$ 8,743,000	5.9%	5.2%	5.0%
Wholesale Trade	\$ 6,846,000	4.6%	8.2%	5.5%
Retail Trade	\$ 12,350,000	8.3%	10.6%	11.5%
Financial	\$ 1,483,000	1.0%	1.8%	1.6%
Services	\$ 17,503,000	11.7%	12.6%	10.9%
Government	\$ 12,960,000	8.7%	8.9%	9.4%
TOTAL	\$149,161,000	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
U.S. Department of Commerce

1990 - 1993 Change

Total wages and salary paid increased by more than 33 million dollars from 1990 to 1993, a 22 percent increase. The increase in farming wages was the highest, increasing more than 10 million dollars. (Farming employment remained nearly constant for the same time frame, indicating a real increase in wages per employee). Service sector wages were the next highest increase, about 5 million dollars more than in 1990.

1993 Jerome County and State of Idaho Comparison

Farming and agricultural services wages represented more than 45 percent of all Jerome County wages paid in 1993 (Table V.E-5). Those two sectors were less than 10 percent of Idaho's wages that same year.

Percentages of wages and salaries paid in the transportation and utilities and wholesale trade sectors were nearly equal for Jerome County and the state. The Jerome County percentage of wages paid was less than the state in the remaining sectors. Its percentage of wages paid in manufacturing and services was considerably below the state percentages.

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Table V.E-5: 1993 Jerome County and State of Idaho Wages and Salary Comparison

<i>Employment Sector</i>	<i>Jerome County</i>	<i>Percent Total</i>	<i>State of Idaho Percent Total</i>
Farming	\$77,882,000	42.6%	7.7%
Agricultural Services	\$ 6,132,000	3.4%	1.4%
Mining	\$0	0.0%	1.3%
Construction	\$ 5,333,000	2.9%	7.5%
Manufacturing	\$16,276,000	8.9%	19.5%
Transportation Utilities	\$10,771,000	5.9%	5.7%
Wholesale Trade	\$ 9,456,000	5.2%	5.1%
Retail Trade	\$15,301,000	8.4%	10.6%
Financial	\$ 2,477,000	1.4%	4.3%
Services	\$22,659,000	12.4%	20.4%
Government	\$16,587,000	9.1%	16.5%
TOTAL	\$182,874,000	100.0%	100.0%

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
U.S. Department of Commerce

1994 Wages Paid By Employment Sector

Jerome County's 1994 average annual wage was \$17,972 (Table V.E-6). The federal government average wage was the highest of all employment sectors. Average wages were lowest in the retail sector, and may be explained by the large number of part-time workers employed in this sector.

Jerome County's 1994 average annual wage was almost \$4,000, or 20 percent less than Idaho's. Jerome County's agricultural wage was above the state average. The county's wage level also was above the state average for retail trade and nearly the same for state employment. However, the county's average wage was below the state average in all other sectors.

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Table V.E-6: 1994 Jerome County and Idaho Wages Paid by Employment Sector

<i>Employment Sector</i>	<i>Jerome County Wage</i>	<i>State of Idaho Wage</i>
Agriculture	\$17,183	\$14,974
Mining	\$0	\$34,501
Construction	\$17,485	\$24,972
Food Processing	\$20,294	\$23,177
Lumber	\$23,750	\$28,502
Other Manufacturing	\$21,223	\$34,490
Transportation Utilities	\$20,808	\$27,277
Wholesale Trade	\$22,701	\$24,265
Retail Trade	\$13,207	\$12,928
Financial	\$18,560	\$25,048
Services	\$16,991	\$20,244
State Government	\$25,068	\$25,295
Local Government	\$16,175	\$19,502
Federal Government	\$29,254	\$34,286
Average Wage	\$17,972	\$21,938

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
Idaho Department of Employment

c. Jerome County Employers

Most of Jerome County's employers were small businesses. In 1992, more than one-half (56.5 percent) of Jerome County employers had less than five employees. Another 20 percent had between five and ten employees. Small businesses were predominant in the service sector. It contained nearly 30 percent of all businesses with fewer than ten employees.

Major employers in the county included the Jerome School District (330 employees), Spears Manufacturing (220 employees), Saint Benedict's Hospital (175 employees), Moore Business Forms (160 employees), and Jerome County (107 employees). The CSI, although located in Twin Falls County, employed 81 full-and part-time Jerome County residents.

d. Unemployment Rate

The most recent, seasonally adjusted unemployment rate for Jerome County was 4.3 percent (about 350 unemployed persons) as of May, 1995. Jerome County's unemployment rate fluctuated between 5 and 7 percent from 1990 to 1994. The Idaho Department of Employment, the source of unemployment information, urges caution when comparing current labor force data to previous years because of a series break between the 1993 and 1994 data sets.

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

e. Household and Per Capita Income

1980 - 1990 Trend

A positive change in income distribution occurred from 1980 to 1990 (Table V.E-7). There were fewer households in lower income categories and more households in higher income categories.

Median household income also more than doubled, but did not keep pace with inflation, in the same decade. The increase in per capita income also was below the national rate of inflation.

Table V.E-7: 1980 - 1990 Jerome County Income Characteristics

<i>Income Category</i>	<i>1980 Households</i>	<i>Percent Total</i>	<i>1990 Households</i>	<i>Percent Total</i>
Under \$5,000	706	14.0%	340	6.4%
\$5,000 - \$9,999	992	19.7%	671	12.7%
\$10,000 - \$14,999	1,062	21.1%	739	14.0%
\$15,000 - \$24,999	1,412	28.0%	1,387	26.3%
\$25,000 - \$34,999	509	10.1%	909	17.2%
\$35,000 - \$49,000	240	4.8%	690	13.1%
Over \$50,000	121	2.4%	545	10.3%
TOTAL	5,042	100.0%	5,281	100.0%
Median	\$13,783	-	\$21,209	-
Per Capita	\$7,150	-	\$9,727	-

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
U.S. Department of Commerce

Jerome County's household income distribution was slightly different than the state and the national distributions (Table V.E-8). The county had a greater percentage of households in the lower income categories and a lower percentage of households in the higher income categories. Its median income was 16 percent lower than the state's median, and nearly 30 percent below the national median.

Table V.E-8: 1990 Household Income Distribution Comparison

<i>Income</i>	<i>1990 Jerome</i>			<i>National</i>
---------------	--------------------	--	--	-----------------

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

<i>Category</i>	<i>Households</i>	<i>Percent Total</i>	<i>Idaho Percent</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Under \$5,000	340	6.2%	5.5%	6.2%
\$5,000 - \$9,999	671	12.7%	10.5%	9.3%
\$10,000 - \$14,999	739	14.0%	11.2%	8.8%
\$15,000 - \$24,999	1,387	26.3%	22.2%	17.5%
\$25,000 - \$34,999	909	17.2%	18.2%	15.8%
\$35,000 - \$49,999	690	13.1%	17.0%	17.9%
\$50,000 - \$74,999	374	7.1%	10.7%	15.0%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	45	0.9%	2.5%	5.1%
Over \$100,000	126	2.4%	2.1%	4.4%
TOTAL	5,281	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Median	\$21,209	-	\$25,257	\$30,056

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
U.S. Department of Commerce

1990 - 1995 Income Change

From 1990 to 1995, Jerome County household income distribution shifted upward (Table V.E-9). There was a 10 percent reduction in the number of households with incomes less than \$5,000. The number of households increased in all other income ranges. The largest numerical household gain occurred in the \$50,000 to \$74,999 income range. The greatest percentage increase was in the highest two income categories.

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Table V.E-9: 1990 - 1995 Jerome County Household Income Change

<i>Income Category</i>	<i>1990 Households</i>	<i>1995 Households</i>	<i>Numerical Change</i>	<i>Percent Change</i>
Under \$5,000	340	306	-34	-10.1%
\$5,000 - \$14,999	1,410	1,455	45	3.2%
\$15,000 - \$24,999	1,387	1,515	128	9.2%
\$25,000 - \$34,999	909	1,099	190	20.9%
\$35,000 - \$49,999	690	848	158	22.9%
\$50,000 - \$74,999	374	573	199	53.2%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	45	79	34	75.7%
\$100,000 - \$149,000	88	205	117	133.5%
Over \$150,000	38	146	108	283.4%
TOTAL	5,281	6,226	945	17.9%

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
National Decisions Systems

Median household income increased to \$24,603, a gain of 16 percent, from 1990 to 1995. Per capita income rose to \$12,443, increasing by more than 27 percent, in the same time period.

f. Poverty

1980 - 1990 Past Trends

The incidence of poverty increased in Jerome County from 1980 to 1990 (Table V.E-10). Approximately 25 percent more persons and families were in poverty in 1990 than in 1980.

Certain segments of the general population had larger increases in poverty. The number of elderly residents in poverty increased by more than 40 percent from 1980 to 1990. They represented nearly 2 percent of total county population in 1990. Female headed families in poverty more than doubled during the decade, and represented nearly 5 percent of all families in 1990.

Table V.E-10: 1980 -1990 Jerome County Poverty Indicators

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

<i>Below Poverty Level</i>	<i>1980</i>	<i>1990</i>	<i>Numerical Increase</i>	<i>Percent Increase</i>
Persons	1,908	2,392	484	25.4%
% Total	12.9	15.8	-	-
Over 65	199	281	82	41.2%
% Total	1.3	1.9	-	-
Families	408	512	104	25.5%
% Total	10.0	12.6	-	-
Female headed	84	195	111	132.1%
% Total	2.1	4.8	-	-

Sources: Intermountain Demographics
U.S. Department of Commerce

2. Analysis

a. Employment Forecasts

Jerome County employment was forecast to increase from 7,651 employees in 1995, to more than 12,000 by 2015 (Table V.E-11). Total county employment was forecasted to increase by almost 60 percent, or an average annual gain of nearly three percent.

The largest employment gains were in wholesale trade (687 gain), retail trade (697 gain), and services (690 gain). Farming was forecast to decrease slightly. However, agricultural services employment continued to increase.

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Table V.E-11: 1995 - 2105 Jerome County Employment Forecasts

<i>Employment Category</i>	<i>1995</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2015</i>
Farming	1,478	1,441	1,441	1,441	1,441
Agricultural Services	551	615	686	766	855
Mining	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	402	482	579	695	834
Manufacturing	687	725	764	806	851
Transportation Utilities	539	548	559	567	577
Wholesale Trade	477	596	745	932	1,164
Retail Trade	1,012	1,154	1,315	1,499	1,709
Financial	312	331	351	372	395
Services	1,233	1,480	1,776	2,131	2,557
Government	960	1,099	1,259	1,441	1,650
TOTAL	7,651	8,471	9,475	10,650	12,033

Source: Intermountain Demographics

The methodology to prepare the forecasts consisted of estimating employment for individual employment sectors and aggregating these subtotals to the county total. The 1995 estimate continued the 1990 to 1993 trend to 1995.

Long-term trends, employment changes from 1970 through 1993, were the basis for the construction, wholesale trade, retail trade, financial, services, and government forecasts. The short-term trend, 1990 through 1993, was used to forecast future levels of manufacturing employment.

In the farming sector, long term and short-term trends were the same. That rate of decline was projected to continue until 2000. Farming employment was assumed to level off for the remainder of the forecast period.

Idaho Power Company statewide prediction rates were used for employment in the agricultural services and transportation and public utilities sectors. Mining was expected to remain the same for the 20 year time-frame.

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

b. Per Capita Income Forecasts

Jerome County per capita income was forecast to increase from about \$9,700 in 1990 to slightly more than \$24,000 in 2015 (Table V.E-12). Although that increase was sizable, it only represented a 14 percent increase when adjusted for inflation.

Table V.E-12: 1990 -2015 Jerome County Per Capita Income

<i>Year</i>	<i>Per Capita Income</i>
1990	\$9,727
1995	\$10,505
2000	\$12,396
2005	\$15,123
2010	\$18,904
2015	\$24,008

Source: Intermountain Demographics

The 1990 per capita income was from the census survey. Idaho Power Company per capita income increases were applied to the census per capita base.

c. Focus Areas

A high quality of life depends on economic activity and the opportunities for meaningful work. Jerome County must successfully maintain and attract commerce and industry essential for the county's economic well-being. To assure economic vitality, Jerome County must continue to encourage diversified growth and promote business opportunities to create jobs, broaden the tax base, and minimize the impact of economic fluctuations. The following paragraphs highlight particular focus areas for the future economic vitality of Jerome County.

Areas of City Impact

New commercial and industrial growth should be directed to the cities of Jerome, Eden, and Hazelton. Opportunities for planned development also are available near the interchanges along Interstate-84, particularly within the expanded Jerome area of city impact. The county should also encourage its cities to provide a diversity of available development sites and locations, with flexibility for different types of buildings and a mix of supporting uses. The creation of new jobs in manufacturing, distribution, agriculture, tourism, retail, and service business will provide the basis for a healthy, rewarding, high quality of life for all who choose to live and work in Jerome County.

Educated Population

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The county's most valuable asset is its people. The economic success of Jerome County is directly related to how well the county invests in its current workers and the young people who will be the future workforce.

Jerome County is fortunate to have developed a strong working relationship with the CSI. CSI personnel regularly participate in the Jerome Economic Development Task Force weekly meetings. CSI facilitates the development of the Jerome economic community coordination functions. They worked with Idaho State University, the Northwest Area Foundation, and Jerome city and county officials to develop the funding structure for this portion. The campus is a regular visit on any marketing trip from prospective businesses. CSI provides educational opportunities and training programs that potential companies find attractive.

Employees must have ongoing access to opportunities for upgrading their knowledge and skills. To accomplish this, the ties between Jerome's schools, the CSI, and the workplace should be increased and reinforced. Investing in ongoing training for the current workforce will result in a larger number of productive workers and a more creative, innovative, and satisfied workforce.

Crossroads Ranch

The Crossroads Ranch development will include freeway commercial services, a hotel and restaurant, exposition center, equestrian center, and western shops. The central location at the I-84-U.S. 93 interchange will stimulate the growth of private development. To assure quality and continuing economic vitality, the development must maintain good site planning, building design, and attractive landscaping. Special care needs to be taken to assure that the Crossroads Range development contributes commercial opportunities to the county rather than compete with the city of Jerome. The frontage road between Crossroads and S. Lincoln Street is a key link that will serve to connect the city and Crossroads.

Tourism

A Jerome County tourism plan would be beneficial to focus the diverse interests in this area. A goal to increase the tourism industry to 10% of the county's economy would be laudable. Major tourism opportunities for the county include developing and promoting the trails and recreation facilities of the Snake River Canyon, boating and fishing on Wilson Lake, enjoying the Farm and Ranch Museum, and patronizing the specialty shops (e.g., antique) in Jerome.

Downtown Revitalization

Downtown Jerome is a central point in the economic vitality of the county. A comprehensive revitalization program to stimulate retail, service, tourism, and entertainment growth would be desirable to the future of the city and county.

Regional Strength

Jerome County benefits from the economic strength of the Magic Valley. Regional cooperation between Jerome, Twin Falls, Gooding, Lincoln, and Blaine Counties should be encouraged.

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

3. Issues and Concerns

- Locations for commercial development need to be identified.
- The size of commercial or industrial development to attract to the county should be defined.
- Job quality should be described.
- A sustainable economy should be balanced with environmental quality.
- Research should be done to determine the type of industry to attract to the area.
- Existing businesses need to be supported with necessary infrastructure.
- Another bridge needs to be constructed between Jerome County and Twin Falls County.
- The need for a commercial and agricultural facility should be investigated.
- Employment changes in the county economy has been inconsistent over time.
 - Total employment increased from 1980 to 1990 by more than 50 percent
 - The county lost employment from 1980 to 1990
 - The 1990 to 1993 economy has rebounded, gaining about 450 jobs
- Farming was the mainstay of the county economy.
 - It employed more persons than any other sector of the economy.
 - Wages paid by the farming and agricultural services sectors accounted for nearly 50 percent of all wages paid in 1990.
- County income characteristics were below national and state benchmarks.
 - Income gains from 1890 to 1990 were less than the national rate of inflation.
 - Per capita and median household income also were below state and national levels.
- The incidence of poverty increased from 1980 to 1990.
- Total county population was forecast to increase from about 7,500 employees in 1995, to more than 12,000 by 2015.
- Per capita income, when adjusted for inflation, was predicted to increase by 14 percent for the same time period.

4. Goals, Objectives, and Actions

Goal: Maintain and improve the diversity of the economic base.

Objective:

Attract environmentally sensitive employers which provide higher wages and year-around

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

employment

Encourage and accommodate a variety of economic activities

Expand economic development activities in the eastern end of the county

Encourage tourism-related activities

Coordinate the provisions of transportation and other infrastructure to accommodate business activities

Encourage regional cooperation in economic development.

Actions:

Support the Jerome Economic Development Task Force and Chamber of Commerce.

Support private sector industrial park development.

Encourage distribution centers and agricultural support facilities, particularly in food processing and dairy products, to locate in the area.

Require business activities to be environmentally sensitive.

Support the farm and ranch museum attraction.

Encourage a tourism destination center.

Encourage businesses to locate in designated areas.

Articulate the transportation advantages of the county to future employers and encourage distribution and transportation business.

Company size should not be a factor when marketing the area to prospective employers.

Encourage economic development around the airport.

Market educational opportunities at the College of Southern Idaho as part of job training.

Support the cities of Jerome, Eden, and Hazelton as they plan for the timely provision of utilities such as sewer and water.

Encourage the redesign and construct the I-84 and Highway 25 interchange for larger volumes of traffic and economic development opportunities.

Encourage and support the expansion of existing businesses

Encourage geographic job development that includes Eden, Hazelton, and the Hansen Bridge corridor.

Review subdivision ordinance to include design standards for commercial and industrial facilities.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION

In order for this plan to be a vital document, a program for implementation must be agreed upon and adopted. This component articulates the various tasks that must be completed for the goals and objectives to be met. This list was derived from the actions developed within each chapter.

In order to ensure implementation of the actions identified in this plan, they have been prioritized by their respective committees and assigned to the responsibility of appropriate government or public agencies. The following table (VI-1) illustrates the categorical priority of each item, as well as the party responsible for implementation.

Prioritization of the actions for implementation has been based on the immediacy of community need regarding their expected outcome. Those identified as “immediate” should be in their developmental stages immediately after the comprehensive plan is adopted. Those actions ranked as “mid-term” should also be considered for swift implementation, although the level of further study or organization involved will likely extend over a longer period of time. Some mid-term actions are also dependent on “immediate” actions preceding them. Actions designated as “long-term” are not necessarily less important. This classification indicates that they simply do not have the same urgency and will likely be ongoing efforts.

Responsibility is assigned for each action. These groups include the following:

- Board of County Commissioners (BOCC)
- Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
- City of Jerome (City)
- Chamber of Commerce (Chamber)
- County Staff (CS)
- Hillsdale Highway District (HHD)
- Idaho Department of Commerce (IDC)
- Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG)
- Idaho Department of Lands (IDL)
- Idaho Department of Water Resources (IDWR)
- Idaho Transportation Department (ITD)
- Jerome County Extension Service (University of Idaho) (JCES)
- Jerome County Planning and Zoning Commission (P & Z)
- Jerome Economic Development Task Force (JEDTF)
- Jerome Highway District (JHD)
- Jerome Recreation District (JRD)
- Jerome School District (JSD)
- Middle Snake River Recreation Work Group (MSRRWG)
- Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS)
- North Side Canal Company (NSCC)
- North Side Transportation Advisory Committee (NSTAC)
- Region IV Recreation and Tourism Organization (Region IV)

JEROME COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

- Rivers, Trails Conservation Assistance Program (RTCA)
- South Central District Health (SCDH)
- South Central Idaho Recreation and Tourism Development Association (SCIRTD)

