
Core Committee Meeting #12- Minutes March 13, 2012

In Attendance:

Core Committee

Julie Stomper (General – via phone)
Cleve Booker (General – via phone)
Dave Hensel (General)
Kerry Buxton (General)
Lauren Wendt (Natural Resources + Outdoor Rec)
Tim Adams (Transportation)
Pete Koson (Economic Development)
Jeff Potter (Community Events + Facilities)

Teton County

Angie Rutherford

Consultant Team (Team 2020)

Jennifer Zung (Harmony Design + Engineering)
Bruce Meighen (AECOM)

Public

Stacey Frisk

Meeting was called to order at 2:10 pm.

1. **Minutes** - Meeting minutes from meeting #11 were reviewed. Tim moved to accept the minutes as written. Dave seconded the motion. There was no discussion and the motion passed.

2. **Review Presentation materials for community outreach meetings**
 - a. Slides with notes were reviewed. Some changes that were recommended include:
 - b. Add notes on information about the current Comp Plan with dates
 - c. Add information on what the Comp Plan is and is not
 - d. Add where we are in the process now
 - e. In general – try to reduce the number of slides
 - f. Talk briefly about outreach completed so far
 - g. Change wording of slide 6 to “options”, make more understandable
 - h. Eliminate slide 8, add call outs to slide 7
 - i. Add information on where photos taken for slides 11 and 12, make sure density pictured is correct
 - j. Delete slide 13 & 14 or change 14 to introduce land use tools only
 - k. Delete slides 19, 20, 21 and add as single slide of “other tools”
 - l. For each meeting next week, we ideally need 3 CC members present. Jen and Angie will also be at the meetings to take notes but will not be facilitating or presenting. Jen sent around a sign-up sheet and will send it out to the CC members not present as well. Meetings are scheduled for March 20, 21, 22 in Teton, Driggs and Victor respectively at 6:30 – 8:30 p.m.
 - m. Jen will send out to the CC and SC members a copy of the newspaper ad for the meetings so that everyone can get the word out to others.

3. **Review public feedback and evaluation of Framework Maps**
 - a. Full copy of the online Framework survey was provided to committee prior to the meeting
 - b. Jen & Bruce handed out a condensed evaluation matrix that summarized the public comment and evaluated the Frameworks against criteria taken from the Vision Document

- c. If the survey showed greater than 63% “Like” then that item was considered “meeting” criteria and the land use areas were incorporated into a Composite Land Use Framework which was also handed out at the meeting.
 - d. Discussed the correlation between public opinion and the total number of criteria met which is totaled at the bottom of each page.
 - e. Some amenity items that were discussed include:
 - i. Trail system along the river – public did not like, it does meet many of the vision criteria; however, consensus was to delete it from the plan.
 - ii. Perimeter Trail around the Valley – public liked, also meets many vision criteria. We discussed that there was some concern of location of the trail and if it was on private land. Discussed that the trail is shown in Framework 1 on public (Forest Service) land. Consensus was to keep it in the plan.
 - iii. Bird Watching Center – public liked, some comments against, only met 1 vision criteria. Discussed that is a detail that doesn’t need to be in the plan so consensus was to delete it from the plan.
 - iv. Visitor Center – public liked, some comments about why need since Driggs is building one. Consensus was to delete it from the plan. This and bird watching could be included in policies.
 - v. Recreation Center – public liked both single location and valley wide program although the valley wide program had higher “like” percentage and many comments on the single location Framework said they liked the valley wide program better.
 - f. Reviewed the Composite Land Use Framework
 - i. Generally used the land uses from Framework 1 and 3 that the public liked. However, in response to public comment, the Rural Conservation area was reduced and changed to Rural on the north end of the valley, east and west of Felt.
 - ii. Discussed that this area is not all “productive” farm land and that some land is very hard to farm. It might not all be appropriate for same land use treatment.
 - iii. Similarly the area west of the blue Waterway Corridor but before the slopes steepen is more similar to the green Rural area.
 - iv. Discussed that perhaps some of the areas should be further divided.
 - v. Question was asked what everyone’s general feeling was of the map. General feeling was that it was good and on the right track.
- 4. Next Steps**
- a. Still need to spend time with policies and land use tools based on the public feedback from meetings to be held next week.
 - b. Discussed having an additional meeting at the end of April, perhaps April 19th or April 26th.
 - c. Jen will send out a doodle poll on the next meeting time.
 - d. Jen will also organize a time on Monday, March 19th to review the final presentation for the outreach meetings.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 4:10 pm.