

In Attendance:

Subcommittee Members:

Amy Verbeten, Joanne Labelle, Lauren Wendt, Matt Lucia, Wade Kaufman, Jennifer Dustin

County Staff: Angie Rutherford

Agenda – Framework Evaluation

All 3 framework options were explained by Angie and discussed by the Subcommittee. Written comments were made for each framework on the sheets of paper as well as comments and drawing on the clear film.

Framework #1 comments;

- The trail system proposed is a very large undertaking, would need wetland mitigation, and properties along the river and creek with conservation easements prohibit trails
- Trails could possibly be set back from the river and have spurs that drop towards the river at appropriate spots
- Should try to overlap trails with already existing trails where possible, multiple use (District 33 grooming in winter)
- We need the district 33 grooming trail map to overlay
- Add a trailhead at Mud Lake (Mud Lake road needs to be better maintained for public safety)
- Build a single-track trail next to road within road easement for non-motorized travel
- Keep perimeter trail with current travel restrictions (certain area on National Forest are closed to human entry during winter to protect wintering wildlife)
- We would like to use our new framework #1 map as a preferred recreation map that can be overlain on all 3 frameworks.

Framework #2 comments;

- Need a pathway/trail plan, see framework #1
- More heritage farms than just the Felt area (Kearsley's Corner, Bagley's, West side of valley)
- Scenic corridor should be less than .5 miles, closer to 1000'. What restrictions would be in place and how would they be enforced. Possible incentives for compliance with restrictions.
- More eye catching entrance signs designating county and/or cities
- Solar field should be coupled with industrial area, near transfer station
- Don't separate communities with industry, use natural separation
- Zone B (white) description needs to be changed /reworded. Remove the second sentence from the description and just state that Zone B is more restrictive than Zone A.

Framework #3 comments;

- Keep rail to trail connection and transit hubs
- We would support the down zoning only if the TDR process was very clear and could ensure that land value is preserved or enhanced for those who are down zoned, and we question that possibility
- Use a combination of trails from framework 1 and 3 (see drawing on clear film)