

Western Greater Yellowstone Consortium Meeting

Rexburg City Council Chambers, 35 North First East, Rexburg Idaho
March 6, 2014

Consortium Steering Committee: Tom Cluff, Jan Brown, and Greg Newkirk (Fremont County); Heather Higinbotham (YBP); Jeff Patlovich (Island Park); Liz Davy (Forest Service); Jason Boal (Teton County, ID); Brittany Skelton (Victor); Ashley Koehler (Driggs); Patty Parkinson (St. Anthony); Scott Johnson, Blair Kay, Keith Davidson, and Natalie Powell (Rexburg); and Alex Norton (Jackson/Teton County, Wyoming, on the phone)

Consultants/Presenters: Wendy Green Lowe (P2 Solutions), Wanda Adams (Grant administrator), Dave Wortman (Brendle Group), Shawn Hill (Frontier Forward), and Jerry Royster (HUD on the phone)

Objectives

The objectives for the March meeting include:

- Discuss revised work plan and overall plans for development of the Regional Plan for Sustainable Development
- Receive a report on the Broadband Study
- Receive a report on the Regional Recycling System Study draft conclusions
- Discuss the next steps for Code Studios work on the development of Model Code for Victor, Driggs, “Drictor,” and Teton County
- Award of the contract for the Housing Inventory Assessment
- Discuss the Final Multi-Modal Transportation Study and implementation activities
- Discuss the Regional Sustainability Indicators project with the Brendle Group
- Discussion about the Island Park Futures Study and the involvement of the Henry's Fork Watershed Council
- Discuss the approach for public participation in developing the Regional Plan for Sustainable Development
- Agree to next steps in developing the Sustainability Indicators
- Discuss participation in the upcoming “Building a Sustainable Economic Future through Equity and Inclusion” training.

Revised Work Plan – Tom Cluff

Tom provided a summary of the changes submitted to HUD (see Tom’s presentation for more detail). The consortium talked about a rough outline at our October meeting. The four main components of the work plan are: the Regional Plan for Sustainable Development (RPSD), the Greater Yellowstone Framework for Sustainable Development (GY-Framework), Model Development Code, and a set of studies and projects to support the RPSD. A major component of the grant work is assessing how well the principles in the GY-Framework map to the principles in our communities. Tom reviewed the original studies in the grant proposal and those studies that were deemed by the consortium as unnecessary or duplicative after further review. These included study allocations for workforce development and the new green economy; a groundwater infrastructure pilot demonstration, and an energy resources regional assessment). The consortium scoped each study and determined where our efforts would best be spent to ensure we weren’t overlapping with work already being done. The Island Park Futures Study came up after the grant work had already started. Tom said that aspect would be covered later in the meeting. The final step of the overall grant is the RPSD, which is something that all HUD grantee consortiums are required to produce. The RPSD is intended to be a regional

vision of how all communities can grow more sustainably. All the regional studies and assessments need to show:

- How HUD's six livability principles can be implemented on the ground
- How they fit with or meet the GY-Framework criteria, and
- How they can be used as a tool for us to guide future planning and development regulation.

Tom said the important thing to remember is that we are not producing a plan that will be adopted and binding for the local communities. The purpose is to develop informational tools, resources and educational materials to inform future development plans and comprehensive plans. The consortium's responsibilities are to share resources, engage with agencies and local constituents, and share the information identified through the studies that will be useful to the communities in the consortium region. The sustainability indicators will give us an ability to test how well we are following those principles that we said are important. The GY-Framework provided the consortium with a starting point, and the RPSD is intended to provide the means of advancing the livability principles in our respective communities. The RPSD will show us where we are off track and that will be useful as decision makers to advise P&Z, county commissions, and city councils.

The technical assistance fund was included in the budget to provide technical project support. So far we have used technical assistance funds to provide match money to the regional broadband study, to fund the Town of Jackson's GY-Framework code audit, and to provide Complete Streets assistance to the City of Victor. There is still about \$42,000 in the technical assistance fund.

One thing HUD really wants to see is that grantees are leveraging the federal investment. HUD wants to know how the consortium has been able to leverage this grant to get a lot more work done beyond the scope of the \$1.5M from HUD.

The latest communication was that HUD is finishing up the last of their questions on specific details on what we're doing with the changed elements in the revised budget and work plan.

HUD has provided various types of assistance to sustainable communities grantees for providing technical assistance, and the next one coming up is the rural places summit in Des Moines. There is another training in Sept. or Oct. in Oakland, which is specifically geared toward implementation for 2011 grantees.

Critical deadlines:

The final RPSD due date is the end of February 2015. All contracted work has to be completed by January 2015 and then Fremont County has one month to finish up paperwork. Wendy emphasized that the final RPSD is a product of the consortium, and the consortium will have to decide whether it's a good product and when to call it "done". The entire RPSD has to be approved by the consortium prior to submission. The final decision will include and affect all of us. Wendy said it was up to each jurisdiction and consortium member to determine who has the authority to provide final approval of the RPSD. It is also important that each consortium member (jurisdiction, agency and non-profit) has a voice in the room.

Fremont County's proposal was structured so that the end product is not compulsory for all consortium members. All of the RPSD work, model code, and study recommendations are voluntary; no one is bound to continue or to adopt the advisory resources.

It is incumbent of each consortium member to determine what they need to see to be supportive of the final RPSD. Dave Wortman of the Brendle Group shared that he is working on a regional plan in Charlotte, NC, where they are looking at ways to leverage expertise, funding, and regional level coordination for greater efficiency. There are lots of examples of opportunities for a regional plan to provide mutual benefits and still not be regulatory.

Broadband Report – Scott Johnson, Rexburg Economic Development Director

Scott thanked the consortium for the service it is doing for the WGYC communities. He commended those involved as people that are looking to build instead of tear down.

About two years ago, BYU-Idaho asked for help from the City of Rexburg with respect to expanding broadband capacity in Rexburg. They were facing major changes to how they educate students locally and around the world, and with those changes came a big issue with broadband access. Every current student at BYUI is required to take online classes because there is such explosive growth and a high demand for classroom space. The City's initial response was no, but they found that many local businesses were also struggling. The city had heard enough struggles to know that this was not just a need in Rexburg, but throughout the region, so they requested technical assistance funding to help support the project. BYUI paid for half of the Design Nine study, and the consortium and others made up the rest. Scott will provide the electronic copies of the three reports to share with the consortium and for posting on the consortium website.

The next step identified is for the region to make targeted investments including incentives to attract a data center; the expected results would be that the area could see increased growth, job opportunities, etc. . Because of the size of our region, they recommended looking at a public-private partnership that we would structure ourselves. There are new business opportunities for existing service providers, as existing and new fiber should support economic development. Partnerships would reduce costs and improve the quality of government service. They also recommended an open access network. Successful ways this has worked are for government entities to step in and provide infrastructure, the highway system, and to still let providers compete. This system would reduce costs for small and large businesses. Another recommendation was to co-locate the facility and data center. The final recommendation was: Don't wait.

Legally there are questions at a state level whether or not municipalities can actually do this. There are a few communities that have installed some systems. Idaho Falls has a ring, but not a complete build out yet. They are able to operate that because they have another utility, Idaho Falls Power. It's questionable whether governments with no utility can do this. The study did take a look at potentially creating a co-op. It is an interesting idea, and would serve more of the area. The City of Ammon and City of Sandpoint both began projects putting in fiber, but are being challenged right now by providers. The Regional VP for Qwest came to Rexburg and was really upset. Under the universal service fund, an agreement that goes back to the 1940's, utilities get paid a lot of money from the government but only if they actually put in the infrastructure. The government would actually be inviting competition, which is not fun for providers.

Scott said the problem is that we have fiber in the region, but that it's owned by many different entities. Currently it's like a bunch of toll roads. Fall River Electric has fiber they've installed to monitor the power grid. There is a lot of capacity out there but the providers are not necessarily making it available. There are multiple providers that have cable that is all run separately, and there is no effort to bring it together. Tech companies have looked at relocating in Rexburg, but didn't come here because of limited fiber capacity.

The lack of broadband is an obstacle for economic development for all four counties. The conclusion is that we can't handle "big data" in the region.

Scott said he thought that Rocky Mountain Power would have an interest: if fiber were run to every residence, it would improve metering. He said there are lots of partnership opportunities. Even where we can provide significant bandwidth, residents and businesses currently pay much higher costs than Boise or SLC; it's very limiting. The big cost for this is the switching—machines that are pushing through the fiber. The study recommended co-location facilities where private and government sectors can connect and operate jointly.

The study showed that we are already way behind other regions in the country. When the City started this project, they pulled a few studies that had just been completed in 2010/2011, 2 studies by 2 separate groups. According to those studies, the state of Idaho is dead last in speed for broadband. It's even behind Puerto Rico. Providers will say it's not an issue but collectively it is an issue. Scott said there is a committee made up of members from the education and business sectors, among others, and that the City will invite all interested parties to attend to help formulate the final recommendations.

At the time the study started, Rexburg had 3 broadband providers, one of which is in bankruptcy. None had put in any infrastructure in the past 8 years. The City is losing legacy revenue faster than they are getting strategic revenue. He said it's a huge risk just partnering with any one provider, but the study looked at all aspects. Just doing the study has pushed some things forward; Century Link recently completed upgrades for infrastructure, and Rexburg also got a new provider. The providers have all said they would love to partner, but only if they are the only partner. The providers have all been consulted about the study, but they don't want competition. For an example of what they stand to lose: in 2012, Century Link received well over \$300M in federal subsidy.

The group discussed whether or not the cost estimates should go on line, and the decision was made to post all three documents since they were funded in part with HUD funds. The cost projections currently are provided as a separate document. The consultant has not actually scoped the project's implementation; the numbers are just based on the study. The City would need an engineering firm scope to give real, accurate costs. Those costs are not current and not region-wide. Scott said to be cost effective, it's at least a 3-5 year ROI, but we're not dense enough for private investment. The government could spread the costs out over 20 years. The state of Wyoming uses its natural resource money to do infrastructure.

The City of Victor is currently working on a grant for fiber infrastructure on Main Street. Their partner is Silver Star Communications, the only provider in their community. Scott was comfortable with Victor citing this study in grant applications. The challenge is in making sure that whatever agreement is formed in Victor that it be open enough to not create a monopoly, which can create huge problems.

Recycling Study – Heather Higinbotham, Yellowstone Business Partnership

Heather shared that the recycling study is nearing completion. LBA Associates has provided her with the executive summary and draft final report, and the advisory team is reviewing the final report. The executive summary has been posted on the consortium website and is available for public review.

Heather shared key findings from the executive summary. It starts out by defining an estimated "\$4.8M per year "loss" associated with the focus of managing waste rather than managing the resources within the "waste". This reflects the combined cost of landfilling and unearned revenues associated with the recyclables buried in landfills by communities in the four WGYC counties (or transferred to out-of-county landfills). It

provides a summary of current diversion levels, programs, fees and policies and the key takeaways from the stakeholder engagement process, which concluded:

- There is a reliance on collecting source-separated materials that hinders increased diversion by generators. In addition commingling is a challenge with the nearest full-scale material recovery facility (MRF) being more than 250 miles away
- There is an absence of policy that encourages a culture change and drives new recycling success
- Low population densities in the WGYC area may not cost-effectively support regional recycling infrastructure
- While there are many interested stakeholders, leadership does not yet exist to champion and lead new regional solutions

The study looked at single- and dual-stream MRF operations both in consideration of service area size and the acceptance of glass in the commingled stream. It also compared service area size, job creation, GHG emissions reduction, capacities, efficiencies, and capital and operating costs. The final alternative in the study was to explore the feasibility of a regional solid waste district that could provide leadership, help generate the necessary resources to develop a MRF that meets the needs of the communities, generate a higher volume of recycling materials by working together collaboratively, and consolidate operational, policy development and/or educational activities to increase efficiency and consistency throughout the region. The findings identified policy development as one of the most valuable responsibilities such a district could undertake.

Next steps for the study include presenting the findings to the consortium communities for feedback, and finalization of the report. LBA Associates will be scheduling in-person half-day workshops to present the findings and conduct the final public input. These workshops will take place in April, and a final report will be presented at the May consortium face-to-face meeting.

Model Development Code – Ashley Koehler (Driggs), Brittany Skelton (Victor), Jason Boal (Teton County, ID)

Ashley, Brittany, and Jason are all relatively new to the area and the consortium. The project was already underway when they all started in their respective positions. The consortium contracted with Code Studio, a planning consultant in Austin TX. This past summer, Code Studio completed design workshops in Victor and Driggs. Phase 1 started with the model code project kickoff meeting in Nov. 2012. They reached out to the whole Teton Valley community. They held specific stakeholder meetings over the course of a few days, mostly listening sessions. Phase 2 was the design workshop to kickoff the initial research needed for each community to draft the actual code. The output is a model zoning code for Driggs, Victor and Teton Valley that could be used for the entire consortium. The model code incorporates the principles of the GY-Framework. In July and August 2013 Code Studio held design workshops. In November they came back and did a summary presentation of findings. For the summer workshops they brought an urban designer, who sketched maps on the spot. They showed examples of redrawn zoning boundaries, conducted an audit of the communities, and looked at which buildings and parts of the community should be preserved because of a great form or streetscape. There was also a lot of data collection. During the summer workshop, Teton County was not as involved. The County contracted with a different planner to draft the county's own code. Since then, they have been more engaged. We have all been working with Code Studio to update the scope of work and project proposal to include Teton County so this is truly a regional effort. The model code is supposed to include examples of cities, counties, and areas of impact all planned together in a way to provide a model for the entire region. Phase 1 and 2 are complete; now we are just waiting on the updated project scope for phases 3 and 4.

Concerns were shared on the timeline for this part of the project as Code Studio said the original timeline would no longer work. Initially, Victor and Driggs were supposed to receive drafts of the model code based on the design charettes at the end of 2013/beginning of 2014. There has been a bit of a back and forth over the past couple of months trying to push Teton Valley's work to the front of the internal work rather than the back end. Heather, Tom, Ashley, Brittany, Jason and Code Studio held a conference call to go over budget, scope, and priorities. The original scope included a white paper and code audit. On Feb. 17 the group received a new budget estimate with line items for deliverables and rough dates; we are waiting on the flushed out version. Now Victor and Driggs should be receiving the initial code drafts in mid-April, and with that the Victor and Driggs GY-Framework audit. The staff will review, and then they will get a revised code draft. Task 3-2 under the area of impact coding includes a charette to look at the Drictor area and complete code work for that. In conjunction with that visit (scheduled May 31-June 3), there will be a 2-day credit workshop to go over and revise the GY-Framework sustainability principles with local officials, developers, etc. There will be an open house for the area of impact coding in August. The final code publishing and workshops will be done in two separate trips in Nov and Dec. 2014. Phase 4 is the model code drafting based on Teton County and the cities of Victor and Driggs, along with the work done in Teton County WY and Jackson. There is not a solid timeline date for those. Brittany was not sure if that would be happening concurrently with the rest of the work. There will be a draft of the model code, production of the model code handbook, and final model code. Ashley said she has communicated with Code Studio that the end date for all of their contracted work is January 31.

After the conference call in January Code Studio immediately sent out an email with bullet points and a revised document clarifying areas of confusion. Lee is going through the original signed contract and revising it, but concerns are that he has not been working closely with the planning staff, which is a provision in the original document. The team has received only 2 documents and there still isn't an updated scope of work. Even though we have a list, timing will be a huge issue, especially with public outreach. Jason emphasized that Teton County is on board and committed to be part of this. The updated scope should include a draft code for the county. There was talk about leaving Teton County out of it, but it doesn't really benefit or meet the desired goals. Teton County is working diligently to make up lost ground so they can have a draft code as well with Driggs and Victor.

Discussion ensued about the adequacy of public participation related the model development code and to what extent the delays on the project may be attributed to Code Studio's performance or our own confusion as to contract oversight. The Teton Valley planners are committed to engage in public participation and to work with Wendy once Code Studio performs its work, but the apparent breakdown of communication and work delays on the part of Code Studio has continued to frustrate the contingent of local planners.

Tom will check in with Lee to make sure he understands the timeline, and to publish the final schedule so all on the consortium will have the same expectations. The January 2015 end date can't slide. Once the revised scope is finalized, Tom will look to either Ashley or Brittany to be the lead contact/project manager with Code Studio so he doesn't have to manage the day-to-day contact.

The May-June meeting will focus on the entire county, but Jason thinks that Code Studio will concentrate on the area of impact and Drictor, and that the county would take responsibility for the public input for the rest of the county. Lee and Jason are communicating on the extent of Code Studio's role in the county and how to supplement the charettes to get back on track. At the end of the discussion, all agreed that Teton County and its P&Z Commission are now fully committed to the project (per a letter received from the Teton County Commission), and that the model code pilot needs to include the full county. The project will be stronger with the county involvement in addition to Driggs and Victor. Ashley, Jason and Brittany will continue to firm up the scope of work and revised contract, and they will discuss and decide who is the best point person for dealing directly with Code Studio.

Multi-modal Transportation Assessment and Development Strategy– Jan Brown

(Guests Keith Davidson, Blair Kay—City Clerk of Rexburg)

The Multi-modal contract with Linx was officially completed in January. Presentations of the strategies and recommendations were made to every city council and county commission between mid-December through mid-February. The Power Point slides from each presentation were similar, and each is posted online. The Public Review draft of the multi-modal assessment is posted chapter by chapter on the Sustainable Yellowstone website.

Chapter 1 provides an overview of the 4-county region with emphasis on the cities and destinations most in need of public transportation connectivity.

Chapter 2 lists all federal agencies and funding sources available to communities under the current Map 21 federal funding law. There is \$600M in current budget for TIGER grants; a certain percentage of that has to support rural infrastructure. As a consortium with RPSD funding, we would get extra points on a TIGER grant if any entity within the four counties plans on a submission. Chapter 2 should be helpful as it was an attempt to have one place in the document where they can learn about transportation funding and resources.

Chapter 3 describes the interactive map platform that currently shows both summer and winter trail systems and public transportation providers

Chapter 4 is a large chapter focused on incrementally building a regional transportation system across the four counties, and there are three main system goals – and not necessarily in priority order:

- Enhance intra-city and commuter bus services within each consortium county
- Expand intercity bus services to improve connectivity across the WGYC region
- Advance an integrated public transportation network that links the regions' national parks and outdoor recreation areas.

The City of Rexburg stepped up as applicant for a pilot demonstration project called the “Upper Valley Connector” but as a consortium, we didn't quite achieve the \$48K goal for matching funds that would allow for a 150-day pilot. Instead the application cover a 100-day demonstration in summer 2015. The Idaho Department of Transportation funding cycle takes a year, so in order to do a demonstration in 2015, the City had to apply by February 24. Goal #4 is to preserve future options for the use of the region's historic rail infrastructure and right of ways.

Chapter 5 looks at Complete Street policies, and the concept of a connected trail network across the region. It looks at how to close the 59 miles of trail gaps that exist between Jackson and West Yellowstone. The cost estimates vary widely depending on how much is paved vs. graded. It is structured so it can be tackled incrementally as each county is interested.

Chapter 6 is focused on collaborative marketing of multi-modal transportation and it looks at the history of using the co-op model as advanced by Linx.

Jan summarized the report's 49 individual recommendations in Chapter 7 (19 are related to Complete Streets) that were captured from all the previous chapters. The recommendations are not yet prioritized as to the order for implementation, nor are there specific performance measures yet outlined for the consortium. Jan feels this can be done as part of developing sustainability indicators with the Brendle Group and in developing the overall RPSD. There are opportunities for additional public involvement as part of the RPSD outreach, plus it will be important to integrate the recommendations with those from other studies, such as housing and recycling. For example, LBA associates asked about any existing transportation system that could haul recyclables. There is still an opportunity to do more focused multi-modal planning using technical assistance funds. For instance, there is a strong recommendation from Joe Gilpin for St. Anthony to take a closer look at improving pedestrian access on Bridge Street and funds could support a downtown pedestrian-friendly design. There has been quite a bit of interest in keeping the trails network advisory committee active and revitalized. There are new and emerging recreation and trail needs, such as the recent fat bike race in Island Park

Following her overview of the final Multi-Modal Plan, Jan discussed Rexburg's Upper Valley Connector proposal in greater detail and distributed the proposed map, schedule, and service description. She emphasized the need to supplement the current commuter service that runs from Driggs to Jackson twice each morning and comes back in the afternoon, M-F. The START bus gets an Idaho subsidy in part to operate that commuter. Current M-F service also includes a TRPTA commuter bus between Rexburg and Driggs that lacks connectivity beyond the two cities and has averaged less than 1 passenger per leg per day.

Jan thanked the cities and counties represented for their assistance in raising the matching funds for this service. Pledges included \$2500 each from the three counties (Madison, Teton ID and Teton WY), Driggs, Victor, Rexburg and Jackson, plus Madison Memorial Hospital. Teton Valley Health Care and St. John's Medical Center each contributed \$500, and BYU-I contributed \$2K as an in-kind contribution for ads in The Scroll. They will cover advertising for the entire student body. Rexburg contributed all of the grant administration time, which amounted to \$5400. This allowed the necessary money to have a 100-day pilot from June 1-Sept 8, 2015.

The proposal has been submitted to ITD, and currently is under evaluation. The local district 6 coordinating council will review it on April 8, and then a recommendation will go to the state level for review. Rexburg will know in May whether the money is there for launch the following June. There will be a full year to finalize the exact stops, schedule, and bid package. The actual service has to be bid out, and there will be a contract for a mobility manager as well. This is an example of the type of implementation effort that had to be done if the pilot demo is to happen in 2015.

Jan described the Upper Valley Connector project to our HUD grant administrator, and she was very pleased that it is happening. HUD wants to see more leveraging like this. The question will be whether everyone in Eastern Idaho and at the state level agrees that this is a good use of \$63K of FTA funds. It appears this Upper Snake district will have possibly \$2M to spend, so Jan doesn't think this request is a big stretch for a new start.

Jan shared that the Linx Co-op has lost money every year in the Yellowstone National Park pilot, as shown in the pilot case study in Chapter 4. In addition, WYDOT denied Linx the 5311(f) grant for 2014 as park-related transportation was determined to be noncompliant with intercity bus funding goals. As a result, there will be no Linx service in Yellowstone this summer.

The discussion ensued about the practicality of funding public transportation in rural areas where population numbers are so low. Jackson has a successful system in part because they are taxing themselves to support the START bus and businesses help pay for the commuter service to keep good workers. We need to look at

Jackson's success with public transportation and see how that can be communicated and potentially replicated in other parts of the region. Teton Valley, Driggs and Victor all have policies in their comprehensive plans to support public transportation. These policies do not yet appear in the city and county comprehensive plans in Fremont or Rexburg, but now. Rexburg is discussing whether they are ready for a fixed route system inside the city to meet needs of students. As the Super Wal-Mart is planned for further out of town, public transportation will be an issue.

Jan updated the consortium on her new position as a special projects manager with Fremont County. She is currently working 30 hours a week for Tom Cluff, specifically for the Island Park Futures Study coordination and coordinating assembly of the final RPSD. Thus all transportation-related recommendations will have a chance to be prioritized and completely reviewed in the context of the overall RPSD. Jan noted that edits and feedback on the public review draft of the Multi-Modal Assessment are still welcome and can be incorporated at any time [Note: Jan is continuing to assist Linx in her capacity as a Co-op Development Specialist for the Montana Cooperative Development Center. Thus she can complete the final editing of the M2 document under separate funding].

Sustainability Indicators – Dave Wortman, The Brendle Group

Dave Wortman with the Brendle Group is looking for feedback from the consortium on the best ways to move forward with the Sustainability Indicators project. Brendle has done a lot of work on sustainability and community planning on a regional level as they are based out of Colorado. They have also done a lot of work with indicators, as part of the planning process but also separately and independently. They kicked off this project officially last year at the May 2 annual summit. At this kickoff they got feedback from the summit attendees on ideas for initial indicators, and have been working since then with that information.

The scope is to research and develop a set of indicators of sustainability for the region. There is a strong emphasis on engaging stakeholders in identifying and prioritizing indicators—Dave said the process is as important as the content. They will compile the indicators in a spreadsheet-based tool to allow for ongoing use by the consortium jurisdictions. The scope will also include a final document with study results and Brendle Group will develop a reporting template. It's important that this work links to the RSPD and other planning efforts throughout the region.

Dave gave a short overview on what indicators are: quantitative signposts for informed measurement and management of sustainability performance. Indicators are effective if they reveal and reflect values, inspire action, and help us learn and adapt to changing scenarios. The role of the consortium is to help articulate a shared vision for our region. The indicators should be tools to help determine if a region is moving toward or away from the key intended outcomes. They can also help inform planning and goal/policy revisions.

Dave shared that there are lots of examples of indicator projects from around the country. Indicator projects are a component of a lot of other regional planning efforts. Dave asked Jerry Royster to see if HUD has a compiled list or status on what other regions are doing. Dave gave a few examples of other regions including Central Texas, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, and the Cascadia Scorecard which all do a good job identifying indicators that are iconic and relevant for each region. One example he liked as a system indicator was tracking salmon populations. It's an indicator of watershed health, economic development, an icon of the region, and a sense of identity.

Dave shared some specifics on what makes a good indicator, and some questions for the group to ponder. First, it has to be clear and concise and not reliant on overly complex definitions or calculations that will be

difficult for stakeholders and decision makers to understand. He asked the group to consider the following for each indicator in relation to our purposes:

- Does it have to be applicable to the entire region, or just specific communities?
- Do we want it usable in evaluating policy and making decisions that affect a community or region?
- Does it have reliable data available throughout the region so that it can be consistently and accurately tracked over time?
- Is it a system indicator that covers multiple community, economic and environmental topics? We want to make sure to avoid paralysis by analysis, or having too many indicators or tracking too much at once. We need to find systemic indicators that track multiple topics at once, such as the Salmon population example

Dave discussed some of the specifics required for HUD: the objectives are that we capture data that can be used to demonstrate the impact of the Sustainable Communities Initiative, and answer questions regarding best practices and lessons learned. The intent is to develop a common framework across the country for the measurement of progress toward making our communities more sustainable and to empower individual communities to track progress toward their individual sustainability goals.

The Brendle Group is making sure to fold in the HUD reporting requirements. There are baseline values for each Flagship Sustainability Indicator which include:

- Transportation Choice
- Housing Affordability
- Equitable Development
- Economic Resilience
- Growth through Reinvestment

The required Flagship Sustainability Indicators have exemptions for more rural areas. There are grantee-driven performance measures that have to be appropriate to local context and created through an iterative process of community engagement.

The types of indicators the Brendle Group is considering are:

- System level indicators—2-3 high level, iconic measures
- Policy/performance—measure across a range of priority topic areas
- Rapid response indicators—provide quick feedback when needed e.g. air quality alerts

They are organizing the indicators by the outline of the GY-Framework. When the Brendle Group first started on this project, they really wanted to dovetail with the RPSD and the ongoing discussions about what the final plan will look like. It made sense to organize around the GY-Framework. So they started with that, but then also thought about the six HUD livability principles, and wondered how best to integrate the livability principles into the indicators framework? They took the GY-Framework and compared it with the livability principles, and came up with integration. They are also looking at other planning efforts in region such as the Idaho Planning Statute.

To date, The Brendle Group has compiled over 100 indicator ideas in an Excel workbook tool, which came out of the first overall project kickoff meeting from two years ago, the consortium summit in May 2013, a review of all comp plans for each county to pull out metrics/indicators, and existing indicators in Teton County, WY.

They modified the GY-Framework to organize indicators, and the advisory team has been reaching out to stakeholders to learn what is currently being measured, what should be measured, and stakeholders' willingness to participate in further developing these indicators. One challenge has been getting feedback that some don't see this area as a region.

They are working at syncing up with public engagement plans/efforts and tracking how changes in the work plan might affect indicators. They are tracking the evolution of the RPSD as a framework for organizing and mapping indicators. With the project schedule being what it is, and delays in the new work plan, the indicators work has been held up but now they are moving forward and forging ahead.

The stakeholder engagement process is targeted for summer 2014. System indicators are tied to the vision for the region. They will be including a visioning exercise. To gain input on performance indicators, they will use a workshop style format organized around each particular topic area. They are making efforts to avoid planning fatigue and confusion. They want to leverage existing events and efforts such as the model code work, Envision Madison, and the Island Park Futures Study.

One person asked if it would be possible to do this system indicators workshop as part of our consortium summit in May? It might be a logical time to piggyback on the existing event. Jerry thought this would be where we will have the most participation.

Another objective with the indicators project is to intentionally reach out to underrepresented populations in the region. The Brendle Group will push to proactively invite these communities into the meeting and process. They want to try and broaden representation. Dave would like to receive a comprehensive list of individual stakeholder outreach activities that have already occurred through other projects, and Wendy agreed to help compile this list.

Next steps will be to complete individual stakeholder outreach and research of existing data in March and April. They will coordinate workshops this summer in May-June. They will develop draft indicators in the fall, then review and finalize the report by end of year (both in a written report and web portal), working to incorporate the work into the overall RPSD. They will use the workshops to apply a set of criteria to indicators already identified through each topic area, and have ones rise to the top for those that are most meaningful and relevant, or that are systemic indicators. Dave said he has done indicator projects before with civic leaders forums, which were inclusive but not necessarily public, and still allowed everyone to show up. It's a model that's been effective. For example, at our May 7th meeting, if we could get a large enough group of civic leaders we could have a forum. Could the P&Z of each county serve as convener of something? Dave's biggest question is whom do we want to engage?

Dave agreed to make available to the consortium the list of indicators on which they are currently working. It is considered to be an interim work product rather than a public document at this time but he can make it available to the consortium members.

Dave posed four questions to the consortium for a brainstorming session:

1. What do you see as top 2-3 issues common across the region that can inform system indicators?
 - a. Open space. It's common in all four counties
 - b. Water quality and quantity (clean and lots)

- c. System failures during peak tourist season—all systems. Traffic, power, wastewater, drinking water, all systems that get stressed in July and August. How often systems fail and how long they stay failed
 - d. Potholes per mile
 - e. Recreation is a common concern, priority across region
 - f. Agriculture. Dave said that the agriculture community is one they haven't heard from yet; it's a big issue and we need to get those folks to the table
 - g. Economic development: all of it. Number of jobs, houses, dollars, etc.
 - h. Commute time. How long you have to drive to get to job that pays you enough to live in a community
 - i. Wildlife? Iconic wildlife species? Some are too controversial to put in there. Wolves, wolverine, grizzly bear. Contentious issue. Fish are a big economic attraction. You can measure angler days. We do have data for value of angling and boating from 10 years ago by Loomis.
 - j. Housing
 - k. Lack of out-migration of locals
2. How well do existing planning documents capture issues that would be relevant to the region as a whole?
- a. There was an effort to include all segments of the population and take a comprehensive look at all sections of Teton County in the process. There were 4 sub-groups comprised of various aspects of community, and agriculture was one subgroup
 - b. Alex asked if Brendle Group has a copy of the indicators in the Jackson/Teton County comp plan? Yes.
 - c. The indicators in Teton Co ID and Teton Co WY are relevant
 - d. Liz asked if it would be relevant to look at Forest plans and winter use plans? The Forest Service goes through this type of planning though their social aspects are just a bit different. FS planning includes lots of aspects of demographic and also open space, wildlife, and recreation issues. The Bridger Teton, Caribou Targhee, and BLM are in process of doing theirs. There is also the Yellowstone winter plan. What about Fish and Game individual region plans or the F&G statewide plan. Jan added the Nature Conservancy or any large landscape that is privately managed. Resources include Henry's Fork Legacy Project, Jackson Hole Land Trust, Teton Land Trust, and State Park plans like Harriman. Dave is trying to extract out from these plans where things are being measured.
 - e. Tom said we would find most of those things identified as common in the Fremont County comprehensive plan. His take is that we typically do a good job of identifying them when we are writing comp plans, but don't necessarily do a good job of understanding how well it integrates with the community perception of those priorities. He's not sure the community always sees those values the same way they are described in their own comp plan. Tom's hope and goal for the indicators project is to create a set of indicators, go back to each jurisdiction's comp plan, decide how to measure these things, and then go back to the community to share how they intend to measure what matters and learn how the community really feels about it. It's easy to write, "We value scenic quality". How we actually measure and implement doesn't always translate back. The plan docs capture issues, but are not truly communicating values in the same way for each county. This indicators project will take the next step in figuring out how closely we really are tied together, and how to unify four counties on these issues
 - f. Jan noted that one omission in Fremont County's comp plan is mobility and public transportation.

3. What other events between now and the end of the year can you suggest as opportunities to collect stakeholder input on indicators?
 - a. Model code charette
 - b. Island Park futures study
 - c. Recycling study meetings
 - d. Envision Madison—learn more about it
 - e. Opportunity for listening post or formal meeting at the annual St. Anthony Fisherman’s Breakfast that is May 23rd this year. With hundreds of people standing in line for a free breakfast, the Brendle Group could conduct one-on-one interviews. It’s a chance to reach the average person for opinions. Can the Brendle Group do a quick and dirty survey of priorities? It’s the day before fishing season opens.
 - f. Code Studio workshops, design charettes
 - g. 4th of July in Teton Valley, community breakfast in park
 - h. Music on Main in Victor
 - i. International Dance Festival in Rexburg in August
 - j. Henry’s Fork Days (mid June)
 - k. Island Park Stampede (fun run over July 4 weekend)
 - l. Rallying the Pines in August in Island Park

4. How do you all wish to be involved in the indicators project moving forward?
 - a. Request for Brendle Group to create an online survey we could distribute to all mailing lists and email lists, and put on jurisdiction’s social media. Simple, asking about quality of life issues, good reach
 - b. City events, city staff is there for. iPads with survey at city events?
 - c. People have networks that they will access. Those are better for getting information out. But what about for getting information in? If there’s an easy link, jurisdictions could post on their websites and social media channels
 - d. We all need to be involved. It’s an indicator if we don’t, that’s not good

Dave pointed out that we have been calling these sustainability indicators. Is that the wrong phrasing? There is a negative perception of the word in the region. Perhaps it’s a combination of fatigue and fear, and a complete misunderstanding of what it actually means. Livability Indicators or Well-being Indicators could be good alternatives, as opposed to sustainability. Jason said he personally wants a more personal term. Dave said the project in North Carolina is called the livable communities plan. Patty thought that sounded friendlier.

Housing Assessment

Heather gave a brief overview of the housing needs assessment, and introduced Shawn Hill with Frontier Forward. Shawn is on the team that was selected to conduct the regional housing needs assessment. Shawn introduced the team. Melanie Rees is an independent contractor out of Colorado, and in Shawn’s opinion is unparalleled in housing assessments in the Rocky Mountain region with over 20 years experience. She has worked largely in smaller mountain regions such as this. Shawn felt that we are fortunate to have her as member of the team and person who will complete the technical work on project. Wendy Sullivan is also an independent contractor, and has experience in doing Analyses of Impediments on a regional scale. Chris Cares is based in Boulder and is the survey manager. His firm is a market research firm, and believes housing issues are very much dependent on the dynamics of the housing market. The household survey Chris will be

managing will have useful inputs in terms of understanding regional housing needs in the context of market conditions. Shawn is a locally based planning consultant. He was brought into the team to be the local representative, and to provide local outreach to the consortium and to its respective communities. He will be pushing the household survey, and getting the necessary data to do the assessment work.

The work plan has 7 key components:

1. Kickoff meeting: work begins with a kickoff meeting with the advisory team, where the group will come up with detailed timelines, establish when and how project deliverables will happen, identify local resources, and discuss regional and local outreach techniques.
2. Outreach to consortium partners: working with the consortium to keep apprised of what's going on, and what the findings what mean to communities.
3. Secondary data collection: this will come from established gov't sources, census, the US bureau of Economic Data, and state workforce and labor agencies.
4. Primary data collection: the team hopes to have secondary data collection completed to begin primary data collection, which includes the household segment and key informant interviews. This will put them in a position to speak about the dynamics of the housing market in the communities. They will be flushing this out with the advisory committee, local realtors, mortgage brokers, employers, and others with intimate knowledge of regional housing conditions.
5. Drafting and draft release of the Regional Analysis of Impediments (RAI) and Housing Needs Assessment (HNA): this step will be the finalization of the document RAI required by HUD. For those not familiar with analyses of impediments, HUD has a requirement for all grantees to identify barriers for protected classes to seek housing. The draft AI has been done, and the team will complete the final RAI as part of this project. Shawn said that taking on the RAI in addition to the housing needs assessment presents challenges, and they are hopeful that the info gathered for the purposes of the finalized Analysis of Impediments will also inform the Regional Analysis of Impediments.
6. Presentation of Survey Results /Draft Report. Findings of secondary data and household survey.
7. Report finalization with input from the consortium.

The team intends to merge the HNA and RAI to inform the overall housing picture in the region. Typically the HNA and RAI are two different animals. The team is really interested to prepare these two documents in tandem, and see how that informs the overall project. The revised Analysis of Impediments will address gaps in the draft AI identified by HUD and also be supplemented with new primary and secondary data.

At the initial kickoff meeting, the focus will be on laying out project goals, refining the overall schedule, identifying existing resources, and discussing the survey design and outreach strategy. The team wants to establish expectations as to when information will be available to present or share. They will be leaning on the advisory team heavily for the outreach strategy. The region is very diverse, and outreach in different regions requires different approaches. The primary data collection will focus on the household survey and key informant interviews. The secondary data sources will include the 2010 census w/ 2000 comparison, residential building permits, the Multiple Listing Service (MLS), subdivision, and development data. The RAI will use HUD data, health department data, US Bureau of Economic Affairs data, state labor, and QCEW data.

The team's approach for the household survey will be to use both web and paper survey instruments. The survey will look at demographics, employment, housing needs and preferences, and occupied housing characteristics. The Spanish version will be a shortened version of the household survey conducted live with Spanish intercepts. The key informant interviews will target employers, government and NGO staff, mortgage brokers and realtors.

In preparing the final report the team will incorporate the presentation of survey data, and continual check-ins with the advisory committee to explain data results. It will also include significant face time with HUD throughout the process and at the final stage to ensure they are meeting HUD's requirements. The final product will be a menu of strategies/actions with opportunities for integration into other disciplines.

Jan asked that h Karen Lansing of the Idaho Falls affiliate of Habitat for Humanity is approached regarding their door-to- door Neighbor Works survey in Ashton. Wendy reminded the group about the public participation training a year and a half ago at the beginning of the grant. We had a Spanish speaking bilingual woman named Olga. She is a kindergarten teacher and works during the school year but could possibly be interested. Wendy said she is an excellent facilitator. Shawn said they would be relying heavily on the consortium and advisory committee members to identify resources. In order to do their work efficiently, they will need to have the ability to incorporate existing data and identify contacts out of the community to help.

Dave asked about the expected timeline for the project. Shawn said they expect to complete secondary data collection in April/May. They will begin surveying probably in late May, and that will run through mid-to end-June. Then they will begin report drafting in July. There will be a check-in toward the ends of July, and they intend to have the report finalized before the end of August. Dave said he has worked with RSC, and they were just talking about a quality of life survey for the indicators project. There is an opportunity to make sure no one is stepping on toes, and there are ways to streamline and integrate. Shawn said he would consider the Brendle Group a key resource. We don't have the resources in the grant to duplicate efforts. They will strive to work together as much as possible. Shawn will be getting in touch with Dave. There could be a role in the summit for survey activity to cover multiple areas. We had been talking about doing a visioning exercise and indicators at the May summit. We also want to incorporate outreach around quality of life impressions. There is the potential to do online surveys, and we could combine surveys so as not to overload folks. Shawn said his only reservation is the nature of the specific information they are seeking for the housing study. Can the two requests for information be integrated? And because we will be relying on survey data to inform a lot of work, does there need to be a certain level of rigor with the survey? Shawn said he doesn't know what would happen if gets too cumbersome. It will be a matter of consistent messaging. The team will be discussing the survey design with the advisory committee at the end of March. We need to all be on the same page and utilize opportunities for collaboration.

Ashley said that the City of Driggs is currently going through data collection for census and state data, etc. She asked if all data would be part of the final document provided to consortium, and if it makes more sense to delay their research to pull from the housing study data collection? Shawn said it will be available, though as an appendix and most likely not in the body of report. All research will become the property of the consortium.

Island Park Futures Study – Jan Brown and Tom Cluff

The Consortium is still awaiting final approval of the revised budget from HUD before moving forward with independent studies associated with the Futures project. However, because of National Wildlife Federation funding, proceed the Henry's Fork Watershed Council (HFWC) has been able to launch a series of public forums that began in February and will go through November of 2014. Under the recent posts on the sustainablyyellowstone.org website, there is a video of the February 18 meeting. The timing notations are included on the video for specific perspectives. The group memory from this meeting is also posted under the public meetings section. Jan and Tom are going to design a Futures Study page once they are sure the HUD budget is approved. The next meeting is March 11 in Island Park at the EMS building and the agenda was distributed along with the topics for the upcoming year. The bullets on each month's listed topic agenda

represent the initial questions that went into the meeting, and the numbers are a consolidation of what came out of the small group discussions.

The April 8 meeting will be focused on land use management analysis. One topic to address is the possible threat from geothermal drilling on state lands. The May 13 meeting will be focused on housing, transportation and public infrastructure. The June 10 meeting will focus on summer recreation and will be held in Island Park, at the EMS building. The July 8 meeting will likely be held in Ashton and will focus on water management, aquatic resources, and water quality and quantity. The August 12-13 meeting will focus on terrestrial resources, range, timber, and wildlife. The HF Watershed Council has a field trip each year, and will focus on the Futures Study this year. There is a lot of interest in what's happening with private lands as well.

The September 9 meeting will focus on cultural and Historic values and will probably be in Ashton. It will include Native American trails and tribal interests. It's important to reach out to the Shoshone Bannock Tribes in a completely separate fashion given their status as a sovereign nation. . Liz Davy said there is sensitivity about the Nez Perce trail to the extent that the Shoshone and Nez Perce shouldn't be required to meet in the same room. Jan expressed that tribal relations is one thing we need to make sure we do right, and well. The October 14 meeting will be on community vitality when we will be looking for perspectives of business owners, and talking in terms of the importance of the Island Park recreation resources to the whole 4-county region. The November meeting will be either November 11 or 18 and is the annual conference, which will provide a summary of observations and recommendations.

The question came up during the discussion in February as to whether the Watershed Council can make actual recommendations, or if this will be more of a findings report? The Watershed Council process doesn't purport to be singularly fulfilling our HUD requirement for public participation. These meetings are more of a forum for people who have daytimes to give, and it has a distinct agency focus. They will present in-depth findings, collected by a series of meetings, and engage as much agency and public expertise as they can through the process. The end process for the observations and recommendations will be consensus-based.

Jan passed out a Watershed Council subcommittee job description that was distributed to all those attending the February 18 meeting. The subcommittee will be responsible for the final design of an agenda of each council meeting during 2014, including suggestions of the most suitable speakers. They also will assist in securing information of relevance to the Futures Study and help ensure that both Fremont County and the Watershed Council benefit from that information. The committee will also reach out to others from their sphere of influence thus ensuring broader input from those with various perspectives on these issues and those underserved members of the community. They will distill input received from each council meeting with specific findings and recommendations. They will review the final futures study report for accuracy and ensure that it reflects council deliberations.

The subcommittee is made up of representatives from Island Park, Ashton, and St. Anthony and includes the mayors from Ashton and Island Park. The Council wants to make sure to engage folks beyond Fremont County who understand how important recreation is to tourism on a regional basis and for residents. There is a hydrologist from Idaho Falls, and a good cross section of residents and folks who were on P&Z commissions. It also includes the head of the Island Park snowmobile committee, and representatives from the Teton Regional Land Trust and The Nature Conservancy. There is a limit to how many people could represent one entity; currently it's 1 representative with 1 alternate. Wendy Lowe is the facilitator. Jan and Tom will be serving as Fremont County staff liaisons to the subcommittee, and Brandon Hoffner (HFF) and Dale Swensen (FMID) will represent the Watershed Council as they are designated co-facilitators. Meetings are open to public for observation only. The idea was to have the subcommittee do more in-depth work in between the large Council meetings since time is so limited. There will be people satisfied with just attending the Council

meetings and feel like they have input that way. The final roster will be available and distributed by the Consortium's next meeting. Also, this group is technically a subcommittee of HFWC, not a subcommittee of WGYC. HFWC has control of the list and wasn't quite ready to distribute. Jan said the March 18 meeting is probably the most important, as they will try to look at the entire year and decide which speakers they need to get on the calendar, and what additional studies are necessary now.

There is \$75K in the budget for in-depth analyses and economic studies to get current info for better recommendations. We all need to consider what studies will be needed in order to make better decisions ultimately for the RPSD. People will keep asking, "What about the National Monument that Jim Caswell was proposing"? People across the area will remain interested in that topic and the Council will continue to answer the questions. It's important to be clear that this is not a national monument study per se. It's a futures study where Island Park can help inform the overall RPSD. If, through the process, the Council or the public suggests that a National Monument proclamation or designation could do x, y, and z, they won't ignore the input. The goal here is to acknowledge that there are people and organizations who have and will continue to explore national monument designations in our area, but the study needs to inform the RPSD primarily because it is part of the HUD grant.

A discussion ensued about the short timeframe left to perform a good economic impact analysis, especially timed with the Futures Study and the need to publish and respond to an RFP. Part of the purpose of the subcommittee is to advise Fremont County how to spend the \$75,000 of HUD funds dedicated to the project, and it is still unclear to what extent the subcommittee may be involved in selecting the consultants. They definitely will assist in identifying the need and scoping out the work that will inform Council discussions and the ultimate study

Jan committed to the steering committee that she would distribute a final list of Council meetings and subject areas, and would highlight those that would particularly affect all four counties. There may be a need to have more consortium members in attendance or to specifically invite officials from outside Fremont County when the subject matter clearly affected other consortium counties. For example, the Fat Bike Race just held in Island Park was organized by folks from Teton Valley; raising awareness about winter trails in Fremont County that are more appropriate for this type activity just underscores that some places are better than others for certain activities.

Tom explained that the concept of a national monument was the catalyst for asking what truly matters about Island Park. It really is an Island Park-focused futures study, analogous to a comprehensive plan update. They are hitting all of the issues pertinent not just to Island Park but for Fremont County to use to update their future comp plan. At least some aspects of each meeting will be relevant to the full consortium. If there is something in particular in which someone is interested, and wants a good discussion of that issue, it will happen at these meetings. Communication is hard in Island Park. Having half of meetings up at the EMS building will be important. Having Sandra Mitchell from the ID State snowmobile association will be a draw.

Public Involvement for RPSD, Futures Study – Wendy Green Lowe

Wendy reminded everyone that the consortium members are the final decision-making authority for whether the RPSD is complete and acceptable to all. Her question for the consortium was, "What do you need to do for public involvement, in addition to what else has been done for all the component parts, to give you what you need to know to make an informed decision on whether you can sign off on the final RPSD?" Each consortium member will be signing on behalf of the jurisdiction that he/she represents. What do we do if in February 2015

if we don't have 15 entities signing off on it? What information do you need to give elected officials for them to approve it?

Several consortium members asked for frequent updates to their council or commission. Jason asked if it was possible to get an inventory of the public involvement for each piece? He is looking for a description of what the public involvement looked like, so they can share it with elected officials. Wendy doesn't have it, but she said she could attempt to collect it. Jan said she has it compiled for the multi-modal study, how many meetings happened, and who came. Ashley said she has the same for the model code project, a list of who came to what meetings. They also have what we've attempted to do at a broad level, project level, and sub-project level.

Beyond the document for current public involvement, folks were interested in a data call for each project.

Liz said, "Because I live in Teton County ID, I see controversy on code issues. I want to know that whether people agree or not, people are satisfied that the process is actually going to work." She said she would rely on the consortium to say if the commissioners are happy, the mayors are happy, and the public in general appears to be...something. She personally doesn't have enough info on the affordable housing, but her concern is that she would have no way of knowing if the public getting that. The consortium is relying on the advisory teams from each study. She wasn't sure how to get details on that involvement.

Wendy said that we could do a scoping effort, and get input from the four counties on what they each think should be in the RPSD? We've kind of done that already. We could wait until the draft RPSD is put on the street and ask for public comment, but that isn't likely to be before November so we would be asking for public comment by the end of December. It's not really enough time. Jeff said the best advertising Island Park has is two local papers and some little Internet group. So far nobody's showed up on any meetings on the comp plan because "It's not my backyard yet". He doesn't think spending grant money and people's time to come to Island Park and have a public forum will be effective at this point. Toward the end of the project is when people will look at it and ask, "Does it affect me?"

Wendy asked again what specifically the consortium members would need when we get all the pieces and parts pulled together, and say this is the final product, to approve? She asked if consortium members would be OK with ongoing status reports to demonstrate that it's been done? She said it's important to give the consortium representatives the cover they may need, referring back to Liz's comment about making sure that each aspect felt like they had decent public involvement, or that people who are really interested in affordable housing were part of the study. Statistical info will be part of all final reports. Jason said if each individual piece had a complete assessment or report of public participation, then he would be comfortable with the full report. The overall RPSD is supposed to be a summary of all these studies; as long as they have all engaged the public adequately then he said he is fine with that.

Tom said he wanted to better describe the final product. The overall RPSD will be not just a summary of all of the studies but also will include other information, for example existing workforce data that's already out there that we didn't produce as part of study but will be included in the RPSD. The question isn't what is needed to approve the final RPSD, but what do we need to do to ensure that the RPSD represents the work of the last 3 years? How can we feel comfortable that there isn't anything we left out? Is there some question we can ask now, so that at the end we don't feel like there is something we should have asked the public that we forgot? Can we identify those questions right now?

The first step is for Tom, Jan, and Wendy to compile all of the public participation outreach to date, so everyone can look at a current map of the public involvement and see if there are any holes. Jerry said he likes the idea of cataloging what has already been done. He suggested we make rounds to councils and

commissions to update them on the status and participations we've had, and directly ask them, "Is there anything you can think of that you'll need to feel comfortable so that we're all in agreement when the final RPSD comes?" Jason said the timing is key as well. If we wait until we're done, then what's the point of asking if we missed something? We should be working on it as we go. We may have the opportunity to fill holes. We could model it after the futures study, and outline meeting topics and who should be there.

Wendy said that part of the data call would be a project mailing list, a comprehensive list of all folks involved. Alex asked how binding the approval of the RPSD would be? He said if the elected officials or Boards of County Commissioners are approving something as a general vision (using the example of the model code not being adopted outright), and none of it is binding, then all Teton County WY and Jackson will want to know is that it will be simple. His concern is oversaturation in asking for public comment. Alex said the focus in Jackson is on other efforts that aren't directly grant funded.

Heater said that the website has several stakeholder lists from various projects. The recycling study has an updated list posted on the website whenever new stakeholders are added to the communications. The website is a good tool for a repository.

Jan suggested that we consider using Metro Quest or some of the other online tools we've looked at. This final public outreach effort will need to integrate the final product with indicators, and provide a summary of where we're headed. We could accomplish our final public participation goals without having to schedule a whole series of meetings. As we near project completion, we ask the public to help set priorities while we are communicating how this all fits together. Wendy added that this idea engages those who happen to work on Tuesdays and can't go to the Watershed Council meetings, or lives out of the region but owns property, or for any other reason can't make the in-person meetings. This would provide a mechanism for people to hear what's going on and provide input. Dave said it would not only categorize what's happening, but also provide contact lists for cross-study collaboration.

Shawn asked the group for the elevator pitch to clearly describe the RPSD and HUD grant overall. He said from his perspective, if there was some improvement that could be made, it would be allowing the general public to better understand what the overall grant effort is all about. He thought that would allow us to increase awareness through informal community networks. All of the valiant efforts being made for public participation give us the ability to increase awareness; those efforts will be increased exponentially by just increasing awareness of the basic concept: what is this grant all about?

Brittany concurred by saying that Victor is totally familiar with the model code project, but they don't know anything about the housing study. She has had to explain it even to staff. If she says something is part of the HUD grant, everyone gives a blank stare. We have a great opportunity at our meeting in May, whether it's with a power point presentation or some other way to communicate where we are now, what we've done so far, and offer it to each entity to take back to their respective jurisdictions and present it to their council or commission and do outreach. She could anticipate a situation where we're presenting the RPSD next year, and a city council or county commission could not realize that it was part of a larger \$1.5M grant effort.

Action steps:

- Quarterly presentations to councils
- Catalogue of everything done to date
- Consolidated list of stakeholders
- Elevator pitch

- Press Release: what studies have been completed, what's going in the next year, resources, etc. Wendy said that maybe getting approval from HUD on the approved work plan would be a newsworthy item!

Someone brought up the issue of the consortium/grant name, and that it has always been a problem. It was selected long ago, not on a consensus basis. Are we better off to call it the Livable Communities Initiative? Saying "HUD grant" doesn't resonate with the Forest Service, or anyone else outside of HUD circles. Livable Communities is at least more descriptive. It's also an issue of the terms "sustainability" and "sustainable development"; people still glaze over. Shawn agreed that it should be distilled further.

Alex suggested we try to come up with a name once we come up with the elevator pitch. Once we can give a 30-second pitch, the name will be quite obvious. Whether Livable Communities is the right answer, or RPSD, or whatever actually invokes the content of plan, it will come out of the elevator pitch. Just by referencing the 4 things Tom talked about this morning, we can come up with a name that represents those four things.

Dave asked what the best way is for him to work with the consortium, as everyone is mapping out what's happening moving forward with public participation and the indicators project wish list? Should there be a periodic group call just on public participation? Things are starting to ramp up; we need to make sure we aren't tripping over each other. Maybe each project lead could join a monthly or bi-monthly call to touch base.

Next steps:

The consortium's preference was May 6 or 7. It will be held in Victor, and we will also be presenting the award for Mountainside Village's GY-Framework certification. The Wildwood Room worked well for us last time; Wendy will check on availability. **Amendment: May 7th is the selected date for the Consortium Summit.*

Next consortium meeting: April 1, 1:30-3:00. Conference call.