

Western Greater Yellowstone Consortium Monthly Phone Conference
(866) 740-1260, access code 1587264#
December 17th, 2013, 1:30-3:00 p.m.

Present on call: Brent McFadden (Madison County), Jeff Patlovich (Island Park), Jerry Royster (HUD), Ashley Koehler (Driggs), Jason Boal (Teton County), Tom Cluff (Fremont County), Greg Newkirk (Fremont County), Wendy Lowe (P2 Solutions), Heather Higinbotham (YBP), Brittany Skelton (Victor), Brent Larson (USFS), Jan Brown (Linx), Wanda Adams (Fremont County), Patty Parkinson (St. Anthony)

Objectives

The objectives for the December meeting include:

- HUD update, budget and work plan – Tom Cluff
 - Discussions and associated decisions
- Model Code update – Doug Self, Ashley Koehler, Brittany Skelton
- Regional Recycling System study update – Heather Higinbotham
- Sustainability Indicators update – Tom Cluff
- Multi-modal update – Jan Brown
- Housing study update – Heather Higinbotham
- GY-Framework Technical Assistance for Mountainside Village Certification – YBP
- Island Park Caldera National Monument Study – Jan Brown and Tom Cluff
- Other grant element updates as relevant
 - Teton WY/Jackson GY-Framework
 - Broadband
- Next meeting: January 21 or 28?

HUD update

Tom has been in conversation with Naomi from HUD; they are still processing our amendment application. She said it looks good and didn't have concerns about it. Tom was cautiously optimistic she'd be done with her review by now. His new estimate is that they will be done by the end of December. He hasn't heard of any red flags or concerns about what's been submitted, and it seems to be moving along through the process.

Heather asked what the next steps will be regarding upcoming consortium decisions. Tom said there would be decisions re: whether to award implementation technical assistance money to the Teton Economic Development group (we'll need to decide how much and how it will be allocated), and money for upcoming trainings and other capacity building efforts. We need to identify what we want to do for trainings and capacity building for the coming year. There will be decisions on the Monument study, and some response from the consortium on the future study portion of it as well. This will not immediate but probably happen a month or so after we hear back from HUD on the approval.

Jeff reiterated how difficult it has been to get information (from the Fremont County website) on what the HUD grant is for, the original application, the amendment application, what's been approved and what's still pending, so has can get a better idea of what the grant is all about. He said it's been a problem trying to find all the details. He would like to see the application that was made to HUD and what was awarded and said that all of the grant info should be on Fremont County's website. Jan said that all of the information is on the consortium website (www.sustainableyellowstone.org); Jeff was not aware of that website. All agreed that the information should be on Fremont County's website also, or at the very least linking to the consortium website.

Jan said we still need the original work plan that was approved. Tom will work on getting all of the information on the Fremont County website and whatever is missing from the consortium website. Wanda said that they were waiting on approval from Naomi to post on the Fremont County website. Jeff said he was talking about

original as well as the amendment; he doesn't know how to get any info about the grant, and he's not even sure what documents he should be looking for. From a transparency issue people need to be able to see everything.

Jan shared that with the work plan itself, each different project had to have its own work plan. Jan didn't know how well they hold together and personally thought the exercise was kind of obtuse. It's Tom's call on how much material is helpful to explain things.

Tom said the purpose of the consortium website is to be a clearinghouse for all this information. If it's not there and needs to be there, we'll get it posted. All of the original information and the group memory from the Feb. 2012 kickoff is up on the consortium website. Perhaps all the cities and counties should link to the consortium website. All agreed that this is a good idea.

Model Code update

Brittany said that she hasn't received any new updates from Code Studio since their visit in November. She sent Lee a summary of the public comment about the maps. She also sent recommendations to Lee with some guidance on specific changes. As far as she knows they still expect to get the draft in January. Brittany will check with Le to see if the estimated date is still good. Ashley shared the same report from Driggs.

Regional Recycling System study update

Heather reported that LBA Associates is on track with the recycling study. The first task, a cross-boundary outreach plan was done in the spring. It is the intent to maintain an ongoing public process throughout the study. LBA Associates has been keeping the stakeholder list up to date with each project phase.

The internal work is not yet ready to release to the public but will be shared with the consortium as soon as it's completed. LBA feels that it makes sense to lie out the facts for each county, and get a "wish-list" of sorts from each county to provide input for the results.

There are 5 alternatives in the study. Alternatives 1a-3 all have to do with a MRF (materials recovery facility), looking at single stream, dual stream, accepting glass or not, etc. Alternative 4 is the concept of a regional waste entity. They are currently tackling alternative 1—single stream MRF with glass diversion. They are working on quantity projections, collecting data and modifying as needed for completeness and consistency, looking at population data and future projections on population and diversion levels.

LBA has finished the market research and has contacted all brokers, end users and immediate processors that might buy the materials or provide revenue potential. The design basis is looking at number of shifts, materials collected, processing, scale of operations, etc. They are taking a small focus for a cost-effective facility and are looking at a 15-year timeline. They are identifying all of the facts, statutes, regulations with ID DEQ and ID Association of Counties.

The single stream analysis should be completed this month internally, and will be shared with the advisory team for initial review and then with the consortium. They are shooting for late February to have a draft report for the advisory team. They are considering the extent of a stakeholder comment session, and feel that a full open comment session is beyond the scope of work. They intend to prepare a 5-10 page executive summary/mini-report to share with the public after getting feedback from the advisory team/consortium on the full report.

Laurie shared that to date, Fremont and Madison counties have not been very engaged. Bonneville and Bannock have not been engaged at all but she anticipates they will probably be more interested after seeing some tangible study results.

Sustainability Indicators update

Tom has been working with the advisory team to discuss the Brendle Group visits this summer and the work they've done. It has become clear that there needed to be more thinking about the concept of creating these indicators to fit in with the GY-Framework. The Brendle Group is doing more work on that now. They are also thinking that the public involvement strategy needs additional attention; they will be connecting with Wendy Weaver on a strategy for public engagement.

Brendle is looking at a regional site visit sometime in January or February. This will be scheduled at a time when we can gather the consortium for a face-to-face meeting in conjunction. Brendle will also conduct stakeholder engagement as part of that process.

Multi-modal update

Since the last consortium discussion, Jan had the privilege of having Charlie Dixon from CTAA (Community Transportation Association of America) visit. Some consortium members were included on the tour, which entailed 2 days in Eastern Idaho. CTAA was doing a short-term technical assistance visit to particularly focus on the city of Rexburg and the issues with trying to link up neighboring counties by virtue of having more regular public service between Rexburg and Jackson. Charlie was impressed with Rexburg and the unique needs of the city. They had a very good tour of BYU-Idaho, and talked with Phil Packer as well as others from the city. There is a presentation tomorrow to the city with preliminary recommendations that will be incorporated into the final multi-modal plan.

There has been tremendous interest in Linx putting in an application for 5311 funding from the state of ID to get a more successful link btw Rexburg, Teton Valley and Jackson. Jan would appreciate letters of support from the communities and consortium post-pre-application phase when they get to the full application stage. At one point they talked about seeing if technical assistance money may be available to further assist with route planning or schedule planning for a fixed route system in Rexburg. Charlie will be presenting examples of the kind of system he thinks needs to be done.

We have to include the future of TRPTA but it's important that everyone in our region recognize that TRPTA is a regional public transportation authority for Bonneville and only has a relationship with other counties by purchasing cart inventory. Jan asked if anyone in the consortium has an official MOU or cooperative agreement with TRPTA? Jan hasn't found any yet. Brittany was not aware of any for Teton County. She was at the smart growth ID meeting and they mentioned TRPTA's restructuring but didn't go into depth. Jan said this poses a challenge as a region to say we don't have an official regional transportation authority under state law in ID. She's not sure we need one. Basically in the study it's showing the statute and why it doesn't pose an advantage for any rural parts of the state that she can see. Rexburg is a schedule and route study.

All other visits with cities and counties are scheduled for Jan 6. Jan's goal is to have the multi-modal plan review draft up on the website by Jan. 3 to refer people to it and continue dialogue. She is presenting to Fremont County the morning of Jan 3rd and Jackson/Teton County that afternoon. She is presenting to Victor on Jan 8th at 7 pm. She is supposed to call Tom Jewell to get on the Jan 9th agenda in Island Park. She has not yet scheduled Teton Co ID or Madison County. She will give a demonstration of the scenario-planning tool that outlines mapping with trails and transit routes. The idea was to at least have a presentation to every county, whether at a city council or county commission meeting. Jason will get Jan on the Teton County ID Jan 13th

agenda and send info out in packets ahead of time. Brent will schedule Jan for the Madison County January meeting.

Jan surmised that the sustainability indicators fit in here, because at some point we need to have indicators and goals for transportation. This is also a question that came up with the recycling study. We view multi-modal as moving people around; she hadn't considered anything about freight services. Is there a need to look at this in our four counties? Brent said for Madison County he didn't think so, because pretty much everybody delivers to Rexburg. Jan said we do have trucking companies, but the question came up whether we have companies that can haul recyclables. She's thinking in terms of whether we have equipment lying idle, outside of the harvest time for potatoes, and is there a way this can be a benefit to our counties? Wanda said that when she was at the Forest Service, they looked a lot at trucking. Are there some companies that would be willing to do other things (such as companies that pick up trash)? If we pursue and put out to bid, then we might have some interest. Existing companies are Snake River Sanitation out of Blackfoot, Allied, Eagle Rock, PSI, and another small one that no one could remember the name of. Jan said when it comes to taking processed recycling (large bales) she would think any type of hauler could take bales. There are all sorts of interstate trucking companies coming through. She doesn't think we have a shortage of choices.

Jerry asked if we have spoken with Maureen at ITD as far as their freight? He thought that would be worth a conversation to see what might be appropriate to add to the plan as an amendment. Jan will contact her. Phil Cameron with YTCEC had a nice meeting with Jan about how he would very much like to see us start working together on alternative fuel liquid Natural Gas stations, and good things the consortium can do to continue to support alternative fuel vehicles. This is all getting woven in to the final multi-modal plan. Jan is concentrating on getting more and more info and thanked everyone who's been helpful.

As far as Linx, besides putting in an application for 5311 funding she is also concentrating on the final report on the 3-year pilot demo in YNP. It appears YNP will proceed with more transportation planning inside the park. Hopefully by the time Jan posts the final report there will be an opportunity to talk about how the consortium is in a good position to do more work within YNP.

Jerry said he was talking with Lori Poreca at a recent retreat, and she had been doing webinars around the state on communities that are successfully implementing livability principles, and that she contacted us to participate. Jan didn't think we were quite at a point of having a success story to share. Jan will follow up with her about where Linx stands. Jerry said he thinks he's convinced both EPA and FHWA to join us at a listening session in the spring. It will be a face-to-face meeting, and the consortium needs to just pick a date and let Jerry know so he can work to get more federal agencies there.

Jan asked if they would consider the session if the meeting was in the Town of Jackson? That is out of Idaho. Jerry didn't know.

Housing study update

Heather has been working with the advisory team to finalize the housing RFP, which was initially drafted last winter but put on hold due to the budget and modified work plan and waiting for HUD approval. The RFP was sent out to the full consortium and an email vote was passed to release it. Heather and the advisory team have been identifying the legal requirements for where and how long the RFP must be posted. Tom will provide additional information for the Idaho requirements and Christine Walker is looking into the WY requirements.

The initial plan was to post by the end of the week, but Tom said that HUD wants to review and approve before it is released. Tom will send to Naomi at HUD to look it over and give approval to release the RFP.

The timeline is as follows:

- Questions due by January 10

- Responses posted by January 17
- Proposals due Jan 31
- Advisory team review all proposals by Feb 7
- Phone interviews Feb 10-13
- Recommendation to consortium Feb 12 along with Fremont County scope and contract

The RFP will be distributed to local newspapers, city websites, APA national and APA state chapters (Brittany is looking into the cost), Habitat for Humanity, and direct outreach to people we think might be interested. If the consortium has additional avenues for distribution please let Heather know.

GY-Framework Technical Assistance for Mountainside Village Certification

Heather was happy to report that we have finally received the independent certifier reports and Mountainside Village will be certified at the Gold level. She asked how the consortium wanted to go about publicizing the certification and suggested that we highlight it at a future face-to-face meeting in Victor. Brittany agreed that we should publicize it as much as possible as a success story. As soon as it's officially certified, the City of Victor will post to the city website and its social media accounts, and see if the City Council will do anything to recognize it. Jan asked if she should say something on Jan 8? Brittany will check with the City Council to see what they say. We will put it on the F2F agenda, have a plaque to present to Mountainside Village, and ask Larry to provide an overview of the project. Heather will send Jan the transportation report to include as an example of transportation credit fulfillment.

The consortium discussed the best timeline for scheduling the recognition, whether in January/February with Brendle Group or in the spring in conjunction with the agency listening session. The consortium felt it would be better in late spring with the agencies to give them a first-hand look of the GY-Framework in application.

Island Park Caldera National Monument Study

There is nothing new on the monument study, not until we hear from HUD if the grant amendment is approved or not. We're probably not going to be calling it a "monument study". Jan said she likes the idea of calling it a "futures study" in relation to the RPSD. We need a different description of it than "monument". Jan and Tom will work on defining that more for the next call. Jan said it's really a resource assessment with future management scenarios. The front page of the Post Register today was all about discovering that the magma chamber below Old Faithful is actually 2 ½ times greater than though in the past. It is 55 miles long and 18 miles wide and 2K feet deep. It gives pause about what our sustainable development plan might say. Is there a contingency if we lose half of the area to an explosion? Someone pointed out that if you are within 100 miles everything will be instantaneously gone. Jan joked that this solves the transportation issue and that could be one of the alternatives in the regional recycling plan—recycling the region.

All jokes aside, the study may have very interesting things to say about what's going on subsurface.

Other grant element updates as relevant

Broadband: Greg said he hasn't heard anything new. There was a quiet proposal made to the city council last time the consultant was in the area. He hasn't heard what the next steps are. All the groundwork is done, and it should be time for the final report. In looking at the interim reports, he doesn't see a vast difference between those and what will come in the final report. Greg will ask if he can get copies of the interim reports to present to the consortium and post on the website. Tom said he would ask Scott Johnson to brief the consortium at our next call or F2F.

Jan asked if there was anyone from the Forest Service on the call? Brent Larson was on the call. Jan said she thinks as we move into the next phase, particularly with looking at the caldera, it's important that we have public agencies represented. Jan added that through the work with multi-modal transportation there is a possibility of approaching Virginia Kelly for time in front of the Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee (GYCC). Brent said they were looking at doing some sensing and that one of the things they've discussed as a group at GYCC meetings was how to solicit input from the public on GYA-wide issues, across a greater landscape. The GYCC is contemplating having a listening session with the public. They haven't gotten that nailed down exactly but are talking with agency managers to take first steps in pulling that together. The new supervisor on the Bridger-Teton national forest is Clint Khyl. There is also a new park manager at Harriman State Park. They intend to invite everyone to participate. The consortium has a responsibility for Harriman, Henry's Lake, Mesa Falls, and Ashton-Tetonia rails to trails. Jan said there is funding available through the Federal Lands Access Program and Federal Lands Transportation program. There is still an opportunity to get in on the WY side for a grant. Jan will be on the agenda for an upcoming Henry's Fork Watershed Council meeting for whatever is going to be unveiled for the caldera assessment, to introduce what that will look like. This meeting is in Rexburg at the Springhill Marriott. Most of the meeting is dedicated to the BLM basin study but we (the consortium) will have the last 50 minutes plus community building time to start the public participation process. The meeting is at 11:00 on Jan. 14. She thought by then we would have essentially an outline of the process for this study and how we would like to involve all the agencies in that process. They are willing to dedicate the full day on the Feb. 11 Council meeting to the assessment and looking at land use, land management plans, public lands, Fremont County and Island Park, looking for alignment, and identifying needs for better collaboration.

Next meeting: January 21 at 1:30.

Next Face-to-Face meeting: February 26, 10:00-4:00

Face-to-face: Tom said he prefers February for a F2F to January. Brittany agreed that the end of February is better. The consortium decided on Wed. Feb 26, 10-4-ish (final time TBD as we put together agenda). Heather will send out an email to consortium to get confirmations to solidify date so we can make sure we can have a quorum at the meeting.

Spring listening session: Targeting May 14 after the Watershed Council meeting. Jerry will send out a doodle poll to get the most agencies possible in attendance.