

Western Greater Yellowstone Consortium Monthly Phone Conference  
(866) 740-1260, access code 1587264#  
July 31, 2013, 1:00-3:00 p.m.

## Objectives

Present on the call: Tom, Jan, Angie, Wendy, Jerry, Heather, Ashley, Shawn, Doug, Alex

The objectives for the July meeting include:

- HUD update – Tom Cluff
- Model Code design charette update – Bill Knight, Doug Self
- Regional Recycling System Stakeholder meetings update – Heather Higinbotham
- Sustainability Indicators update – Heather Higinbotham
- Multi-modal update – Jan Brown
- Report on Teton WY/Jackson GY-Framework audit – Alex Norton
- GY-Framework Technical Assistance Request for Mountainside Village Certification – YBP
- Update on Victor, ID Main St and Center St intersection –Bill Knight
- Website update – Wendy Green Lowe
- Other grant element updates as relevant: Housing?
- Henry's Fork Caldera Project – Tom Cluff
- Next meeting: August 20<sup>th</sup> face-to-face in St. Anthony, 10:00 am-4:00 pm

### HUD Update

Tom shared that they are making headway on the revised work plan and project budget. There is a question from HUD to discuss re: Envision Utah and possible capacity building help in this area. In April Tom was ready to go to HUD with suggestions but he has not been getting positive feedback. They suggested he talk to Envision Utah as a capacity building intermediary. Tom doesn't think EU will give us much in the way of useful help, and he wants to turn it down. HUD is concerned that it's free help, so why turn it down? Tom's issue is that their contract with HUD is small enough so they can't really provide any useful work for us. Tom thinks they will bring us suggestions and ideas, which will take extra work to evaluate and respond. Then if we pick a strategy, there will be more extra work to develop into a new piece of the project and manage to completion. So "free" help isn't actually free in terms of the extra workload it triggers. The caveat is that in January we talked about work plan changes and wanted to see more capacity building. If EU were able to put together training, it would fit in that goal, but we still have the same problem that it's extra work someone has to tackle. If the consortium wants to bring EU in and provide some training, someone needs to identify time and have the ability to work with EU and make that project happen. Tom wants feedback from consortium.

Heather: would EU provide only training and suggestions? Tom said that is correct, they would provide advisory or training, and the contracts are small so they can't really do any work. When he brainstormed ideas with them, they came up with the same obvious ideas we already know about. Wendy asked what kind of training? Tom thinks Envision tomorrow, which is a software program related to scenario planning tools. He doesn't know how well that dovetails with anything else we're doing. Do we have to buy the software? Tom didn't know. Jan asked about the training that was offered at the Scenario planning workshop in Salt Lake. Tom said their contract with HUD runs out at the end of this fiscal year. If they do anything it has to be right away. Should we have them show up to our in-person meeting, and give them agenda time? The group felt that this was not the best use of our time. Shawn said that if there is anything that it's worth EU to provide, something we can use, if the only issue is personnel and capacity and the ability to absorb suggestions and incorporate into SOW, Shawn would be willing to volunteer to be that interface and explore ways to take what they have and see how consortium could benefit.

Jan thought that from the multi-modal standpoint, maybe a mini-workshop on lessons learned in public transportation in SLC would make sense? EU was involved in the beginning of the light rail project. Tom had concerns about how useful that would be.

Shawn asked if the consortium's final work product could benefit from their lessons learned, the way they compiled resources and incorporated into their final report. He was willing to go out there and see what they have and if any of it's useful. Tom will get Shawn the contact info. Driggs voiced support of Shawn taking this initiative. Jan felt it was an option for anyone working on these projects to try and gain successful insight. She is especially interested in transportation lessons learned.

Envision Madison: we will invite them to give a presentation to us at our August face to face.

### Model Code

Code Studio started on Saturday with two workshops, one in Victor and one in Driggs. There were over 15 participants at each workshop. They conducted hands on workshop/activity, collected comments, and then the Code Studio team began sketching and designing preliminary plans for a form-based code. There were a few stakeholder meetings with about a dozen or less at each. It was good to energize the planning conversation in the two communities. They will have more of a final draft this winter on the code. This Thursday night the closing presentation will be a preliminary wrap up of comments and ideas. It will be held from 5-6 pm in Victor at the Dewey House (37 Main St, next to Grumpy's Goat Shack restaurant). Shawn attended a lot of the charettes and shared two main takeaways—the main focus was on the cities of Victor and Driggs; Lee suggested after being on the ground for a bit that another trip by Code Studio to Teton Valley might be necessary to do some work in the Drictor corridor (unincorporated county btw the two cities). Lee thought that would warrant further study. Shawn thought regarding the political issues, there may be an opportunity to obviate that and expand efforts across the political spectrum.

### Recycling Study update

The regional recycling study is underway. LBA Associates team (Laurie Batchelder Adams and Julie Klein) toured the consortium area July 15-18, meeting one-on-one with stakeholders, visiting existing recycling facilities, and hosting open house meetings in each county. Heather joined them July 17-18 for the Fremont/Madison open house and the final debrief meeting in Rexburg. Each meeting had 12-18 people in attendance. The team is now working on compiling all of the feedback/baseline data they've collected and will be distributing draft potential alternatives and diversion strategies for review by the advisory team and stakeholders.

### Sustainability Indicators Update

Heather is getting up to speed with the Indicators study, as she has taken over as the consortium liaison in place of Jan, who is now focused solely on the multi-modal aspect. The Brendle Group is planning two regional road trips for later this fall in the September/October and November/December timeframes. Heather is working with them to identify key stakeholders and organizations to reach out to and get engaged.

### Multi-Modal Update

Jan just emailed out the mid-summer update for the Linx system. Linx has been in the papers lately, in Jackson and Idaho Falls. A reporter had asked in June about ridership, which at that point was only 4-5 riders/week on the green line. In the month of July, they had a significant increase particularly in park ridership and also in Jackson. There is room for improvement. The report gives a sense of what the overall demonstration project is doing with WYDOT funding. She was pleased to include the pilot demo as part of the multi-modal contract. Everything they are learning in the park, all the questions asked and patterns of use, is all being logged and analyzed. She appreciates the participation of Fremont Co and HUD grant.

Other related multi-modal news: Kyle Babbitt got us to a certain point with the concept plan on a recreational trails network, then she had to withdraw because she took a job at Harriman State Park. Jan was looking for someone to take that product, review and integrate it into something more readable and helpful with specific next steps. Jan identified a master's student named Kate Wilson who lives in Island Park and is working on masters at ISU in GIS with a background recreation. Kate has approval of her advisory faculty to work on this project. She will be coming on with orientation meetings in August and if interested may come to the consortium F2F. Jan reported they are also making headway with Rexburg in meeting with Natalie, and next week are pulling together to look at Rexburg transportation needs. The city rejected TRPTA's fixed route plan, and said they are looking for new ideas. She felt it would be appropriate and Natalie agreed to convene the Envision Madison players on the transportation front next Wed. Aug 7 at 2pm. They will do a needs assessment and hold a listening session to make sure we know in the multi-modal plan where Rexburg is coming from and what we can do for them.

#### Teton WY and GY-Framework update

Alex explained that the framework project has three pieces: rural regulations, restructuring of their code, and the downtown regulations. Right now they are working on the code restructure with Code Studio's assistance. They made a map of the new format, which is a more forward-looking character based code. The draft may be ready for release come mid- to late- September. For the rural regulations, they are trying to release concepts for public testing a week from Friday; these will be basic concepts, not all the details that would go into zoning code but how you modify current regulations to meet the comp plan goals. They will have a website associated with it, which will allow people to test concepts and view impacts. It will be similar to the off-the-shelf products we looked at but customized for what we're doing. If interested, Alex will add consortium members to the list serve—email Alex if you are interested. He will provide a link to the website, public meetings, etc. For the downtown regulations, they will have workshops in late June; they are working on a summary document there. This serves as a transition between the workshops and actual drafting of the code. It will be 1 part summary and 1 part initial proposal to get people's reaction prior to actually drafting code.

Heather asked about Code Studio's role and Alex clarified that they are working on the downtown regulations. Teton WY and Jackson have separate contracts with them. The technical assistance contract with HUD is fulfilled and the current contracts now are outside of the HUD grant. Tom said we can use some of this for in-kind match. Code Studio is definitely aware of everything that the Town of Jackson and Teton County are doing, and helping them in the model code process. On the rural side, Code Studio is not a direct consultant other than helping with formatting. They are aware of all the pieces and observing content and discussions. Alex is not sure exactly how it might be applicable in other jurisdictions within consortium. Some of the things are probably not replicable in other jurisdictions politically and due to land value.

#### Technical Assistance:

Heather presented proposal for technical assistance funds in the amount of \$2,400 to cover honorariums for the independent certification team for Mountainside Village GY-Framework Certification.

Doug asked if the work plan specified private projects or just community? Alex reminded the group that when we asked in January, no one else was interested. If that's not the case, then Alex said he has no problem extending the technical assistance to private developments. Doug was concerned that we could use the money other places. Heather reminded the group that there is a certain amount of money specifically set aside for GYF certification, it just wasn't clear if it specified only jurisdictions or if it could be used for private developments. Are Jackson and Teton WY intending to certify? Alex thinks so. He said the update of their regulations is an ongoing longer process, but thinks they could still submit at this point.

Jan looked back to the original contract/scope of work that talks about how the GYF as it currently applies to commercial developments will also apply to cities and counties. There was a discussion of how it will work. In the org chart and project implementation schedule, under technical support fund it states: "identify projects

deserving of mini grants or cities needing audits...assess results of technical assistance provided to cities and counties." It could be interpreted either way. Alex said to Doug's point, he agreed in general that we seem to always need funds in other places. What was the update from Tom on how the budget looks? Tom said we are still making progress on the update of the budget but it's not finalized. He is still tentatively looking at something close to what we talked about in January. Tom shared that he had same reaction Doug did and thought it was for jurisdictions, but the dollar amount is small enough that it won't scuttle the budget one way or the other. Alex agreed that \$2,400 is not a budget breaker; he cast Teton WY and Jackson's vote in favor of this. Jan suggested that the minutes reflect that this is a mini-grant, and the audit is more involved and is specifically for cities and counties. She cast her vote yes for YBP. Tom voted yes for Fremont, Wanda yes for Fremont. Angie cast Teton Co ID 2 votes yes but liked what Alex said about calling it a mini-grant. Driggs: Doug voted yes to support as a mini-grant. He would like to see more discussion of how many of these we want to do.

#### Website:

Wendy asked if everyone was able to get on the website and look around and if everything that was needed was on there? Tom said he was in favor of more inclusion rather than less, that unless there was a specific reason something shouldn't be included then it should all be available for transparency. If the consortium is paying for work/accomplishing work then it should be on there.

Nelson has not spent all the money we allocated. Heather asked if we should train some folks to upload documents to the website or just have Nelson upload everything? Tom and Wendy talked about having him stay on to provide maintenance. Tom felt that unless it's redundant, we should keep him on and have his help. He stated how refreshing it is how much better website is now. If other people want to be involved in uploading and want training and to learn how, that's great. If we get enough consortium members interested, then we can talk about doing specific training. Wendy has the info on what it would cost to continue in maintenance capacity, train consortium members to upload, or a combination of the two. The current perception is that he can do it for what was originally budgeted. Wendy will check on that and get back to the consortium.

Doug asked if we have an operating manual for the website? Tom said we have not asked Nelson to create one. He thought maybe we could use some of the remaining budget.

#### Other grant updates as relevant:

Broadband: Greg Newkirk went to the latest broadband meeting, and said they are working on the next version of the draft. He felt that the meeting was positive, and they've made a tremendous amount of progress and are now working on the final draft of the study report and outline of implementation strategy that will include specific first steps on implementation for the pilot project.

Wendy asked if there was a contract for the broadband study? In keeping with what we have up there for other components, we need to get that and all other contracts to Wendy also. Heather and Tom will get all contracts to Wendy.

#### Henry's Fork Caldera Project

Jan provided history about how this project came about. Some time ago, earlier this spring, there was a series of articles, one by the ID Statesman, that detailed the process by which the Bush administration had gone through (at Dirk Kempthorne's request) to do a proclamation for the Island Park Caldera, specifically for Mesa Falls, as a national monument. There are YouTube videos and various other things online that outlined Kaswell's (spelling?) ideas but never got finalized. Jan was contacted by a state, regional, national organization saying they could find financial support to make it happen and wanted to gauge interest in Island Park for the process. Jan said she had no interest in being involved in a top down effort, but certainly had a concern about the reduced attention from Forest Service about hydrogeological resources of Island Park. The commissioners

were concerned about top down also. Tom had heard about this idea and asked around, but nobody knew anything. It wasn't clear who was talking about a monument or not. He asked the commissioners about their concerns; they thought it was already all federal and saw no benefit of another layer of federal control. As Jan mentioned, there is concern about the Forest Service not keeping up with what's needed in the area due to budget restraints. The commissioners want to be involved in any discussions about it. Don't want a repeat of the Grand Staircase designation where the local people learned about it the morning after it was designated in the paper. The general consensus from the consortium was that they are interested in participating in the discussion. It needs to be locally inclusive and driven from the ground up. Jan offered to meet with funders and national or regional organizations to take them on tour of the area and start a dialogue. She was asked to in July and had Tom along on the trip. Jan and Tom's opinion is that it fits with the consortium project. If anyone is doing studies, it should be done under the RPSD and using the GY-Framework criteria. There may be some money that could be invested in the project that could help meet the match requirement for HUD. We could use this money from the outside and perhaps some money in the budget as well to conduct the necessary public participation. The Henry's Fork Watershed Council is interested in being the convener of the larger discussion with the Island Park community.

Tom shared one reason he thought this was a good fit for grant—if we're producing a regional plan for sustainability that is at least partially geared toward the GY-Framework, and we did this work and finished the plan in 2015, and then afterward there is a monument designation in 2016 or some time after that, it is a strategic threat to our plan that we could produce something that is drastically changed when if we don't take considerations into account in our current work.

Tom asked the consortium if anyone had any concerns about the consortium tackling the monument designation conversation?

Jan pointed out that to date, the BLM, FS, and ITD have been absent from the consortium dialogue. She thinks they would show up if this was woven into the overall RPSD project.

Doug said he doesn't have enough information on it. Are we talking about doing a study? Jan said yes, and they are still trying to frame the exact scope. Some of the money we talked about re-tasking in January would go to this, and it would be a big new component of the overall grant but also would be attracting significant investment from other groups. Doug said the description of the project should show how/if it is a regional issue/project. How would the caldera national monument be a regional benefit for Jackson? It's something to think about as we look at describing it to regional jurisdictions, HUD, etc. Jan thought it would be an interesting process to show how the GYF can be used in a scenario planning exercise, not unlike how the model code project is happening. We would be testing ideas and testing processes in all parts of our 4 county region. The RPSD that is based on Framework categories and statements of intent is a useful framework for a national monument declaration. Jan said that in accordance with the Antiquities Act, they would be required to draw up a proclamation with very clearly stated objectives for any national monument. The objectives would be of interest to all four counties to have something of that stature.

Doug asked if this is perhaps more like technical assistance than part of comp plan? Maybe we don't know yet. Tom said that the economic and social impact of a monument designation would be felt throughout the entire region for sure. These are areas where people live, play and work, in industries and geographies that overlap the monument area. The designation would affect a significant portion of our region.

Wendy asked if we have a read from HUD how they feel about it? Tom felt that they don't understand the monument project at all. They are still trying to get their head around what a designation means and how it relates to the rest of the project. Wendy said that is how she's feeling about it too. She recognized that she is not a consortium member and it's not her place to have an opinion about the work we are doing, but what's confusing to her is the 30,000 foot description of what this \$1.5M is doing. From the outside, it looks like a

series of separate projects, but what pulls them together as a whole? Greg Newkirk gave the same reaction as he reviewed the website—when you first get there, you don't see what it's all about. It doesn't feel like it's pulling together as a whole. Tom said this was a good point, and a lot of people have the same question or concern. The grant is describing a lot of different pieces of work, operating from the assumption that the Framework ties all those pieces of work together. Wendy said it was her understanding that at the end RPSD will pull it all together, but that this is hard to explain when it hasn't been embarked on yet. Jan said that the way the grant was written, it laid out 3 elements that comprise the RPSD: 1) the GYF as the guiding document; 2) the roll up of the RPSD that takes all of the projects and lays out a future scenario; and 3) the model development code which is an essential part of the RPSD. It was key that all of this was to be voluntary and not a mandate. Basically it was the elements of the proposal that was difficult for HUD to understand because COGS or other entities that have mandates were doing most other projects awarded. It was clear from the beginning that tools, codes, and directions, had to move forward in concert, and that we had to identify a plan that we all could adhere to but that each entity would be free to use what they felt was best. Wendy said she understood that aspect, but that we need a 15 second elevator speech. She shared that she is struggling to see how all these pieces fit together. Maybe that's where HUD is struggling also. Jan said if we can't put it into decipherable statement on the website, we are in trouble.

Heather asked if there was any other business before we adjourn. Jerry from HUD shared that a month or two ago, the Partnership for Sustainable Communities wanted to hold listening sessions around the country. The regional administrator would like to hold one in our area. They are wanting to hear from communities what has worked, what isn't working, and hear from federal partners about other grant opportunities coming up, grant coordination, etc. They are hoping to do it this fiscal year before October 1, and estimate they would need 1 ½ to 3 hours. It will depend on each community who shows up, and what the main issues and interests will be. Jerry hopes it will be the HUD regional administrator as well as the EPA regional administrator, Federal Transit Authority, and Federal Highways. He can't vouch for everyone's travel budgets if they all are able to attend. Wendy asked if this listening session is supposed to be focused on this particular grant? Jerry said it wasn't, but that the Partnership for Sustainable Communities is very interested in going to communities where SC grants were awarded. Jan asked if we could schedule it for our Aug 20 face to face, maybe from 4-6 after the consortium meeting? Wendy didn't think that would be adequate notification if we were looking for public involvement. Jerry thought our most likely attendees would be stakeholders, like the people who showed up at the summit in May. Jan said that food is important to have. Jerry asked if there was a community willing to host one? Then he can get the right people involved in getting the gears moving. The consortium overall thought that August 20 is too short of a timeframe. No one felt there was much chance in pulling off a second face to face in September. Will the listening session be the same people? The face to face is just for the consortium members. Jerry felt that it's critical for all (or as many as possible) consortium members to show up at listening session; the consortium is the one with insights. Jan asked if we have any other public involvement events coming up? Heather said it's possible we could hold it in conjunction with the sustainability indicators meetings, and hold the listening session as a social hour after? Tom likes the idea of doing it in conjunction with indicators work. Preferred dates are Tues, Wed or Thurs. Sept 24, 25, or 26. Heather will work with Brendle to see if those dates would work.

Next face to face: August 20, 10:00-4:00 at the Fremont County Office 125 N Bridge.