

Western Greater Yellowstone Consortium Monthly Call December 11, 2012, 1:00-3:00 p.m.

Bill, Jan, Angie, Alex, Wanda A, Greg, Tom, Wendy, Val, Patty,

Objectives

The objectives for the December meeting include:

- Invoices for December
- Report on DC trip—Tom, Angie
- Report on public participation plans and approach moving forward—Wendy, Tom
- Project reports
 - Model code (status of Code Studio contract?)—Bill, Angie, Doug
 - Groundwater Assessment—Greg
 - Workforce Assessment—Doug
 - Sustainability Indicators—Jan, Tom
 - Status of interviews and recommendation
 - Regional Recycling—Heather
 - Recommendation
 - Housing—Alex
 - Energy—Stephen?
 - Broadband—Angie
 - Transportation
- Regional Plan for Sustainable Development
 - Who is doing it? What will the process look like? What are the needs from the individual studies to inform the final RPSD?
- Project team lead reimbursements discussion
- Draft template for responding to Technical Assistance Requests—Heather
- Teton WY Technical Assistance Request—Alex
- Discuss priorities and structure for year-end summit, as outlined in grant proposal
- Next meeting: Face-to-face in January: select date and location

Wanda: invoices by December 20th, commissioner's process before the holidays. Checks can be picked up on December 28th.

DC Trip: weren't able to get in touch with each other while there. Tom and Mayor Stronks connected. Wasn't the opportunity for interaction that they had advertised. Mayor Stronks sat in a couple sessions he thought were informative and valuable. Tom: most of what I heard was restatements of boilerplate already seen, not informative or helpful. Not too impressed. Angie: echo Tom, big division between FY2010 and FY2011

grantees; 2010 people really looking at implementation right now. Was a lot about funding sources of where to find implementation money. 2011 grantees are barely getting feet under them, in different spot. Valuable to talk with other grantees, and talking with Naomi and some of the capacity-building folks. Useful to build capacity. Went to a couple outreach sessions that were good. Talked with Naomi about time for grant people to meet with Grant Tech Advisor and hash out details. About 350 people there, difficult to find people. Wanda: initially only had us scheduled for two, so that may have been the last required.

P2 Plans:

Tom and Wendy met and decided to change the structure of the way we've been talking about public participation components of this project. Rather than worrying so much about how we're conducting P2 for each individual component, more focus on overarching program. Pulling together what Wendy knows from each individual efforts to design an integrated P2 plan for whole project. To facilitate bringing that together, face to face in January.

Tom: especially frustrated in dealings with HUD: between people I talk to here and at HUD, documents, still difficult to nail down a clear picture of what we are picturing doing under the grant and match with HUD's picture, given approved work plan and budget. At this time in making changeover in project mgmt., HUD asking to review work plan and budget, any anticipated changes all at once, in one rush of paperwork. Look at all elements currently working on or anticipating as part of grant, identify clearly so we all know what we're all working on. Hear frequently: Stephen gave us direction but didn't explain very much. Less and less tenable on ongoing basis. Tom wants to know that consortium truly buys into every piece of it, understands value. Then write a description on amended work plan, so both HUD and consortium are all expecting same set of deliverables. Tom's concern is that HUD understands deliverables differently even though they're very poor about explaining their expectations. Want to know that consortium truly has endorsed all of the work in the grant, and not dependent on me stepping into Stephen's roll and continuing his pattern of direction.

Wendy: we haven't done anything bad or wrong just grappling with how to integrate the whole thing. P2 plan will be part of new description in January. Wanda: important. The way Stephen wanted to operate was to take bits and pieces and pull into HIS vision. None of us have his vision, so if we all get together and understand what the end product is going to be.

Tom will send out next steps for formulating list of projects and budgets to finalize when we get together in January that will satisfy HUDs requirements and make sure we get genuine buy in. If anyone has concerns about the grant itself or management of the grant, anything related to it, let's get those out in the open and dealt with too. I know there's a feeling on the part of some or maybe all that the management of grant has not been transparent enough. I see evidence, want it to be one of first things we solve as we address HUDs request for information.

Project reports

Regional Plan for Sustainable Development

Three elements in proposal and work plan. First is GYF is guiding document. 2nd is model code. 3rd is comprehensive resource plan and development strategy that all these other elements are supposed to roll into. This is what Stephen put on the white board in October—roll up, GIS layers, summation of demonstration projects from all other grant elements.

Alex: at what point do the individual studies stop and get turned over to whoever is going to put into the framework for this comprehensive resource plan and development strategy? This will affect the RFPs go out and what the respondents will need to do. Question of how this will all tie together. Jan: vision is that this would be a regional plan/overlay, suggested bigger picture look at where we stood with housing and energy and transportation so we'd have a better understanding of the collective. In proposal, perhaps best to look at what was said in proposal and then change it from there. We shouldn't redefine something without having a starting point of what's already been submitted to HUD. If we're making changes, show where those changes are. Don't want to create more confusion. Alex: housing RFP is close to ready but don't know what

responsibility consultant has to putting together those objectives and strategies based on data, or if just supposed to put together the data.

Fremont County volunteered all this time, no one really understood what Stephen was committing the county too especially with all this paperwork. Need to consider in redoing work plan: when and how is this work going to get done, is it reasonable, does it need to be adjusted? Tom: on board with Alex in not really sure where we draw the line and turn it over. Let's make sure by the end of our January meeting we do understand it. Jan: possible to call housing RFP phase 1, and just look at the numbers? Don't have to use all the money. Budgetary standpoint: might not go into as much detail if have to save some for strategy development but if only looking at numbers can go more into detail. Can do phases but will have to take a guess at budgeting.

Housing—Alex

Jan: question about Island Park. IP ranger station is going on auction block—2 acres of land, all the facilities, homes, etc. Would love an assessment to zero in on housing needs in IP for workers, seasonals, and rentals. Would love to make case with FS esp. because they are a consortium member, to look at using that property in a variety of ways, not just sell it. Alex: have to generate census data through surveying in many communities, so small that census data is worthless. In surveying have to get huge response in order to make data valid. Habitat wants to do a walk to each house survey in Ashton, can get that data but don't have budget in all communities to get that data.

Alex: talked about different options and what is needed for regional comp plan. Ready to get started on data collection but not sure from a scope of work standpoint it matters if RFP goes out in Jan or Feb because surveying should happen in peak season of summer. Lag time to prep surveys shorter but fine in timeline.

Discuss in January with overall regional comp plan discussion as to what depth and scope for study. Once housing group understands what responsibility is to regional comp plan, can design level of detail for RFP.

Model code (status of Code Studio contract?)—Bill, Angie, Doug

Contract: Tom checked with attorney, they have seen contract, reviewed it, approved it for signature, but it didn't make it to where it needed to be signed. It's been reviewed but no one can lay their hands on it. Need to find a new copy of that contract. Jan and Heather will look for copy, if can't find it heather will contact lee to send a copy.

No updates other than the stakeholder group comments that were sent out to the group.

Angie: question about getting info to the public, which website to use, who has access and control over sustainablyellowstone.org website. Is that info portal? Post it locally on Driggs/Victor/county websites? Need a strategy for getting information out. Have not been successful navigating the consortium website.

Who is in control of website? Stephen gave contact for Star Moose, and supposedly were just supposed to email Daniel to get anything on website. Website is not intuitive, hard to navigate. Conversation for January as to who should be in charge of the information, where to post things.

Post things locally in your communities. Angie: hard to keep everything coordinated. Ideally it would be linked or same info on all sites. It's a big problem and little problem at the same time. Need to decide the best way to communicate with the public about everything. Use mechanisms that stakeholders are accustomed to, just need to make sure we're consistent.

Bill: between three entities in Teton County, can agree on substance of what's going to go on website. Consistency should be easy to accomplish. Need to decide what we want to have happen with the project website. They need to be under our control. Jan: there is a contract, don't know what the terms are. Need to understand what the charges are, if there is contact management, etc. Wendy: if it's not something we can manage, it won't meet our needs as a P2 tool. Wanda will get an electronic copy and send to consortium.

Groundwater Assessment—Greg

Based on feedback, thinking we'll want to completely rethink this from the ground up. Going back to the drawing board on this. May have found solution in search of a problem rather than looking for a solution to a problem. Any other resources needed to put together scope and RFP? Greg is really rethinking, more I began to look at the company, they had a solution pre-identified and don't know if it will address the problem and need to more clearly define the problem. Groundwater is a problem but need to start at the beginning then will know what players will help the most with this. Local folks lined up, but want to make sure not spending money without having anything to show for it in the end. Jan: at least start with contacting public works directors in each city/county to inform the scope. John Millar from Rexburg very sharp. Each consortium rep to send contact info for public works director or whoever has jurisdiction on water quality. Also getting DEQ on board.

Workforce Assessment—Doug

Doug not on call.

Sustainability Indicators—Jan, Tom

Jan: sent out a separate email to folks with original RFPs. Had 6 proposals, narrowed down to 2 after advisory team scored. Provided a point for folks to submit questions (attached to Jan's email), answers and questions posted on consortium website. Had a good give and take in defining the RFP and how people responded. Recommend in future RFPs that electronic version is also required, not just optional. Required an addendum by finalists to look at flagship sustainability indicators performance report that HUD requires. Tom: got communication from HUD about reporting required that was poorly communicated to anyone on our end. Indicators we didn't anticipate any work on were now required part of project. Not clear on how it would work, went to finalist and said, give us additional response that takes into account need to report indicators. Was a nice look at problem solving ability of these two respondents.

Clear scoring for team to recommend. Jan motion: Indicator advisory team recommends that Fremont County Process: Tom says if consortium approves, he will move forward with getting contract approved from HUD and Fremont County and handle technical end of process.

Bill seconds Jan's motion. Discussion: Angie: hasn't had time to review, any reason that this is a controversial vote? Tom: no, process went well. Jan: important to remember that RFP was approved by consortium, no deviation from original scope of work except addition of flagship indicators.

Vote: Bill, Jan, Angie, Alex, Greg, Tom, Patty, all vote yes. Heather will double check that we have quorum. Jan believes it's 13 total votes for consortium. Each agency and YBP has one vote; each jurisdiction has 2 votes. 24 votes total, so over half is 13.

Regional Recycling—Heather

Heather move to approve LBA and Associates for recycling contract. Greg second. Discussion or questions? No. Bill, Jan, Angie, Alex, Greg, Tom, Patty, all vote yes.

Energy—Tom does not believe Stephen is going to be involved moving forward. We will discuss this component at our face-to-face meeting in January. Interested in consortium members' thoughts on what energy component should be. Angie: energy advisory team actually met? No. Jan had some contacts, but

Stephen wanted to be in charge. Start with clean slate in January to form advisory team. Jan: in January could be an option to reallocate budget for energy if there's nothing moving forward.

Broadband—Angie

Nothing new on broadband. Assuming that Rexburg is moving forward as planned. Jan: we wanted assurance that it is really a regional effort. Angie: Scott Johnson got back that concerns will be addressed, cost \$5,000 more and they aren't requesting additional money from us. Angie will get us a copy of the RFP, contract, timeline, and any pertinent info regarding the study.

Transportation

Jan: multi-modal assessment and development plan. Just about to finish up the recreational trails mapping and assessment exercise that Kyle leading, will be done by end of December. Complete streets done and report ready to be integrated into final report. Last phase is documenting the current supply and demand within four counties for public transportation and how our current providers are or are not meeting needs of communities. Collete Rinehart conducting interviews with various agencies. Will be subcontracting with transportation planner to essentially tie everyone together in final analysis and have a complete assessment ready for four counties to go to individual county commissions and city councils. Talked with Tom about no cost extension of time to accommodate. Happy to make sure that multi modal assessment winds up at the same place as everyone else. No more than a 6-8 month extension to complete project. Think report will benefit by third year of pilot in YNP as well as buses for byways assessment happening on Yellow ten Teton Loop, a lot more data generated and assembled at someone else's cost that will benefit the report.

Project team lead reimbursements discussion

Table until January; Doug is not on call.

Draft template for responding to Technical Assistance Requests—Heather

Jan's question: we have \$75K total left in the TA fund. Would there be a prudent move to not fund anything else until we know how many folks are interested? Call for assistance to make it a fair process or is it first come first served kind of approach? How do we make it a fair process? Does there need to be a budget reallocation?

Tom: Who is anticipating certifying? What is the cost of certification that this fund is geared toward helping with? When I say Fremont County wants to certify what is the process and the cost? Jan: \$2,400 cost to certify if you do all the work yourself. Teton WY is requesting financial assistance to do so.

Alex: in terms of putting together the materials as to whether we'll meet requirements to certify, have done most of that in house. Code Studio will be giving us analysis third party of plans and regulations to give us recommendations on how to move forward not necessarily the materials.

Jan: think we need more discussion about if it is first come first served or if we have any threshold for amounts. Precedent's already been set with broadband but now that Tom's in the picture we need to discuss. Uncomfortable with the first-come first-served approach till the money's gone.

Tom: also wanting to know with broadband and going forward, where are our controls over who is selected to receive money? When HUD decides later on they did or didn't like how we spent money, where is our justification for how we spent money? Want to know how we as a consortium satisfy ourselves to outside inquiry over awarding TA to recipients and that price is appropriate.

Jan: suggesting we do more due diligence on our process. Legitimacy that HUD will come back and ask those questions. Naomi actually got back to me the other day with interest in something. Accurate that HUD will be looking at process.

Alex: was under the impression that Code Studio was doing the model, one of the ancillary benefit of audits was looking at what is going on in other areas of consortium. Thought that Code Studio was identified contractor do to this sort of thing.

Angie: all jurisdictions interested in certifying or getting an audit, then we decide at that point, then it becomes first come first served. Due date for January or February meeting (Feb. to get permission from commissioners)

Jan: think Code Studio is pricey. Don't recall that it was an assumption they would get the job.

Alex: would be separate contract from work that Teton ID is doing, but was under impression that Code Studio was the logical extension with Teton WY to help inform the model code. Code Studio excited about the ability to look more in depth than they can under Teton ID contract in other areas in the consortium area for local examples and best practices beyond Teton ID. That's why we went this route and thought we didn't have to go through RFP process. Our internal timeline and the work we're doing to amend our LDRs in Jackson and Teton County, have sort of a timing situation where if the decision isn't going to be made until Feb or March not sure it will work for us because we might move past some of the utility of that or request will change in what we're asking consultant to do. Ready to get balls rolling immediately.

Jan: can't officially vote since we don't have a quorum.

All jurisdictions interested in January let us know if they are interested in certifying, define process then move forward with first come first served.

Teton WY Technical Assistance Request—Alex: tabled until January and any interested jurisdiction has stated their interest in certifying

Discuss priorities and structure for year-end summit, as outlined in grant proposal: tabled until January

Next meeting: Face-to-face in January: select date and location