

Sustainable Yellowstone Consortium Grant Meeting March 8, 2012 Draft Group Memory

On Thursday, March 8, 2012, Fremont County and the rest of the Sustainable Yellowstone Consortium held its monthly meeting. The meeting was held at the Teton County WY Commissioners Room, Jackson, WY.

Participants

Jan Brown (Yellowstone Business Partnership), Bob Foster (Teton County Business Development Center), Heather Higinbotham (Yellowstone Business Partnership), Bill Knight (City of Victor), Stephen Loosli (Fremont County), Patty Parkinson (City of St. Anthony), Brent McFadden (Madison County P&Z), Shona Ringel (Madison Co P&Z Coordinator, GS Admin Assistant), Steve Lookabaugh (Island Park P&Z), Wendy Green Lowe (P2 Solutions), Jeff Daugherty (Teton Co WY).

Wendy Lowe (P2 Solutions) served as the facilitator for the meeting. This document is a summary of discussions that occurred (prepared by Heather Higinbotham).

Objectives

The objectives for the meeting included:

- Report from Knoxville Training (Heather Higinbotham, Stephen Loosli, Jeff Daugherty, Bob Foster, and Val Christensen)
- Report from Feb 15 kickoff and listening posts
- Division of labor for grant elements--identify/assign lead for each element, timeline and outline for moving forward, getting info up on website for folks interested in a particular team, etc.
- Outline 10-12 month operating plan starting April 1
- Clarify/define consortium liaison responsibilities to their jurisdictions
- Schedule IAP2 certificate training program

Knoxville Update

The primary focus of the training was looking at how to communicate efforts to constituents. Envision Utah was represented (a regional planning organization similar to an MPO but who delves deeper into long range planning). They had a rough start but emphasized proper messaging. The consensus among attendees/partnership representatives was that Fremont County is off to a good start (some consortium members were meeting team members for the first time in Knoxville).

The obvious question to Fremont Co team was, "Why would we not implement?" We see it as straightforward but need to create champions that will help communicate and support to those who won't read and understand but only criticize.

There was an emphasis on USDA funding and help, leveraging this grant can lead to other opportunities.

Sustainable Yellowstone website is now live. All documents will be posted on website, along with all resources from the Knoxville training and a link to scenario planning ("if...then..." statements).

HUD is fully expecting demonstrable results. 2010 group were guinea pigs. From their feedback, HUD created capacity building teams to train and help grantees build skill sets. No one built \$\$ into their budgets to attend trainings; we can move up to 10% of \$ in budget without resubmitting to HUD. We have to document *everything*: reimbursements, anything spent on the grant, including in-kind time and resources.

There are active proponents to the program nationally who are demanding accountability from HUD. Stephen sent out guidance to the consortium: please follow it!

It is incumbent upon us to develop contractual work plan and scope of work by which we'll be held accountable. On all future bids, we should be conservative in time schedules and work faster than predicted (not in reverse!).

Resend all consortium members final MOU and contact list. We need to make sure communications aren't getting caught in spam filters.

HUD wants to sign off on everything (including press releases).

1. Work Plan: 4-6 pages of toll-up into chronological narrative. Gives HUD opportunity to measure our progress/payout against our deliverables.
2. Distill work plan into measurable deliverables using HUD speak in their logic model.
3. Semi-annual progress report (narrative)

"Grant" is wrong wording: "partnership" or "cooperative agreement" is more appropriate. We don't get any money until the work is done. HUD is looking over our shoulders as we move forward.

We can spend up to 2 ½% of project budget on F&B. Per diem will be reimbursed by location.

During an August 2011 webinar, OSHC explained the rationale for requiring a Fair Housing and Equity Assessment. There is mandatory program policy guidance for 2012 in HUD materials.

1. Segregated areas, increasing racial diversity
2. Racially and ethnically concentrated poverty
3. (see HUD handout)

In social equity vs. equality, look at: work, food, education, housing, social issues.

Equitable access to opportunities of America: what you choose to do is up to you. We are responsible for the creation of opportunities for all. We need to pay attention to the social equity definition in the Knoxville handbook (page 4).

Do we have policies and programs that are allowing the equity to be shared or are we intentionally or unintentionally hindering that?

Priorities:

1. Complete the studies in each community
2. Make sure those people as groups are offered a place at the table to discuss problems and solutions

Consider “horizontal inequity”: groups (i.e. African Americans in the deep South) and “vertical inequity” (i.e. individuals).

There are compounding effects, such as lack of nutritive food, lack of educational opportunities.

The #1 indicator in educational success is of the parents: the parents’ achievement is a critical importance factor in teaching/example. Also consider that communities know best.

Our job is to identify these barriers, how to provide opportunity—*not* to solve all social ills.

Can they get somewhere (transportation)? Can they afford to live near services? Can they play in the market, get back on their feet in a recession?

Can we host capacity building folks here? i.e. Envision Utah

We have to identify where we are good and bad at providing services so citizens have access to the market place. Inability = unfreedom.

We are exporting our skills in an economically beneficial way: tourism, manufacturing.

There is an advantage for small communities: we will finally have studies and data and a model code to implement policies.

Are there any surprises to counties? i.e. undocumented workers—make sure they know that’s not what we’re focusing on.

Is there a uniform tool HUD is using to measure effectiveness of public participation?

Grant elements:

1. GY-Framework: Lead-YBP (Heather); full 3 years
2. Comp Resource Plan/Sustainability Strategy: Lead-Fremont (Stephen); last 12 months
3. Model Code Development: Code Studio (Bill Knight, Lee Einsweiler); tour in April, start in June; full 3 years (years 1-2 Teton Valley; year 3 tailor to other jurisdictions)
4. Regional Recycling: Madison County (Brent McFadden, with Heather Overholser (Teton WY) and Patty Parkinson); months 3-27
5. Workforce Assessment: Rexburg (Bob Foster lead, Scott Johnson and Doug Self); months 3-24 workforce assessment and education; year 3—implementation plan
6. Multi-modal Transportation Assessment: Linx (Kimberly Brown): completion April 2013
7. Housing Study: Teton WY (Jeff Daugherty); year 1—Market analysis; years 2-3 TBD
8. Energy Resources Assessment: Madison/Fremont (Stephen and Brent); months 6-30
9. Groundwater: Fremont (Stephen); months 6-30

10. Sustainability Indicators: YBP (Jan); full 3 years

Work Plan

First Quarter 2012:

- Complete HUD work plan (due April 1)
- Signed contracts (P2 Solutions)
- Schedule IAP2 Training

Second Quarter 2012:

- Kickoff meeting for each team
- Complete contractual HUD logic model due April 30
- Communication plan
- Public participation training
- Code Studio tour—late April

Third Quarter 2012:

- July—reconvene P2 team leads to develop integrated public participation strategy and calendar
- Scopes of work for each study to consortium to review/approve

Fourth Quarter 2012:

- RFPs out as appropriate
- Complete Streets training (Linx)