

Western Greater Yellowstone Consortium Monthly Phone Conference
(626) 677-3000, access code 8377863#
April 29th, 2014, 1:30-3:00 p.m.

Consortium Steering Committee: Tom Cluff and Jan Brown (Fremont County); Heather Higinbotham (YBP); Jason Boal (Teton County, ID); Brittany Skelton (Victor); Ashley Koehler (Driggs); Patty Parkinson (St. Anthony); Alex Norton (Teton County, WY); Jeff Patlovich (Island Park, ID); Brent McFadden (Madison County)

Consultants/Public: Wendy Green Lowe (P2 Solutions), Wanda Adams (Grant administrator), and Jerry Royster (HUD); Shawn Hill (Frontier Forward, Housing consultant); Stacey Frisk (Valley Advocates for Responsible Development)

Objectives

The objectives for the April 29th meeting include:

- Update on HUD revised work plan – Tom Cluff
- Update on Island Park Futures Study – Jan Brown and Tom Cluff
- Update on Broadband Study – Jan Brown
- Final Planning: Annual Summit
- Next meeting: May 7 Annual Summit, Victor ID

HUD Update: Revised Budget and Work Plan – Tom Cluff

The revised budget and work plan amendment submitted to HUD has been approved. Tom Cluff will send out an email summary of what has changed. Major changes included:

- Eliminating the workforce, energy and groundwater studies
- Increased budget to support additional travel and training efforts
- Economic development project in Teton County, ID
- Increased public participation budget.

There is still \$42, 093.00 remaining in the technical assistance budget line item. If consortium members have special projects that need additional support from grant funds, and are a good fit with the overall grant, they can work with Tom to draft a proposal for consortium review/vote/approval. Projects must fit with the overall grant objectives and HUD spending rules. There was a question of whether flights over floodplain would qualify as potential projects for technical assistance. It was reiterated that a consortium member would have to demonstrate how a special project fits in the overall grant and helps accomplish the purpose of the grant. Consortium members were encouraged to bring projects forward to explore fit.

The specific match requirements for technical assistance to date have been handled on case-by-case. We are looking to leverage as much additional money as we can, and want to ensure that we are spending the technical assistance money on worthwhile and relevant projects. There is no defined match percentage requirement; at one time the consortium discussed a minimum of 20% match. The goal is to get suggestions about projects before we wait too long on details.

The overall HUD grant match requirement was 33%; we have not yet met the match and need to identify additional match. Tom will send consortium the exact amount of match deficit to help the

consortium have a full picture and enable consortium members to bring additional resources to the table.

Island Park Futures Study Update – Tom Cluff, Jan Brown

The Island Park Futures Study is being scaled back from its original vision. The project was envisioned to have the Henry's Fork Watershed Council as a partner completing a portion of the work. The Henry's Fork Watershed Council has decided not to participate in the project. The overall feasibility of what had been envisioned with the futures study does not work without the Watershed Council partnership. The schedule of public meetings that was distributed at the March consortium meeting is no longer valid, and it's undetermined what will be replacing that.

The scope of this project is being revised and some of the funds are being repurposed. One new component will be an economic development base study for Island Park, to look at the overall economy of the Island Park area and update older baseline data. It will also look at scenarios for development and evaluate the economic impact. Even though the envisioned futures study isn't happening, this component is still necessary. There will be a new scope provided to the consortium when the details are worked out of how the changes will affect grant funds.

There was a recommendation that it may be worth taking a bigger picture look at the new scope, and going beyond Island Park to include the Greater St. Anthony Chamber, the town of St. Anthony or Fremont County as a whole.

There was a question about whether this project is being scaled back because of feedback or guidance from HUD or because of the change in partners? The project is being scaled back because of the change in partners. HUD views the Island Park economic development base study as a component of the overall final RPSD. The \$75K allocated for the Futures Study will be reallocated in the revised scope. The match line item of \$75K is not being contributed anymore. There are limitations on how much money can be moved from one study (line item) to a different one based on HUD requirements.

There was a discussion on possible extensions to the grant timeline, based on the approval delay from HUD on the revised budget and work plan. There technically are not extension options, as these grants were stimulus money. There is no ability to add additional money to the grant program. There are some options for extending the final deadline of grant: it must be a no-cost extension and it doesn't gain us much beyond more time to work on paperwork.

There was a significant concern expressed that the model code project cannot be completed in the remaining 9 months and may need an extension. There is a planning call with Code Studio later today that will clarify timeline and deliverables, and whether an extension is needed.

Broadband Study Update – Jan Brown

Jan Brown attended two Broadband update meetings in April, and distributed notes from those meetings to the consortium. The advisory committee on the broadband study is largely made up of Rexburg and Mad County folks; Jan is the WGYC representative. Scott Johnson is heading up the study and has ensured that the scope of the project is regional. Pages 34-35 of the findings and recommendations document recommends that an open multi-service network be implemented across the region. The study looked at 8 governance models, and has narrowed to three that are all very

different. The meeting gave active providers in the 4-county area the opportunity to share what they've done in the past few years. There is a wide diversity of providers in the region. Century Link, Fremont Communications, Silver Star and Optix were in attendance. The approach to date has been market-driven, waiting for providers to install infrastructure upgrades. There is a measurable interest and also a fear from private operators that municipalities will move forward with improvements; providers were more interested in a private-public partnership.

Final Planning for May Annual Summit

The group went through the agenda and discussed the components on which the summit will focus. The final agenda will be distributed to the consortium within the next day, once there is clarification from HUD on whether they want specific names listed for federal presenters. Everyone was reminded that this is a public meeting, not a consortium meeting.

The initial idea with combining the summit with the listening session was trying to attract as many federal partners as possible to attend the summit, in addition to stakeholders in the region. The agenda includes pre-summit tours of other consortium areas (outside of Victor, where the summit is being held), and was sent to a large number of federal officials, and to every consortium member and all elected officials in each jurisdiction. It is unknown how many federal officials will attend the pre-summit tours of Rexburg and Driggs.

The Summit will be at Teton Springs Resort. The capacity is 60 with a classroom setup or 200 with a theater style setup. To date 33 people have RSVP'd for the full event and only 6 have RSVP'd for dinner. We have to meet a minimum of 30 people for dinner.

There was a request for consistency in communications from the consortium on project components, for instance when referring to the model code, which is higher level and non-jurisdiction specific, as separate from Teton Valley's draft code, which is an actual code with the intent of adoption. Stakeholders are finding it hard to communicate about opportunities for public involvement with confusion about the components.

There was a suggestion to include a handout with a brief description of each project, 1-2 sentences from the scopes of work for those that are unfamiliar with the projects or overall grant work. The consortium felt that would be helpful.

There was a request for stakeholders or the public to sign up for an email list via the sustainableyellowstone.org website, to be notified of public meetings and events. This feature will be added to the website. Wendy Lowe is compiling a comprehensive stakeholder list for the overall grant; she sent out a request to the consortium to respond to the draft stakeholder list to add to it as appropriate for each jurisdiction or agency.

Next Meeting: Annual Summit—Wednesday, May 7th in Victor ID