

Western Greater Yellowstone Consortium Meeting Group Memory
Fremont County large meeting room, 101 N. Bridge St, St. Anthony ID
August 20, 2013

Present: Wendy Green Lowe (P2 Solutions), Heather Higinbotham (YBP), Jan Brown (Linx), Bill Knight (Victor), Ashley Koehler (Driggs), Greg Newkirk (Fremont Co), Patty Parkinson (St. Anthony), Wanda Adams (Fremont Co), Tom Cluff (Fremont Co), Natalie Powell (Rexburg), Val Christensen (Madison County)

Objectives

The objectives for the August meeting include:

- Review operating protocol and quorum requirements
- Update and discussion on changes to the budget and work plan
- Presentation from Envision Madison on current project and potential collaboration
- Presentation from Envision Utah on technical assistance and capacity building
- Discussion on the Island Park Caldera Monument Project

Review Operating Protocol and Quorum Requirements

Wendy distributed copies of the current operating protocol. Heather shared the previous meeting comments regarding the operating protocol. We did not have a quorum present for the morning discussions. Wendy suggested that we discuss the operating protocol and come up with proposed changes and then either make decisions at the next meeting or via email. Natalie said she could try to get Brent or Shawna on the phone to vote. Val ended up coming to Rexburg for the afternoon and we had a quorum to vote.

Wendy commented that the consortium membership is not listed among the protocol; it doesn't list the cities, counties, or other consortium members. Should we identify them? We could list them under the first bullet: include all the members and revise the total votes; the total number changed since the Town of Jackson joined the consortium. There are 11 local governments and 4 non-gov't partners, for a total of 26 votes.

Jan pointed out that we have rarely had anyone from Ashton, Island Park, IDL, FS, or BLM participate in any of the phone conferences or in person meetings. We currently don't know who the representative will be for Teton County ID. Bill felt that the only logical person to extend an invitation to would be Commissioner Rinaldi.

Jan asked if it hurts us to have 2 votes for local gov'ts? We still have to have 8 voters present to make decisions. Greg asked about the possibility of proxy votes. We discussed allowing proxy votes and the general consensus was that if they are present for the discussion and designated before the meeting, then this would be acceptable.

Wendy asked the group to identify the specific changes to the operating protocol that need to be made. At a minimum, we need to change the 24 to 26 to reflect the addition of the Town of Jackson, and add the names of each voting entity.

Greg asked if we could put a caveat in the protocol that the consortium can't vote on anything that isn't published in the agenda, and that we adhere to distributing the agenda a week prior to meetings. Jerry said he's also participated in meetings that ask for votes in advance. Tom suggested that the agencies still have a vote but aren't counted toward the total for a quorum, that we should just count the jurisdictions and

YBP as the total needed for quorum (11 jurisdictions and YBP for 12 total). We would need 6 voters present and a simple majority to carry the vote. Jan commented that she's never understood why there is a 2-vote provision for the local governments. Tom thought it was likely designed to make sure that the local governments were in the drivers seat in the process. His assumption was that the consortium was happy to have agencies and non-profits as partners but didn't want cities and counties to be steered by them.

Tom proposed we change the quorum number from 8 to 6 voters, and keep a simple majority of voters in attendance to carry the vote; that we keep the requirement for the protocol to be amended by a 2/3 vote; that we keep the requirement for a 7-day notice so that when there are items to vote on people know what they are voting on in advance; and that we distribute a call for agenda items at least 2 weeks ahead of each meeting if not more. There were no other proposed changes.

Wendy asked how we want to propose the vote on this. The consensus was unanimous to vote electronically on changes to the operating protocol. How long do we want to give people to vote? Tom felt that people should be able to vote within 48 hours. Jerry thought 1-2 days didn't seem like enough time. He suggested we add this to the protocol. Jan asked if there was a chance we could get Madison and Teton County WY on the phone today and take care of this? We could send everyone not in attendance a notice and say we're going to hold the phone open at the end of the meeting with the proposed items needing votes.

The only things on the protocol proposed to change are: include the list of cities and partners, change 24 to 26 total votes and change the definition of quorum from 8 to 6 total voters. The rationale is the lack of participation by the agencies but we don't have to specify that in the protocol.

Update and Discussion on Changes to the Budget and Work Plan

Tom distributed a spreadsheet that he's been working on with HUD. In January when we met and talked about this, we came up with some recommended changes. Tom has put together two alternative proposals. The first one accomplishes more or less the changes discussed in January. We put some numbers to that; Tom and HUD have gone back and forth on it since January. There were main changes. The first was that we will no longer do the workforce assessment, new green economy, groundwater, or the energy resources regional assessment, and to take that money and move it elsewhere (primarily personnel to help Fremont County with rolling out the final RPSD document). Some money has already been spent in those pieces of work, which led to us arriving at the conclusion that we didn't need to do those components. A second change is to increase the budget line item for additional travel, training and per diem costs—those have been higher than we anticipated. Under the Technical Assistance line item, Tom broke out what we're spending and on which projects. The broadband study was partially from workforce and partially from Technical Assistance. For convenience sake, he put a new line item specifically for the broadband study. The Victor Complete Streets work has been put under Technical Assistance. The Jackson code audit should be under TA. The Jackson code writing (\$100K, which is separate from HUD grant but is being counted as match) should be under something else. Victor staff time will need to be documented for match. The Teton Valley Economic Development sustainable plan implementation started around same time grant kicked off, and Tom is bringing that in and counting toward match as well. They are asking to do the first year of implementation under that project as part of our grant. They sent Tom a proposal; he hasn't had time to go into it in detail. He will review and we will discuss and vote to approve or not on our next call. The consortium would match \$20K from our grant and they would match \$20K for their first year of implementation. HUD has expressed a desire to have grantees do more implementation under the auspices of grant, so this is a good fit. They like to see this happen within our three year grant period.

We originally had \$100K in TA and there is \$41,550 remaining. As we identify other TA projects we can add them under this line item. Any project receiving TA should conceptually have some element of match that comes with it. For the Public Participation line item, HUD has expressed in a couple of calls that they're concerned we aren't doing enough to reach out to critical non-participatory groups (like our agencies!) and disenfranchised groups or demographics. Wanda added that we've been dipping into that fund for our meals, and the website is in there too now.

Linx is adding \$5k to its budget as part of the Yellowstone demo project, which will be a valuable addition to the overall multi-modal project. The Fremont County Economic Development Strategic Plan would be a new project—most communities felt that they had adequate economic development work going on everywhere but Fremont County. Tom put extra money in there for catching Fremont up with the other counties. The stark difference between the Island Park region and Snake River Plain region may necessitate additional studies. Tom added a \$50K contingency for additional cost of compiling the RPSD.

In the training budget, we originally had \$15k and have already overspent that by \$5k. He added funds there to send consortium members/bring outside people in for training. We may need to add some money there for per diem. That's alternative 1, and it gets the match for everything we need.

Alternative 2 is essentially the same thing except we spend a little less money on direct assistance to Fremont in rolling the final RPSD document together. We would spend a little more money on P2 facilitation. We would eliminate the Fremont County Economic Development Strategic plan and the line item for compiling the RPSD, and add the monument study, which should cover a lot of this ground already. Jan will summarize what we want to do with that.

Tom asked if there were any questions about what we've talked about so far in the budget besides the monument? The group asked if HUD has seen both alternatives? Tom talked about all of the elements with HUD but they have not seen the budget alternatives in spreadsheet form. Tom wants to go to HUD with feedback from the consortium and a recommendation for x alternative. He provided the narrative justification for why the overall work fits under the general Framework.

Wendy asked if we did a call for a vote later in the day, could we include a vote on which alternative we want to propose to HUD? Tom said yes and that his recommendation is alternative 2. The Fremont County commissioners have endorsed the concept of moving in that direction (of the monument study). Tom needs the consortium to buy into it, and if the consortium doesn't then we need to support alternative 1. Bill said that it's important that it's not portrayed that it's already predetermined that we want a monument, but rather it's actually analyzing the pros and cons and impacts of having a monument which will allow us to make a decision whether we support the monument or not.

Wanda pointed out that the personnel line item goes down by \$110K between alt. 1 and alt. 2. Alternative 2 would be getting Fremont off the hook of having to document \$110K of match for in-kind hours.

Wendy said that as a facilitator she has some concern about calling a vote later in the day when people haven't had the benefit of hearing the presentation on what's been proposed. If the vote fails, we could fall back to alternative 1 or we could say we need to have a subsequent meeting. Could we send this budget to all the consortium members and encourage folks to call in?

Tom said if we need to take another week to make sure everyone's up to speed and have a call-in vote or email, that's OK. Natalie will make a call to see if we can get another person from Madison County or Rexburg. If so, then we have a quorum and don't need to do an email vote or have folks call in.

Wanda asked who would do the RPSD in alternative 2, would it be part of the caldera study? Tom said it would have to go out for bid. He is looking forward to seeing a bigger response than just a couple of people. The extra \$30K on public participation is related to caldera study. Wendy said that part of the reason why P2 to date hasn't been inclusive to disenfranchised populations is that they really aren't critical stakeholders for the specific studies. The monument study will cast a pretty wide net and we need to do a good job. Tom also said that part of the base rationale for a monument analysis is that it has to be hyper local and clear that we're generating ideas and receiving input from local impacts and that we aren't merely walking through the planning process. We are actually going out and rounding up input. The Commissioners and other people who have been talking about this, none of them are interested in doing it if it's not genuinely inclusive of local priorities.

Wendy asked if this was in part a reaction to the monuments that were appointed at the end of March? It was perceived as coming down from on high (she used Grand Staircase Escalante as an example). Jan said the most current ones were bottom up. Do we have a description of what they did for public involvement? We can get it. The proclamations themselves make it very clear that existing uses (such as collecting firewood and pinion nuts) are still allowed. In those instances, it was clear that local concerns are reflected. We would say something about huckleberries and mushrooms.

Ashley asked about alternative 1 and the Teton Valley Econ Dev. plan, if those projects are supposed to be templates for everyone. Is Fremont hoping they can pull from what Teton Valley does? Tom said no; because it was done at the same time and we're rolling the results from that into the final RPSD, and will include that work as match. Alternative 2 doesn't mean that the Fremont County Econ Dev. Plan isn't going to happen but that the monument study is going to include the Econ Dev. Plan and it will happen as part of the process.

Wendy asked if there were any more questions for Tom as to proposed changes in the work plan and budget besides what is proposed for the Island Park Caldera monument assessment?

Ashley asked on alternative 2, the compilation of the RPSD should be broken out on its own line item. She felt that it seems like a critical piece and should be specified and given a line item.

Jan asked if there were there any other modifications to original budget line items aside from those discussed? No, Tom said he has discussed all the changes. Some of website cost has been moved to public participation.

Multi-modal Assessment update

Jan has identified an intern, Katie Wilson, who is head of IP planning commission finishing up her masters of GIS. She is interested in making her project an interactive map, taking the recreational trails network Kyle Babbitt started and building on that. Jan will be working with her advisor. The group asked how one would interact with the map? Instead of just a PDF you could go in and click on the space for more info, and it would be an internet based interactive map with pop ups for more information. She's very excited about having a product of the multi-modal plan that will try to achieve the goals that the entire advisory team really wanted. Ultimately it will be posted on sustainable Yellowstone site, and she is also looking for a recommendation on whether Fremont County or Linx would house the interactive maps. She will be convening the advisory team again for all the pathway groups in October to map out pathways.

Jan asked if it is ok if we reimburse travel costs for Katie Wilson to come up from Pocatello for meetings, etc.? It would come out of the multi-modal contract. We can't pay her but can we at least offer to help with expenses?

Another part of the multi-modal assessment is the Linx bus in Yellowstone and Yellowstone Gateway Connection service. Jan passed out schedules from the summer. The service operated from June 4 through this Friday (August 23). The WYDOT grant covered 50% of total operating costs for the purple, green, red and one orange line loop. Linx had to raise gateway partner funds to fund the south loop and counter clockwise directions. They didn't achieve their set goals so are ending early. 70% of their ridership has been park concession employees. They had 2,400 boardings in 11 weeks. Wendy asked if this was their only choice besides a personal vehicle? Yes, there is no shuttle in Yellowstone except Linx. They installed handcrafted lodge pole pine signs that had to meet NP specifications. Linx also purchased bike carriers for the sprinter vans. There is a big cycling event in Yellowstone now; quite a few folks are wanting to go into the park so the carriers got a lot of use. So far the ridership is not great from Jackson, Cody or Riverton because it's the first year. Those are the routes being supported by the WYDOT grant so those are the ones continuing. They did receive a marketing grant from Idaho Travel Council that helped with a big push these last 5 weeks. 27 countries were represented in the ridership. Their primary ridership is employees without cars and international visitors. It's the folks who are used to looking at rail or bus timetables. Linx has relied on ticket vendors because the concessioners are the only ones allowed to sell tickets in the park, but it was a challenge because they had trouble answering travelers' questions. What we want to do with the multi-modal assessment is compile a 3-year report on the pilot demo in Yellowstone and provide recommendations to the park service on how Linx can contribute in the park. The recommendation is that we look at public transportation more like a utility than as a commercial operation. That is how Yellowstone views its concessions. They won't put out a small public transportation bid for service unless there is an opportunity for profit. Nowhere in the country is public transportation a profit-making enterprise. Inherently transportation is a public supported enterprise. The big conversation in Yellowstone and outside will be how we can have a system that has a public-private partnership to make it work. We can make it affordable and meaningful through the Linx coop. We should figure out a way where we in the region's rural areas can cross long distances in a way that's cost effective and navigable. Salt Lake Express operated the orange and green line in Jackson and the park; Karst ran the blue line; Xanterra ran the yellow line; LP Transportation ran the red line; and the purple line was Wind River Trans Authority. They are running to Jackson 3x week at 195 miles. Linx wants to be able say what the ridership issues are. It's amazing how many folks want to fly out of Jackson because of the great deals at their airport. The Town of Jackson supported the demo as well as the Jackson chamber; they wanted to extend transportation beyond the Start bus. The pink line was by reservation only with YLoops road trips out of Cody, and no one took it. We will take it off the next map. Jan passed out three timetables of the schedule that is starting on Saturday. They are dropping the orange and blue lines even though those had the highest ridership. The international employees are leaving (visas run out), so the drop will continue into September. Xanterra will operate a bus out of Gardiner to Grant and connect with the other lines. This will be one-way service, not day trip round trips. It is a seasonal change, 5 weeks with the fall schedule to see what interest there is. It is largely (2/3) paid by the grant. WYDOT really wanted to see the system operate through September. This is primarily because of the childless couples and seniors, regional folks who go in the park in the fall shoulder season. They will be looking at the profile of ridership in the shoulder season. It will have reduced frequency and they will measure the impacts. Jan provided an example of a rider who planned her entire trip with Linx. She will fly into Billings, get on in Cody, spend 2 nights at Old Faithful, 1 night at Mammoth, 1 at Lake, and then travel down to Jackson. She can do it even with this reduced schedule. She is from New York and Indian by heritage. She asked, "Why would anyone drive a car in Yellowstone?" She was frightened to drive on mountain roads, and felt it was safer to take public transportation. There have been people who asked if part of the master plan is to ban private vehicles in parts of park; this is not part of the plan—the YNP park superintendent wants any transit system to be complementary to cars and a sound alternative to private vehicles. Give people the option to park their RV and not move it. They will document for the NPS but also in the multi-modal plan, not just inside the park. It's how this region could look at making the system make sense for all of us and have better connections.

Salt Lake Express starts their morning run from Rexburg, not Idaho Falls. People can get to West Yellowstone by 8:30 am then get on a bus to get into Yellowstone Park.

The Community Transportation Association of America is putting in an application for short-term assistance to look at the numbers from the summer service; this will be a 3rd party evaluation (CTAA time will be included as part of the match) and they will take all the info from the pilot and give an analysis of what it means. We are also asking them to assist Rexburg through their next steps of implementing a new system and what financing is available. The third component is an assessment of how to improve the co-op as business model for transportation. Outside perspectives will be folded into the final multi-modal plan. They are scheduling field trips for September 24 to Bozeman and September 26 to Jackson for exploratory meetings for interested local gov'ts in the consortium to join Rexburg, who is a catalyst for this. Natalie shared about the TRPTA issue. They are trying to form a walkable campus in Rexburg by reducing parking through mixed-use zones and development. There is a critical need that students still can get to Wal-Mart, the grocery store, etc. Winter brings cold temps and it is a long walk. There is a need for in town transportation. TRPTA's proposal did not meet the needs of Rexburg (they proposed to operate 8-5 M-F). Their needs are specific with students being the main riders who also need to go places in the evenings and on weekends when not in school. Linx is the umbrella for all these other programs, so Rexburg enlisted Linx to take a look at how we can meet their needs. Natalie will go into it more with her Envision Madison presentation.

Jan felt that it seemed silly for the multi-modal project to not align with what's happening in each town, which is the reason for these field trips. We need to think in terms of connectivity with all communities. Her goal is to get on every city council and county commission agenda in November. The meetings don't overlap so it's doable. She will work with the pathway groups and anyone else that's interested to host a public open house an hour before the scheduled meetings at courthouse or city buildings so everyone can look at the maps and talk with them, then she will make a formal presentation to the councils/commissions. Jan will take all the input and submit the final multi-modal section of the RPSD at the end of December. She will have to do more surveying than the data that was collected at the May 2 summit. In addition, the Buses for Byways research that's going on with ITRR will touch on our area. Right now there is not enough ID data in there. Part of her thinking is to get the links out to our four counties more intensely. Then it's independent. We have really good data from Jackson but are lacking ID. Quotes she has gotten from elected officials state that "Linx is the future, we have to go this direction." How do we get all four of our counties on the same plane and how we can move that direction? Wendy said that in addition to the demand piece, has any part of the work looked at how to do a better job of marketing the opportunity? Under a different USDA contract, YBP had a marketing firm look at how to market Linx around the parks. Wendy was thinking about how to actually understand what a time table is. The estimate to properly market Linx over the first three years was that it would take \$2.5M. There are such different audiences and markets of traditional media, and then there are the challenges in the park with no Internet or cell coverage. We have to cover all communication venues. To properly do year 1 was \$680K, which is twice the cost of running the service. Salt Lake Express said their most successful marketing is to just run the buses. Kathy Pope said it took 4 years of the West Yellowstone service from Rexburg before it became profitable.

Jan said what Linx really needs is something called a "mobility manager" in the transportation lingo. The concept is that co-op members will benefit from increased ridership for all. She is trying to get the concept ingrained in the transportation sector that working under a co-op is beneficial. Tom said there is also the cold hard fact mentioned earlier that you have to subsidize public ridership in any transit system. If they have to be subsidized to operate, they won't have cash to give to marketing.

Wendy shared about going to Old Faithful for 5 days of skiing. She drove to West, rode the snow coach, or whatever is required when you book reservations. But then when they got there, they had to procure services from somewhere else to do the skiing. How much of an impediment is it that winter is a totally different reality than summer with transportation? The stories of all these people getting there were fascinating. She said it's mind-boggling trying to go to Yellowstone in the wintertime.

Tom felt that it's bigger than just the park; transportation is a key challenge of the entire region. There are different economies in different halves of the year. Jan agreed that the multi-modal assessment has to address winter separately because it's a totally different story. In winter, everyone wants to go from Jackson to Bozeman. If we could include transportation as part of ski safari package, people will book 2-3 weeks and ski different resorts but they don't want to drive between them. It has to be small scale with greater flexibility for Europeans. Jan was told that Xanterra is no longer going to be doing transportation shuttles, which opens up anyone else who wants to do shuttles that aren't part of an interpretive tour. Shouldn't Linx be doing these connections? Link #1 btw Rexburg and Jackson and #2 option to get into Snow Lodge. We should do it as part of a package, from Bozeman or Jackson. It's business planning.

Envision Madison presentation

Natalie Powell from the City of Rexburg gave a presentation (see power point) on the Envision Madison effort. The purpose of Envision Madison is to "ensure our residents that they will be able to choose their own future and pursue the broad public participation to capture a common dream; present the public with real options to ensure quality outcomes; create a vision that reflects the values, voice and vision of the public; and together determine the strategies which make the most sense to implement".

The Envision Madison Partners include the City of Rexburg, Sugar City, Madison County, BYU, ITD, and Rocky Mountain Power. They hired Envision Utah to guide them through the envisioning process. They will complete a current conditions model; conduct a quality of life study; and develop themes and scenarios based on public input and current laws and zoning practices. From these studies they will create an action plan reflecting the wishes of the community, outlining short and long-term implementation steps. The timeline is to hold kickoff and public workshops in the spring and summer of 2013; in the fall 2013 taskforces will report and conduct data analysis; in the spring of 2014, they will complete the final report and Envision Madison action plan.

Heather asked how the consortium could help in this effort? The transportation area is a great place to start, and is much better explored at a larger scale.

Envision Utah presentation

Christie Oostema is the planning director for Envision Utah, which is based in Utah but providing capacity building assistance throughout the region and nationwide. Christie introduced herself and gave her background: she has been in the planning world for more than 15 years, and has been with EU for 5+. Envision Utah was formed in the mid '90s to evaluate and address growth issues in the region, along the Wasatch front and Salt Lake City metro area. EU is a non-profit partnership of businesses, government and community leaders that would implement grass roots processes to figure out future growth. They are a capacity building service provider for sustainable communities grantees. The Partnership for Sustainable Communities identified 8 capacity building entities. Envision Utah's area of expertise is scenario planning/regional visioning. They are tasked to provide assistance and build capacity so that work continues after each grant completed.

Christie outlined 4 components of visioning/scenario planning.

1. Values driven planning, to address what matters most to people.

2. Partnership building, to help identify who is impacted by a planning effort and who can implement.
3. To help regions identify issues, craft their story, and narrow down what they are trying to address.
4. Teaching tools and techniques related to scenario planning and community engagement techniques.

They also work with the implementation piece, moving from vision or plan and figuring out an implementation framework for on the ground impacts. They work with communities to line up the people and resources necessary to achieve their goals. The process of regional visioning is a valuable tool to meet difficult challenges and create sustainable communities. They use scenarios, or the ability to look at various future paths, to understand the long-term consequences of today's choices and short-term actions. She heard two potential options in conversations with consortium members. One might be with economic development and helping to bring together and map task forces around various economic development goals and objectives. Another area is more in-depth training in scenarios modeling. It sounds like we have a good primer on the overall process, and at this point want to understand how to model from a technical perspective with a land use software like Envision Tomorrow plus. They can train a group of people in how to use the software. There is no cost for the software; it's open source. Tom asked if that would come later in a process, after a lot of the smaller studies are done? Christie said it would be helpful if we wanted to do training like this to do it sooner so we understand what the tool can do for us. EU used it at the front end to create a baseline so they understood if current trends were to continue they could project what their region might be like. You can compare that baseline or reference to alternatives that the public may create in response. Jan asked if basically you need equivalent inputs to make that work? Shawn said there are a couple of components to the grant that seem like this would make sense, in particular the Multi-modal assessment and recycling study. Can we incorporate those in scenarios modeling? Or is it purely a land use and growth tool? Can we look at multi-modal needs if a certain scenario were realized? One thing the model can do specifically is look at development patterns; it will evaluate how many transit trips that type of pattern might generate. It works best in localized areas. EU does often coordinate with local MPOs. We questioned the applicability in our unique context: Shawn stated that we have fairly significant commuter sheds, with Teton Valley ID as a great example. Jackson is the employment center for Teton ID. This also exists to some extent in Fremont and Madison counties. How can we manage our commuter needs? We could gain an understanding from a model of likely or desired land use patterns, then understand what commuter sheds might look like and apply it to multi-modal needs as well. Shawn and Christie talked about the bookend of Envision Madison as part of the overall regional planning, and future land use patterns are already pretty well defined. In doing regional scenario modeling, we can take those two counties and use them as one set of defined inputs, then take various inputs with varying levels of development and incorporate into the model. Jan said we have a number of small studies and disparate projects, is there a modeling tool that can take everything together? Do we have that need as we move toward the overall plan? Can the software integrate everything? Christie said if we have an understanding of land use patterns, we can model and get outputs showing water consumption, energy, transit trips, a lot of other outputs based on land use inputs. Jan felt that it doesn't fit here. There are multiple types of utilities. Bill talked about the two cities that are attempting to change land use patterns in Driggs and Victor. The point is to change, not react and model from the point of origin in a conventional manner. The RPSD is supposed to be a voluntary guide or map to the future. At the beginning we had to explain to HUD that it would be voluntary actions to align interests for mutual benefit, but not a top down planning exercise. Shawn brought up the Wasatch front example where EU did scenario modeling. It really wasn't so much an exercise in coercing various communities into a preferred alternative, but more educational. There was a packet sent out to every household. At the household level and at the community level, people could identify their preferred scenario. It provided some definition and parameters for the discussion. It encouraged casting a wider net, so everyone could chime in early and often. It was a platform to outline ideas and test impacts. It provided info people could use to evaluate which scenario makes sense for them.

They can understand implications for property taxes or whatever measures matter to them as a community.

Jan asked Christie if she had any experience with MetroQuest and how it compared to their software? She said her co-workers found it to be very expensive to customize and had a noticeable lack of flexibility. She thought the graphics were fun, and enjoyed it as an observer. It's a great tool for visual learners. Shawn said we've talked about the elevator conversation and how we let the layman understand the bigger scope of our project. He thinks something like this could really help us in the public outreach and engagement component that we are lacking.

Jan asked if it made the most sense to consider asking Envision Utah to help us design a technology based tool when we get to the point to reach out on the four-county scale as we get to RPSD rollout? It seems premature to do something at this time. Christie said that their contract ends at the end of this year. Christie said she understands that we're honing in on our work plan revisions and if it's helpful, she would love to look at the final work plan and see if there are specific pieces that would be apparent in that work plan that would make sense for EU to help with. She doesn't know what tasks we have to tackle at this point. Shawn and Christie could chat more and outline potential ideas for the consortium based on the tasks we are trying to complete. Shawn said once we know if we are moving with just the RPSD or the full-on monument study, that decision is necessary before we move forward with anything with EU. Technically Envision Utah's contract is up at the end of September; they've filed a three-month extension that will be approved. The capacity building program is being renewed, and they are on a team that includes all of the current capacity builders that submitted a proposal. They haven't heard yet if they've been awarded. If they are successful, they will start the next contract at the end of September and go for another 18 months.

Island Park Caldera Monument Project Discussion

Jan shared that there are five national groups already lined up to get involved in the study. She is proposing to jump in line in front of those national groups, as a representative of the locals to define the values, geologically, ecologically, historically, that need to be preserved. Jan was personally invited by the national interests to be involved in the effort. She said she wouldn't participate unless it was part of the HUD effort and used the GY-Framework as a guiding document. There are currently four different foundations willing to step up and offer funding. Representatives asked Jan to give them field tours of Island Park because no one knows anything about it, which she did in July. One foundation doesn't like to work with anyone else or have their name out there so they got a private tour. Several are Seattle based: Wilberforce, Harder, and Brainerd foundations sent program officers for a trip with Jan and Tom and YBP board chair Arthur Kull. Their conclusion at the end was "we had no idea these natural resources were here", and they all thought it was a great idea and were willing to participate. The National Wildlife Federation and Idaho Conservation League are also interested. All players are circled around the former NFS supervisor Jim Caswell, who was head of the Office of Species Conservation for Kempthorne. Jim was then head of the BLM under Kempthorne, who directed Jim to do a monument study without any public involvement. They got within a few months of having the Island Park Caldera National Monument imposed on Fremont County from the Bush administration. Jim thinks it still should happen but is absolutely supportive of a locally driven process. He thinks it should take the entire Island Park and Ashton districts above the hill and maybe even include Ashton, and look at all federal land and study for possible inclusion in the national monument. Originally it was going to be just Mesa Falls. He wants to look at all the hydro-geologic resources represented in this place, cultural resources, existing recreational trail and use, motorized included. The worst that could happen is to make it sound like a wilderness designation or imposition of new scenario—it's not. A national monument designation would have to protect winter snowmobiling, and whatever comes out of current OHV. Jan's greatest concern is the movement from eliminating the Island Park ranger district and pulling Forest Service resources out of the community. This

means less everything—investment, maintenance. She sees a fragmentation of land management designations and uses that are no longer coordinated. Less presence and investment while use numbers go straight up is not a good combination. We would end up with forest that is a fire hazard and ill maintained. National Monument designation changes management priorities. The forest service has their own priorities based on budget allocations. Monument designation establishes priorities and principles. It can protect our local federal lands from dissipation. It will preserve hunting and fishing. It doesn't change funding.

Wendy asked how Jan proposed to engage GYC rather than putting them in a position to sabotage? Jan thought by making sure that Fremont County is a full partner, it would protect the process. We need to invest and integrate this project into our HUD process, and have the congressional folks say the same thing. We are studying the area to see the merits of a designation with the public fully involved. Jan approached the Henry's Fork watershed council who has a 20-year history of trying to have fragmented interests work together. BLM, state land, private, Bureau of Reclamation, state park, fish and game, would all be involved.

Brent said that this to him sounds like a precursor of trying to expand Yellowstone National Park, which they've been trying to do for a long time. Jan said this would be Forest Service not Department of the Interior. It would complement but remain distinct from YNP; it still protects geothermal resources but even more so our own springs that feed our aquifer. 25% of the Snake River system generates up there from snowfall. The aquifer system for the entire southern Idaho agricultural economy relies on these natural features. Why not have a national monument that not only preserves and recognizes the water resources but allows us to develop economic resources?

Jan feels that what happens in Island Park matters to the neighboring counties. Why can't we make sure that through our planning process we do the right thing and actually get some direction? Jim feels that we could test out collaborative management process with a local board of advisors as the governing entity. There would be other players at the table besides the Forest Service that administer any management plan. She gave an example of the Idaho Roadless rule that resolved the roadless issue statewide. That was a way of saying it can't just be the federal agencies that have the final say.

Tom said it is the commissioners' intent that Fremont County is the host of the study. There is not a preconceived notion that a monument designation is a good idea; it's an objective study with reasoning why or why not. Wendy said for public participation, we have to make sure we have people that are fearful or concerned at the table.

Jan emphasized that this study/determination of designation is going to happen whether the consortium is part of it or not.

Bill asked why we have to make the decision of the HUD budget reallocation today? Tom said because he has to get a recommendation to HUD about how we are changing our budget. It could wait a week for further discussion on the monument study. Greg pointed out that this \$120K was money that was originally going to be spent up in Island Park for a different study (the groundwater). The pieces of work we aren't funding are the ones we voted on in January.

Jan feels that the study would impact all four counties, certainly from the multi-modal and recreational trails analysis. We know that there are other groups in Washington pushing for a monument designation. We don't know their priorities. The Fremont County Commissioners directed Tom; if we do this, that we have to have our meetings in Island Park or go get the locals from Island Park and bring them to the meeting, to make sure the stakeholders are involved.

Tom's preferred option is option 2 that includes an assessment of the Island Park Caldera monument that is objective as possible that would include the RPSD as part of the process. The commission wants to be informed by what the citizens of the county think is the right thing to do.

Alternative #1 does not have monument study in it. One of these two alternatives needs to go forward to HUD with a recommendation from the consortium. Wendy reminded the group that the consortium members are representing 26 votes. When we call it to vote, we are trying to reach a wise decision for the consortium as a whole. She said some of the consortium members might need to consult with others before voting, while some may feel comfortable voting now. Brent said he could talk with the Madison County commissioners on Monday.

Wendy asked how many people in the room felt qualified and able to vote today? She pointed out if we delay the vote and go to all voters, there is a challenge that all voters won't have the information discussed in the meeting today.

Patty moved that the consortium recommend alternative 2 of the budget that Tom prepared to propose to HUD. Heather seconded.

Jan said that the Henry's Fork watershed council co-facilitators were both present at the commission meeting and have both committed to put the watershed council into service to do a whole year of meetings based on the GY-Framework. The concept is that the monument study would be the paperwork or documentation needed to certify under the Framework.

Brent wanted to clarify that this is no out of pocket to any of the city or county entities. Tom confirmed.

11 votes in favor (Fremont, St. Anthony, Madison, Victor, Rexburg, YBP). 0 opposing. 2 abstaining (Driggs). 11 absent (Teton WY, Teton ID, Ashton, IP, BLM, FS, IDL). Motion passed.

Vote for proposed changes to operating protocol:

- Add to first bullet names of cities, counties, and other partners
- Change number in first bullet to six
- Change quorum to six in the 4th bullet
- Voters must be present for discussion to participate in the vote (physical or virtual)

Tom made a motion that we change the operating protocol to accomplish the 3 listed changes and add that voters must be present for the discussion, physically or via web or teleconference. Heather seconded.

Discussion: Brent was concerned about having less than half of the voting members present.

Tom repeated the intent of this change on the quorum is that we will base counting for quorum purposes on the local jurisdictions. We won't count the agencies attendance to affect whether they show up or not; our hands have been tied at times because the federal agencies refuse to participate.

Ashley asked if members could vote after the meeting, if we email out? No, the consortium agreed that in order to vote they have to be present for the discussion.

Votes: 13 in favor (Fremont, St. Anthony, Madison, Driggs, Victor, Rexburg, YBP), 11 absent, 0 opposed, 0 abstain

Other Project Updates as needed

Jan revisited the multi-modal grant through CTAA for technical assistance for the city of Rexburg, the 4-county multi-modal plan, and YNP pilot analysis/interpretation of numbers. She needs to show local

support from the consortium (a simple checkbox on the application). The people in attendance at the meeting have been advised and are supportive of Jan submitting this application.

Code Studio update

Code Studio was in Teton Valley July 28-August 2 for stakeholder meetings and design charettes. They rented locations in Victor and Driggs for the week. There were overview presentations in each town on Saturday, followed by staff and consultant workshops on Sunday, then stakeholder meetings M-W, and a concluding presentation Thursday. There were six different groups, including real estate, downtown, advocacy, and real estate design. Each held a roundtable discussion. Code Studio generated character maps/regulating maps. The current term is compact walkable development. In conventional zoning, use is everything and must be segregated. With CWD, the focus is on community-generated form.

There are 5 members of the team: 2 principals (Lee and Colin),

The next step is to code this to make some variation from the study legal and doable. They will come up with a draft code. Bill can show almost conclusively that this has opportunities for the citizens of Victor who have 1-acre lots to be able to cut them up and make money from it. It is not universal. Ashley said the template of a model code would be universal for all communities.

There are two primary ingredients: 1) you have to have growth or the potential for growth; and 2) you need demographics that can show trends.

Wendy asked a clarifying question for Tom. If we take alternative 2 to HUD and they say no, what happens then? We'll worry about it then. We will have to find out what their problem is in that case. Jan said if they have the understanding that this monument study helps us toward the RPSD that they have had a hard time understanding, they will feel better about it.

Next call: Monday, September 23rd, 1:30-3:30 (moved from Tuesday because of Streamline transit system tour for multi-modal project. Tom and Brent want to attend tour)

Meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.