

Western Greater Yellowstone Consortium Monthly Phone Conference  
(866) 740-1260, access code 1587264#  
March 26, 2013, 1:00-3:00 p.m.

All present introduced themselves: Heather Higinbotham (YBP), Angie Rutherford (Teton ID), Bill Knight (Victor), Wendy Green Lowe (P2 Solutions), Jan Brown (YBP), Greg Newkirk (Fremont Co), Alex Norton (Teton WY), Patty Parkinson (St Anthony), Jerry Royster (HUD). This document serves to summarize the discussions and decisions that occurred.

Heather Higinbotham reviewed the objectives for the March conference call:

- HUD update
- Report on contract status
- E-Center housing study
- Website restructuring
- Report on Teton WY/Jackson GY-Framework audit
- Model code priorities: shift of focus to cities/areas of impact?
- Draft agenda and date/location for year-end summit

### **HUD update**

Tom Cluff was not present. Jerry Royster provided an update from his perspective. Jerry believes the only thing Tom is waiting on HUD for is clarification on the match requirements and clarification on the training money Stephen Loosli used for his master's degree. Jerry wondered if there is some miscommunication in the match, that Tom might be hoping that HUD will reduce the match; Jerry doesn't know that it can happen legally. Jerry encouraged the consortium members to continue sending Tom documentation to identify match (what consortium members are probably doing already), that wasn't counted before towards match that could be. Jerry stated that the consortium will be required to meet the match stated in the approved proposal because we were awarded points based on how much match we had. HUD does not require that all match come from Fremont. The consortium needs to just identify the match they have and if Fremont Co can't identify all that from Fremont then it will be critical for consortium members' in-kind contributions to meet the match. Naomi sent a list of items that can be used for match. Jan mentioned another source of match not yet considered with the advisory committee teams being formed in support of contracts; we haven't yet calculated how much time volunteers will be giving. She shared that the Indicators project will be off and running now that the contract is final and she will calculate hours for every phone call and meeting and project hours moving forward. Jerry reminded the consortium that we could count equipment, space, meeting space, and computers. HUD isn't specific that it has to be on a particular form but you have to document how you are counting your time. Heather will put together an in-kind reporting form for consistency; all consortium members will need to report monthly and make it retroactive back to February 2012. Heather will get from Tom info from HUD on what's allowable for match.

### **RPSD and Project Administration**

Tom was not on the call so this is tabled until next meeting.

### **Report on contract status**

The Model Code contract is signed. The Sustainability Indicators contract is currently being reviewed. Project start date is estimated to be in conjunction with the May 2 summit. The Regional Recycling System contract is pending. Estimated completion and start date is unknown.

### **E-Center housing study**

Tom was not on the call so this is tabled until next meeting.

### **Website restructuring**

Wendy Green Lowe talked with all consortium members and received fairly common feedback. Everyone wants the website to be organized more similarly to how the project is actually being organized, and to be more navigable. Everyone wants to be able to post documents and share info at their location as well as a schedule of what they think is coming up. Several members thought it would be helpful to be able to receive comments for each project rather than the project as a whole. The only person that wanted something more sophisticated than that was Alex, who is interested in doing something along Metro Quest capabilities at a later point in the housing study to play with preliminary ideas and let people provide input.

Website Content: there was a mix between folks wanting to upload content themselves vs. hiring a content manager. Wendy talked with Nelson Soucek (Liberal Palette, in IF, who redid her website) who is willing to redo the site architecture and navigability. He will also provide training for those who do want to post content on their own. Another optional part of the scope will allow him to provide ongoing maintenance if people don't have the skills or desire to do themselves. He explored Metro Quest online and believes he can replicate the functionality of MQ for a price more compatible with our region of the world. Wendy and Tom will put contract in place for him to take over website component. We don't anticipate needing any more money than was already allocated, so there is no additional need for consortium to review/approve. If anyone is interested in seeing the contract, let Wendy or Tom know.

### **Report on Teton WY/Jackson GY-Framework audit**

Teton WY, Jackson, Heather and Lee call 3/26 to discuss progress. Conversation about audit progressing, comments on Framework as it relates to Govt's as opposed to development. Continue in May at the YBP conference.

Lee will have draft by April 5, will do internal review then workshop on April 18<sup>th</sup> for public presentation of audit, mix in workshop components specifically with ToJ and Teton County LDRs related but separate, next step in our own process, as well as GYF Framework certification. Don't have exact schedule yet for workshop. Angie: spoke with Lee a couple weeks ago about potential to meet with Teton ID commissioners. Should we try to coordinate with that trip? Alex: plans in terms of schedule are just for the 18<sup>th</sup>. Thinking about afternoon into evening public session, then evening presentation to elected officials. Don't know what his travel plans are but don't think will be needing his time on 17<sup>th</sup> or 19<sup>th</sup>. Angie: great for commissioners to hear Code Studio's plan from CS not Angie. Angie will email about getting that on the schedule.

### **Model code priorities in Teton ID: shift of focus to cities/areas of impact?**

Bill emphasized that we as a consortium have to talk with the county commissioners. If they are not interested or receptive to using what Code Studio produces under their guidance, there is no sense in going forward with expenditures/resources/time and therefore should shift our focus to the cities. Angie stated that it is very important for any communication with the county commissioners to be a statement from the consortium and not from Angie. Bill pointed out that we as a consortium and HUD expects Lee to write code that supports the livability principles we were granted money to support. Along those lines, we expect that we won't be wasting time and the commissioners will at least entertain adopting some principles written to this standard. Those are the expectations of grant, and the question becomes: can they support this or not? If not, we should focus on the cities. Angie's biggest push is to have a really great model code written, in such a way that we can pull from it when the atmosphere is more receptive to adopting those codes.

Jerry asked for clarification on the code work. Will this be developed in such a way that is regulatory ("this is how you have to do it") or more incentives-based? Bill shared that he feels strongly about developing it through a strong public participation process. Angie sees it being more incentive-driven in further reaches of the county as far as subdivision design. All agreed that densities should be higher with respect to the downtown core. Whether it will be a code requirement or optional, at this point we don't know. We will market it heavily. Bills' reasons outlined the percentage of sharp real estate people who will "get it". Sonoran institute has a ton of data on housing and RE choice using 6 residential community samples; all suggest that baby boomers and gen Xers are looking for walkable neighborhoods.

Bill brought a request to the consortium. ITD district 6, the stewards of state highway system including 31 and 33, are putting a light in at the intersection of Main and Center St in downtown Victor. This requires some redesign on Center Street, going west. The current design is reflective of the rural state highway system, moving all parking 150 feet back from the intersection. Because of bureaucratic rules, that's what they're looking at. In their minds it is creative and innovate, but the parking is completely unwieldy and not in accordance with a form based code; it is not a complete streets system. They currently have a 5-foot sidewalk. Bill redesigned it and the city engineer is putting it on CAD. The entire community is getting involved. ITD can dictate how it's going to be done, but they are willing to work with them. Bill was asked to bring to the consortium group a request for a small amount of assistance in dealing with this (bringing someone like Joe Gilpin of Alta) to look at the design and redline it. A case can be made that this is an essential component of a form-based code. Whether it's a more appropriate fit for the contingency budget or technical assistance fund should be a collective decision. Jan suggested lumping it into the multi-modal budget and considering it as part of the overall multi-modal project, complete streets done under contract. Jan asked if Bill Shaw is involved? Bill said that he is not part of the team; it's David Alvarez and Blake (last name?) out of Rigby. Jan offered to go see Tom Cole; Bill feels it's important to work from the bottom up. Scott Fitzgerald (the previous mayor) wants to bring in someone who specializes in complete streets. The quoted figure was \$3,400; it possibly could be done for less. Jan will call Joe directly, ask him to put in a proposal to do what is needed, and get to Jan. Jan will send Bill the report from Joe's work last year.

The timeline is ASAP, 30 days or so. They have 30 days to develop something and make a community process out of it. They want a complete streets specialist to weigh in. Bill will send out proposal from Joe Gilpin and Heather will distribute among consortium to vote.

### **Draft agenda and date/location for year-end summit**

The year-end summit is scheduled for May 2<sup>nd</sup> in Teton Valley. Three projects have specific things they want to accomplish:

- Multi-modal: Jan wants to present progress to date and conduct a survey of participants related to their potential demand for services, looking at things like where they'd like to go, when, and the purpose of their trip so we can further understand the difference of doctors' appointments vs. recreational travel. She will look at a fun creative way to solicit input
- Regional indicators: the Brendle Group is prepared to come to the summit and have this be the project launch
- Technical support being provided to City of Jackson/Teton WY in efforts to certify under the GY-Framework.
- Balance of projects: brief status report. We need to make specific mention of the two components that were discontinued since the first summit last year (energy and groundwater) as well as a mention of the two new pieces, broadband and the possible addition of a new ag economy aspect brought in under the workforce assessment component.
- Regional Recycling: Heather said this will on the contract with LBA Associates. It is a possible opportunity for public involvement.

We are looking at a 10:00-4:00 meeting. The longer we can go, the better. Wendy is still trying to finalize a location. Teton Springs is not available. Huntsman Springs turned her down. Rim River responded, but she doesn't think it's a very good solution for us. They would charge us half their normal rate (\$1,300 for the day) and they do not have tables or chairs so we would have to rent them. She left a message for The Wildwood Room but has not heard back. The most recent suggestion from yesterday is the Lynn Canyon Ranch; she will look into it. The Wildwood Room is a big metal building, and will seat a couple hundred people. Last year we had 60 not counting consortium members. Angie feels that the Wildwood Room would be great if its not too expensive.

Angie asked who our target audience is: the general public, taxpayers, elected officials, or all of the above? It is easiest to invite everyone that attended last year but clearly we want a bigger impact than that. We have an opportunity to hit critical mass; it's possible that Victor would have 15 or 20 people there.

Jerry reminded us that the HUD regional administrators from Denver and Seattle are coming to the event, and we will need to make space on the agenda for them to talk. Jerry thought they would need a maximum of 30 minutes. The HUD regional administrators have already locked in that date, so it would be difficult to change our date at this point. If we do change, we need to let them know ASAP. They've been planning to come since we started talking about having it in February. Jerry also agreed with the earlier comments about public participation—make sure our location is easy to get to/find, make sure we can accommodate them if they show up. Wendy restated that it is certainly our intention to have people participate if they show up. Jerry suggested we send out a save the date notice, asking people to help spread the word. Wendy reminded the consortium that we ruled out other days of the week because of other considerations; this was the best day that week.

Jerry mentioned a presentation he attended by a fellow at Yellowstone for 32 years, who talked a lot about recycling and transportation. Is any part of the recycling study partnered with Yellowstone? He encouraged us to draw them into the partnership, especially the Yellowstone Park Foundation (we can count any funding from the Foundation as match; we just can't count federal).

Next meeting: due to the Summit on May 2, the consortium agreed to move our call a week earlier to April 23 at 1:00.