

Western Greater Yellowstone Consortium Monthly Phone Conference
(866) 740-1260, access code 1587264#
March 5, 2013, 1:00-3:00 p.m.

All present introduced themselves: Tom Cluff (Fremont ID), Heather Higinbotham (YBP), Wendy Green Lowe (P2 Solutions), Doug Self (Driggs ID), Bill Knight (Victor ID), Jerry Royster (HUD), Shawn Hill (Town of Jackson), Natalie Powell (City of Rexburg), Patty Parkinson (St Anthony), Greg Newkirk (Fremont ID), Alex Norton (Teton WY), Angie Rutherford (Teton ID), Wanda Adams (Fremont ID), Jan Brown (YBP). This document serves to summarize the discussions and decisions that occurred.

Heather Higinbotham reviewed the objectives for the February/March conference call:

- Status on updated project work plan/budgets for all project elements, HUD requirements
- Regional Plan for Sustainable Development and Project Administration proposed budgets and job descriptions
- Report on contract status
 - Model Code
 - Sustainability Indicators
 - Regional Recycling System
- Report on Teton WY/Jackson GY-Framework audit
 - Progress, timeline, coordination with Teton ID and model code development
- Website: plans moving forward
- Match commitments (in-kind hours reporting) and Project Team Lead reimbursements
 - Necessary documentation and process from Fremont County
- Priorities and date/location for year-end summit

Project work plan and budget for all project elements, HUD requirements

Tom is still working through logistics with HUD on the work plan, budgets, and project administration work we talked about in January. Tom stated that each avenue that seemed open in terms of solving problems on capacity has brought up questions leading to a dead end. He estimates they are still a week or two away from any concrete answers. Tom is frustrated with HUD saying they offer flexibility but following through with that flexibility. Tom wonders if he will have to identify money within the county's budget to meet the required match. Fremont county does not have the capacity for in-kind to meet what Stephen pledged originally. Tom is seeking guidance from HUD on requirements for match commitments and reporting in-kind hours. He has gotten two entirely different answers and is not clear on what they will honor. Tom is requesting that all consortium members document everything now (in-kind hours, donated meeting space, materials, travel time, etc.) so we have it ready to submit when HUD is clear on the format.

RPSD and Project Administration proposed budgets and job descriptions

The only development here is that HUD would prefer we do this in house because of the capacity building goals in the grant. HUD's concern is if we contract the work and then that person leaves, there's no one to do work moving forward. The conversation is around the capacity to complete work of the grant vs. the capacity to carry the work forward after we're done, who is in the consortium and on project teams when it's all done. It's not a question of whether can we hire someone to do it, but of overall restructuring and shuffling work items around. If we hire help to put the plan together, HUD wants to make sure we don't end up with a plan on the shelf and not enough buy-in.

Shawn Hill asked if it would address HUD's concerns if we hire a person from the region that is well established and doing work closely related to the grant efforts, who is committed to the efforts of the consortium and has a long-term interest. Heather agreed that it's critical to have someone from the local communities that has a vested interest and understands the communities in the region, who can help created buy-in and has staying

power. Tom believes that is a best-case scenario and hopes HUD would accept this. Tom questioned if we know a person in the region that fits those criteria and has the time and capability to work on this grant. Jerry shared that the issue is the amount of time that was going to be put in to do the work was originally internal; their concern is about the capacity moving forward. He does not believe HUD has a concern about hiring a contractor to do the work.

Report on contract status

Model Code: Lee Einsweiler and HUD are reviewing the contract right now. Upon approval from Code Studio and HUD, the contract is ready to go.

Sustainability Indicators: Tom is expecting the final draft today and will send to contractor for review.

Regional Recycling System: Tom hopes the draft contract will be ready within a few days. He has communicated with contractor “when it’s ready”

Report on Teton WY/Jackson GY-Framework audit

The Teton WY/Jackson GY-Framework audit is underway. Code Studio was in town Feb 21-22 to conduct initial interviews and to look at various developments under the current regulations. They have been provided with all materials and plan to have a draft for internal review by April 5. They will present to the community in April 18th after staff review. From there, the town/county will use what they’ve presented in terms of GY-F and other recommendations as they move forward with updating the Land Development Regulations.

- Tom reported that Lee seems positive about things so far.
- Alex felt there have been great interviews and folks are getting excited about updating the LDRs.

They have not spent a lot of time on coordinating with the Model Code yet. Alex and Shawn have answered questions about various tools as they arise from Lee and Colin. They hadn’t gone through a staff audit of the GYF regulations prior to the Code Studio visit. Some of the work they have done with regulations can be incorporated into the model code; they are working on identifying aspects right now. Shawn shared that the TOJ is doing its own update to their development code in the downtown area. They sought proposals from Code Studio and another firm, and will choose one firm to do the updates. Shawn hopes that Code Studio is the successful candidate. The chosen contractor will do work for Jackson that will also be useful in the model code development.

Website: plans moving forward

The consortium will need to identify a new website host and administrator. Star Moose is under the impression that they fulfilled their contract over a year ago and is not doing any work on the website moving forward. Tom shared that the contract to host is still good, and Star Moose can continue to administer the website using the logins we have, should we choose to have them host. Wendy asked where she could see the comments that she and any other consortium members submitted. Heather shared that she didn’t receive comments from anyone, and if folks sent them directly to Star Moose we will need to compile those and have them sent to her. Wanda Adams clarified the budget: the originally line item was \$25K, and to date Star Moose has been paid \$16,490 and there is a balance of \$8,510.

The website is a word-press website. Whether we have consortium members trained to do uploads, or hire someone, we need to have a usable website that is intuitive and makes sense to what we’re doing. Alex has experience with word press and doesn’t believe it will cost that much to hire someone to do restructuring. It would be smart to work with someone that will be available whenever minor work is needed. The word press format is easy to post to; consortium members should be able to upload all info themselves. Wendy will

contact the person that did work on her website and see if they are interested, and also get input on a design that will actually work. The consortium voted to go forward and pay for redesign. All comments on the website content and design need to be sent to Wendy. It was requested that all consortium members look at website and make comments. If comments were already sent, resend to Heather and Wendy.

Wendy asked if anyone anticipates soliciting comments from the public via the website, or if it is only about sharing information. Alex said that he could envision needing a tool or setup for interaction but it's still open on what that looks like. Wendy will let her website contractor know that this is something we're open to (were still looking at Metro Quest).

Priorities and date/location for year-end summit

Jan suggested we look at April 9 in conjunction with the Henry's Fork Watershed Council monthly meeting. Jan ran into Fred Hoffner, head of the Henry's Fork Foundation and discussed their upcoming meeting. The agenda for their regular meeting was wide open for April, and he suggested that we could take 3 hours on their agenda and invite all folks that are interested to come to their regular meeting and learn about the consortium. With this approach we would have a built in audience that already works collaboratively across 3 of our 4 counties. The meeting is in Rexburg at Springhill Suites. They are leaving the agenda open until we discussed at this meeting.

- Wendy has a conflict, will be in Utah that day.
- Angie stated that we need to look at what the goals of the summit are and whether that aligns with working into the existing Watershed Council meeting. What's the point of the summit, what are we doing with it and would that work in that setting?
- Tom stated that the summit is whatever we want it to be. North Dakota had a session with their legislature; other places have had an open house. HUD doesn't specify what we have to do. Tom asked what we want to accomplish with the summit.
- Heather commented that we should take advantage of the opportunity for public interaction, and not just have a summit because it's required.
- Angie sees the opportunity for the consortium to gather information and use the public in a way we might not be able to with these individual pieces of the grant. We need to define our goals before we can understand what our logistical needs are going to be.
- Wendy is concerned that we haven't delivered on keeping folks engaged that were at the kickoff last year. Any collective sense of engagement and subsequent efforts for P2 will fall flat if people feel like we haven't followed up.
- Jan shared that we wouldn't have to fit into Watershed Council agenda; they are open to designing it to meet our needs. Do we have a facilitator if Wendy is not available?

Consortium members shared general goals for the summit:

- Jan shared that the multi-modal group will be into surveying part of project and could use the summit as means of reaching out and rolling out what's already been done on the recreational trails component and work on the surveying/public input part of project.
- Another goal Jan shared is the opportunity for kickoff and discussion of the indicators project (assuming contract is signed and we are moving forward with the Brendle Group).
- Alex talked about using the summit as an opportunity for public input on housing, but they haven't made a lot of progress because we don't know what the budget will look like moving forward. They can't release an RFP until they know the budget.
- Angie stated that the model code timeline would have to be revised, based on contract.
- We need to use our goals to generate excitement around the project.
- Wendy will touch base with all project leads to get information and come up with an agenda for the session that would incorporate everything. It is important to have active work (i.e. Brendle with indicators, model code, LBA and recycling) heavily showcased at consortium.

Jan asked about everyone's availability the week of April 29th, after all spring breaks are over? Everyone indicated they were available. Jerry said that with the sequestration, they know HUD shutdown days. That week is not off days, but Jerry is gone April 25-30. He doesn't want to make us move what works for the consortium based on his schedule. The group agreed that Thursdays tend to be good days. It was suggested to look at May 2nd as an option. Teton Springs Resort in Victor was mentioned as a possible venue.

Tom will send out whatever guidance he gets from HUD as soon as he gets it, rather than wait for the March consortium call.

Next meeting: March 26th, 1:00. Wanda will not be available.