

**YBP Mobility Feasibility Project
Agency Coordination Team
Meeting Notes
July 9, 2009**

Team members present: James Caniglia, Virginia Kelly, Bill Knight, Lou Moore, Dale Reinhart
Staff, Technical Experts: Jeff Osgood, Brian Gion
Facilitator: Barb Beck

Team Tasks and Desired Outcomes

Facilitator Beck explained covered expectations for this meeting and the overall process. Deliverables for today include: identification of additional stakeholders, a list of potential benefits from the project to government agencies, a list of issues, and draft a plan to accomplish our work between today and December 2009. The group briefly discussed the geographic scope of the project and decided that all relevant individuals, agencies, and resources should be included in the discussion regardless of whether they resided within YBP's boundaries in the three-state area.

Who Else Needs to be Invited to Participate?

- Doug South, Planner, Driggs
- Kathy Rinaldi, County Commissioner, Teton County, ID.
- FAA representative working on Teton County, ID airport project
- ID, MT, WY Departments of Commerce representatives
- ID, MT, WY Insurance Commissioners
- ID, MT, WY Departments of Public Health
- Bill Murdoch, Gallatin County Commissioner, Bozeman
- Phillip Fletcher, Planner, Park County, MT
- Mike Phillips, MT State Legislator
- Andy Schwarz, County Commissioner, Teton County, WY
- Mark Barron, Mayor, Jackson, WY
- Scott Fitzgerald, Mayor, Victor, ID
- Elizabeth Scanlin, Mayor, Red Lodge, MT
- John Prinkki, County Commissioner, Carbon Co, MT
- Mike McGinley, County Commissioner, Beaverhead Co, MT
- Kathy Spencer, Planner, Cody
- Lynn Zanto, Montana Department of Transportation
- Victor Bjornborg, Montana Department of Commerce
- Greater Yellowstone Coordinating Committee—Recreation Subcommittee
- GYCC—Employee Commuting Subcommittee
- Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument
- Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area

- USDOT, Western Federal Lands Washington), Craig Dewey
- USDOT, Central Federal Lands (Denver)
- John Thompson, Economist, BLM, Billings
- Senator Tester's Office, Matt Jennings
- Senator Baucus's Office, Liz Ching?
- Other national field office reps
- Crow Tribe
- Northern Cheyenne Tribe
- Wind River Tribes
- Ft. Hall Reservation Tribes

Agency Coordination Issues Brainstorm

- Doing business in Yellowstone (and with others) requires a permit or contract. This would include transportation services.
- A special use permit may be required if NF roads are part of the system.
- Would an umbrella permit issued to the co-op allow providers to operate under it as opposed to permitting each provider?
- Municipalities may require business licensing.
- Are drivers' licensing requirements the same across states (CDL?)
- What transportation services are regulated at what levels of government? For example, qualifications, vehicles, insurance?
- How would the co-op be treated by various government agencies—regulatory and other, related to distinct businesses organized under the co-op as a whole?
- How are taxes paid, and by whom?
- How would National Park entrance fees be collected?
- Would pass through riders be assessed differently than park destination visitors?
- How much flexibility is there in the long-term concessions' contracts to make adjustments to services and rates?
- When there are ground-disturbing activities or federal funds involved, NEPA and other federal statutes may have requirements.
- What are the legal issues in establishing a large transportation system?
- What legal options are available under current regs and state statutes?
- How will organizing as a co-op affect future funding potential?
- What is the regulatory situation on each of the reservations related to transportation?
- What policy barriers are there to contend with? e.g. can't cross a boundary
- What barriers are grant driven? (some at the state DOT level)
- Public involvement is needed, now and as things move ahead, and for pilot decisions and priority setting
- What is the overall public involvement strategy?
- Perceptions of a publicly-run vs. a privately-run system will differ

- What is the government's responsibility to provide transportation services vs. private sector gain?
- Would this system cause funding allocations to change within the transportation pot so that some interests/aspects receive more funding while others are reduced? Between communities, between states and communities and federal agencies, between different modalities, etc.
- How will dispatching occur?
- How can this system be designed to be sustainable?
- What will government's role in funding be long-term?
- Resource capacity is a concern, how will the system ensure that specific locations or attractions are not over-used or that the quality of the experience is not reduced by transportation changes?
- Can government entities be co-op members?
- Who will be able to buy seats? Do you have to be a member?

Potential Benefits of the Project to Government Agencies

- Infrastructure construction costs would be reduced, delayed or eliminated.
- Road and trailhead congestion could be reduced.
- Visitor services and quality of experience could be improved.
- The need for future transportation routes could be eliminated.
- Reducing dependence on individual vehicles will alter the whole development pattern (for the good.) The pattern will be more compact and enable transit-oriented development reducing the need/cost for services and infrastructure. Conversely, less congestion could encourage cars.
- Environmental conditions--air and water quality, wildlife habitat, open space--would be improved.
- Consumers are better served and cost to government is reduced.
- Needs of aging population are better served.
- Agency employees have commuting options.
- System would provide attractive option for consumers when gas prices rise.
- Other modalities would be better linked.
- Could support development of alternative fuels.
- Would help government respond to changing demands from constituents.
- Contributes to meeting other agency goals such as reducing carbon emissions.
- Contributes to tax revenues that support local government when private businesses are financially successful.

Path Forward--Work Plan

Assignments and milestones

- Barb will type up notes and circulate to the team first and then shortly thereafter submit them to YBP for posting on the website. (by July 13)
- The list of who needs to be invited will go to YBP staff for calls.
- Team members will make contacts to invite new members as they feel comfortable and refer them to the website, instructing them to fill out the form there. (by July 31)
- Barb will ask the technical team and YBP staff to review our list of issues and provide answers on those issues that exist and that the team members simply didn't know about. The rest of the issues will be referred back to the team for further research. (by August 15)
- Team members will conduct additional research on the remaining issues and report back. (by Sept. 15)
- Products from team will be compiled and submitted to YBP (by Sept. 30)
- Summit in Cody (TBD October 2009)

Team members do not believe an in-person meeting is necessary, but would reconsider this initial decision if necessary. Due to members' calendars, scheduling will have to occur with adequate lead time for both calls and meetings.

The team scheduled conference calls for August 7 and September 11 at 0900. Barb will provide an e-mail reminder, call-in instructions, and an agenda prior to the calls. The first call will cover progress on issues, information on the progress of the other teams, identification of information needs. Barb will also brief any new team members on what has happened to date so time will not be wasted on the call bringing new members up to speed.