



Subject Tribal Trail Connector Stakeholder Meeting #3

Project Name Tribal Trail Connector EA

Location Teton County Commission Chambers
Jackson, WY

Date/Time 15 July 2019 – 1:30 – 3:30 pm

Participants Amy Ramage - Teton County
Heather Overholser - Teton County
Jazmine Watson - Teton County
Bob Hammond – WYDOT
Dave Schofield – Stakeholder
Lisa Carpenter – Stakeholder
Dave Schuler – Stakeholder
Ralph Haberfeld – Stakeholder
Mike Halpin – Stakeholder
Darren Brugmann - START Director
Frank Lane – Stakeholder
On Phone:
Tom Holland – Stakeholder
Alex Muromcew – Stakeholder
Kevin Stogsdill – WYDOT
Carolyn Moore – WYDOT
Darin Kaufman – WYDOT
Randy Bomar - Morrison Maierle
Steve Lowham - Morrison Maierle
Jim Clarke – Jacobs
Whitney Wimer - Jacobs

Copies to Ralph Haberfeld/Stakeholder
Keith Compton/WYDOT
Ted Wells/WYDOT

Meeting Purpose

To present Tribal Trail Connector design alternatives in preparation for upcoming Stakeholder meeting on July 25, 2019.

Notes	Action
<p>1 Tribal Trails stakeholder meetings will be open to the public:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Media presence possible • No public comments will be allowed <p>If after the meeting you have additional comments/opinions on design alternatives discussed today forward them to Jazmine Watson - Jwatson@tetoncountywy.gov.</p> <p>2 Public Outreach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Park area social media group/list serve recently shared information about Tribal Trails/Future Projects • Teton County is collaborating and meeting with different HOAs to present project information and collect comments <p>3 Alternatives</p> <p>Various project design alternatives were presented: Eight alternatives were presented for the North intersection with Hwy 22. Below is a summary of each alternative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IN1 – No Build Alternative represents the existing conditions. • IN2 – New intersection for Tribal Trail Road with an underpass and access ramps. All Indian Springs traffic is directed to Tribal Trail Road by removing the Indian Springs access to Hwy 22. Coyote Canyon will keep their access, but it will be changed to a right on/right off for Coyote Canyon. Traffic from Coyote Canyon heading into Jackson would use the underpass to access Tribal Trail Road. • IN3 – Similar to IN2 except this option eliminates both Coyote Canyon/Indian Springs existing access points. Traffic from Indian Springs and Coyote Canyon heading into the Village/Wilson would utilize the new access on the North side of Hwy 22 at the Tribal Trail Road access point. Traffic from Indian Springs and Coyote Canyon heading into Jackson would access Hwy 22 through easement from the South side of Hwy 22. • IN3A – Same as IN3 but this eliminates the underpass from Coyote Canyon. This also eliminates Indian Springs access and their access will be through the southern access to this area. • IN4 – The existing intersection is converted to right on/right off with an underpass allowing traffic to access both sides of the Hwy 22. • IN5 – Same layout as IN2 but the access to Hwy 22 is via a roundabout instead of an intersection. • IN6 – Keeps access at existing Coyote Canyon/Indian Springs, but all access would become right on/right off so traffic will need an underpass. This also creates a new intersection at Tribal Trail. This would create two intersections approximately 1200 linear feet (LF) apart, which does not meet WYDOT current spacing requirements for intersections. • IN7 – All access to Hwy 22 is directed to one intersection approximately midway between the two areas. <p>4 Questions from Lisa Carpenter. Where will the existing pathway go under the Tribal Trail Connector road? Where will the new pathways go? What will the pathway intersections look like at each of the alternative being presented?</p> <p>Answer from Randy Bomar. Designs are currently conceptual and show possible locations of pathways. We have not looked into the specific locations or types of crossings at any of the locations. As alternatives get evaluated more specific design details will be added to each alternative that moves forward through the screening process.</p> <p>Lisa indicated that it would be hard to fully evaluate an alternative without knowing specifics about pathway locations and crossings.</p> <p>5 Question from Mike Halpin. Has the County gone through legal yet?</p> <p>Answer from Amy Ramage. No, but the County will be consulting with legal.</p>	

Notes	Action
<p>6 Concern from Darren Brugmann. Two-lane roundabouts are difficult for 40-foot buses to navigate.</p> <p>7 Question from Dave Schuler with Teton Science School. If the easements and Right-of-Way (ROW) were not a concern, would you put the road in a different location?</p> <p>Answer from Jim Clarke: The designers started with the environmental and property constraints mapping we developed early in the process. This shows wetlands and/or conservation easements in areas outside of the platted ROW, so that was a logical location.</p> <p>Dave indicated that the Science School might be willing to donate/swap land if there was a better option.</p>	
<p>8 Three alternatives were presented for the South intersection with Boyles Hill Road. Below is a summary of each alternative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IS1 – No Build Alternative represents the existing conditions. • IS2 – Intersection becomes a 4-way stop. • IS3 – Stop signs are replaced with a roundabout. 	
<p>9 Three roadway alignment alternatives were presented for the Tribal Trail Connector road. Below is a summary of each alternative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ON1 – No Build Alternative representing the existing conditions. The figure shows the National Wetland Inventory wetland boundaries and the location of the Tribal Trail Connector easement. Jim Clarke informed the group that the wetland field crew was in the field this week. We are planning to present the field verified wetland boundaries at the July 25 stakeholder meeting. • ON2 – Shows a typical roadway alignment. The roadway is centered within the ROW from Cherokee lane to roadway terminus. • ON3 – Shows a roadway alignment with Chicanes, gentle curves that shift the roadway from side to side within the alignment. Chicanes act as traffic calming measures. 	<p>Jacobs to present results of wetland field work at July 25 stakeholder meeting.</p>
<p>10 Four traffic calming ideas were presented. The traffic calming ideas can be placed anywhere within the project area. For simplicity they are all shown on one figure. Locations of the traffic calming measures shown are only examples not true placement locations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OS1 – Traffic calming ideas including center island narrowings, neighborhood traffic circles, roundabouts, speed tables. These are shown for visual only and intentionally not shown in specific areas. 	<p>Morrison Maierle to present photographs of traffic calming options at July 25 stakeholder meeting</p>
<p>11 Five Typical section alternatives were presented for the Tribal Trail Connector road. Below is a summary of each alternative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative 1 shows the existing conditions of Tribal Trail Road. Option would keep the existing dimensions along the Tribal Connector road. • Alternative 2 is similar to option 1 but curbs are added to the cross-section. • Alternative 3 shows bike lanes on both sides of the roadway, a 9-foot center island area. The center islands can be the full length of the project, or short stretches. The islands can also be converted into turn lanes at existing intersections. This option also shows a 10-foot walking pathway. Roadway widths have been narrowed to 11 foot to match the roadways going south. • Alternative 4 switches the pathway to the west side. The pathway will tie into the existing pathway south of the project. • Alternative 5 moves the roadway to the west side, eliminates the bike lanes, and shows a large buffer for the pathway. 	
<p>12 Feedback from Stakeholders is listed below.</p>	
<p>13 Evaluating the improvements to multi-modal will require more detailed information about bike/ped crossing locations and details. Need to show where crossings are at grade versus tunnel.</p>	
<p>14 START buses will have difficulty with navigating 2 lane roundabout. One lane or simple traffic circles are ok. Speed tables are also difficult for large buses.</p>	

Notes	Action
<p>15 Consider alternatives not within the platted right-of-way.</p> <p>16 Consider plowing/maintenance concerns of options.</p> <p>17 The Indian Springs access has legal issues that will have to be resolved if pursued.</p> <p>18 Consider larger pathway on east side in lieu of dedicated bike lanes.</p> <p>19 Potential future wildlife crossing at Bar Y</p> <p>20 Pathway locations</p> <p>21 Emergency vehicle access considered for Indian Springs in lieu of public access on to Hwy 22:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance concerns, snowplowing, type of structure <p>22 Expenditure of each alternative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more info to evaluate what is “exorbitant” cost <p>23 Next TTC stakeholder meeting: Thursday July 25, 2019, 10 am-4 pm, BBC Chambers (lunch provided)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level one screening of alternatives will begin at the next meeting • Level two screening at a later date <p>24 Traffic Model – Cambridge Systematics modeling will be discussed at next meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic Demand Model vs. Microsimulation Model 	

Figures presented during the stakeholder meeting are attached.