



Stakeholder Committee Meeting #10 Minutes

Tribal Trail Connector Project

**Date/Time:** Friday, January 21, 2022, 9:00am-12:00pm (via Zoom)

**In Attendance:**

**Stakeholders:** Lisa Carpenter, Ralph Haberfeld, Tom Holland, Lindsay Kissel, Frank Lane, Scott Pierson, David Schuler, Colby Stevens, Virginia Powell Symons, Deb Weursch

**Teton County Staff:** Heather Overholser, Amy Ramage, Jazmine Vosika

**Consultants:** Randy Bomar, Tim Brugger, Jim Clarke, Brian Freed, Whitney Wimer

**WYDOT staff:** Jeff Brown, Keith Compton, Bob Hammond, Nick Hines, Darin Kaufman, Matthew Oolman, Peter Stinchcomb, Kevin Stogsdill

**Jackson Hole Land Trust Staff:** Derek Ellis

**Minutes taken by:** Chris Clabuesch (Teton County)

**Agenda Items:**

1. Welcome
  - a. Introductions
  - b. Meeting Goals/desired outcomes
  - c. Ground Rules
2. Project updates since June 2021

**Geotech Updates:** Study finds it is feasible to construct a road in areas outside of fen wetland (as laid out in 4 alternatives); groundwater (GW) levels vary in this area.

Dave Schuler: "What are cost implications for GW near surface level?" – higher dollar amount, more than traditional road section. The road alignments being looked extending north of existing Tribal Trail Road all are within the platted easement, out in the middle of the agricultural field.

North Slope – Geotech data show that it is possible to build a retaining wall to stabilize the hillside.

**Groundwater Monitoring:** 3 different sections for wells; Teton Science Schools (older wells), MW21 are monitoring wells installed in 2021 in the valley, 4 wells in WYDOT right of way installed by WYDOT in 2020.

FEN - Groundwater elevation remains consistent throughout the year.

UPLAND – significant changes in groundwater elevation.

VALLEY (open ag field) – less variation in groundwater elevation, shows water is moving underneath the pathway wells.

How is irrigation affecting the data? Fen GW levels remain consistent regardless of the water coming from Brown ditch.

Construction along existing two-track road and WY-22 both impacted the fen – preservation of what remains is of high importance.

Alternatives we will be discussing will not have an impact to the FEN, that was a priority established early in the alternatives process.

Most of hydrology from valley does not flow into fen. Water entering the fen comes from the direction of Coyote Canyon. Distribute weight of road to minimize compaction.

Is there a proposal to realign the Brown Ditch? Unlined ditch does not influence the groundwater much. Possibility of piping the ditch to outflow into the fen.

We were unable to install some of the wells in May and had to wait until August due to the amount of water – therefore, do not have a full cycle of data yet. We will continue to monitor groundwater into the foreseeable future.

Groundwater monitoring will continue during construction and for a set duration after the road is complete.

**Traffic Update:** Traffic modeling is being updated. TTC would provide network redundancy, need is increasing with the ongoing process of Northern South Park. Potentially 900-1000 new units with new neighborhood proposal.

**Jackson Hole Land Trust:** They can support I-N2b but not any other alternative that will impede on conservation easements. Request to modify conservation easement would need to come from both Indian Springs & Teton Science School.

**Indian Springs Ranch:** WYDOT confirmed in Sept. 2020 that, if and when Tribal Trail is connected to WY22, the ISR access/connection would be closed. Indian Springs opposes all alternatives, and they do not have any intention of requesting an amendment to the conservation easement.

The North Side easement date is 2003 – That property belongs only to TSS.

3. Alternatives Screening – Conceptual layouts, detailed design process has not begun (links provided)
  - a. [I-N2b: At-grade signalized intersection](#)
    - i. [Alternatives I-N2b – Potential 2-lane variation](#)
    - ii. [Alternatives I-N2b – Potential 2-lane variation](#)
  - b. [I-N5b: South frontage Rd. with right-in right-out](#)
  - c. [I-N18: South frontage road with signal](#)
  - d. [I-N19h: Lazy J with underpass](#)

#### 4. Review Alternatives Screening Results

##### Level 1 Screening

All Alternatives: Provide road network redundancy; Reduce vehicle miles travelled; Reduce trips through the Y; Improve emergency response time; Improve multi-modal connections; Have no irresolvable environmental impacts; and, Have no physical or legal constraints considered fatal flaws

##### Level 2 Screening

**I-N2b:** Moderate reduction in VMT; some impacts to wetlands; slight reduction in impacts to human environment and safety concerns; most cost-effective solution.

Light pollution and view shed were considered in the Human Environmental Impact criteria.

Stakeholder expressed safety concerns about left turn movements from Coyote Canyon onto WY-22, as this is not ideal for TSS. Safety for I-N2b should be considered. WYDOT's thoughts on signal at TSS - Separate NEPA process is beginning that will consider the entire corridor. Will be working closely with the County.

Traffic has gotten worse progressively every season. Signals will not help with congestion.

**I-N5b:** Purpose and Need same as I-N2b; Project Objective Screening – Impacts to natural resources, private property, cost effective & constructability all rate “poor.”

**I-N18:** Project Objective Screening – natural resource impacts, private property impacts, constructability all score “poor.” Human environment, safety concerns, direct multi modal and cost effectiveness all score “fair.”

**I-N19:** Natural resources private property cost effectiveness & constructability all score “poor.” Maintenance, Multi-modal & Human environmental impacts all score “fair.”

**Questions:**

Is the committee also going to score the alternatives?

Screening was done ahead of time to save time during the meeting, but discussion is welcome at this time. An evaluation was done ahead of time to give everyone time to react to it and changes to the scoring can certainly be made.

Concerns about wildlife crossing. Not impossible but it is an impediment. Construction of Bar Y wildlife crossing would help.

Last two alternatives get outside of platted easement. If platted easement is changed, would the needed road easement could be less than what is currently platted (i.e., less land disturbance).

We do not have design completed; corridors shown do not account for earthwork needed and might be wider than shown

Two changes would be required -1) change to platted easement on ISR plat and 2) conservation easement would need signed off by two parties: ISR & TSS.

Question about keeping ISRs access for right turn only:

WYDOT - from an operational standpoint, one connection on the southern side of WY22 is always going to be better than two.

**TSS**

Dave Schuler – main concern is TSS access and being realistic. They see this as an opportunity to improve the safety of their access and would like to see an outcome that is best for the community and in terms of environmental impact.

Question posed to WYDOT - Which alternative is preferred in the absence of environmental/legal obstacles?

Something that ties Tribal Trails to Indian springs and Coyote Canyon offers the greatest community benefit, although causes some challenges. Retaining wall is an expensive structure in the “lazy J” alternative.

5. Southern Intersection Alternatives at Boyles Hill Road and Tribal Trail

Considered 4-way stop or roundabout. Preference (committee & public) was for roundabout. Level 1 & Level 2 screening has already been completed.

6. [Project Schedule](#)

7. Next Steps

- a. Public Outreach
- b. Stakeholder meeting
- c. Board of County Commissioners workshop/approval
- d. WYDOT Access Review Committee

8. Conclusion

It was determined that another Stakeholder meeting is needed before a public meeting. Screening for Level 1 and 2 matrices need more stakeholder discussion.