



**Stakeholder Committee Meeting #11
Meeting Summary Notes
Tribal Trail Connector Project**

Date/Time: Friday, March 11, 2022, 9 am to 11 am

Location: Virtual Meeting via Zoom

Stakeholder Meeting #11 Purpose: To provide project updates and get stakeholder feedback on Level 2 ratings for the four WY-22 intersection alternatives presented.

In Attendance:

Stakeholders: Lisa Carpenter, Ralph Haberfeld, Lindsay Kissel, Deb Weursch, Frank Lane, Scott Pierson, Virginia Powell Symons, Bryan Chassard (sitting in for Colby Stevens), Dave Schuler

Teton County Staff: Heather Overholser, Amy Ramage, Jazmine Vosika, Kelly Landowski

Consultants: Randy Bomar, Tim Brugger, Jim Clarke, Whitney Wimer, Charlie Wence, Jacqueline Dowds Bennett

WYDOT Staff: Keith Compton, Bob Hammond, Nick Hines, Darin Kaufman, Matthew Oolman, Peter Stinchcomb,

Jackson Hole Land Trust Staff (JHLT): Derek Ellis

Agenda Items:

1. Welcome
 - Introductions

 - Meeting Goals/desired outcomes
 - o Follow-up from last mtg (ran out of time); The goal of today is not to have a consensus but to get feedback on the 4 alternatives; Would also like feedback on timing of the next public meeting

 - o Also, asking for feedback on what alternative to bring to the County Commissioners

 - o Ground Rules
 - Reviewed previous slides

 - Roles/Responsibilities of staff and stakeholders
 - o Commissioners will decide on whether or not to continue with a build alternative, or not move forward with the project

 - o Expecting the stakeholders to provide input from the community and to take message back to the community

2. Overview of January Meeting

- Today's meeting is a continuation of the stakeholder meeting in January, because that meeting ran out of time. Today's meeting will also address a few comments/questions brought up from the January meeting.
- Reviewed the key updates presented at January's meeting, including the preliminary geotechnical report, groundwater memo, and additional traffic analysis
- Informed stakeholders about meetings and interactions with the Jackson Hole Land Trust (JHLT) and Indian Spring Ranch (ISR) homeowner's association (HOA). These were key discussions and drove where we are at today.
 - o There are conservation easements on either side of Hwy 22 that would require an amendment to build 3 of the 4 remaining alternatives (all but N2B)
 - o JHLT is not in support of amending these easements unless there is a net zero change to the conserved area.
 - o ISR HOA doesn't support a connection to Tribal Trail
 - o ISR HOA is a signatory to the conservation easement on the southside of HWY 22

3. Project updates since January

- Indian Springs groundwater letter
 - o Informed the meeting attendees that ISR HOA hired a consultant, Clearwater Geoscience LLP (Clearwater) to perform review of Jacob's Draft Groundwater Evaluation Memo
 - ISR HOA provided the County a copy of the Clearwater letter two days prior to the January stakeholder meeting, which is why the memo was not discussed at that meeting
 - In general, Clearwater asserts that the level of detail in the Jacobs memo is not adequate for making a quantitative assessment of the amount of water needed to support the fen
 - Clearwater proposed additional studies that are beyond the scope and intent of the Jacobs memo
 - The purpose of the Jacobs memo was to characterize the groundwater flow regime by determining:
 - Depths of the groundwater
 - General direction
 - Variations in groundwater flow
 - Information was used to make professional judgements about if and how a project alternative might indirectly affect fen hydrology.

- Not intended to serve as a detailed hydrogeological report to map the full extents or details of the geologic matrix or aquifer of the entire area
 - The groundwater monitoring plan was developed in consultation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers permitting staff
- Traffic Analysis
 - Discussed the existing operational and traffic congestion issues on HWY 22
 - WYDOT will be evaluating different solutions for Hwy 22 as part of a separate project
 - The Tribal Trail project is not intended to fix the problems with HWY 22
 - Provided a high-level analysis for Tribal Trails Connection to HWY 22
 - Purpose of analysis was to estimate how a connection to the current HWY 22 2-lane configuration would affect the operation of HWY 22 in the interim until WYDOT implements improvements to HWY 22
 - Interim condition design year is 2030
 - Model developed to assess operations extends along HWY 22 from the WY 22/390 intersection to the “Y” intersection and includes the Snake River Bridge widening and WY 22/390 improvements
 - Model includes volumes from Phase 1 of the northern South Park housing development and assumes Indian Springs Drive HWY 22 access is closed and Coyote Canyon Road access stays the same
 - Speed Limit at 50 mph and used summer volumes
 - Which are higher, so this gives a worst-case scenario for today’s discussions
 - WYDOT traffic recorders suggest winter traffic volume to be 1/3 lower than the summer volumes
 - Modeled two potential 2-lane interim options for I-N2b (signalized intersection)
 - Option 1 – stop control for Tribal Trail approach to HWY 22
 - No impact to HWY 22 operations; delays for left turns from Tribal Trail to HWY 22
 - Option 2 – signal control for all approaches
 - Signal does introduce some delays for HWY 22 but still within WYDOT’s acceptable operations parameters
 - Red time for westbound direction of HWY 22 creates gaps for Coyote Canyon turning movements
 - Signal reduces delay for Tribal Trail left turns

- Traffic Simulations
 - Showed video and screen shots of computer simulation developed from operations analysis models for morning and evening peak hours
 - Morning peak hour replicates existing eastbound backup through potential Tribal Trail connection to HWY 22
 - Evening peak hour shows all queues clearing with each signal cycle
- Without Tribal Trail Connector, alternate routes would add more travel time and mileage to the roadway network

Traffic Questions/Comments:

- **Dave Schuler:** Indicated that the peak traffic times for the Teton Science School (Coyote Canyon) are 3:15 pm to 3:45 pm; Also mentioned the Science School sees lots of “close calls” as people are entering/exiting their approach.
- **Ralph Haberfeld:** Asked for further explanation on how increasing speed/flow at HWY 22/390 intersection makes this area better than worse?
 - Jacqueline: The improved flow through the HWY 22/390 intersection will typically eliminate any westbound backups into the area of the Tribal Trail Connection, resulting in better westbound HWY 22 operations. However, this improved flow allows more eastbound volume to flow into the area of the Tribal Trail Connection which in turn would result in more vehicles in the peak hours being delayed by a pending signal.
- **Lindsay Kissel:** Can you quantify the acceptable delay thresholds vs. traffic back-up?
 - Jacqueline: Yes, it’s a determination of level of service (LOS). LOS is given a grade of A-F; the LOS is A if the average delay for vehicles is between 0 to 10 seconds per vehicle. Level F is the lowest. LOS C is 20 - 35 seconds of average delay per vehicle per signalized intersections and is the WYDOT standard for peak hours.
 - Jim: 2030 provides a good “worse case” for what is being considered an interim timeframe
- **Lindsay:** When was the travel demand study completed?
 - Jacqueline: The regional travel model was used to obtain the traffic analysis volumes. The County’s modeling effort was started prior to the pandemic. The model network is based on historical records and is still being updated to capture other projects (e.g. - S. Park development and WY 22/390). The ongoing data collection should be accounting for what is being considered a “pandemic change”.
- **Scott Pierson:** Does signal help at Bar Y and Skyline?
 - Charlie: Yes, because westbound traffic is stopped at TT. This helps by providing gaps in traffic flow.

- **Amy Ramage:** Clarified that a pedestrian crossing was modeled, but there would be an underpass at TT for pathway users, not an at-grade pedestrian crossing.
- **Bob Hammond:** Mentioned in the chat that traffic counts were lower in 2020, but are back-up to pre-pandemic levels now

3. Alternatives Screening Results

- Continuation of the alternatives screening process review started at the last Stakeholder meeting. We quickly reviewed the preliminary screening but ran out of time to get feedback from the stakeholders.
 - o **Level 1 Screening** – Confirmed Stakeholders didn't have any additional questions on the level 1 screening results.
 - No questions
 - o **Level 2 Screening** – Reviewed alternative evaluation screening matrix and provided the same info at January meeting along with summary slide and comparison. Intend for this to be more a question answer time than a repeat of information.

Alternatives Screening Questions/Comments

- **I-N2b**
 - o **Ralph:** The project objective of “Minimize Private Property Impacts” doesn't seem to accurately capture the impacts. Removing the existing ISR access to HWY 22 does affect private property, not only by inconveniencing residences but also by reducing the valuations of the homes. Wants to minimize property impact, have no headlights into neighbors' windows, and stated that removing the existing ISR entrance has a huge impact on private property and will cause valuations to be reduced by half.
 - Whitney: Reviewed the “Alternatives Evaluation Criteria Memo” which defines what the criteria looks at as part of the evaluation. *Note: A copy of the memo was sent to all stakeholders prior to meeting and can be found on the [Tribal Trail Connector website](#).* In the memo defines the criteria as “minimize private property acquisitions, including conservation easements”. The criteria is focused on purchasing property as part of the project. Which is why the project team scored this as good.
 - Jim: This memo goes back to the earliest discussions with the stakeholders, where we discussed the purpose and need and the project charter.
 - Whitney: Will make note of the discussion. Open discussion is the purpose of today's meeting.
 - o **Scott:** For the time being, the N2B is a good compromise based on what was presented before. Especially when it comes to considering possible litigation.
 - o **Amy:** The N2B alternative does not preclude the option for ISR to provide their

own separate connection to TT.

- **Heather Overholser:** Portions of the current ISR platted easement do encroach into the fen. ISR would need to work with the JHLT to modify the easement to move it out of the fen.
- **Lindsay:** Please clarify if the multi-modal objective is looking at improvements in travel from west to south? The memo mentions between South Park and the West but isn't specific.
 - Whitney: Yes, we do consider the multi-modal improvements in both directions
 - Jim: We have heard that START would incorporate TT into their operations if the project moves forward
 - Lindsay: Does this also apply to the improved emergency response criteria? Looking at movements from west to the east?
 - Whitney: Yes, it does

- I-N5b

- **Dave:** Why is there a difference in the multi-modal rating between I-N2b and I-N5b?
 - Whitney: N5b is bit longer than 2b, primarily in the westbound direction. N5b is also more challenging for the pathways. It's not ideal for the pathway to be located between two roads.
- **Scott:** This alternative has a lot of pink. Questions which option is better cost wise according to model. For cost effective, long range, should the score be fair (yellow) considering the future HWY 22 needs for reconstruction compared to N2B?
 - Whitney: Building an underpass is more costly. Essentially, the criteria looks at the initial costs, which are higher. Long term costs could be addressed more to help clarify the cost.

➤ *Post Meeting Updates:*

- ❖ *Team looked at if the long-term cost would warrant a change in the "Be cost effective" or "Maintenance" criteria.*
- ❖ *Team determined that no changes were warranted to "Be Cost effective" because the cost for changes to the conservation easements and installation of underpass are considerably higher than installation of a signal within the platted easement shown in N2b.*
- ❖ *The Team determined the N5b rating for "Maintenance" should be lowered from good to fair. The change is a result of the*

underpasses require additional long-term maintenance.

- **Ralph:** Personal opinion, not speaking for the HOA. He likes this option for the “safest” of all the options.
 - **Frank Lane:** Will the pathway be reestablished? And will construction costs be higher for this option?
 - Tim Brugger: Yes, this will be more expensive than the N2b option, due to the additional roadway length, and construction to protect the pathway.
 - Heather Overholser: The score is poor due to easement that is required to construct
 - **Tim Brugger:** Alternative Construction costs, the team only looked at the I-N2b option, however, based on amount of reconstruction, the cost of this option would be higher.
- **I-N18**
- **Deb:** Having a light, whether within the platted ROW, or at CC, appears to be beneficial. Having a light helps control our high peak volume traffic and there is a safety component to doing this.
 - **Virginia:** Would the pathway be signal controlled at the Coyote Canyon intersection?
 - Yes
 - **Ralph:** The underpass might solve left turn issues for Skyline because they could turn right and quickly u-turn through the tunnel. It does nothing for Bar-Y.
- **I-N19, (Lazy J)**
- **Scott Pierson:** Is there potential to impact the transmission lines to the North?
 - Whitney: It would affect feasibility and costs
 - Tim Brugger: We made an effort to avoid them w/ the current layouts, but will need to look at in more detail during design
 - **Keith Compton:** Will there be impacts to human environment?
 - Whitney: Pointed out summary table, yes it would
 - **Ralph Haberfeld:** Concerned about gravel trucks.
 - Heather Overholser: Speed was reduced to 25 mph for adjustments.
 - **Frank Lane:** To keep vehicles off TT, the other alternatives would help better (than N2B) if that was the actual goal.
4. Next Steps
- Public Meeting #2
 - Doing an Open House style meeting in April to present the 4 alternatives to the public (likely a 2 hour mtg in the early evening)

- Will also have a virtual open house (open for a couple weeks after the in-person meeting)
- Everyone seemed to be in favor of a Virtual and in person public meeting in April.
- Stakeholder meeting (if needed after the public outreach meeting)
- Board of County Commissioners workshop/approval
- WYDOT Access Review Committee