



Subject Tribal Trail Connector Stakeholder Meeting #1

Project Name Tribal Trail Connector EA

Project Number WXXY2000

Prepared by Kristine MacKinnon/JACOBS

Location Teton County Commission Chambers
Jackson, WY

Date/Time 16 May 2019

Participants Dave Schofeild/Stakeholder
Dave Schuler/Stakeholder
Mike Halpin/Stakeholder (filling in for Ralph Haberfeld)
Scott Pierson/Stakeholder
Tom Holland/Stakeholder
Jeff Daugherty/Stakeholder
Alex Muromcew/Stakeholder
Lisa Carpenter/Stakeholder
Frank Lane/Stakeholder
Carrie Geraci/Stakeholder
Amy Ramage/Teton County
Heather Overholser/Teton County
Jazmine Watson/Teton County
Nick Hines/WYDOT
Kevin Stogsdill/WYDOT
Carolyn Moore/WYDOT
Ryan Shields/WYDOT
Bob Hammond/WYDOT
Darrin Kaufman/WYDOT
Tim Brugger/M-M
Randy Bomar/M-M
Jim Clarke/JACOBS
Kristine MacKinnon/JACOBS

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

| Notes | Action |
|--|---|
| 1 All attendees made introductions. Jim Clarke (JACOBS) facilitated the meeting. Started with ground rules for the meeting (see agenda). Jeff Daugherty (Stakeholder) suggested adding the following: - add assumption of positive intent | Jim Clarke (JACOBS). will add the additional items to the meeting ground rules. |

| Notes | Action |
|---|--|
| <p>- recognize that people with different opinions are not bad people, don't let passion preclude judgement.</p> | |
| <p>2 Amy Ramage (Teton County) gave a background on the project charter process. Bob Hamond (Wyoming Department of Transportation (WYDOT)) added that WYDOT has limited decision making authority for this project. We do need to follow the Environmental Assessment (EA) process; WYDOT oversees that process. Teton County will make most decisions, as Tribal Trail would eventually be a county road that connects to WY 22.</p> | <p>Amy Ramage (Teton County) will email the cooperative agreement between Teton County and WYDOT to the stakeholders</p> |
| <p>3 Dave Schofield (Stakeholder) asked if a connection to WY 22 would be built to Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) standards. Amy Ramage (Teton County) responded that they have county design standards and WYDOT would have to approve any connection to their highway.</p> | |
| <p>4 Jim Clarke (JACOBS) continued with the description of the environmental review. Going through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process because the project could be eligible for federal funds or there could be other federal triggers, such as need for a federal wetlands permit.</p> | |
| <p>5 It was noted that the START director and Pathways coordinator will be involved in the NEPA process and are part of the Project Team identified in the Project Charter, but were not in attendance at this meeting.</p> | |
| <p>6 The Project Charter requires representatives of specific community groups. Noting from the stakeholders in attendance, there are representative from all areas noted in the Project Charter.</p> | |
| <p>7 Project Charter directs meeting summaries be published.</p> | <p>Project team will take notes, present a draft meeting summary. Stakeholder group will edit and approve. Final meeting summary will be posted on the project website (JACOBS).</p> |
| <p>8 A project website www.tribaltrailconnector.com has been secured. The website will have project information, ability for the public to comment, 3D renderings, FAQs, and meeting notes. The site is under development and content and functionality will be added throughout the study.</p> | <p>Put link to project website on the Teton County site (Teton County).</p> |
| <p>9 Jim asked the stakeholders if it was important to have bilingual resources for the project. The group responded yes.</p> | <p>Produce bilingual handouts (English/Spanish) for the public meeting (JACOBS).</p> |
| <p>10 There will be different checkpoints with the public, as part of the stakeholder process, to ensure the process is transparent and the community has a voice in the project. Also will be different checkpoints with the County Commissioners and the County Commission must approve the project per the Project Charter.</p> | <p>The charter will be made available to the public on the project website (it's currently available on the County's site). There will be media releases. (Teton County/JACOBS)</p> |
| <p>11 This is the first time for Teton County will be using the project charter process. The county wants feedback from the stakeholders on the process and is open to making changes.</p> | |
| <p>12 Visioning Process. Since this is the first time using the Teton County project charter process, Jim Clarke (JACOBS) invited the stakeholders to share their vision of "Ten years from now, what would you want to say regarding the process in which this stakeholder group has participated?" It was noted that this visioning exercise was focused on the process; at the next stakeholder meeting, the group will envision the project itself.</p> | <p>JACOBS will distribute the results of the visioning process.</p> |
| <p>13 Jim Clarke (JACOBS) explained the NEPA process and the different levels of actions under NEPA (categorical exclusion, environmental assessment, environmental impact statement). Nick Hines (WYDOT) noted that Environmental Assessment level of evaluation was chosen in the project charter.</p> | <p>Jim will send links for FHWA NEPA process to stakeholders.</p> |
| <p>14 NEPA process has started. Will be touchpoints with stakeholders and the public throughout the process. The public scoping meeting will present information about the NEPA and project charter process. Will request feedback from the public on what the issues we need to consider before alternatives are chosen.</p> | |

| Notes | Action |
|---|--------|
| <p>15 Will also meet with stakeholders and the public once preliminary alternatives are identified.</p> | |
| <p>16 Nick Hines (WYDOT) added that environmental surveys will be completed this summer, as these surveys are dictated by the seasons.</p> | |
| <p>17 Alex Muromcew (Stakeholder) asked what will be analyzed in the traffic analysis. Amy Ramage (Teton County) responded that the traffic model output will show impacts if an alternative is built or not built. Results will depend on the proposed designs for the intersections, etc. Mike Halpin (Stakeholder) asked if modeling could be done while discussing alternatives. The County will look into this.</p> | |
| <p>18 Alex Muromcew (Stakeholder) asked if the comprehensive plan calls for establishing a regional transportation planning organization. Amy Ramage (Teton County) responded that this is a “bigger picture” concept. A regional authority would ultimately oversee transit and pathways. Would possibly develop in parallel to this, but in a separate process. Bob Hammond (WYDOT) added that it would likely take several years to set up a regional transit agency. It could extend outside Teton County, possibly into Lincoln County and Teton County, Idaho.</p> | |
| <p>19 Carrie Geraci (Stakeholder) asked if the ITP has county design road standards. Amy Ramage (Teton County) responded that they are not listed in the ITP, but the county has its own standards, but they are more directed for rural roads and not intended for this type of project. Jim Clarke (JACOBS) added that cross-sections will be developed during the design process. There will be some flexibility in cross-section design.</p> | |
| <p>20 Dave Schuler (Stakeholder) asked if this project would work in parallel to the proposed wildlife crossing of WY 22. Would hate to tear down a new crossing for this project. Amy Ramage (Teton County) responded that the projects would need to move in parallel and will also need to take into account any other future plans for WY 22. Jim Clarke (JACOBS) noted that wildlife connectivity would be considered in the alternatives comparison.</p> | |
| <p>21 Alex Muromcew (Stakeholder) asked if there will be any study of wildlife migration routes. Yes. Jim Clarke (JACOBS) responded that the county wildlife study, WYDOT connectivity study, and data from the Science School and Wyoming Game & Fish Dept. will be reviewed.</p> | |
| <p>22 Carrie Geraci (Stakeholder) asked if we have an illustration of how the proposed wildlife crossing relates to the Tribal Trail Connector project. Jim Clarke (JACOBS) responded that we are still in the process of collecting data. Once we have a better understanding, we will look to the stakeholders to assist in identifying any data that’s missing. Once we have done some data collection, then will revisit wildlife connectivity.</p> | |
| <p>23 Bob Hammond (WYDOT) added that the wildlife crossing of WY 22 will have its own stakeholder group and design process. Could possibly have one of these stakeholders come to the Tribal Trail Connector stakeholder group and provide information.</p> | |
| <p>24 Jim Clarke (JACOBS) added that there needs to be lots of information sharing on nearby projects. Amy Ramage (Teton County) stated that potential locations for the wildlife crossings were identified in the planning and environmental linkages study (PEL). The Wildlife Master Plan also identified a need for the overpass, west of the Tribal Trail Connector project on WY 22, near the Bar Y approach, just west of the Teton Science School.</p> | |
| <p>25 LUNCH BREAK</p> | |
| <p>26 Jim Clarke (JACOBS) presented the draft project purpose and need (P&N) (see presentation). This P&N was identified in the Project Charter and includes these elements: provide travel redundancy; reduce vehicle miles of travel (VMT) associated with circuitous routing of traffic; reduce local trips through the Y intersection, improve emergency response, and provide improved multi-modal connections. Under the “Reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT),” Amy Ramage (Teton County) asked if we can quantify reduced VMT via a total difference in mileage. Jim Clarke (JACOBS) responded that this</p> | |

| Notes | Action |
|---|--|
| <p>may be possible; would need to discuss with traffic modelers. Alex Muromcew (Stakeholder) supports this.</p> | |
| <p>27 Dave Schofield (Stakeholder) noted a large increase in skier traffic this year due to the ICON pass. Amy Ramage (Teton County) noted it is tough to model this.</p> | |
| <p>28 Need to know about future developments. Does the county's traffic model include this? Amy Ramage (Teton County) explained that the traffic model looks at future growth, including the effects of a new school or new development.</p> | |
| <p>29 Amy Ramage (Teton County) added that the next phase of traffic modeling is micro-simulation. The summer portion of this phase is scheduled to be completed by this fall with the winter portion, using winter traffic counts, will be completed in 2020. Both will be important to this project.</p> | |
| <p>30 Frank Lane (Stakeholder) presented information from the local fire department. There has been an increase of West Side responders from Stations 2 and 6 (near Wilson).coming into town. This is partly due to a lack of volunteers but could also be a response time issue. Frank will try to track down more information. Wanted the stakeholder committee and project team to know that Jackson is currently relying on West bank responders for town emergencies. It used to be that the west bank relied on Jackson responders.</p> | <p>Frank will try to track down more information on emergency response issues discussed.</p> |
| <p>31 Jim Clarke (JACOBS) also noted that US 89 is a National Highway System (NHS) highway which carries special significance. Need to look at traffic impacts to this highway of national importance.</p> | |
| <p>32 Jim Clarke (JACOBS) also noted that lack of road redundancy was a big issue in the Paradise, CA fire and greatly impacted emergency response.</p> | |
| <p>33 Under "Provide Improved Transit Connections"; it was noted that the ITP is based on reduced VMT numbers and increased mode shift. Amy Ramage (Teton County) also noted that the ITP established Average Daily Traffic (ADT) thresholds or benchmarks for certain projects (once these are met, the project would be constructed. These benchmarks have already been met, including for Tribal Trail Connector. Also, the VMT goals established by the community in the ITP have been greatly exceeded in the latest indicator report.</p> | |
| <p>34 Note that START and school buses are routed through the Y intersection. Dave Schuler (Stakeholder) asked if the busses would take a different route. The Y is central to transit trips and transit looks at many factors when they plan routes. Jeff Daugherty (Stakeholder) added that school bus routes are based on where students live and routes cannot be predicted from year to year due to student locations and the fact that attendance boundaries can change.</p> | |
| <p>35 Frank Lane (Stakeholder) asked how much more development is allowed in Tribal Trail neighborhood. Dave Schofield (Stakeholder) responded that there is one lot available.</p> | |
| <p>36 Dave Schofield (Stakeholder) asked about the Hereford Ranch development long range plan, since there is only one direction Jackson can continue to grow.</p> | |
| <p>37 Jim Clarke (JACOBS) asked if these five transportation needs are valid. Stakeholders agreed these are appropriate.</p> | |
| <p>38 Mike Halpin (Stakeholder) stated that ADT and VMT are not necessarily the same. Traffic studies analyze ADT instead of VMT. Jim Clarke (JACOBS) also stated that we will look at travel times. Dave Schofield (Stakeholder) added that sometimes it takes an hour to travel four miles. Amy Ramage (Teton County) added that phase 2 of the traffic model will look at travel times on certain routes. This analysis will be run in summer and winter.</p> | |
| <p>39 Jim Clarke (JACOBS) explained the Project Objectives. In NEPA, all alternatives must meet the Purpose and Need. Objectives are used to supplement the P&N to help differentiate between alternatives. Used to help identify which alternative best meets the needs. Identified in the Project Charter, the Objectives include:</p> | |

| Notes | Action |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Roadway network compatibility - Multimodal function - Safety – improve emergency vehicle access, route redundancy. Possibly add reduction in crashes? - Environmental protection – in the charter, defined as “reduce VMT and vehicle emissions” for NEPA, we added “avoid and minimize impacts to other environmental resources” - Cost effectiveness – reduce VMT and reduce travel cost for the community | |
| <p>40 The stakeholders reviewed the Objectives and alternatives screening criteria based on the P&N and Objectives. Lisa Carpenter (Stakeholder) would like to add a safe alternate route for non-motorized vehicles as part of multi-modal function and safety. Dave Schuler (Stakeholder) added that the way the bike path is routed now, people choose to cross the highway instead of using the underpass because there is backtracking involved. Mike Halpin (Stakeholder) added that if the connector is built, the existing bike path needs to be moved. Has Certificate of Owners on original plat from 1992. Pathway in lot 57 now, would need to be moved to the road lot.</p> | |
| <p>41 Bob Hammond (WYDOT) reminded the group that the P&N and objectives are the most important part of the NEPA process – everything is measured against it.</p> | |
| <p>42 Lisa Carpenter (Stakeholder) asked about the definition of “multi-modal” in the P&N. She assumes that it includes bicycle and pedestrian facilities and not just START transit. Would like confirmation. Should this be defined? Jim Clarke (JACOBS) added that part of the mechanism to reduce VMT is to get people out of cars and using bike/ped.</p> | <p>Add “bicycle and pedestrian” to the definition of multi-modal (JACOBS)</p> |
| <p>43 Carrie Geraci (Stakeholder) would like to see text about functionality and aesthetics. The design should be aesthetically pleasing, fit with community character, and satisfy the need of current residents.</p> | <p>Add ‘aesthetically pleasing’ to this objective and screening criterion. (JACOBS)</p> |
| <p>44 Tom Holland (Stakeholder) suggested to change the objectives to say “reduce/minimize environmental impacts”. After some stakeholder discussion, it was agreed to keep the phrasing as ‘avoid and minimize’ impacts.</p> | |
| <p>45 Dave Schofield asked to capture cost of traffic delays and the number of daily trips in addition to reducing VMT. Jim Clarke (JACOBS) added that the cost of alternatives will be analyzed.</p> | <p>Capture cost of traffic delays and the number of daily trips in addition to reducing VMT.</p> |
| <p>46 Mike Halpin (Stakeholder) noted that west of Tribal Trail Connector, infrastructure will remain unchanged. This project will reduce trips east of there, on WY-22, and through the Y intersection.</p> | |
| <p>47 The next public meeting is the Public Scoping meeting. Stakeholders would like to review revised Objectives before the public scoping meeting</p> | <p>Jim Clarke (JACOBS) will send out the revised P&N tomorrow (5/17/19). Stakeholders will provide comments by 5/21/19.</p> |
| <p>48 The Public Scoping meeting will be in an open house format with information boards and comments sheets for the public to fill out. No formal presentation planned, will focus on one-on-one conversations. Stakeholders are not required to attend but are encouraged.</p> | |
| <p>49 Jeff Daugherty (Stakeholder) requested that we categorize comments and focus on themes. Jim Clarke noted this this is similar to how we process public comments.</p> | |
| <p>50 Schedule: Next stakeholder meeting, will identify and evaluate alternatives: in fall 2019, plan to identify the preferred alternative.</p> | <p>Stakeholder meeting #2: July 25, 2019</p> |
| <p>51 Heather Overholser (Teton County) will update elected officials on this project.</p> | |
| <p>52 The group was shown the draft environmental resources maps. General suggestions were to confirm the correct location of pathways, possibly add church locations.</p> | <p>Jim (JACOBS) will send the stakeholders drafts of the maps for them to mark up.</p> |
| <p>53 Lisa Carpenter and Alex Muromcew (stakeholders) want traffic calming south of the project area. Would like to see the South Park/Tribal Trail intersection</p> | <p>Teton County and WYDOT to coordinate on what is included within M-M’s scope.</p> |

| Notes | Action |
|---|--|
| <p>designed. Project team will ensure that down- and upstream facilities can accommodate traffic changes.</p> | |
| <p>54 Would a pathway overpass be acceptable within the zoning regs?</p> | <p>M-M will follow up with Teton County.</p> |
| <p>55 When WYDOT permitted the Indian Springs Drive connection to WY 22, the approval was contingent on Indian Springs Drive being re-routed to use the Tribal Trail Connector intersection with WY 22 when the connector was built. This would prevent having two intersections too close together. There is a platted easement to account for this.</p> | |