

**Subject:** Tribal Trail/WYO 22 Intersection Discussion

**Project Name:** Tribal Trail Connector EA

**Location:** MS Teams Meeting

**Date/Time:** June 24, 2020, 1:30 – 3:00 PM.

**Participants:**

Amy Ramage – Teton County  
Jazmine Watson – Teton County  
Darin Kaufman – WYDOT  
Bob Hammond – WYDOT  
Jeff Mellor – WYDOT  
Randy Merritt – WYDOT  
Matt Oolman – WYDOT  
Peter Stinchcomb – WYDOT  
Kevin Stogsdill – WYDOT  
Keir Opie – Cambridge Systematics  
Randy Bomar – Morrison Maierle  
Tim Brugger – Morrison Maierle  
Jim Clarke – Jacobs  
Whitney Wimer – Jacobs

**Meeting Summary Notes:**

Action Items found in these notes are **underlined in bold**. Group decisions are **highlighted**. The notes presented below are summary notes.

**Meeting Purpose and Goal:** Discuss comments on the draft traffic operations report and traffic model assumptions for Spring Gulch Road intersection. Review the comparison matrix criteria and performance measures.

**Summary**

**Cambridge Traffic Report:**

Kier provided an update on the general themes of the traffic comments and responses. The report focused on the three alternatives. The intent was to focus on just the operations of those alternatives, not be all encompassing.

Northern leg/frontage road, connecting Coyote Canyon Road to Tribal Trail Connector, was initially included in the analysis, but has since been removed.

Other design alternatives are being included the Traffic Impact Study (TIS). The TIS is separate from what Keir is doing.

The roundabout is being removed from further consideration in the traffic report.

The model assumes the Florida T at WYO 22/390 is completed by 2030. This project does help the baseline improvement of WYO 22 with or without Tribal Trail Connector.

The model assumes the left turn lane at Spring Gulch Road is lengthened to 800 feet instead of double left turn lanes. Double left turn lanes take away from the critical movement of eastbound traffic on WYO 22. Spring Gulch Road needs more discussion to figure out how to address the problems.

Question: The County is looking for feedback on what assumptions should be used in model for Spring Gulch Road. What improvements are reasonable or what other considerations need to be made?

In the PEL Spring Gulch was identified as a high priority. Three alternatives were carried forward in the PEL: Florida T, roundabout, and additional lanes. Based on the model runs for Tribal Trail Connector, a roundabout at Spring Gulch Road is unlikely to function. The spacing between the vehicles on WYO 22 will make it difficult for traffic to enter from Spring Gulch Road.

Spring Gulch, in its current configuration does not work if Tribal Trail Connector is a signal, in 2030 future year model. Once WYO 22 is four lanes both intersections function as signals.

WYDOT indicated that putting in another signal (Tribal Trail Connector) will probably cause impacts to other intersections on WYO 22. Need to know if Tribal Trail Connector will be causing problems at other intersection. **The information needs to be included in the TIS and matrix along with mitigation measure to correct/lessen the strain on other intersections.** The big question to be answered; does Tribal Trail Connector cause intersections to fail or fail faster? Some intersections may be problem intersections and fail regardless of Tribal Trail Connector.

Regardless of the type of connection with WYO 22, Tribal Trail Connector does help the function of Spring Gulch Road.

Question: What can be assumed for the Spring Gulch Road base model? Can more money be allocated to Spring Gulch Road? Since Spring Gulch Road was identified as a priority in the PEL, could Cambridge make an assumption that intersection would be improved for Tribal Trail Connector model?

Response: WYDOT say no, as improvement to Spring Gulch are not in the STIP.

### **Moving forward the traffic model will assume no improvements are made to Spring Gulch Road.**

Cambridge is concerned that the model may not produce meaningful results.

Question: Is having a model that doesn't quite work going to give WYDOT the information they need for the safety analysis?

Response: Let see what happens in the model without improvements to Spring Gulch Road in the 2-lane configuration and go from there.

Without improvements to Spring Gulch Road, it is possible that Tribal Trail Connector would become a by-pass, thus increasing the amount of traffic on Tribal Trail.

Question: Is WYDOT comfortable with the assumption the WYO 22 is widened to 4-lanes in 2045?

Response: Yes

### **Matrix Discussion:**

Review of the criteria and performance measures in the comparison matrix.

### **Proposed changes to the comparison matrix:**

- Include multi-modal as a criteria and performs measure.
  - Performance measure could be number of at-grade pathway crossings
- Under N2a and N2b need to break out the improvements to Indian Springs Drive/Coyote Canyon Road as built not built. There is no way know that intersection will be modified. Need to know what happens if the intersection remains unchanged.
- Change wording of the wildlife movement criteria: remove "improve".

- Weaving analysis will be added to the traffic operation criteria.
- Add criteria on how each option affect the other intersections.
- Add note about the public preference for signal vs intersection was split.

**Proposed changes that were not included in the comparison matrix and why:**

- Signal warrant is only applicable to N2b and is covered in the TIS.
- Travel time is not a critical decision point for WYDOT. The information will remain as part of the level 2 evaluation matrix.
- Speed calming is only applicable to the existing portion of Tribal Trail road.

Question: Is the level of service for just the Tribal Trail Connector/WYO 22 intersection or does this include the worst movement on WYO 22?

Response: Level of service will be looked at for just the Tribal Trail Connector/WYO 22 intersection.

Question: Which criteria would have more weight for WYDOT (i.e. safety over other criteria)?

Response: Safety and traffic operations will be higher for WYDOT.

Question: Who is the target audience? They should really be included in developing the scoring weight and possibly filling out this matrix.

Response: Randy M agrees; however, it will be challenging to get the access review committee involved. He may take the comparison matrix to the state traffic engineer to get input to give to the County. Bob indicated on the arrestor project the team got together with decision makers to work through the criteria weights for that project.

The comparison matrix is not meant to be an EA process; instead it's for WYDOT decision making process (for funding). Jacobs confirmed that the matrix may be touched on briefly in the EA, but not a critical component of the EA.

**Next Steps**

- Update the comparison matrix and work with core WYDOT team to complete.
- Work with WYDOT to develop weighted scores for the comparison matrix.
- Provide Darrin with a preliminary TIS report to reduce numbers on revision prior to the Access Review Committee.
- Team is working toward presenting at September Access Review Committee meeting.