



Subject: Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #6

Project Name: Tribal Trail Connector EA

Location: Skype and Teton County Library Auditorium, 125 Virginian Lane, Jackson, WY

Date/Time: November 15, 2019 / 10:00 am – 3:00 pm

Participants:

Alex Muromcew – Stakeholder
Dave Schuler – Stakeholder
Dave Schofield – Stakeholder
Jeff Daugherty – Stakeholder
Ralph Haberfeld – Stakeholder
Carrie Geraci – Stakeholder
Lisa Carpenter – Stakeholder (phone)
Michael Halpin – Stakeholder proxy for Frank Lane and Tom Holland
Skyler Helffrich – Stakeholder proxy for Scott Pierson
Darren Brugmann – START Director
Amy Ramage – Teton County (phone)
Brian Schilling – Teton County
Heather Overholser – Teton County
Kristen Waters – Teton County
Bob Hammond – WYDOT
Darin Kaufman – WYDOT (phone)
Ryan Shields – WYDOT
Kevin Stogsdill – WYDOT
Margaret Mordahl - WYDOT
Carolyn Moore – WYDOT
Nick Hines - WYDOT
Randy Bomar – Morrison Maierle
Steve Lowman – Morrison Maierle (phone)
Whitney Wimer – Jacobs

Public:

Allie Gross – JH News & Guide

Martin Muschavech
Noah Osnor
Susan Mick
Margi Griffith
Lisa Potzernitz
John Wright
Neil Ford
Luther Propst

Copies to: Ted Wells/WYDOT

Meeting Summary Notes

Action Items found in these notes are **underlined in bold**. The notes presented below are summary notes. Copies of all materials presented, and recordings of the meeting can be found on the Stakeholder page of the Tribal Trail website, <http://www.tribaltrailconnector.com>.

Meeting Purpose

Provide Project Updates, Evaluate New Alternatives, and Conduct Level 2 Evaluation

Introductions/Review Meeting Purpose

Review Stakeholder Ground Rules. Ground rules were revised based on feedback from Stakeholder Carrie Geraci. New ground rules are shown in italics.

Project Updates

No Action Alternative

- Serves as a baseline for comparing the build alternatives.
- Defined by NEPA includes all projects that are “committed” or “programmed” projects to occur by the Tribal Trail Connector (TTC) project’s future design year 2045.
- When TTC study started, widening of Hwy 22 was not a programmed project.
- WYDOT has added the widening of Hwy 22 to the draft STIP for 2026.
- No Action Alternative has now been updated to include 4-lane Hwy 22 in all traffic and travel scenarios.

Purpose and Need

- Basis of the Purpose and Need comes from the 2015 Integrated Transportation Plan (ITP).
- Project Charter, as set forth by the Board of County Commissioners, reiterates the Purpose and Need
- Jim Charlier, lead consultant on the original ITP and update, provided the Project Team with “Tribal Trail Connector Notes”, which includes information on the context of Tribal Trail Connector in relation to the ITP. Primary needs for Tribal Trail Connector as identified in the ITP are to provide travel redundancy and improved emergency evacuation and response.
- **Jacobs will send Stakeholders the letter from Jim Charlier. Complete**
- Purpose and Need statement, which the Stakeholders have reviewed, is being expanded on and will serve as Chapter 1 of the Environmental Assessment (EA). Items that are being updated:
 - Evacuation information that has come out a study performed on 5,000 western communities as a result of the 2018 Camp Fire, that devastated Paradise, California.
 - Within the broader study, Jackson was compared to 1,350 communities of a similar size in the 11-state Rocky Mountain region.
 - Jackson ranks number 1347 out of 1350 in terms of having evacuation constraints.
 - 3 communities scored worse than Jackson for evacuation constraints.
 - Link to article being referenced “[Wildfire risks: Look up every Western Community](#)” published Arizona Republic and USA Today 2019.
 - Expanded Purpose and Need also is relying on professional opinions of local Emergency Service staff.

Comments

- Question from Alex Muromcew. Are improvements called for in the Purpose and Need actual needs or wishes?
 - Response. Jim Clarke noted the process defined by the NEPA process and the Project Charter are beyond wishes. If an alternative doesn’t meet the Purpose and Need, then the alternative is screened out of through the process.
 - Response. Heather Overholser said project Purpose and Need was approved by the Town Council and County Commission in the Integrated Transportation Plan, and again approved by County Commission in the Tribal Trail Charter Agreement.

- Question from Lisa Carpenter. Noted that the results of the study that resulting in Jackson scoring so low in terms of evacuation constraints is more likely from Jackson being surrounded by mountain ranges and less likely to do with the Counties roadway network. Question asked: how will the Tribal Trail Connector project impact the low score (low emergency evacuation score)?
 - Response. Jim responded that Lisa makes a good point. We probably can't quantify what Tribal Trail Connector would do to that ranking.
 - Comment. Lisa is concerned that if this is used as a decision-making point then how the score is impacted by Tribal Trail seems to be important.
 - Response. Jim followed up on the missing links identified in the ITP. To improve redundancy and emergency evacuation in terms of the larger transportation scheme, ITP called for connecting some of the missing links. Tribal Trails was one of several of the missing roads.
 - Response. Heather replied that in order to look at impact to evacuation constraints then need to look at all of the proposed projects within the ITP; need to review the broader picture, all the missing links, not just what Tribal Trail would do to the score.
- Question from Mike Halpin. Can you explain why there is a change to the "No Action Alternative"?
 - Response. Jim replied when we defined the baseline for the project the widening of Hwy 22 was not included because it was not a programmed project. WYDOT has since added funding to the draft STIP for studying the widening Hwy 22 in 2026. The projects forecast year is 2045, we felt it was "reasonably foreseeable" that the widening Hwy 22 would be in future 2045 condition. Why is it important to add the widening to the No Action alternative? The traffic modeling for the No Action Alternative will assume a widened Hwy 22.
 - Response. Heather elaborated that all alternatives would assume the widening of Hwy 22.
- Question from Carrie Geraci. Previously we reviewed the alternative without considering an expanded Hwy 22. Now we are reviewing all the alternatives assuming that Hwy 22 will be widened. Is that correct?
 - Response. Mike Halpin replied but not until 2045.
 - Response. Jim clarified we don't look at every year. The assumption is that by 2045 Hwy 22 will be widened.
 - Response. Heather replied to Mike. The traffic model has a baseline year of 2016 and a future No Action scenario of 2045. Purpose is to show comparison and see the difference in the numbers.
 - Response. Jim explained that part of the NEPA process is have minimum 20-year future projection to make sure that transportation funds aren't being invested in improvements that would be outdated in 10 years. Fundamentally it doesn't change the alternative process we've been through to date. Main change is in the modeling. Hwy 22 functions better in a future condition because its widened, whereas a 2-lane Hwy 22 doesn't work with the proposed future traffic volumes.
- Question from Ralph Haberfeld. What are the other missing link projects?
 - Response. Heather said that the other connectors as listed in the ITP are North Bridge, east/west connector from S. 89 to S. Park Loop Road, and improvements to the Snow King route from town to S. 89.

Change in Posted Speed

- Based on public and stakeholder comments, the project team determined that the design speed of the Tribal Trail Connector will be lowered to 25 mph. Up until now, the design speed has been 35 mph.
- The lower speed would not impact travel redundancy, EMS or evacuations.
- Lower speed will affect mobility which would help deter cut-through traffic and provide better safety for residents in the area.
- Cambridge has modeled both the 35 mph and 25 mph posted speed limit so see how the traffic is affected.
- Question from Bob Hammond. Has anyone done a speed study for what people currently driving on Tribal Trail?
 - Response. Jim replied no but the posted speed is 35 mph.
 - Response. Mike confirmed that the posted speed is currently 35 mph. Stated it would be nice if the speed was lower.

- Response. Heather said part of project will be to lower the existing Tribal Trail design speed to 25 MPH. Right now, Tribal Trail is posted 35 mph, but it feels like you can drive faster because its wide and straight.

Pathway Update

- Design team has been working with the Brian Schilling, County Pathway Coordinator, on the location of pathway connections. Will discuss the pathway connections when we discuss the alternatives.

New Alternatives

Level 1 evaluation matrix and figures presented at the meeting are available on the website.

Alternative I-N14

- Jim spoke about the new alternative proposed by Mike Halpin and 7 out of the 10 stakeholders; this has been labelled as I-N14. The letter from the stakeholders was shown.
- Mike Halpin asked if the intersection of ISR and Coyote Canyon would be in the project scope of work. Heather said the idea is to connect all the roads together and/or find the best solution – further conversation is needed if it is going through as its own intersection (WYDOT would have to approve both intersections). Constructing improvements to the ISR/TSS intersection will need to be approved by the commissioners and funding determined.
- Lisa Carpenter said the pathway on this alternative would need to be vetted through the Pathways Taskforce to see what serves the community best.

Alternative I-N15

- Jim went over an alternative that was suggested by Frank Lane for consideration, dubbed I-N15. TTC would be gravel road only for emergency vehicles.
- This alternative does not address the intersection at ISR and Coyote Canyon
- Regarding a comment that the gravel road could eventually be paved over in the future, Randy stated that this is not how construction works; it would take a full reconstruction of the gravel road.

Alternative I-N16

- Heather said this was added in response to public comment regarding the uncertainty regarding widening of Hwy 22 and not designing/building the intersection until WYDOT's Hwy 22 plans are complete.
 - Heather and others discussed that the connection to Hwy 22 (right in, right out only) would be an interim solution until WYDOT plans are completed and the Hwy 22 improvements are constructed.
- Dave Schofield - WYDOT would maintain anything within the right of way and County would maintain the roadway outside of the right of way; would this create a problem to be governed by two different groups? –
 - Bob Hammond said it would be all maintained by County only except for Hwy 22.
 - Heather said the ultimate intersection design and construction would be up to WYDOT when they widen Hwy 22 (regarding the right on/right off).
 - Mike Halpin asked when 22 planning will start. Bob said WYDOT has taken steps to put Hwy 22 planning in their draft STIP for Year 2026.
 - Carrie asked how can we make decisions going forward if the NEPA process for Hwy 22 hasn't started.
 - Bob said this process has nothing to do with Hwy 22.
 - Jim said projects would never get done if you waited on all other projects within the area to be designed. We're assuming the widening of Hwy 22 would be 4 lanes and some connections with Hwy 22 would more easily accommodate widening of Hwy 22.
 - Jim said this project should not be driven by the future widening of Hwy 22.
 - Bob gave example – the pathway underpass near Skyline was designed and constructed with the forethought of a future widened Hwy 22.
- David Schofield – Where does the proposed wildlife crossing fit into this?

- Heather said, per the wildlife crossing master plan, we have a conceptual idea where the crossing will be located, which is between Bar Y and Skyline.
- Dave asked how far west of the TSS/ISR intersection will overpass be located?
- Heather said that a wildlife overpass would be best situated where the road is elevated by Skyline; however, this idea is conceptual at this time and that the planning and construction of the wildlife crossing would be integrated with the possible TTC.
- Dave asked if it would be more cost efficient to plan both projects together.
- Heather said all will be planned in conjunction

Level 1 Review of Alternatives I-N14, I-N15, I-N16

I-N14: eliminated from the screening process because it does not meet project purpose and need

- Some stakeholders requested to keep alternative I-N14 as a recommendation to the commissioners outside of the NEPA process
- Mike Halpin – Regarding “Reduce VMT,” what is the NO based on? It seems from the latest traffic demand model that all of the alternatives should say NO in reduction to VMT. The project team clarified that the traffic model does show that a Tribal Trail connection would reduce VMT through the Y but reductions are modest relative to total traffic through the Y.
- Heather read a letter from Jim Charlier who was the consultant in the development of the ITP and is helping with the ITP technical update. He feels the most important project purpose and need statements are improving roadway network connectivity in the community, improving emergency response time and improved multi-modal connectivity (i.e. improved routing for school and START buses). Although one project purpose and need statement is about reduced VMT, it is not the only purpose of this project and not one of the most important aspects either.
- Heather stated that County Public Works staff is being directed by Commission to bring forward a design alternative that meets project purpose and need and, therefore, cannot present an alternative to the Commissioners that does not meet purpose and need. If Stakeholders feel they want to recommend something that doesn’t meet purpose and need, the stakeholders can bring it to the Commissioners independently or staff can bring it to the Commissioners as a second alternative, noting that it does not meet purpose and need.
- Dave Schofield asked: if I-N14 is a new alternative, why is it being eliminated. Jim said since this alternative, through level 1 screening of project purpose and need, was determined to not meet purpose and need, it becomes eliminated.
- Heather said I-N14(Mike H.) and I-N15(Frank L.) came from stakeholders
- I-N16 was developed by staff based on public comments.
- Alex M - shocked that alternative I-N14, which was brought to the group by the stakeholders, has already been eliminated.
 - It was clarified by Jim that the matrix was filled out ahead of time to speed the process.
 - The stakeholders have an opportunity to review the level 1 matrix and scoring at the meeting and the stakeholders can recommend the matrix responses be changed.
 - Alex - does not understand if Indian Springs intersection is part of this project or not.
 - Heather said it is part of the project study area; however, it’s a separate project unless we can connect the two private roads as part of the preferred design.
 - Randy said their scope of work is only the Tribal Trail connector and intersection to Hwy 22. Indian Springs came up because of the wording on the plat/easement.
- Carrie - wants to understand about the new alternatives in terms of pathways and how emergency vehicles would use the existing pathway as an emergency route.
 - Brian Schilling, Pathways Coordinator, said the current pathway would need upgraded for all EMS vehicles, and that the Pathways department would prefer a separated pathway from the one used by EMS.
- Dave Schofield – wants to make a point that the line he agrees with on I-N14 is “Not now, not until we’ve looked at the whole thing” and see how it all fits. What’s coming to 390, 22, Teton Pass and down south. This is why he went along with I-N14.
 - Jim states that if we wait for all projects in the valley to be designed, nothing will ever get done. That’s why there is the ITP, which is a long-range plan for all transportation within the valley.
- Bob H. – WYDOT will ensure that everything will connect properly.
- Alex agrees with the “why now”

- Heather - answering Carrie's question about the County hiring a transportation planner- the County is currently looking to hire a consultant to fill this role.
- Jeff Daughtry – look at mandate of County - they are established to meet health, safety, welfare objectives and our current infrastructure does not meet these objectives. The stakeholders do not have a mandate, but County does. County has an obligation to provide some sort of redundancy to address these issues.
- Dave Schofield – 20 years ago we knew there would be a transportation problem, and nothing was done. Today we have experts, and models, and we know traffic will increase. With that being said, we should have listened 20 years ago. If we did, we wouldn't be in this predicament. Hwy 22 will be widened at some point.
- Michael H. – does not feel I-N14 should not be eliminated at this point and should be taken through all the level screenings. It's not a "no build," it's a "not now build." Jim said we need to stick to the process, but stakeholders can present this to the commissioners outside of the process.
- Heather asked whether emergency response time be changed to a "yes," because I-N14 helps reduce EMS response time.
 - Whitney said it was indicated as a "no" because it doesn't provide emergency evacuation.

I-N15: eliminated from the screening process because it does not meet project purpose and need

- Travel redundancy changed to NO
- All agreed to be eliminated

I-N16: carried forward into level 2.

- Heather – once Hwy 22 is designed and expanded, the intersection that would allow all traffic movements would be designed and constructed by WYDOT with the widening of Hwy 22. If needed to be used for other turning movements in the case of a temporary traffic re-route or emergency, it could be by highway patrol or county sheriff
- Jeff – looks at this alternative and suggests it would be meaningful to have "light" yes's or no's. I-N16 would cut mileage in half but the buses would still need to be able to take a left turn onto Hwy 22. Darren from START agreed with Jeff.
- Mike said should be no, no, no, yes, no for this alternative (for purpose and need screening) because the full intersection build-out with all turning maneuvers isn't happening tomorrow, just like I-N14 and I-N15.
- Dave Schuler - would this alternative require a redesign of the "Y" because you're not reducing as much traffic from the "Y"?
- Bob says it meets the criteria but doesn't do a good job of reducing traffic through the "Y".

Level 2 Alternatives Evaluation

Level 2 evaluation matrix and figures presented are on the website under the Stakeholder Meeting #7, November 21, 2019 materials.

- Sean McAtee from Cambridge –
 - Provided refresher regarding July meeting, provided update on work done over the last 2 months, described input into level 2 criteria
 - Introduction into Travel Model – tool used to test 'what if' scenarios. Helps to organize assumptions, but not real world.
 - An increase in the model speed resulted in increased traffic.
 - Utilize LBS = location-based services (i.e. phone apps using your location)
 - Fixed demand – reducing circuitry of existing trips
 - Induced demand – VMT change is shows a slight increase, but negligible (note that school and START would decrease VMT, but this is not called out in the model)
 - Simulation can be very different from the demand model
 - Local traffic would use TTC and relieve northbound traffic at the Y
 - Q&A on model
 - Dave Schofield believes the model
 - Cambridge looked at both winter and summer peak times. Since summer is a lot higher than winter, they went forward with using the summer times

- Ralph – transportation is being revolutionized right now. We're looking out to 2045 with the model, and we don't know what traffic/transportation will look like (used example of autonomous cars). We don't know the direction it's going.
- Brian asked about induced demand for Tribal Trail versus the induced demand related to the widening of Hwy 22. Sean said the widening of Hwy 22 would have a lot more induced demand than TTC.
- TTC results in reduced congestion, decrease travel time, decrease emissions - only thing that increases is VMT due to induced demand assumed in model.
- Cambridge spoke about current conditions in 2045 (with 22 not widened, the queue on westbound Hwy 22 would be all the way back to Spring Gulch Road).
- No issues with merging or stop controls at the Hwy 22/TTC intersection.

Level 2 Evaluation Matrix

- Round-about designs - Multi-modal rated as fair due to buses getting around roundabouts – unless the roundabout designs are adequate enough
- Mike asked about roadway lighting and the impacts of it – has not been discussed
- Dave Schuler of TSS says the impact on their property would be a positive thing. Would like to upgrade the “impacts to private property” ratings to TSS property from poor to fair.
- Regarding truck restrictions, it is challenging to restrict certain type of vehicles on public roads because they are funded by the public and for public use. Alex thinks TTC will encourage so much extra traffic from the south and encourage people to speed once they're out of the 25 mph sections.
- Dave Schofield stated that he goes the school speed limit during that section of road but speeds up once he is out
- Dave Schuler lives in Lincoln County and says he never uses South Park Loop Road to get to the Teton Science School facility. He stays on Hwy 89 because its faster then would take High School Road or the northern part of South Park Loop Road to get to Boyles Hill road.
- Good ratings for “constructability” do not mean WYDOT has okayed the design; but no anticipated issues during construction. Two accesses within close proximity to each other may not be allowed or permissible by WYDOT.
- Safety concerns and constructability for I-N2 was decided to change to fair from good.

Next Steps

- Complete Level 2 Screening and get public input on alternatives evaluation. Reconvene stakeholder committee after public meeting.
- Question-Do we want to take all of the design alternatives to the public meeting or further narrow them down for the public? Answer—we'll need to present results of screening and provide a reduce list of viable alternatives.
- Because Level 2 screening was not completed, group decided to have a Skype call on November 19, 2019. Goals are to complete level 2 screening; look at Mike's hybrid idea and take it through level 1 and level 2 screening; and weed out any alternative that falls to the bottom.