



**Stakeholder Committee Meeting #12
Meeting Summary Notes
Tribal Trail Connector Project**

Date/Time: Wednesday, August 17, 2022, 2:00-4:00
Location: Virtual Meeting via Zoom
Recording: [Tribal Trail website Stakeholder Meeting 12 recording](#)

Stakeholder Meeting #12 Purpose: To provide project updates and get stakeholder feedback on Level 2 ratings for the four WY-22 intersection alternatives that will be presented to the Commission.

In Attendance:

Stakeholders: Ralph Haberfeld, Lindsay Kissel, Frank Lane, Scott Pierson, Virginia Powell Symons, Grant Galloway (sitting in for Colby Stevens), Dave Schuler

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

Consultants: Tim Brugger, Jim Clarke, Whitney Wimer, Charlie Wentz

WYDOT Staff: Bob Hammond, Nick Hines, Darin Kaufman, Matthew Oolman, Peter Stinchcomb, Andrea Allan, and Jeff Brown

Jackson Hole Land Trust Staff (JHLT): Derek Ellis

Agenda Items:

1. Welcome
 - Introductions
 - Meeting Goals/desired outcomes-Discuss the 4 alternatives to be brought to the Commissioners
 - Follow-up from last meeting
 - Review the results and feedback from the public meeting and comment period
 - Roles/Responsibilities of staff and stakeholders
 - Asking for feedback from Stakeholders on what alternative they would choose to bring to the County Commissioners,
 - Reaching a consensus, may not be possible,
 - Commissioners will decide on whether or not to continue with a build alternative, or not move forward with the project

2. Overview of March Meeting
 - The last meeting provided an update on geotech, groundwater, and traffic updates based on Stakeholder questions
 - Finished reviewing the alternatives level 1 and level 2 screening
 - Traffic modeling, WY 22 remains 2-lanes in 2030, then in 2045 is a 4-lanes
 - Tribal Trail won't be able to address the problems on WY 22.
 - Not the intent of Tribal Trail
 - WYDOT is doing a separate project to address WY 22

3. Public Meeting Summary

- Discussion is meant to be interactive. The discussion will focus on the one-page summary that was sent to the group pre-meeting. It's also on the [website](#).
- Public comment was April 27 - May 20, 2022
 - Comments received on May 21 and 22 were also included in the results since it was close to the end of the public comment period.
- Three public notices were published during the comment period
- Attendance and participation of the public
 - Open house-60 people signed in
 - 405 IP addresses
 - 389 Public Input comments
 - 33 emails sent via the Tribal Trail or Teton County email addresses
- PublicInput.com (Public Input) is the County's online platform for collecting comments.
 - First time the program was used on a large project
 - Learned a lot about the asking questions in the platform
 - Received large amounts of data that took extra time to process
- Review of the four questions the County requested feedback on.
- One question that was not asked was "Do you support the project?"
 - Jacobs performed that analysis based on the information provided to the questions.
 - The green column in the comment spreadsheet denotes this question.
- Whitney clarified that the reason the comment numbers shown under each graphic are different is because not everyone answered every question.
- Question. Do you know how many people were from WY?
 - Yes, determined that information based on ZIP codes provided
- Question. Should we assume that the out of state commentors may be part-time Teton County residents?
 - Yes. Given that Teton County is an affluent area the project team did not feel it was appropriate to exclude comments that did not register as WY.
- The majority of commentors are in favor of the "No Build" alternative; whether local or non-local.
- Defined "local" as people with ZIP codes within either of the Teton Counties (WY/ID). ZIP code graphics shows the "local" area.
- Comment. Seems like the "real" locals would be the residents of Indian Springs and Indian Trails.
 - Response. One of the questions did request information about local neighborhoods. This was one of the lessons learned about Public Input. We should have provided a list of neighborhoods for people to pick from because the information we received was too inconsistent to use.
- Ralph Haberfeld requested feedback from the local neighborhood representatives.
 - Virginia Powell Symons. People are mostly in opposition of the project in the Cottonwood neighborhood Concerned about heavy traffic through school zones.
 - Frank Lane. No formal vote in Indian Trails but the majority of the residents he has spoken to are opposed to the build project for the same reasons, heavy traffic.
- Heather Overholser reminded attendees of the recent approval of the Northern South Park development.
- All the comments are provided in the spreadsheet that accompanied the one-page

summary.

- Each comment has a unique idea so you can match the comments up with copies of the “hard” or emailed comments attached at the back of the spreadsheet.
- Jim Clarke provided a few takeaways from the public meeting results.
 - We’ve learned a lot on soliciting input from the public and would make it easier to summarize.
 - That redundancy wasn’t a top concern, for people who preferred the “No Build” alternative indicates that we as a project team should have done a better job identifying this as a key part of the project.
 - Touched on the redundancy responses we’ve received from local emergency folks.

4. Review of four build alternatives’ pros and cons

- I-N2b (One of the two alternatives from the June 2020 Commissioner mtg)
 - If the commission approves moving forward, it would go to WYDOT’s Access Review Committee, for things like if WYDOT would allow a signal
 - There are wetland impacts, but not fen impacts
 - Per the plat and the access permit w/ WYDOT, the Indian Spring Ranch approach would be closed by WYDOT
 - Includes a pathway underpass at Tribal Trail
 - 25 mph design speed on Tribal Trail
 - Would include design features to help calm traffic speed
 - Amy: covered the 2-lane vs. 4-lane options for near term and long term. We have lots of iterations of this alternative but won’t get into that today.
 - Derek Ellis-This is the only alternative allowed by easement.
 - Least expensive alternative
- I-N5b:
 - Would establish a new easement for Tribal Trail
 - Underpass for Indian Spring Drive and Coyote Canyon Road
 - Less capacity impact on WY 22
 - More impacts on wetlands, but not directly to the fen
 - Jeff B: this option is forward compatible w/ future WY 22 widening; the portion sweeping into the ROW is fine by WYDOT’s standards
 - Pathway would be put in the underpass
 - Pathway is preliminary, and would be looked at in further detail
 - this option would require a revision to that easement
 - Indian Springs Ranch has made it clear that they will not agree to amending the conservation easement (w/ this alternative)
 - Cost medium, least expensive of the underpass options.
 - No escalation costs for possible litigation were factored into these costs
- I-N18
 - Frontage road similar to I-N5b
 - Indian Springs Drive and Coyote Canyon Road converted to signalized intersection.
 - Cost similar to I-N2b
 - Would require a modification to the conservation easement
 - Indian Springs Ranch has made it clear that they will not agree to amending the conservation easement (w/ this alternative)
- I-N19h
 - The most expensive option

- Retaining wall is feasible, but will cost quite a bit more
- Would also require amendments to the easements to build
- Indian Springs Ranch has made it clear that they will not agree to amending the conservation easement (w/ this alternative)
- Would this need to go to the WYDOT Access Committee? (basically, anything that changed the access, would require an access permit)
- Jeff: the 4 alternatives we are looking at today are the 4 WYDOT has looked at and is comfortable with. This option has a good traffic flow

5. Questions and/or comments:

- Frank Lane inquired about power lines

6. **Vote:** Do stakeholders prefer build vs no build?

- Frank: (No-Build) based on feedback from others in neighborhood, prefers a no-build; in favor of an “emergency road” (gravel, unimproved) to connect to WY-22 for redundancy.
 - Later in the discussion, Frank expanded on his previous comment about an “emergency road.” In 2020 a group of stakeholders brought alternative route for consideration by the project team, which would specifically be built for emergency response.
 - Amy: Talked to Chief Hansen (JH Fire/EMS) who feels that it would be challenging to manage such a road.
 - Heather, this concept can be added to the staff report for the workshop.
- Virginia: (No-Build) Seconds what Frank mentioned. Recognizes that there would be benefits for local traffic. If approved, wants to make sure this is not a “cut-through” for motorists/tourists. Also wants to see how it would fit into planning for Northern South Park.
- Scott: (Build) Thinks the connection is important for safety, redundancy; the Northern South Park future development will add more traffic, which make TTC important. Overall, more redundancy is needed throughout the County roadway network.
- Ralph: (No Build) The neighborhoods that would be the most impacted are the most against it. Wildlife impacts, viewsheds are impacted, wants to retain an open mind (as he is a stakeholder), the neighborhood was mostly against when they had a vote (which was several years ago); the new Indian Spring Ranch board is even more against it than the previous one was. Redundancy is a “red hearing” because there is always the possibility to open Indian Springs.
- Lindsay: (Build – however, it depends on which alternative gets selected) Has reservations based on how it might impact WY 22 now and in the future.
- Grant: (Build) From the school districts perspective, they prefer build option. The connector would help get kids out of school busses more quickly, reduce route times, reduce traffic related to schools. Would add a new route for possible evacuations.
- Dave: (Build; however, Teton Science Schools has chosen not to have an opinion on whether or not a road is built, and the Schools’ opinion is dependent on which alternative is selected.) Has comments similar to those of the school district in that the connector would improve redundancy, decrease travel times for students, and connect to potential staff housing opportunities in Northern South Park.
- Deb (via email): BUILD
- Lisa was not in attendance.

- Tom Holland was not in attendance.

7. **Vote:** Stakeholder preferred build alternative

- Ralph: Doesn't want to cut off Indian Springs Ranch, so N2b is the worst, would decrease property values in Indian Springs; however, the other options have easement issues.
 - Likes 5b and 18, does not like Lazy J
- Bob: Clarification: Cost order of magnitude is quite a bit different (2x and 3x the costs of N2b and N18)
- Scott: N2b – because its buildable, without litigation
- Lindsay: No to the signal... N19h seems to provide the safest option & then the N5b comes in second
- Virginia: N5b... seems simpler than N19h; however, N2b seems like the most likely to get done and could support that one...
- Frank: Hesitant to adding a signal to Hwy22; cost of condemnation is going to have to come up; N5b is his preferred
- Grant: for the future, N5b and then N19h
- David: N2b seems to be the one that meets the criteria; however, this seems to not help out Coyote Canyon... so, N5b would be the preferred alternative

8. Next Steps

- Board of County Commissioners workshop: tentatively scheduled for September 12.
 - UPDATE: Workshop has been changed to Monday, October 3.
- Board of County Commissioners vote
- If project approved, WYDOT Access Permit application process
- WYDOT Access Review Committee