



## MEMO

**TO:** Stakeholder Advisory Committee      **DATE:** January 24, 2020

**FROM:** Study Team

**SUBJECT:** Study Status Update

**COPIES:** Project File, Mike Halpin, Ted Wells/WYDOT

**ATTACHMENTS:** Attachment A - WYDOT Alternatives Review Letter,  
Attachment B - Level 1 Alternatives Evaluation Matrix,  
Attachment C - Level 2 Alternatives Evaluation Matrix,  
Attachment D - Figures

This memo is a follow-up to our November 2019 meetings and provides status updates on the alternative evaluation process, coordination meetings, and next steps.

### Recap of November Stakeholder Meetings

During the November 15<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> meetings, stakeholders provided valuable feedback and helped inform the study team's Level 1 and 2 alternatives evaluation by offering new alternatives (I-N2c, I-N14, and I-N15) and suggesting revisions to the study teams' ratings. Several Level 1 and 2 ratings were revised based on Stakeholder feedback.

Between the two meetings, stakeholders reviewed 30 different Level 1 alternatives related to the Tribal Trail Connector (TTC) roadway alignment and northern and southern intersections with WYO 22 and Boyles Hill/South Park Loop roads, respectively. Fifteen alternatives moved forward into the Level 2 evaluation. Also, ten typical cross-sections were added.

Based on the meeting discussion and stakeholder suggestions, the study team decided to request WYDOT review of WYO 22 intersection alternative relatives to access concerns. Results of the WYDOT coordination are discussed in the **WYDOT Review** section below.

Stakeholders asked how the ratings would influence which alternative was selected as the preferred alternative and presented to the County Commission? The Stakeholders felt that some criteria are more important than others and should factor more into the selection process. See **Level 2 Scoring Update** below for the study team's approach to address this question.

Level 1 and 2 evaluation matrices were updated based on these meetings, then further refined based on updated information. The following sections summarize changes to the ratings and matrices.

### Teton Science School/Indian Springs Proposal

At the November 15 meeting, the Teton Science School (TSS) and Indian Springs (IS) subdivision representatives approached Teton County staff with a proposal to design, construct, and fund an underpass

connecting Indian Springs Drive and Coyote Canyon Road. The underpass design and location are similar to the proposed underpass included in several project alternatives. TSS and IS would like to see an alternative that includes an underpass at Indian Springs Drive and Coyote Canyon Road; however, they are willing to pursue the project on their own.

## **WYDOT Review**

On November 26, 2019, the study team requested that WYDOT review seven Level 2 alternatives and provide preliminary determinations of the feasibility of those alternatives considering their multiple access points. WYDOT's review considered whether alternatives might be permissible based upon WYDOT design and access standards, as well as existing access permits for Indian Springs Drive and Coyote Canyon Road and associated plat language.

WYDOT provided comments on December 11, 2019 (Attachment A). In short, WYDOT determined that:

- several alternatives (I-N2, I-N2b, and I-N11), could advance
- several alternatives (I-N2c, I-N4c, I-N7, I-N-10, and I-N16) should not advance due to operational and safety concerns; and
- proposed other intersection configurations as part of the alternative evaluation.

The study team reviewed WYDOT's four proposed alternatives (refer to figures in Attachment A) and determined that one alternative was viable. This new alternative--I-N17--is included in Level 1 and 2 evaluation matrices.

In its review, WYDOT noted the Preferred Alternative, once identified, would require detailed operational analysis and approval by its Access Review Committee.

## **Pathways Task Force Meeting**

At the November 15th meeting, stakeholders and the study team agreed to have the Pathways Task Force review proposed pathway connections and provide recommendations. The task force convened and recommended the pathway be located on the west side of Tribal Trail Road with a crossing at Seneca Lane to the existing pathway.

## **Design Modelling at WYO 22 Connection**

Given the challenging terrain along WYO 22, the study team advanced the design on some of the Level 2 alternatives. Using highway design software, the designers modelled elements such as a northern frontage road along WYO 22 and an underpass under WYO 22 at its connection with the Tribal Trail Connector. The initial modelling indicated that both a frontage road and underpass would require considerable excavation and retaining wall along the steep hillside north of WYO 22. Further modelling is necessary and may result in adjustments to Level 2 scores to factor in increased costs, visual impacts, and constructability issues. The updated scoring may result in the elimination of one or more of the design alternatives; however, more analysis is necessary.

## **Level 2 Criteria Ranking**

Responding to stakeholder comments regarding the differing importance of the Project Objective criteria, the study team surveyed stakeholders and asked them to rank the criteria in order of importance. Cost and Constructability criteria were excluded from the survey due to lack of information. Seven out of the nine stakeholders responded to the survey. The following table shows the results, with higher scores reflecting higher importance.

	Minimize impacts to natural resources	Minimize impacts to the human environment	Minimize safety concerns	Minimize private property impacts	Provide more direct and efficient multi-modal routing	Maintenance
Survey results	<b>4.43*</b>	3.14	<b>4.71</b>	3.00	<b>3.71</b>	2.00

\*Top three criteria scores shown in bold font.

To reflect this stakeholder feedback, the study team adjusted Level 2 ratings in several different ways, using various scoring and weighting methods. Regardless of the approach, the alternatives recommended for elimination from further review rated lower than other alternatives. Attachment C - Level 2 Alternatives Evaluation Matrix, reflects scoring without criteria weighting or prioritizing.

## Alternatives Evaluation Updates

WYDOT's alternative review resulted in changes to the Level 1 and Level 2 alternative evaluation matrices. The latest Level 1 and 2 alternative evaluation matrices are attached (Attachment B - Level 1 Alternatives Evaluation Matrix; Attachment C - Level 2 Alternatives Evaluation Matrix), with modifications shown in blue. Notable updates since the November meetings are summarized below. Please refer to the attachments for details; the attached figures (Attachment D - Figures) notes those alternatives the study team recommends be eliminated from further review.

### Level 1

Table below summarizes the **changes** made to Level 1 matrix.

Alternative ID	Eliminated in Level 1	Carried Forward into Level 2
I-N2c		X
I-N4b	X	
I-N4c	X	
I-N6c		X
I-N7	X	
I-N9b	X	
I-N10	X	
I-N16a	X	
I-N16b	X	
I-N17		X

Additional information about the **changes** summarized in the Table above.

- I-N2c hybrid alternative proposed at the end of the November 15 meeting. At the November 21 meeting, stakeholders agreed alternative meets all the Level 1 criteria and will move forward into Level 2 evaluation.
- I-N4b alternative has design features only associated with grade-separated interchanges that would not apply or function with at-grade intersections.
- WYDOT determined Alternatives I-N4c, I-N7, I-N10, I-N16a, I-N16b could not be permitted due to operational and safety issues; these were eliminated.
- County staff added I-N6c to provide an alternative with an at-grade signalized intersection and northern frontage road.
- I-N9b has the same design elements as I-N6c and therefore was removed from the Level 1 evaluation.
- I-N17 was added based on WYDOT's recommendations. Alternative meets all the Level 1 criteria and will move forward into Level 2 evaluation.

## Level 2

The table below shows the changes made to Level 2 alternatives based on input and information from the Stakeholder Advisory Committee, Pathways Taskforce, and TSS/IS meetings. Additional information regarding these changes follows.

Alternative ID	Improves multi-modal connections	Minimize impacts to natural resources	Minimize impacts to human environment	Minimize safety concerns	Minimize private property impacts	Provide more direct and efficient multi-modal routing	Be cost effective	Constructability
O-N1				Good to fair				
I-N2a							Poor to fair	Fair to poor
I-N4a							Fair to poor	
I-N6b		Poor to fair					Fair to poor	
I-N11	Good to fair			Good to fair	Good to fair	Good to fair		Fair to good
I-S1	Fair to good		Good to fair	Good to fair				
I-S2					Good to fair			
I-S3			Good to fair	Good to fair				
T-E1						Good to fair		
T-E2		Good to poor				Good to fair	Good to fair	Good to fair
T-A1	Good to fair	Fair to poor				Good to fair		
T-A2	Good to fair					Good to fair		

- **Improves multi-modal connections.** Changes relate to pedestrian safety and reflect Pathways Task force input and preferences.
- **Minimize impacts to natural resources.** Further design review indicated that retaining walls could reduce wetland impacts near intersection with WYO 22. Changes made to typical cross-section ratings reflect additional effects to Spring Creek.
- **Minimize impacts to human environment.** Changes based on increased emissions and noise levels from vehicles stopping and starting at stop signs.
- **Minimize safety concerns.** Changes relate to lack of proposed improvements to Indian Springs Drive and Coyote Canyon Road.
- **Minimize private property impacts.** Construction activities could temporarily impact private property.
- **Provide more direct and efficient multi-modal routing.** Changes relate to pedestrian safety per taskforce input.
- **Cost Effectiveness.** Alternatives with two underpasses originally scored *Poor* due to high cost. Considering the TSS/IS proposal and potential cost-sharing, these alternatives generally were updated to Fair.
- **Constructability.** Changes relate to the extent of hillside excavation (cut) or roadway and additional fill material required for pathway construction.

## **Study Team Recommendations**

The study team recommends dismissing alternatives I-N2c, I-N4, and I-N6b and typical cross-sections T-A1, T-A2, and T-A5 from further evaluation based on their performance against Level 2 criteria relative to other alternatives. Key reasons for dismissal include the following:

I-N2c	WYDOT recommended eliminating; does not provide full movement for travel redundancy, EMS and emergency evacuation.
I-N4a and I-N4c	Closes Indian Springs Drive access to WYO 22.
I-N6b	Per traffic microsimulations, roundabout at WYO 22 does not perform as well as other alternatives, resulting in poor Level of Service and back-ups on Tribal Trail Road during peak hour. Roundabout also would require considerable grading into steep hillside north of WYO 22, adding cost and complicating construction.
T-A1 and T-A2	Includes pathway on east side of Tribal Trail Road; eliminated per Pathway Task Force recommendation.

## **Conclusion**

The study team recommends the following alternatives be carried forward for public comment and potential further evaluation:

- O-N1
- O-N2a
- O-N2b
- I-N2
- I-N2b
- I-N6c
- I-N9a
- I-N11
- I-N17
- I-S1
- I-S2
- I-S3
- T-A3
- T-A4
- T-B1
- T-B2
- T-B3

## **Next Steps**

Over the next several months, the study team will work toward identifying a Preferred Alternative. Next steps in this process include:

- Stakeholder input and feedback
  - Please review the information provided in this email and provide any thoughts, comments, or questions by 12:00 PM (midday) on January 31, 2020.
- Public meeting
  - The study team is working to schedule a public meeting in late February to get feedback on the alternatives evaluation. Features being discussed for the meeting include a visual simulation of the proposed connector, enhanced online features via the project website, and traffic model simulations.
- Reconvene Stakeholders
  - The study team would like to reconvene the Stakeholder Advisory Committee to review public input and provide feedback to inform the identification of a Preferred Alternative.
  - This meeting will represent our eighth stakeholder meeting. Stakeholders have been extremely generous with their time and we're mindful that this is a limited resource. Therefore, County staff are working to onboard a trained facilitator to lead future stakeholder meetings, with an eye toward keeping meetings efficient and productive.
  - The study team is tentatively planning on holding the stakeholder meeting on March 3 or 4. Please, use the link to complete a Doodle poll with your availability.
    - [Tribal Trail Stakeholder Doodle Poll](#)
- Board workshop & Preferred Alternative approval

- Following the stakeholder meeting, the study team plans to hold a workshop with the County Commissioners to review the study background, progress, and results of the alternatives evaluation. The workshop will help inform the commissioners in advance of a future commission vote.
- After the workshop, county staff will recommend the identified Preferred Alternative to the County Commission at one of its regular meetings in early Spring. At that point, the Board will vote to approve or reject the Preferred Design Alternative.