

# Stakeholder Meeting #2

---

29 January 2019 / 2 PM - 4 PM / Teton County Public Works

## ATTENDEES

Nick Hines (Facilitator)  
Mac Dukart for ~~Chris Colligan~~ (Greater Yellowstone Coalition)  
Katherine Dowson for ~~Jack Koehler~~ (Friends of Pathways)  
Amy Ramage (Teton County)  
David Hardie (River Hollow HOA)  
Ross MacIntyre (River Hollow HOA)  
Bill Schreiber (Jackson Hole Mountain Resort)  
Melissa Turley (Teton Village Association ISD)  
Gary Fralick (Wyoming Game and Fish)  
Aly Courtemanch (Wyoming Game and Fish)  
~~Darren Brugmann (Southern Teton Area Rapid Transit)~~  
Lynne Whalen (Community Representative)  
Bob Hammond (Wyoming Department of Transportation)

### Additional WYDOT Attendees

Hank Doering (Project Development)  
Ryan Shields (Traffic)  
Keith Compton (D3 District Engineer)  
Ted Wells (D3 District Construction Engineer)  
Stephanie Harsha (D3 Public Relations Specialist)

## AGENDA

### Old Business

1. Update on proposed school at Stilson

School District has not decided at this time on if the school will be built at Stilson. There is one more stakeholder meeting then the school board will decide. At this time it the public is leaning towards not putting the school at Stilson.

2. Update from Wildlife Subgroup

A spreadsheet and map showing the locations was provided by the subgroup (attached). It was asked how much money does WYDOT have to put towards wildlife crossings. WYDOT stated that we need to

look at what is correct thing to do here and what is needed at this location and we need to be able to justify that it is needed. WYDOT recommended that the sub-group look at what is needed at this location to reduce moose-vehicle collisions and provide justification. Since the meeting Amy has been provided with examples of how WYDOT justified crossings in the past.

3. December 12, 2018 Meeting Minutes -

Correct Bill Schreiber organization in the Attendees list.

**Stakeholder Group Recommendations and Updates:**

1. [Transit Study for 22/390](#)

WYDOT is currently defining the scope of work to hire a consultant. WYDOT is looking for transit recommendations by the end of October.

2. [Minimize Island Width on Florida T](#)

WYDOT has reviewed and continues to look at this concern. The width can not be reduced due to curve radius and deflection requirements. The concern is not necessarily about reducing ROW but the intrusiveness of the intersection.

3. [Update Traffic Volumes](#)

a. The following was provided in an email to the group

Segment	2011 July Weekday Avg (PEL)	2017 July Weekday Avg (most recent counts)	2035 July Weekday Avg (PEL)
Segment 1	23,000	28,000	35,000
Segment 2	13,000	16,600	23,000
Segment 3	11,000	13,400	18,000
Segment 4	6,500	8,800	10,000
Segment 5	16,000	16,700	23,000
Segment 6	9,000	9,400	15,000

One thing to remember is the the Level of Service (LOS) was poor back in 2012 (PEL page 8 and 62), indicating that the roadway was operating

above capacity. So even if there was no traffic growth the roadway was and is still over capacity.

Went over the table above - Was recommended to put the LOS on the table and put it in the presentation. WYDOT is looking into this recommendation.

#### 4. Create Wildlife Subgroup (Jack, Aly, Gary, Chris, Bob, Amy)

Update from the subgroup was provided above

#### 5. Have Presentation at Public Meeting and provide dry run.

WYDOT presentation was presented.

General Comments included:

- Reducing the visual impacts for the overall project
- Minimizing impacts overall
- Less engineering figures and more graphics
- Slide 9 - Shade the old structure and the new structure to better illustrate where both will be.
- Slide 10 - put option 1 at the top, add costs, spruce up more
- Spend more time talking about corridor vision
- Provide slide handouts - Was discussion on condensed version or all slides - no decision was made on this
- The right turn from 390 to 22 solid white line did not always show up. Looked like there was just a large right turn lane
- Slide 17 - Put Teton crossing
- Some other ideas where to look at starter questions and what challenges and opportunities there are with the project
- Discuss bridge lifespan
- Look at big picture with the PEL then narrow down to focus on this project.
- Mention transit consultant in the powerpoint.

### **New Business**

1. Friends of Pathways Letter to WYDOT

Many of the concerns from the Friends of Pathways letter were address during the slideshow presentation. In general:

- a. 1) - be transparent and honest - We talked about explaining the PEL process better in the presentation and also explain why we have to modify the intersection due to the road not aligning with the new bridge.
- b. 2) Reconduct public scoping process - Explain more in the slideshow what has been done (PEL) and why we are starting this project where we are.
- c. 3) Provide design options - Need to explain more in the slideshow that the PEL selected options and WYDOT narrowed down the options from there. There is also a slide showing the cost difference of the different types of bridges in the slideshow. Also the seismic concerns with the different types of bridges.
- d. Broaden the slideshow presentation to include impacts to the whole corridor. WYDOT is looking into shoulder widths at still meet WYDOT design criteria.

## 2. Lynn Whalen email

Many of these questions were also addressed during the slideshow presentation review. Discussed funding and can not afford to do the whole corridor at once. Explain in slideshow why the bridge needs to be replaced due to it being fracture critical. There was the discussion of redundant routes. WYDOT is responsible for this road and bridge and locating redundant routes does not address the fracture critical bridge. Suggested redundant routes be investigated with other entities.

## **Project Milestones:**

- ✓ Preliminary Plans issued - October 3, 2018
- ✓ Stakeholder Meeting (#1) - December 18, 2018
- ✓ Stakeholder Meeting (#2) - January 29, 2019
- First Public Meeting - February 21, 2019
- Stakeholder Meeting (#3) - expected April 17, 2019 (tentative)
- Stakeholder Meeting (#4) - expected June 12, 2019 (tentative)

- Need all Bridge recommendations by July/August of 2019
- Grading Plans - expected Nov 2019
- Stakeholder Meeting - expected Nov/Dec 2019
- Right-of-way/Engineering Plans - expected July 2020
- Stakeholder Meeting - expected July/August 2020
- Right-of-way/Engineering Plans - expected Oct 2020
- Final Plans - expected April 2021
- Project Letting late 2022 or early 2023
- Construction Spring 2023

1/25/2018

226.590-Wildlife Crossings.dwg



PROPOSED	A
DATE: 1/23/2018	
BY: [Signature]	

PROPOSED WILDLIFE UNDERPASSES

TETON COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS



DATE	
BY	
PROJECT NAME	
SCALE	

**WYDOT SNAKE RIVER BRIDGE REPLACEMENT AND HWY 22/390 INTERSECTION RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT - WILDLIFE CROSSINGS OPTIONS**  
 PREPARED BY WILDLIFE STAKEHOLDER SUB-COMMITTEE, 11/15/2019

PRIORITY 1 JUST EAST OF INTERSECTION MOOSE POND AREA		PRIORITY 2 EAST OF SNAKE RIVER EMILY'S POND APPROACH AREA		PRIORITY 3 WEST OF INTERSECTION STILSON TO HIDDEN HOLLOW		PRIORITY 4 NORTH OF HWY 22/390 INTERSECTION HWY 390 XING	
<b>GOLD</b>	<b>single span bridge</b>	<b>GOLD</b>	<b>extend bridge to the east</b>	<b>GOLD</b>	<b>separate box culvert</b>	<b>GOLD</b>	<b>separate new crossing south of existing gateway structure</b>
<b>PROS</b>	High cost	<b>PROS</b>	High cost	<b>PROS</b>	High cost	<b>PROS</b>	High cost
<b>CONS</b>	High cost	<b>CONS</b>	High cost	<b>CONS</b>	High cost	<b>CONS</b>	High cost
<b>SILVER</b>	bottomless arch culvert 65' bottom	<b>SILVER</b>	box culvert 16x16	<b>SILVER</b>	combined structure with gateway - larger arch	<b>SILVER</b>	parallel box culvert directly adjacent to existing gateway box
<b>PROS</b>	High cost	<b>PROS</b>	High cost	<b>PROS</b>	High cost	<b>PROS</b>	High cost
<b>CONS</b>	High cost	<b>CONS</b>	High cost	<b>CONS</b>	High cost	<b>CONS</b>	High cost
<b>SILVER</b>	extend bridge to west	<b>SILVER</b>	smaller arch structure	<b>SILVER</b>	existing gateway box culvert	<b>SILVER</b>	multi use arch structure (combine gateway, wildlife, w/when boat ramp access under road)
<b>PROS</b>	High cost	<b>PROS</b>	High cost	<b>PROS</b>	High cost	<b>PROS</b>	High cost
<b>CONS</b>	High cost	<b>CONS</b>	High cost	<b>CONS</b>	High cost	<b>CONS</b>	High cost
<b>BRONZE</b>	box culvert 12x20 or 16x16	<b>BRONZE</b>	box culvert 12x20 or 16x16	<b>BRONZE</b>	existing gateway box culvert	<b>BRONZE</b>	existing gateway box culvert
<b>PROS</b>	High cost	<b>PROS</b>	High cost	<b>PROS</b>	High cost	<b>PROS</b>	High cost
<b>CONS</b>	High cost	<b>CONS</b>	High cost	<b>CONS</b>	High cost	<b>CONS</b>	High cost

PO Box 2062  
Jackson, WY 83001



307.733.4534  
info@friendsofpathways.org

January 22, 2019

Mr. Keith Compton, District Engineer  
Wyoming Department of Transportation  
3200 Elk Street  
Rock Springs, WY 82901

RE: Wilson-Jackson Snake River Bridge Reconstruction Project

Dear Keith:

Thank you for appointing Friends of Pathways (FOP) to a seat on the Stakeholder Advisory Group for the WYO highway 22/390 and Snake River Bridge reconstruction project. We take seriously our commitment to abide by the Stakeholder Group Charter to provide recommendations on road design which will ensure adherence to the 2014 PEL Study and provide the best possible outcomes for the public and wildlife. We have been asked to relay any concerns with the stakeholder process or proposed design of the project to WYDOT, so they can be addressed in a timely manner by WYDOT project engineers. This letter is intended to serve that purpose.

We believe there are several fundamental flaws in this project which, if not addressed right now, will create public distrust in both WYDOT and the intent of the bridge replacement project. To rectify this problem, we recommend WYDOT take three actions before hosting the public outreach event for this project in late February.

- 1) **Be transparent and honest with the public that the current Intersection and Bridge Redesign Project is a pre-cursor to an expanded Highway 22 project, not just a bridge replacement project.** Addressing this up front is not only the right thing to do, but will give WYDOT more credibility with the public when the time comes to put WY22 into the STIP for Teton County.
- 2) **Reconduct the public scoping process.** The preliminary plans that have been presented to the Stakeholder Group contain elements beyond those required to meet the Purpose and Need which is "to replace the bridge." If the Purpose and Need of the project is truly just to "replace the bridge" then there is no justification for expanding the capacity of the intersection or adding lanes on the Snake River Bridge. The scoping process needs to be revisited with greater public engagement and outreach. An open and thorough scoping process is arguably the most important part of NEPA and guards against public backlash and distrust. To ensure compliance with the PELS, the project's Purpose and Need should be re-evaluated and should contain the needs, vision and goals as identified in the PELS as well as any others that come to light through this re-evaluation.
- 3) **At your public meeting in February, provide design options for the intersection and bridge that show a range of road types and development scenarios that are consistent with the guidance of the PELS.** Please include a scenario where the bridge halves are separated (two separate two-lane bridges) and where the bridge approaches are four-lane separated by a median.



Presenting a range of options to the public, and asking for their feedback and opinions, will encourage better public support for this project and future WYDOT projects.

Through our outreach, we have discovered it is impossible to focus the discussion only on the intersection and bridge without conversation leading to the expansion of the highway. FOP has collected different images that depict four-lane roads with a median (aka Parkways). These images (attached) are consistent with the recommendation offered in the PELS for the segment from Hwy 390 to Broadway. (See Page 29 of the PELS – “Recommended Cross-Section Alternatives.”). Given that WYDOT has already stated in the PELS that this is an appropriate design for HWY 22, it would be valuable for public understanding to have depictions of this type of option during the public scoping process. Thorough and transparent outreach will pay dividends for the successful completion of this project and future phases.

Thank you for considering and addressing these concerns. FOP looks forward to working with WYDOT and the Stakeholder Advisory Group to develop the best possible outcomes for this critical travel corridor.

Sincerely,

Jack Koehler, Program Director  
Friends of Pathways

Attachment

CC: Bob Hammond, Resident Engineer  
Jackson-Wilson Snake River Bridge Stakeholder Group

*Friends of Pathways supports a vibrant community by promoting sustainable transportation  
and healthy recreation in Jackson Hole.*

PO Box 2062  
Jackson, WY 83001



307.733.4534  
info@friendsofpathways.org

## Parkway Examples



Harden Parkway, Salinas, California, 12' left travel lane, 11' right travel lane  
4' right shoulder, No left shoulder, 18' grass median, 35 MPH speed limit



George Washington Parkway, 11' travel lanes, 1-2' shoulders, 13' grassy median, 40 MPH speed limit



Clara Barden Parkway Maryland, 11' travel lanes, 6" left shoulder, 2' right shoulder, 10 median, 45 MPH speed limit

Concept road section - bridge approaches and surrounding area- for discussion



This section is the same overall width as the WYDOT proposed section, however the pavement width is less - 56' vs. 76'. The median separating the travel lanes would provide many benefits including; increased safety for motorist and wildlife, space for left turn lanes at intersections, and a more visually pleasing roadway.

*Friends of Pathways supports a vibrant community by promoting sustainable transportation and healthy recreation in Jackson Hole.*



Nick Hines <nick.hines@wyo.gov>

---

## December 12, 2018 Stakeholder Draft Minutes

---

lmwhalen@bresnan.net <lmwhalen@bresnan.net>

Sun, Jan 27, 2019 at 8:53 AM

To: Nick Hines <nick.hines@wyo.gov>, "dbrugmann@jacksonwy.gov" <dbrugmann@jacksonwy.gov>, "hardie@wyoming.com" <hardie@wyoming.com>, "jack@friendsofpathways.org" <jack@friendsofpathways.org>, "mturley@tetonvillagewy.org" <mturley@tetonvillagewy.org>, Alyson Courtemanch <alyson.courtemanch@wyo.gov>, Amy Ramage <aramage@tetoncountywy.gov>, Bill Schreiber <bill.schreiber@jacksonhole.com>, Bob Hammond <bob.hammond@wyo.gov>, Chris Colligan <ccolligan@greateryellowstone.org>, Gary Fralick <gary.fralick@wyo.gov>, Hank Doering <hank.doering@wyo.gov>, Keith Compton <keith.compton@wyo.gov>, Leroy Wells <leroy.wells@wyo.gov>, Ross MacIntyre <rmacintyre174@gmail.com>, Scott Gamo <scott.gamo@wyo.gov>, Sean OMalley <somalley@tetoncountywy.gov>, Stephanie Harsha <stephanie.harsha@wyo.gov>

This is not a critique of the minutes as I did not find anything inaccurate. They are very general statements of the discussions we had.

But as I think over this project I cannot help but wonder how it is being moved forward and it's potential impact in the short term. The proposal is to take a two lane bridge with connections to two lanes on both the east and the west, turn it into a 4/5 lane bridge with connections to two lanes east, and two lanes west. What am I missing? Does this piecemeal approach not seem like a bottleneck in the making.

This bridge is old granted but exactly where does it fall on the list of dangerous bridges in Wyoming? And since we continue to funnel all traffic onto Rt. 22 without seriously investigating potential sources of redundancy, I have to question whether this project is timely.

-----