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intent of this update
intent of this update

• update transportation element from 2000/2008
• rely on adopted comprehensive plan (no rehash)
• use lean, focused public process
• provide transparent analysis system – no black box
• ensure the ITP can be easily updated
• provide specific transit system development plan
• provide full documentation
comprehensive plan guidance

“residents and visitors will safely, efficiently, and economically move within our community and throughout the region using alternative transportation”
must do

• meet future transportation demand through the use of alternative modes
• create a safe, efficient, interconnected, multimodal transportation network
• integrate land use and transportation planning
the plan: why and what for
your greatest needs

1. take a strategic approach to traffic
2. grow your transit system
3. connect active transportation
1. move beyond focus on traffic

strategic approach to major capital projects

- Demand
- Benchmark
- Project development
- Benchmark
- T – 10 (major corridors)
- T – 5 (widen, rebuild)
- Open to travel
VMT – interior west states
2000 - 2013

CO
12%

ID
18%

WY
15%

Source: FHWA and US Census Bureau
per capita VMT – interior west states

2000 - 2013

CO: - 8%
ID: - 5%
WY: - 3%

Source: FHWA and US Census Bureau
future vmt = per capita vmt \times \text{population}
2. grow your transit system
transit ridership trend
(annual boardings)

Source: START
3. connect active transportation
the competition

Telluride

Banff

Whistler
your greatest needs

1. take a strategic approach to traffic
2. grow your transit system
3. connect active transportation
methodology and approach
plan development process

- JIM briefings
- Interviews
- TAC* meetings
- Public workshops
- TAC draft
- Public draft

* TAC = technical advisory committee
planning horizons

2015 2018 2019 2024 2035

implementation

immediate actions

high priority actions

technical update

long range planning

planning horizon for 22/390 PEL*

study

benchmarked actions

full update

* PEL = WYDOT plan for WY-22 and WY-390
not a "gentleman’s" plan
two forecasts

baseline scenario
no intervention
trends continue
2013 travel behavior

plan scenario
ITP implementation
transit ridership x 4
5% drop in SOV
draft plan
draft plan

1. plan overview
2. transit development
3. active transportation
4. transportation demand management
5. major capital projects
6. regional transportation planning organization
7. action plan
appendices

A. transportation programs and policies from the comprehensive plan
B. stakeholder interview summary
C. public workshop #1 outcomes summary
D. public workshop #2 outcomes summary
E. transportation indicators trend data
F. transportation demand management program options
G. monitoring active transportation system demand and performance
H. north bridge traffic impact analysis
I. fixed guideway transit feasibility
J. wildlife protection resources
K. regional transportation planning organization resources
chapter 1. plan overview

blueprint for implementing transportation provisions of the comp plan
chapter 2. transit development

make transit a viable choice
“viable choice” – transit works for ordinary people in all traveler categories in all major corridors

- transit facility improvements
- service improvements
- commuter routes
- corridor routes
- circulator routes
- transit pass and fare programs
- marketing and information

brt
feasibility of high-capacity, fixed-guideway transit

(appendix i)
bus in mixed traffic
- insufficient capacity

enhanced bus
- intermediate step
  - insufficient capacity

bus rapid transit
- plan
  - by 2024 if possible
streetcar
  • inappropriate

light rail transit
  • infeasible

commuter rail
  • infeasible

metro rail
  • infeasible

aerial tramway
  • potentially feasible
  • major barriers
Passengers/Hour in the Peak Hour, Peak Direction

feasibility

- maximum capacity
- minimum cost effectiveness

Bus in Mixed Traffic
Enhanced Bus
BRT
Streetcar
LRT
Commuter Rail
Metro Rail
Aerial Tramway
chapter 3. active transportation

health, safety, destination environment
four major initiatives

town community streets plan

enhanced winter maintenance in town

county neighborhoods policy and plan

continue pathways plan implementation
South Cache
a bicycling network
Crosstown bike route
public health
chapter 4.
transportation demand management

leverage our investment
four major initiatives

commuters:
  employer involvement
  transit passes
  web tools, apps

residents:
  access to schools
  special events
  web tools, apps

visitors:
  real-time traffic info
  outreach before arrival
  web tools, apps

new development:
  tdm plan
  program participation
  reporting, monitoring
**Jackson/Teton County Integrated Transportation Plan Dashboard**

**Report Year**

2013

**Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled**

480 million

**Active Transportation Mode Share**

16.1%

**Average daily summer VMTCapita**

34.0

**Average monthly summer START ridership/capita**

1.0

**KEY**

- 2013 Base
- 2024 Plan
- 2035 Plan

**Wildlife Vehicle Collisions**

- 2012: 168
- 3-yr Avg: 222
monitoring active transportation

population-level demand
facility-level demand
facility use data
walk/bike environment data

(appendix g)
chapter 5. major capital projects

strategic capital programming
principles

- network approach
- interagency coordination
- multimodal function
- strategic timing
four capital groups
capital group 1

- “Y” intersection
- Tribal Trails Connector
- WY-22 pathway
- WY-22 multi-laning
- BRT
- WY-22 intersections
- wildlife permeability
capital group 1 benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1 Indicator Count Station</th>
<th>2013 (actual traffic)</th>
<th>2024 (forecast traffic)</th>
<th>2035 (forecast traffic)</th>
<th>1st Benchmark (initiate project development)</th>
<th>2nd Benchmark (initiate construction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WY 22 Jackson West (PC #158)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer average vehicles per weekday</td>
<td>21,379</td>
<td>23,800</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>18,600</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
capital group 2

- WY-390
- WY-22 intersection
- wildlife permeability

benchmark count station
capital group 2 benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 2 Indicator Count Station</th>
<th>2014 (actual traffic)</th>
<th>2024 (forecast traffic)</th>
<th>2035 (forecast traffic)</th>
<th>1st Benchmark (initiate project development)</th>
<th>2nd Benchmark (initiate construction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WY 390 Teton Village (ATR #141)</td>
<td>14,575</td>
<td>16,800</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>18,600</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
capital group 3

- Spring Gulch Road
- fixed guideway transit
- north bridge
capital group 3 benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 3 Indicator Count Station</th>
<th>2014 (actual traffic)</th>
<th>2024 (forecast traffic)</th>
<th>2035 (forecast traffic)</th>
<th>1st Benchmark (initiate NEPA/PEL process)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US-26 Gros Ventre (ATR #84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer average vehicles per weekday</td>
<td>12,770</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>15,800</td>
<td>17,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
capital group 4

- Tribal Trails Connector
- East-West Connector
- Maple Way – Snow King
chapter 6.
regional transportation planning organization

continuing, cooperative, comprehensive
RTPO phasing

first stage organization

- establish policy board
- establish technical advisory committee
- TDM program
- pathways program
- START planning services
- reporting and monitoring plan performance
- develop transportation funding proposal
- STIP evaluation and representation
RTPO phasing

second stage organization

- prioritize and allocate new regional funding
- regional transportation planning
- grant administration
chapter 7. action plan

strategic, prioritized, accountable
implementation

- immediate actions (2015 – 2018)
- high priority actions (2015 – 2024)
- benchmarked actions (2025 – 2035)
funding the plan

- federal funding
- project development
- dedicated transit funding
- capital funding
- private sector
- transparency and accountability
funding sources suitability

- sales tax
- lodging tax
- general county-wide property tax
- RTA tax
- private sector
**Jackson/Teton County Integrated Transportation Plan Dashboard**

**Report Year:** 2013

- **Annual Vehicle Miles Traveled:** 480 million
- **Active Transportation Mode Share:** 16.1%
- **Average Daily Summer VMT/capita:** 34.0
- **Average Monthly Summer START Ridership/capita:** 1.0
- **Annual START Ridership:** 0.90 million

**Key**
- 2013 Base
- 2024 Plan
- 2035 Plan

**Wildlife Vehicle Collisions**
- 2012: 168
- 3-yr Avg: 222
wrap up
your greatest needs

1. take a strategic approach to traffic
2. grow your transit system
3. connect active transportation
discussion
details – specific issues
north bridge
north bridge traffic changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Segment</th>
<th>2013 Daily VMT</th>
<th>Annual Growth Rate</th>
<th>Baseline 2024 Daily VMT</th>
<th>Change w/ North Bridge</th>
<th>2024 VMT w/ N Bridge</th>
<th>Difference in Daily VMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WY-390 (Village to WY 22)</td>
<td>51,687</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>61,678</td>
<td>-43%</td>
<td>35,157</td>
<td>-26,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WY-22 (WY 390 to Y)</td>
<td>64,581</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>75,103</td>
<td>-26%</td>
<td>55,576</td>
<td>-19,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-26 (Y to Cache)</td>
<td>37,279</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>42,987</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>48,145</td>
<td>5,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-26 (Cache to Gros Ventre)</td>
<td>55,685</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>64,211</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>79,622</td>
<td>15,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New North Bridge Corridor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>21,576</td>
<td>21,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Route</td>
<td>209,232</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>243,979</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>240,076</td>
<td>-3,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide</td>
<td>1,357,230</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1,551,660</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>1,547,757</td>
<td>-3,903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
north bridge
traffic
changes

appendix h
tribal trails connector
South Park Sub Area
And High School Road Corridor
Transportation Analysis
Joint Information Meeting
June 7, 2010

Previous Tribal Trail Study Efforts
- 1983 Indian Springs Master Plan
- 1991 Teton County Transportation Master Plan
- 1995 ROW and survey
- Several others
  - High School Road Improvement Plan (2001)

Study Purpose
- Assess traffic impacts of the proposed Tribal Trail Connector on High School Road
- Identify road improvement needs for the South Park Sub Area
- Identify current nonmotorized user safety issues in the north part of the study area

Study Purpose
- Study analyzed 4 traffic scenarios:
  - Existing conditions
  - Existing volumes with the Tribal Trail Connector
  - 2030 baseline conditions
  - 2030 conditions with the Tribal Trail Connector
Future Volumes with Tribal Trail Traffic Forecast

- 13,300 vpd forecast to use Tribal Trail Connection
  - Local traffic: 70% (up from 61%)
  - Through traffic: 30% (down from 39%)

- North Cache next to the Town Square currently carries around 14,500 vpd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between</th>
<th>And</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Side</td>
<td>South Park (local)</td>
<td>9,255</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town (through)</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South of Town (through)</td>
<td>3,185</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Park</td>
<td>Town (local)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,330</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Traffic</td>
<td>9,290</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Through Traffic</td>
<td>4,040</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tribal trails connector bottom line

• connector would significantly reduce traffic and congestion at the ‘Y’ intersection
• east-west connector would reduce traffic on High School Road and South Park Loop Road
• 70% of traffic on tribal trails connector would be local, not pass-through
ttc project benefits  (from draft ITP p.33)

- reduced vmt due to circuitous traffic
- reduced traffic and congestion at ‘Y’
- improved emergency vehicle access/response
- improved local road redundancy – emergencies
- improved routing potential for START
ttc measures  (from draft ITP p.33)

• coordinate closely with WyDOT
• study potential for grade separation – nb to wb
• use berms and landscaping barriers to reduce visual and noise impacts
• use design to reduce cut-through traffic
• use design to keep traffic speeds slow
high capacity transit
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODE</th>
<th>CAPACITY (passengers per hour per direction)</th>
<th>CAPITAL COST ($millions per route mile)</th>
<th>TERRAIN (maximum grade)</th>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUS IN MIXED TRAFFIC</td>
<td>Up to 500</td>
<td>$0.5 - $1.5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENHANCED BUS</td>
<td>Up to 750</td>
<td>$1 - $5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Busy arterial corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Up to 2,500</td>
<td>$10 - $30</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Heavily-traveled arterial corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREETCAR</td>
<td>Up to 1,500</td>
<td>$30 - $80</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Urban streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>Up to 3,600</td>
<td>$50 - $150</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Metro areas over 1 million population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUTER RAIL</td>
<td>Up to 20,000</td>
<td>$15 - $100</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>Major metro regions (&gt; 5 million) with large, dense downtowns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAVY RAIL</td>
<td>Up to 25,000</td>
<td>$100 - $600</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Metro regions (&gt;2.5 million population)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AERIAL TRAMWAY</td>
<td>Up to 4,000</td>
<td>$5 - $50</td>
<td>Almost vertical</td>
<td>Steep grade settings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
bus in mixed traffic

- insufficient capacity

enhanced bus

- intermediate step
- insufficient capacity

bus rapid transit

- plan
- by 2024 if possible
streetcar
• inappropriate

light rail transit
• infeasible

commuter rail
• infeasible

metro rail
• infeasible

aerial tramway
• potentially feasible
• major barriers
Passengers/Hour in the Peak Hour, Peak Direction

- Bus in Mixed Traffic
- Enhanced Bus
- BRT
- Streetcar
- LRT
- Commuter Rail
- Metro Rail
- Aerial Tramway

- 25,000
- 20,000
- 15,000
- 10,000
- 5,000
- 1,000

1,000 passengers/hour in the peak hour, peak direction.