



April 7, 2010

Sean O'Malley, Teton County Engineer  
cc: Paula Stevens, Board of County Commissioners  
Re: Contract for Transportation System Design Standards Update – South Park Area  
Submitted via email

Dear Sean,

On behalf of the Jackson Hole Conservation Alliance, I am submitting the following comments (in written form) that I presented verbally at the April 6 hearing regarding potential transportation analysis for the South Park area. As I mentioned at the workshop, we primarily have questions that relate to traffic forecasting and the proposed timeline under which the scheduled tasks are to be completed. In response to the April 6 hearing, we appreciate the extra time that you will take to clarify the scope of work to be carried out in other phases of the proposed study.

Broadly speaking, we raise the following questions to better understand the nature of the proposed analysis and to ensure that the study helps inform the comprehensive planning process in the most productive and appropriate way possible:

- Specific to Task Two regarding traffic forecasts, what assumptions about “proposed development in the MTP area on a parcel level” is the county intending to provide to Fehr and Peers Transportation Consultants? Will information be based on the development potential that was proposed in the April 2009 Future Land Use Plan draft (including figures in Appendix I), on recommendations jointly provided by the planning commissions to date, or on some other set of assumptions?
- Are assumptions based on a narrowly defined development potential figure, or is the intention to test a range of scenarios to help take a look at potential implications of different land-use scenarios? These approaches are very different, and would play very different roles at this stage in the comprehensive planning process. (This question was largely answered in verbal comments during the April 6 hearing, but it will be important to ensure this intent is clearly outlined in the description for scope of work.)
- In terms of how the model is designed, does the study involve making assumptions about potential development in geographic areas outside of the study area? For example, to get a sense of possible thru-traffic and estimated traffic growth on High School Road, do assumptions have to be made about the overall level of growth possible throughout the county and town?
- Regarding Task Three, when it refers to “parcel based DU and square footage changes allowed under current zoning,” is staff intending to provide assumptions and numbers based on the Buildout Task Force, or will Clarion assumptions and figures be used (which were the basis for previous traffic modeling)? Does “current zoning” include base zoning only, or does it include a set of assumptions about possible density-bonus options? It would be helpful to clarify how Task Three will be conducted at this time given that it appears that assumptions still have to be made about projected growth. While we think it is a step in the right direction to gather information to help update design standards, could clarification be provided as to the types of assumptions that have to be made for this particular model to carry out this task?

Overall, we really appreciate the effort to conduct analysis that will help inform future land use decisions. That said, **the value of the modeling will only be as helpful as the quality of the assumptions put into the model.** Testing of various scenarios at this point is helpful, but it will also be important to make sure our community, at some point, analyzes the transportation implications of the proposed Future Land Use Plan that will be a part of our community's new comprehensive plan. In order to make the study as helpful as possible, and before moving forward with all the tasks of the study, we would appreciate the clarification of assumptions and data to be provided by staff to the planning consultants.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Kristy Bruner  
Community Planning Director