

## South Park Loop Pathway Connector

Public Comment received via email 9/1/2015 through 12/3/2015

**From:** John Danby [mailto:johnrdanby@msn.com]

**Sent:** Thursday, September 17, 2015 9:47 AM

**To:** Brian Schilling <bschilling@tetonwyo.org>

**Subject:** South Park Loop Pathway Plan

Brian,

I read with interest today, the article in the Jackson Hole Daily regarding the South Park Loop Pathway Plan. As a regular pathway user, I am very appreciative of the work that Friends of Pathways have done in the community. Since I began running again in 2010, I estimate that I have run well over 3,000 miles along our amazing pathway system. I do not intend this letter as criticism but as input from someone who has extensive experience using this segment. As a resident of Melody Ranch, I am very excited to have this section completed. With this section, I look forward to a much safer route to reach other segments of the pathway system. I understand that several options are being considered for the routing of the path. Over the past 5 years, approximately 25% of my runs take me through this section. It's a beautiful section that I really enjoy. As I've run through this segment, my mind has always contemplated how to get over several obstacles along the route. Given my background in construction, I am well aware of the constraints to cutting in this pathway. Of particular concern is the sections both East and North of Shooting Iron Road. On my many runs through this section I have run on either side of the road, always attempting to run against traffic. I have found that the best place to run on this section is along the outside of the curve (West and South of the road). This provides the very best visibility for me and the traffic. I believe that providing crossings to avoid the challenging terrain could create significant hazards to both motorists and pathway users. They are as follows:

The main difficulty is that there are several bends in the road that create challenging blind spots for motorist and pedestrians. In some cases the best places to make a pathway crossing due to terrain align with these blind spots.

The tall cottonwoods along the east most segment create very challenging shadows for drivers making it very difficult to see pedestrians. This condition also exists at the current pathway entry to the 3-Creek segment. Crossings through this area would prove very hazardous.

The bulk of the tree and brush is on the north and east sided of South Park. Placing the pathway in this area would result in the removal of much of that growth. This would eliminate much of the beauty and shade through that corridor.

The speeds along this roadway are 35mph. The Sherriff's department has done a good job monitoring traffic along this road, But it is not uncommon to see speeds in excess of 45 mph particularly around the bend at Shooting Iron and near the 3-Creek pathway entrance. Further, I have noticed that the prime time for pedestrian/biking traffic along this road aligns with the high traffic volume (7-9 am & 5-7

pm). Obviously placing crossings on the road will disrupt traffic flow and may put pedestrians in harms way.

To be clear, my concerns are not about roadway intersection crossings. Those are issues that I expect to encounter on my runs. A run from my neighborhood to Rafter J and back would result in over 20 roadway intersection crossings. I am more concerned about avoiding zig-zagging across South Park. If the pathway were constructed with these types of crossing (avoiding construction of retaining walls as the article indicates), it would align these crossings with the hazards I've listed above. As much as I'd like to keep the costs under control I believe that creating the crossings would create hazardous conditions between pedestrians and motorists. Further, I can think of no other pathway within the current system that criss-crosses along it's companion roadway. I encourage the pathway officials to find a way to keep the path on the south and west sides of South Park road. Doing so will provide the safest pathway for our community.

Thanks for your consideration.

John R. Danby

---

**From:** Jon [mailto:jon@jeparker.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2015 8:05 AM  
**To:** Brian Schilling <bschilling@tetonwyo.org>  
**Cc:** Jon <jon@jeparker.com>; biba@jeparker.com; shana.stegman@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Fwd: TOMORROW, OCT 20 - VENUE CHANGE South Park Loop Pathway Open House, 3:30pm

I regret that I was not able to attend the open house. The photo in the article below shows the hill by my house and my driveway. Unless the road is relocated to the east, I would like to see the pathway elevated. This option would minimize the cut into the hill, and would minimize the snow and water being splashed onto the path and users. The elevation could be achieved by using the stone filled wire baskets as the base and putting the path on top.

Thanks

Jon Parker

3650 S Park Loop Rd

---

**From:** John Danby [mailto:johnrdanby@msn.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2015 10:13 AM  
**To:** Brian Schilling <bschilling@tetonwyo.org>  
**Subject:** RE: South Park Loop Pathway Plan

Brian,

Thanks for your work and time on the presentation on Saturday. It was very insightful and really helped me get my head around the idea of moving the path to the north and east sides of South Park Loop. I'm

hoping to attend the meeting today but just had a few additional thoughts based on our meeting on Saturday.

- The proposed N & E positioning of the path actually provides only one crossing for residents of the Melody neighborhood. I live in the far east side of Melody Ranch, and by using the roads & paths within the neighborhood, I would be able to jump right on the path without having to cross South Park Loop at the beginning of my trip. I really like this idea and it is probably the biggest factor weighing in on my evolving opinion.
- The crossing at or near 3-Creek will really need community input. There were a lot of different opinions in the meeting Saturday and I still believe that safety has to be the number one priority. I'm willing to sacrifice aesthetics for safety.
- I am concerned that even removing 50% of the large cottonwoods near the Seherr-Thoss property will create a tremendous amount of resistance in the community. While this issue isn't particularly important to me, the trees provide aviary habitat, provide screening for the gravel pit, and are considered legacy plantings. During the Seherr-Thoss development discussion which would have resulted in the closing of the pit and the creation of a large neighborhood, the tree issue came up repeatedly. In the meeting Saturday, it was mentioned that these trees may actually be at the end of their life span. I know that comment was somewhat anecdotal but perhaps we would be well served to have an arborist provide input. A report from an arborist may allay some concerns. The report may also include a habitat mitigation plan for that segment.

Once again thanks for your time and I look forward to attending the meeting this afternoon.

John

---

**From:** Mark Memmer [mailto:markforauto@msn.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2015 1:47 PM

**To:** Brian Schilling <bschilling@tetonwyo.org>

**Subject:** South Park Loop Pathway

Hi Brian,

Vickie and I will try to make the workshops but in case not we want you to know we definitely favor keeping the south park loop on the southern and western edges to minimize the road crossing. Build the retaining walls or whatever it takes. Thanks, Mark and Vickie Memmer

---

**From:** Jim Whalen [mailto:jwhalen@tetonsheriff.org]

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 21, 2015 5:39 AM

**To:** Brian Schilling <bschilling@tetonwyo.org>

**Cc:** Sean O'Malley <somalley@tetonwyo.org>

**Subject:** Great job

Brian,

Great job yesterday! Excellent presentation...you had everything covered and it was clear you thought about and had answers for every question. Like you, for safety reasons, initially I was in favor of trying to keep the pathway on the south and west side of the road but it just doesn't make sense to do it that way. Cost and visual effects swayed me the other way. Who knows what the BCC will ultimately decide but either way it was clear you presented all the information they need. As the sheriff and a property owner on S. Park, thank you!

Jim

---

**From:** John Danby [mailto:johnrdanby@msn.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 21, 2015 4:19 PM  
**To:** County Commissioners <commissioners@tetonwyo.org>  
**Subject:** South Park Loop Pathway Plan

Members of the Teton County Board of Commisioners,

I attended the South Park Loop open house on Saturday (10/17/15) and again yesterday on Tuesday (10/20/15). My initial thoughts on the pathway was that under no circumstances should the planned path be moved from the south and west side of South Park Loop to the North and East side. Based upon the two open houses and the time I've spent reviewing the plan, I believe that moving the path to the north and east side would be a good idea. However, I do have a few comments regarding the matter. They are as follows:

- The proposed N & E positioning of the path actually provides only one crossing for residents of the Melody neighborhood. I live in the far east side of Melody Ranch, and by using the roads & paths within the neighborhood, I would be able to jump right on the path without having to cross South Park Loop at the beginning of my trip. I really like this idea and it is probably the biggest factor weighing in on my evolving opinion.
- The crossing at or near 3-Creek will really need community input. There were a lot of different opinions in the meeting Saturday and I still believe that safety has to be the number one priority. I'm willing to sacrifice aesthetics for safety. I am not opposed to a flashing yellow light in this area as I believe it will reduce speeds through that section.
- I am concerned that even removing 50% of the large cottonwoods near the Seherr-Thoss property will create a tremendous amount of resistance in the community. While this issue isn't particularly important to me, the trees provide aviary habitat, provide screening for the gravel pit, and are considered legacy plantings. During the Seherr-Thoss development discussion years ago which would have resulted in the closing of the pit and the creation of a large neighborhood, the tree issue came up repeatedly. In the meeting Saturday, it was mentioned that these trees may actually be at the end of their life span. I know that comment was somewhat anecdotal but perhaps we would be well served to have an arborist provide input. A report from an arborist may allay some concerns. The report may also include a habitat mitigation plan for that segment.

Once again thanks for your time and I look forward to attending the meeting this afternoon.

John R. Danby

Jackson, Wyoming

---

On Oct 21, 2015, at 4:16 PM, JAMES WARNER <[invocation@charter.net](mailto:invocation@charter.net)> wrote:

>

> Dear Lauren, Please forward to Brian Shilling, Appreciatively, James

>

> Dear Brian

>

> My thanks for your presentation and listening skills at yesterday's meeting.

>

> Here's an idea:

>

> If the East crossing were a bike/pedestrian-wide over-pass an interesting advantage seems to arise. If it's height were low enough it might be a significant limiter to truck traffic trying to by-pass normal highways. Bigger trucks could still access as necessary from the other direction for local community projects. Such a limiter could take significant pressure from the elected, and also take away some angst from the local communities concerned about looming by-passing traffic.

>

> I've no idea of the legalities of limiting traffic is such way (as in still allowing fire-trucks), or if the percentage of trucks blocked would be significant, or if the added costs are practical; still its potential to be a safer bike-way with the plus of being something of a savior for local neighborhoods seems charming.

>

> Appreciatively, James K. Warner

---

**From:** Al Zuckerman [mailto:[AZuckerman@ci.jackson.wy.us](mailto:AZuckerman@ci.jackson.wy.us)]

**Sent:** Thursday, October 22, 2015 4:54 PM

**To:** Brian Schilling <[bschilling@tetonwyo.org](mailto:bschilling@tetonwyo.org)>

**Cc:** Sean O'Malley <[somalley@tetonwyo.org](mailto:somalley@tetonwyo.org)>; Dave Gustafson <[dgustafson@tetonwyo.org](mailto:dgustafson@tetonwyo.org)>

**Subject:** South Park path connection

Hi Brian,

I couldn't make either meeting on the pathway connection so if you don't mind I'll just give you my two cents, although it is probably only worth half a penny, if that.

I'm not sure of the width of the county right-of-ways on either side of the road but it seems that the topography of the "butte" and then the "cliff" near the Shooting Iron intersection where they just put in the nifty guardrail make the other side of the road more appealing. I realize this will create the need for street crossings and if the connection is built from Highway #22 through Indian Trails potential higher traffic counts could make crossings even less safe. However, I think that if the pathway

crossings were made at intersections with side roads installing stop signs at these intersections would create the safety factor needed. For example, if you continued the pathway from where it ends at Three Creeks south across the Rancho Alegre driveway and then crossed at the north entrance of Grand Teton Circle you could create a three way stop sign intersection there. The advantage to this would be a clearly marked and defined safe intersection for pathway users to cross the road and also create a break in the speed of vehicles now travelling on the Loop Road with currently no traffic slowing interruptions along its entire length. This would be especially advantageous at this point because of the curve in the road. Vehicles travelling in either direction would be forced to slow down for the stop signs in the area of this curve making it safer. This three way stop sign intersection application could be duplicated elsewhere along the Loop Road such as at the Shooting Iron intersection (where path users from that subdivision would have the opportunity to safely cross the road to access the pathway) which, by the way, is also on a curve and could benefit from slowing traffic with stop signs there as well. Then as you travel east along the path on the north side of the Loop Road you could create another three way stop signed intersection with a side road to connect with the existing pathway on the south side of the road. By putting in these stop signed intersections it could not only create safe crossings for pathway users but interject a traffic calming tool by slowing vehicular traffic on the Loop Road which, if you drive along it as often as I do, is no longer the country lane it used to be.

Congratulations to you and the whole team on making the connection between the westbank and Jackson!

Best,

Al Z.

---

**From:** Richard Bloom [mailto:richbloom.jh@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Thursday, October 29, 2015 3:11 PM

**To:** Sean O'Malley <somalley@tetonwyo.org>; Brian Schilling <bschilling@tetonwyo.org>

**Cc:** Lauren Dickey <lauren@friendsofpathways.org>; Jack Koehler <development@friendsofpathways.org>

**Subject:** Re: Missing SPLR Pathway Open House

Sean and Brian - I will be there but late as I have a Teton Raptor Center bi-monthly board meeting till after 6pm.

Brian and Sean - I would like to review the alignment especially if it crosses to the north side of South Park Loop road at Courtland and Kestrel Lane. The area of primary concern is not losing the mature cottonwood trees on the south side of Munger View Park (noter side of SPLR).

Given the County owns that park parcel - have you consider when crossing SPLR to then go to the north of the number of mature cottonwood trees?

It seems a simple alignment to go on the south border of the County park land and the road ROW (just north of the mature cottonwoods) - then at Seherr-Thoss to lightly curve back to the road ROW. That alignment is south of any and all park landscaping, flat, would remove the cost of tree removal, create some separation from the road - and directly connect the path to the County park. This is similar to the pathway through Cottonwood Park. It does require one minor extension of an existing culvert. Of course it then preserves these mature cottonwoods which are an amenity to both Melody and Munger View Park. The grade along here is simpler to deal with then extending from the existing road with its fairly step crowing above the existing grade of the ROW and park land to the north of the road. Of course there are some willows etc. to remove - but the alignment makes a lot of sense.

Happy to walk that potential alignment with you - which I just now walked as to its feasibility.

I know we will lose a lot of trees along the Seherr-Thoss quarry - which is a different discussion. Replanting north of the new pathway in this location within the ROW - is mitigation that should be considered.

Since I can not find any draft alignments on-line - I thought I would put this question forward now after a good discussion I had with Jack Koehler on the thinking to date.

I would love your thoughts?

Rich

---

**From:** Richard Bloom [mailto:richbloom.jh@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 29, 2015 3:30 PM  
**To:** Sean O'Malley <somalley@tetonwyo.org>; Brian Schilling <bschilling@tetonwyo.org>  
**Cc:** Lauren Dickey <lauren@friendsofpathways.org>; Jack Koehler <development@friendsofpathways.org>; Gordon Gray <ggray@tetonwyo.org>  
**Subject:** Re: Missing SPLR Pathway Open House

Sean and Brian - PS - The ROW in question is Lot 10 (goes to mid-line of SPL road from Seherr-Thoss to far side of Melody to the east) from the original Melody Ranch master plan - and is also under a restriction when conveyed that prohibits tree removal as Gordon Grey is aware of. See attached.

My suggested alignment - which you likely already have consider - would honor that recorded restriction when Lot 10 was conveyed.

Rich

---

**From:** Richard Bloom [mailto:richbloom.jh@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 29, 2015 6:05 PM  
**To:** Sean O'Malley <somalley@tetonwyo.org>  
**Cc:** Brian Schilling <bschilling@tetonwyo.org>; Lauren Dickey <lauren@friendsofpathways.org>; Jack Koehler <development@friendsofpathways.org>; Gordon Gray <ggray@tetonwyo.org>  
**Subject:** Re: Missing SPLR Pathway Open House

Sean - glad you have landed on the same solution. Irrigation induced wetlands will be a problem to a small degree - but in both the ROW or several yards to the north.

Meanwhile see attached. Not being a lawyer I am not sure how Dave Larson and PVG are affected - since they released all rights.

Meanwhile I am sure along with WYDOT you will be engaging the Melody ISD that I sit on who owns the roads lots - including Kestrel Lane.

Happy to work towards an expedient, safe solution that preserves the trees to the greatest extent possible.

Rich

---

**From:** Richard Bloom [mailto:richbloom.jh@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 06, 2015 4:00 PM  
**To:** Sean O'Malley <somalley@tetonwyo.org>

**Cc:** Brian Schilling <[bschilling@tetonwyo.org](mailto:bschilling@tetonwyo.org)>  
**Subject:** Melody Pathway Easements and MOU

Sean - thanks for meeting on the potential pathway alignment near Munger View Park - a safe solution that minimizes tree removal - plus ensures replacement where removal is absolutely necessary - is an outcome that would be in the best public interest.

Attached are the pathway conveyed easements and maintenance MOU between the Homeowners Association and County. Brian is copied as he is familiar in us having a potential pathway connector section, at least conveyed, as an easement that fronts SPLR from Kestrel Lane to the east.

See attached. I also include some other historical background materials.

Also note I attached first a 2006 easement that fixed the alignment issue you noted on the pathway. The 2008 attached easement shows the received pathway easements for the future that we discussed. These all sat for a few years until I developed a joint MOU to deal with all future scenarios plus addressed some squashiness in how the original pathway easements legal descriptions were written. The recorded MOU is attached.

---

**From:** lorna miller [<mailto:lornamiller@live.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 11, 2015 9:39 AM  
**To:** Sean O'Malley <[somalley@tetonwyo.org](mailto:somalley@tetonwyo.org)>  
**Subject:** question about the proposed S Park Pathway.

Hi Sean,

I have a couple of quick questions after listening to the recent S Park Loop Rd Pathway workshop with the BCC.

Someone had asked about potential wildlife impacts and either you or Brian said that the plans would have to go through the the "County Environmental Review". Can you please give me details about what is involved in the review and the details of the process.

Also you mentioned "pedestrian handrails" but I was unclear about where those might be installed. Can you clarify where they will be installed and what the specs are (I think this was if the east side option is chosen). Also is that an ADA requirement?

Thanks

Lorna

---

**From:** lorna miller <[lornamiller@live.com](mailto:lornamiller@live.com)>

**Date:** November 11, 2015 at 3:34:04 PM MST

**To:** Sean O'Malley <[somalley@tetonwyo.org](mailto:somalley@tetonwyo.org)>

**Subject:** another question about the proposed S Park Pathway.

Thanks, Sean. I appreciate the prompt response. ( I thought it was a county holiday!! )

Yes, I am indeed asking because of wildlife since the length and height of the retaining wall, if the west side option is chosen, would be an impediment to movement not to mention a hazard. Jumping down onto a slick blacktop surface from considerable height is a serious injury potential. (I once watched deer twins crossing the highway and the blacktop was like ice for them: they fell down and had great difficulty finding their footing to get up again. They were older and not newborn when one might expect co-ordination to be a problem)

The possibility of a retaining wall at the southerly curve would also be problematic for wildlife.

I'm trying to understand the process. The link says that an EA "may" be required. As the pathway design goes through the review process, do you post the timetable somewhere on line so that progress on the EA process can be followed by the general public?

Who will you be using as the consultant for the EA? Did the Highway 22 pathway go through the same process?

Thanks for clarifying the railing issue. This reminds me that I'd been meaning to ask for ages about the high woven wire fence along the section of the elk refuge pathway close to the fish hatchery. Was this installed because of the retaining walls there and was it related to people or wildlife? Was that something that the refuge asked for, was there some additional federal regulation that you had to meet because of the FWS or was it your general design guidelines?

Regarding the Snake River Bridge, do you have any plans to put a seat on the bridge at that middle spot where it is wider? For some older pedestrians or even anyone with back problems or other

impediments, they may not be able to walk that far on an incline without having to sit down. Besides, people would probably like to sit there and enjoy the view!

thanks again.

Lorna

---

From: [somalley@tetonwyo.org](mailto:somalley@tetonwyo.org)  
To: [lornamiller@live.com](mailto:lornamiller@live.com)  
CC: [bschilling@tetonwyo.org](mailto:bschilling@tetonwyo.org)  
Date: Wed, 11 Nov 2015 12:11:22 -0700  
Subject: RE: question about the proposed S Park Pathway.

Hi Lorna,

Thank you for your interest in the South Park Pathway. The County is subject to the same regulations as a private developer and will follow the Environmental Analysis outlined in 8.2.2 of the Land Development Regulations. <http://www.tetonwyo.org/compplan/LDRUpdate/CurrentCountyLDRs.pdf>.

With respect to handrails, the location and extent will depend on the pathway design and location. In other words, these railing installations (which are typically between 42"-54" in height) will be determined as the design is finalized. It is likely that a pathway located primarily on the north/east side of South Park Loop Road will require few, if any, railings. The south/west side is more problematic with respect elements that can impact wildlife movement (which I assume is why you are asking). The south/west alignment will require both railings (above steep embankments) and relatively high (6'+) retaining walls.

ADA does not require installation of railings on bicycling facilities. However, guidelines in use by design professionals describe "best practice" for railing installations – specifically where departure from the pathway is likely to result in severe injury or death to the pathway user – e.g., bridges, cliffs, etc. We follow these guidelines (see the Snake River Pathway bridge for example) - although our local practice is to err toward installing fewer railings if possible. Reasons include: potential impact to wildlife movement, aesthetics, cost, and balancing the relative danger to the user of hitting the railing (versus departure from the pathway).

I have copied Brian Schilling with this email in case he has more to add or needs to correct any of my comments. Hope this information is helpful.

Best,

Sean

**Sean E. O'Malley, PE**

*Teton County Engineer*

*PO Box 3594*

*320 South King Street*

*Jackson, Wyoming 83001*

*307.733.3317*

*307.732-8580 - direct*

[www.tetonwyo.org](http://www.tetonwyo.org)

---

**From:** Bob Moore Construction [mailto:rem@bresnan.net]

**Sent:** Saturday, November 14, 2015 9:33 AM

**To:** Brian Schilling <bschilling@tetonwyo.org>

**Subject:** SPL Pathway

Hello Brian,

Thanks for the walk through the other night concerning the South Park Loop Road pathway. As you may be aware by now there are certain individuals in the South Park area that are reluctant for the pathway to be completed in their neighborhood. They are aware that there is a demand for a safer way for

navigation for this corridor be it walking, biking, driving or whatever. I have noticed the increased level of usage on this stretch of road and believe that it is primarily due to the low vehicle usage as well as the rural character that make it a desirable area in which to recreate. That being said please keep in mind that a large percentage of these people are temporarily visiting this area and that some of us chose to live here. Please keep the following thoughts in mind while you proceed on this project.

As mentioned the other night your bullets mention that it is unsafe. I'm unaware of any pedestrian bicycle incidents that have ever occurred along this stretch of roadway, I might be ignorant and if so please correct me. That being said a pathway would only make it "safer". My feelings are that some individuals including yourself will feel that it could then be made even safer by lowering the speed limit and creating "traffic calming devices". The terminology traffic calming devices always cracks me up as I'm not sure I have ever witnessed excited traffic. These traffic calming devices are contrary to what is my idea of "rural" character.

Crosswalks..... I understand their value. There is a new mindset concerning these that because they are in place the pedestrian has the God given right to use them at will regardless of what is actually taking place in the roadway. I saw this first hand immediately after they put the walkways in on the north end of SPLR. Two ladies on bicycles rode into the crosswalk, no sign of slowing down, and the car in front of me almost had them both. Ignorance, God given right, or whatever if the walkway wasn't there they may have stopped and looked both ways and then crossed. I can see their application in town and in high traffic areas but they might be overkill and potentially more dangerous in a low traffic area also they can always be added at a later date if needed. When I'm a pedestrian I feel that I'm practical enough to yield to a single car in the roadway at a crosswalk and if they start to slow down I will even wave them through. It is akin to having an empty roadway and having someone pull out in front of you. You just ask yourself what if anything was going through their heads. It might be better that people start using theirs and crosswalks and signage and flashing lights and sirens aren't helping the matter.

Signage.....This is really getting way out of control and I believe that Friends of the Pathways is the biggest offender. When I drive or ride or walk or whatever I chose to do and traverse town I'm embarrassed at the amount of unsightly and redundant signage that is littering the landscape. Is town really that big and difficult to navigate? If someone from out of town is attempting to navigate the town of Jackson, for primarily four months of the year, wouldn't it be nice to think that they could ask someone for directions? This of course is if they don't have a "hand held device" that can get them there. It is just plain unsightly as well as ridiculous. If you have a moment drive down the north end of SPLR and count the signs and reflect at how rural it looks. My fear is that it is soon to be coming to my neighborhood.

Trees.....There is no other roadway in the valley that has the same look and feel as SPLR. Much of this is due to the trees and narrowness of the roadway, both ‘traffic calming devises” in their own right. As you indicated yourself there will be tree loss and you are in the midst of a study. It is quite evident that there will be significant tree/shrub loss of which you can make an attempt to replace but we are talking about some old trees here, it isn’t going to be the same.

Retaining walls..... As mentioned prior to Gordon Gray as well as possibly yourself retaining walls are really not too “rural” in character. If they have to be, boulder stack would look most natural. I’m sure your intent is to use the wire basket / gabion style walls of which I wonder how ungulates hooves work while they are pondering the drop to below. As mentioned Elk move very frequently back and forth across the same area that you are looking to place this pathway and tall retaining walls would probably conflict with the Comprehensive Plan, not that it matters as they ok’d a Science School in an elk migration corridor/avalanche paths. While you are collecting information be aware that the Huffsmith Hill hillside does naturally slide snow as well as earth and through the use of retaining walls it might be exasperated.

Equestrian trail..... Please provide more discussion concerning this because as I see it now it will be just whatever happens as a byproduct of the pathway. Keep in mind that horses might be a little uneasy sandwiched between cars and mothers pushing chariots or while running directly adjacent fencing. Please also keep in mind that horses and asphalt don’t mix very well.

I realize that you are a very ambitious individual with a publicly mandated agenda concerning this project. I’m also aware that this project can and will be completed at any and all cost. It is really unfortunate that yourself the special interest group that you work for as well as a large percentage of the public at large can’t see the benefits of what this project could be as well as the cost savings if the roadway realignment and this project were to be planned as one. It is my understanding that the section of roadway that this pathway will be adjacent to will be being repaved in the next two years that being said in problem areas why couldn’t the roadway shift a few feet one way or another?

Thank you for your effort as well as time.

---

**From:** Richard Bloom [mailto:richbloom.jh@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 17, 2015 9:44 AM

**To:** Sean O'Malley <somalley@tetonwyo.org>; Brian Schilling <bschilling@tetonwyo.org>

**Subject:** South Park Loop Pathway - 3 Creek to Melody Ranch

Sean and Brian - first a thank you for holding the three open houses on the alignment challenge on the South Park Loop road (SPLR) pathway section from Kestrel Lane to 3 Creek Ranch.

To summarize our brief conversation Sean:

1. Tree removal is both a legal challenge and community sentiment issue on the alignment of the pathway crossing SPLR to Kestrel Lane and continuing till it joins the Seherr-Thoss property.
  1. A solution that involves no tree removal will be much easier to navigate on this section.
2. On traffic calming - I believe we now acknowledge that the large cottonwoods and mature willows along SPLR in this section cause "friction" - and are already offering an effective form of traffic calming.
  1. Any clearing of trees and shrubs with a replacement of mediums (or even round about) would likely result in increased traffic speeds.
3. I believe a user controlled light in some form crossing SPLR at Courtland Drive and Kestrel Lane would be the best crossing solution.
  1. I would remind you significant crossings are occurring, and will continue to occur, from the other three entrances into Melody Ranch and Sage Meadows across to the existing pathway on the south side of SPLR.
4. Additional traffic calming should be explored at Melody Ranch Drive (the first primary entrance into Melody Ranch east of Flat Creek).
  1. As we discussed this has the highest turning and entrance/exit volume of any curb cut from HWY 89 along SPLR to beyond 3 Creek Ranch.
  2. It also is downhill from HWY 89 on a road that was widened to a cross section of 30 feet from 22 feet.
  3. The intersection of Melody Ranch Drive and SPLR also has virtually no exiting tree conflicts.
  4. As a reminder 22 feet remains the road cross section from Flat Creek bridge to the west on SPLR - which also provides effective friction - thus traffic calming.
5. The alignment after crossing SPLR, and then along the southern border of the County owned Munger View Park parcel (north of Lot 10), is an excellent alignment for a variety of reasons that we have discussed in previous emails.

I look forward to my continued engagement to help find the best solution.

Rich

---

**From:** Richard Bloom [mailto:richbloom.jh@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, November 22, 2015 12:07 PM  
**To:** Brian Schilling <bschilling@tetonwyo.org>; Sean O'Malley <somalley@tetonwyo.org>  
**Cc:** Tyler Sinclair - Teton County <tsinclair@tetonwyo.org>; Alex Norton <anorton@tetonwyo.org>  
**Subject:** Re: South Park Loop Pathway - 3 Creek to Melody Ranch

Brian and Sean - please let me know exactly when and where the December 7 Board of County Commissioners workshop is occurring.

Two supplemental pieces to my previous comments below. It is offered to be helpful to an already difficult pathway alignment challenge.

First on "friction" and "context sensitive design" in the South Park Loop road (SPLR) and pathway section from Hwy 89 east to the Seherr-Thoss pathway section.

I would add in addition to any treatment at Melody Ranch Drive for traffic calming - that you consider supplementing existing cottonwoods on the section of SPLR (both sides of the road) to the east that has existing cottonwoods in sparse or deteriorating condition on both sides of the road where the cement curbing is located. This section is just west of the two existing medians - and before (east) of Melody Ranch Drive. See the first attachment that highlights the sections in yellow that I am talking about - plus also identifying the intersection of SPLR and Melody Ranch Drive.

The second attachment is from our in-force LDRs - as I have been reviewing the rural tools final, final direction Alex just published Friday.

Of special note is **Division 5.3.2 - 3.e - South Park Loop Scenic Area** - page 5.38 in the current LDRs - and unchanged by the rural tools update.

The pathway alignment as you go from South Park Ranches (the Shootin' Iron curve) north to 3 Creek Ranch (and then north to High School Road) is affected.

Division 5.3 contain our Scenic Standards. 5.3.2 contain our Scenic Reassures Overlay (SRO) Standards. 5.3.2-3 contains our Map of the SRO Scenic Areas.

The relevant controlling LDR excerpt is as follows addressing the identified South Park Loop Scenic Area (5.3.2-3.e):

**South Park Loop Scenic Area.** *The South Park Loop Road Scenic Area extends along the eastern and western sides of South Aprk Loop Road, from the South Park Ranches subdivision to High School Road and includes Hufsmith Hill. It provides an important County-wide scenic resource because the road corridor is framed by cottonwood trees planted along irrigation ditches which line the road. The scenic quality of this area is dependent upon the preservation of the cottonwood corridor, which helps to filter views to development in the adjoining hay meadows. These meadows provide Foreground settings to view of Rendezvous Bowl and the Snake River range.*

It is critical to take this section of the adopted, and current, LDRs to heart when navigating solutions on the pathway alignment from South Park Ranch subdivision north to beyond 3 Creek Ranch. You may have been aware of this already - but given the complexity of our LDRs - may also have missed it.

Again the restriction on Lot 10 (with its deed prohibition on any tree removal) along the entirety of Melody Ranch and north SPLR till one reaches the Seherr-Thoss propriety - is the controlling legal sideboard on this alignment. The good news here is there is a safe alignment and crossing solution available that honors the tree removal prohibition.

Please make this additional information, the two attachments - along with my previous communications and attachments - part of the public record - and convey my ideas and considerations along to the Board of County Commissioners at the December 7 workshop.

I will be in attendance.

Sincerely, Rich Bloom

---

**From:** Michele Gammer [mailto:mgammer@gammerlaw.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, December 01, 2015 8:51 AM

**To:** Brian Schilling <bschilling@tetonwyo.org>; Sean O'Malley <somalley@tetonwyo.org>

**Cc:** Michele Gammer <mgammer@gammerlaw.com>

**Subject:** South Park Loop Pathway

Dear Mr. Schilling and Mr. O'Malley,

I hope you had a good Thanksgiving holiday. I am writing, as a South Park resident, to ask that, when you make the presentation about the proposed extension route of the South Park Pathway to the Teton County Commissioners, that presentation contain an explanation and analysis of the proposed pathway's impact on the scenic nature of South Park Loop Road, including but not limited to the cottonwood trees located along that Road. I made this request previously to you when we met after a Commissioners' meeting, but I want to be sure it has been communicated in writing.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michele Gammer

South Park Resident