

Subject: SR167 extension versus the Interurban
From: "MILT E LOFLIN" <MILTELOF@msn.com>
Date: Wed, 19 Mar 2003 21:28:33 -0800
To: <mderosia@cityofmilton.net>
CC: <johnanddottieselby@att.net>, <suave51@juno.com>, <DRKerlin@aol.com>, <emailbob@att.net>, <kasay@cityofmilton.net>, <lensand@mindspring.com>

Marlo,

The WSDOT meeting last night to present the tier II EIS for the SR 167 extension had good news and bad. Unfortunately, more bad than good.

Some of the good news was that there was mention of a bicycle and pedestrian element in the design. The first EIS had no mention at all. That means they are thinking, a little, about non-motorized transportation.

The other bit of good news is that on the north side of I-5 they planned a separate bicycle/pedestrian trail for a few thousand feet. It appeared to follow the Hylebos creek. The eastern end appeared to link to 70th Avenue as an I-5 crossing point. This will be a completely new trail as far as I know. I am not aware of any previous plan for such a trail, but new or not, it is good news.

On the south side of I-5 there was a double dose of bad news. Affecting the interurban trail adversely was their plans to re-channel Hylebos creek to the east, re-channel the Surprise Lake output stream to the east, and put a U-loop in 20th Street prior to 70th Avenue. These changes combined to block the western end of the interurban trail from reaching 70th. To get to 70th under their plan, one would have to go onto 20th, loop under the morass of ramps, circle through the western round-about, travel to the eastern round-about, circle it and then proceed on 70th. I cannot imagine a family, on a bicycle outing with their kids, being comfortable mixing with this traffic. This plan effectively kills reasonable family use of that portion of the interurban as a link to possible southbound trails or to cross I-5.

And speaking of mixing with traffic, the other bad news was that on SR 167 south of I-5, they were planning to accommodate bicycle traffic by allowing bikes to ride on the shoulder of the highway, alongside 60 MPH traffic. Frankly, that is absurd as a plan to accommodate non-motorized traffic.

The extension of SR 167, because it crosses right over the western end of the interurban, is an opportunity, a huge, once in a lifetime opportunity to provide reasonable connectivity to the trail. I had hoped that Fife, Pierce County, and WSDOT would share that view and work together to provide trail accommodations for the interurban at least from Valley Avenue, and better, to the Puyallup River Trail, the planned major trail link coming out of Tacoma. So far, that combined effort has not materialized.

I know you have occasional contact with WSDOT, ENTRANCO, Fife, and Pierce County. Feel free to make my concerns known to them.

Thank you for your continued efforts to develop the interurban trail!!!!

RESPONSE C30-001

The project will accommodate the Interurban Trail and retain the public access connection to the trail in the vicinity of 70th Avenue East and I-5. The relocated portion of the trail will be ADA accessible, a separated Class I or II non-motorized path linking to the City of Fife's bicycle and pedestrian facilities. We have noted your concerns about the proposed bike lane on the shoulder of SR 167 in the pedestrian and bike section (3.15.6) of the FEIS.

C30-001

SR 167 Extension Open House Oral Comments, 3/20/03

1 BE IT REMEMBERED that on Thursday, March 20,
2 2003, at the Puyallup High School, 105 7th Street SW,
3 Puyallup, Washington, commencing at 6:00 p.m., before
4 LESLIE J. THOMPSON, CCR, Notary Public in and for the
5 State of Washington, the following proceedings were had,
6 to wit:

7 <<<< >>>>

8 ORAL COMMENTS

9 DOUG WORDEN: I'd like to put in one for our
10 neighbor, whose English is not good.

11 Young owns the corner store on Valley and Freeman,
12 and in using the -- if the Valley Avenue realignment
13 option goes through, it doesn't touch his property, so his
14 property would not be bought. However, it would make a
15 cul-de-sac close to his store, and 90-some percent of his
16 business comes down Valley, which would stop.

17 He is open about 92 hours a week now to make a
18 living, and he could no longer make a living in his store
19 if this option is gone through -- goes through.

20 We've been told that his property could not be bought
21 in this case, and so he would have to go to court in order
22 to get reimbursement for his lost business. So he is
23 definitely against it.

24 PHILLIP JESSE: I'm Phillip Jesse, Citizens
25 Advisory Committee member.

2

C31-001

Dixie Cattell & Associates (360) 352-2506

RESPONSE C31-001

The Valley Avenue Interchange Option is the environmentally preferred option with the least amount of impact to adjacent properties.

1 I received a phone call about two weeks ago from a
2 lady whose name I either didn't write down or I don't have
3 with me who was concerned about the Valley Avenue
4 interchange, that intersection or that portion. And she
5 mentioned herself and other people near her that will be
6 greatly affected by it.

7 And of the three sort of options, there's not
8 building it; then there's the, it's called the Valley
9 Avenue option, and the Freeman Road option. There's three
10 options. Let me just go verify that. There's the no
11 build, the Valley Avenue option, and the Freeman Road
12 option. And of the three, Freeman Road is the worst
13 option for them. Freeman Road is basically vacated in
14 that area, and there's a number of small businesses and
15 homes right there that, with old people and so on and so
16 forth that would have difficulty.

17 So that's what I wanted to report on.

18 PADDY WORTHINGTON: I'm curious about why a
19 noise wall was not studied by our house that is going to
20 be affected by all this.

21 MS. BENNETT: You'll need to give your address
22 probably.

23 MR. WORTHINGTON: We're right on Milwaukie
24 Avenue right next to the freeway, 6014 Milwaukie Avenue
25 East.

C32-001

RESPONSE C32-001

The Valley Avenue Interchange Option is the environmentally preferred option with the least amount of impact to adjacent properties.

C33-001

RESPONSE C33-001

The noise study was updated in February 2004. An additional noise wall was evaluated along the south shoulder of SR 167 between Milwaukee Avenue East and SR 167. This wall was found to be feasible and reasonable and will be included in the project. For more information, see section 3.6.6 of the FEIS.

1 Anything to add?

2 MRS. WORTHINGTON: No.

3 MR. WORTHINGTON: And that bridge makes big
4 bumps when the trucks go over it, and it really, like,
5 shakes our house.

6 MS. BENNETT: Which bridge?

7 MR. WORTHINGTON: The overpass, the 167 overpass
8 that's already there, the existing one.

9 MS. BENNETT: Is that the one at Milwaukie?

10 MR. WORTHINGTON: Milwaukie, right.

11 Shouldn't there be something about compression brake
12 signs up there on the freeway with all the residential
13 area around Milwaukie and 167.

14 I think that's good.

15 JOHN POWERS: John F. Powers. My address is
16 8411 29th Street Court East, Edgewood, 98371.

17 My statement is I would prefer, I believe, the
18 diamond low version of the interchange at the northern
19 edge of Puyallup with 161. And I would prefer the Valley
20 Avenue option of the interchange at the intersection of
21 Freeman and Valley.

22 I would appreciate it if there is some kind of sound
23 mitigation done along the side of the freeway. Even if
24 you just plant some shrubs, at least think you're doing
25 something. And it also helps to take care of the runoff,

4

Dixie Cattell & Associates (360) 352-2506

RESPONSE C33-002

C33-002

We will consult with WSDOT's Bridge Preservation Program as we begin the widening design of the existing bridge. We will incorporate any bridge improvement measures recommended by the Bridge Preservation Office.

RESPONSE C34-001

C34-001

The Urban Interchange and the Valley Avenue Interchange Options will be carried forward into design. These options have less overall environmental impacts than the other options. Please see section 2.6.5 for more information about the preferred SR 161/SR 167 Interchange Option.

RESPONSE C34-002

C34-002

A noise wall in the vicinity of the Valley Avenue Interchange was analyzed, and it did not meet current noise mitigation criteria. If vegetation is used for noise mitigation, it needs to be at least 100 feet wide and fairly dense to provide any audible noise reduction. We will incorporate plantings in accordance with WSDOT's Roadside Classification Plan.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

which you're going to have to take care of.

Something that I have heard from others in our city is the need to obtain the right-of-way immediately for this project because of the rapidly escalating cost of land and warehouses primarily that -- and other businesses that will be developed in the area where this is to be. That would -- that would tend to stem the increase in costs that -- the inflationary cost of the project. And I think that is very important to the -- not just to me in particular, but all the residents of the state of Washington.

I would like to suggest that DOT consider not doing some smaller projects in order to fund this. If we can only fund \$200 million dollars a year this would be a nine-year project, so where do we get \$200 million dollars? We get it from ten \$20-million-dollar projects. I think that it's worth it, and I think that the state needs to realize that this is an economic, a tremendous economic benefit to the state, not just to the people around here, and that it will pay itself back much faster if we complete it as early as possible.

(Proceedings concluded.)

5

Dixie Cattell & Associates (360) 352-2506

RESPONSE C34-003

If it is necessary to acquire your property for the SR 167 Extension project, then the property purchase will occur in accordance with the Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970. Currently, WSDOT is using a prioritization process for determining which properties to purchase for the SR 167 Extension project because we do not have enough funding at this time to buy all of the property needed for the project. We are concentrating most of our property acquisition in and around those areas that will need to be constructed first according to our staging strategy for the project. We are currently buying undeveloped and non-businesses properties from willing sellers following our prioritized list. We will continue to purchase property using this prioritization process until existing allocated funds are exhausted. The Legislature has appropriated funding for this project through June 2009. When the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Final EIS is approved by FHWA (currently scheduled for early 2007), the acquisition process should remain the same for all practical purposes, however, WSDOT will then have the authority to condemn property under eminent domain law.

C34-003

C34-004

RESPONSE C34-004

We have a commitment to deliver WSDOT's entire program and can not delete several other funded projects in favor of another project.



Comments

State Route 167
Extension
from
Puyallup to
State Route 509

Puyallup
Open House

*Intersection of Milwaukee Ave ³⁴ Frontage road
running East ⁴⁴ West toward Meridian Ave.
how come you overlooked the Noise Measurement
⁴⁴ Modeling Locations Fig 3.6-1*

*CURTIS ROBINSON 6020 MILWAUKEE AVE
Paddy Worthington 6014 Milwaukee Ave E.
Bill McArthur 6008 Milwaukee Ave E.*

C35-001



Comments

State Route 167
Extension
from
Puyallup to
State Route 509

Puyallup
Open House

*Why was there no Noise Wall
Modeling done between Meridian
and SR 512*

*Heidi Worthington
Paddy Worthington*

C36-001

TRANSCRIBED COMMENT C35-001

Intersection of Milwaukee Ave. and Frontage Road running east and west toward Meridian Ave. How come you overlooked the noise measurement and modeling locations? Fig. 3.6-1

RESPONSE C35-001

The noise study was updated in February 2004 and an additional wall was evaluated along the south shoulder of SR 167 between Milwaukee Avenue East and SR 167. This wall was found to be feasible and reasonable and will be included as part of this project. Please see section 3.6.5 of the FEIS.

TRANSCRIBED COMMENT C36-001

Why was there no noise wall modeling done between Meridian and SR 512?

RESPONSE C36-001

The noise study was updated in February 2004 and an additional wall was evaluated along the south shoulder of SR 167 between Milwaukee Avenue East and SR 167. This wall was found to be feasible and reasonable and will be included as part of this project. Please see section 3.6.5 of the FEIS.

The preferred interchange is the Fife option as the other ones impact the surrounding area extensively,

Our first preference is that the freeway not go down the center of the valley at all. Choosing an area already impacted by traffic would be preferable.

Doug and Sharon Worden
8319 Valley Ave. E
Edgewood, WA 98371

C37-001

RESPONSE C37-001

The Tier I FEIS established the preferred corridor alternative. The preferred corridor alternative was selected with agency and tribal support in 1999. Please see the SR 167 Tier I FEIS and Record of Decision.



Comments

State Route 167
Extension
from
Puyallup to
State Route 509

SR 161 Interchange - Urban Option
Valley Avenue Interchange / Valley Ave. Option
Valley Ave Interchange /
I-5 Interchange okay -
54th Ave Interchange - Half Diamond
SR-509 Connection - Proposed
Like Roundabouts

C38-001

Puyallup

TRANSCRIBED COMMENT C38-001

SR 161 Interchange - Urban Option
Valley Avenue Interchange - Valley Ave. Option
I-5 Interchange okay
54th Ave. Interchange - Half Diamond
SR 509 Connection - Proposed
Like roundabouts

RESPONSE C38-001

Thank you for your comments. The preferred options that will be carried forward are the Urban Option, the Valley Avenue Option, and the Half Diamond Option, as described in section 2.6 of the FEIS.



State Route 167
Extension
from
Puyallup to
State Route 509

Puyallup
Open House

Comments

I like the relocated Hylebos Creek option. We need to support smart proposals like this that spend money to enhance both transportation and habitat corridors.

Look closely at enhancing all ways of connecting green belts and area trails for pedestrian and bicycle commute options.

Thanks!
Terese Van Assche
31108 11th Place SW
Federal Way, WA
98023
Friends of Hylebos Creek

C39-001

C39-002

TRANSCRIBED COMMENT C39-001

I like the relocated Hylebos Creek option. We need to support smart proposals like this that spend money to enhance both transportation and habitat corridors.

RESPONSE C39-001

Thank you for your support.

TRANSCRIBED COMMENT C39-002

Look closely at enhancing all ways of connecting greenbelts and area trails for pedestrian and bicycle commute options.

RESPONSE C39-002

We will consider your recommendations as we proceed with design of the project. The proposed Riparian Restoration Proposal would connect with many existing open spaces within the project area. Also, see response C 30-001 above.



State Route 167
Extension
from
Puyallup to
State Route 509

Puyallup
Open House

Comments

Good job on the riparian plan. This should be beneficial to everyone.

C40-001

TRANSCRIBED COMMENT C40-001

Good Job on the Riparian Plan. This should be beneficial to everyone.

RESPONSE C40-001

Thank you for your support.

-----Original Message-----
From: Kathie Redford
To: campben@wsdot.wa.gov
Sent: 3/28/2003 5:18 AM
Subject: Freeway Extension

Dear Mr. Campbell,

At one time in the past I remember reading an article in the Tacoma paper that talked about this freeway extension project and I think that it said something about a tie-in with the traffic flow coming off Canyon Road on south hill. I believe that another road was proposed that would link in with Canyon at its intersection with Pioneer Way then run northeasterly across the valley over a new bridge at Clark's Creek (to replace the existing steel structure) and tie in with this new freeway extension somewhere in the neighborhood of 70th Ave. I don't see any of this in the plan and I am unable to open up the "options" page of the extension website to see if that is part of the plan, or at least in the not too distant future. Any information regarding this would be appreciated.

Regards,

Dennis A. Redford

--- Kathie Redford
--- dakredford@earthlink.net <mailto:dakredford@earthlink.net>
--- EarthLink: The #1 provider of the Real Internet.

RESPONSE C41-001

Traffic volumes from the Canyon Road project were included in the traffic modeling for this project. For more information, please see section 3.14.1 of the FEIS.

C41-001

-----Original Message-----
From: Craig Wright
To: campben@wsdot.wa.gov
Sent: 3/28/2003 9:31 AM
Subject: Proposed SR 167

Neil,

I have just read about a proposed SR 167 extension that is in the works. All I wish to comment on is that I hope that before the extension is complete, is that SR167 between SR517 and I405 is modified to handle the large increase of traffic that would be created by this extension.

As of now my commute between Puyallup and Kent, takes about 40-45 minutes. New home construction in Orting, Puyallup, Sumner, and Bonney Lake I would think is one of Pierce County's largest growing areas with most of this population commuting North onto SR167. This is only to get worse under existing conditions, not including the increased traffic that would be created by this extension.

Last, I have had experience with Toll lanes (being a Southern California transplant) with using the 91 Freeway between Anaheim and Corona, and the Foothill corridor Toll Roads between Corona and Orange County and have a positive experience. The 91 Freeway did cross between Orange and Riverside Counties. Could such a project occur between Sumner and Renton?

Thank you for your time and I look forward to learning more about this project.

Regards,
Craig

Craig Wright
Seattle Bike Supply
7620 S. 192nd St.
Kent, WA 98032
1-425-251-1953

C42-001

C42-002

RESPONSE C42-001

The proposed SR 167 extension will ease congestion on local roads. The increase in traffic on the existing SR 167 freeway between Puyallup and I-405 will be minimal.

RESPONSE C42-002

WSDOT is currently considering implementing a plan for high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes on SR 167 between Renton and Auburn allowing drivers to pay a toll for use of the future HOV lanes. However, HOT lanes are not proposed as part of this project.

-----Original Message-----
From: Peter Rimbo
To: campben@wsdot.wa.gov
Sent: 3/27/2003 8:14 PM
Subject: SR-167 DEIS COMMENTS

Mr. Neal Campbell
Project Manager
WSDOT Turnwater Design Office
P.O. Box 47446
Olympia, WA 98504-7446

Dear Mr. Campbell,

We are writing to you today to provide our comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the proposed SR 167 project. Specifically, we are concerned because the proposed SR 167 corridor is located in the Hylebos Creek Watershed (as close as 250 feet from the creek), home to a variety of wildlife including Chinook salmon and Bull trout; both considered threatened species under the Endangered Species Act. Wildlife and their habitats are directly at risk due to increased flooding, water pollution, and other impacts that would be caused by the SR 167 project. However, we feel the DEIS does not thoroughly assess potential environmental impacts that could be reasonably expected from highway construction project as large as this.

We believe to properly design the SR 167 project to protect Hylebos Creek and adequately mitigate resulting impacts, the Department of Transportation must conduct a more thorough environmental assessment. Please include the following in the Final Environmental Impact Statement:

- *
Size of proposed restoration area, length of stream channel restoration, and restoration methods proposed.
- *
Analyses of direct, secondary, and indirect impacts and combined effects on the environment.
- *
Analyses of impacts combined with reasonably anticipated growth

1

C43-001

and major development projects planned.

*

Fisheries assessment of conditions and impacts for salmon species (and life stages) native to Hylebos Creek.

*

Specific impacts to low flow conditions on Hylebos Creek.

*

Description of major pollutants expected to be generated, amounts expected to enter the creek, and how their effects.

We support the Riparian Restoration Proposal as restoration of the natural floodplain is the only way to manage the SR 167 stormwater impacts on the lower Hylebos Creek. We should not be building stormwater ponds in a floodplain, because they just will not work as they will only waste money and worsen flooding. Restoring stream and wetland habitat in the Lower Hylebos Creek watershed as part of the SR 167 project will help restore the once abundant Hylebos Creek salmon runs. The Washington Department of Transportation should strive for a project that not only meets transportation goals, but also enhances the environment of the Hylebos Creek Watershed.

Thank you for taking our comments and placing them in the Public Record.

Sincerely,

Peter and Naomi Rimbo
19711 241st Ave SE
Maple Valley, WA 98038-8926
<mailto:primbos@attbi.com> primbos@attbi.com

RESPONSE C43-001

Thank you for your support. Information on the Riparian Restoration Proposal (RRP) has been expanded in the EIS. Please look at subsections 3.2.4 Water Resources, 3.3.8 Wetlands, and 3.4.4 Wildlife, Fisheries, and Threatened and Endangered Species. Other subsections in sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 have been expanded to look at impacts per sub-basin and reorganized to include indirect and cumulative impact analyses. We believe the changes in these sections address your concerns.

C43-001

-----Original Message-----

From: Kurt Sontag [mailto:kurt1sontag@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 29, 2003 2:49 PM
To: campben@wsdot.wa.gov
Cc: chinook@hylebos.org
Subject: Proposed SR 167 Project

To whom it may concern at the Washington Department of Transportation in regards to the SR 167 Highway Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It is of utmost importance that these six points below are taken into consideration.

1. Support The Riparian Restoration Proposal. Restoring the natural floodplain is the only way to manage SR 167 stormwater in lower Hylebos Creek. Restoring lower Hylebos stream and wetland habitat will leave a positive legacy for future generations.
2. Provide details about the size of the proposed restoration area, length of stream channel restoration and the restoration methods proposed.
3. You must fully address direct impacts to the environment and the ways in which those impacts will act together to affect the environment. Currently, the DEIS addresses project impacts in a linear, piecemeal fashion which understates the actual environmental impacts.
4. Strengthen the "cumulative impacts analysis." Under the National Environmental Policy Act, the EIS must describe how the proposed project will affect the environment in combination with planned growth and other developments in the surrounding area.
5. Characterize conditions and impacts for both different salmon species and different life stages for each salmon species. Several species that were overlooked such as freshwater mussels, pacific Lamprey, river otter and beaver must be identified.
6. Address impacts to low flow conditions and to provide a full description of the major pollutants expected to be generated by this project, the amounts expected to enter the creek and how they will affect Hylebos Creek.

03/31/03

Sincerely,

Kurt Sontag

RESPONSE C44-001

C44-001

Thank you for your support. Information on the Riparian Restoration Proposal (RRP) has been expanded in the EIS. Please look at subsections 3.2.4 Water Resources; 3.3.8 Wetlands; and 3.4.4 Wildlife, Fisheries, and Threatened and Endangered Species. Other subsections in sections 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 have been expanded to look at impacts per sub-basin and reorganized to include indirect and cumulative impact analyses. We believe the changes in these sections address your concerns. Please also see responses to comments G01-001 through G01-049.