PAGE 1 of 2

FROM: RICHARD & JENNIFER SCOTT
6724 12TH ST. E.
TACOMA, WA. 98424
253-922-2456 (H)

Comments

State Route 167 Extension from Puyallup to State Route 509 (Fife)

Fife Open House

RECEIVED
MAY 05 2003
TUMWATER DESIGN

DEAR NEAL CAMPBELL, WSDOT,

MY NAME IS RICHARD SCOTT, AND I LIVE AT THE VERY MOST TIP OF FIFE HEIGHTS CLOSEST TO THE NEW PROPOSED INTERCHANGE WITH I-5, 167, & EXTENTION INTO THE PORT OF TACOMA. MY WIFE AND I HAVE A GREAT CONCERN ABOUT EXTREME INCREASES IN TRAFFIC NOISE THAT WILL OCCUR AT OUR RESIDENCE WHEN THE INTERCHANGE IS BUILT. OUR HOUSE IS THE CLOSEST RESIDENCE TO THIS INTERCHANGE THAN ANY OTHER HOUSE IN THE AREA. I GUARANTEE YOU, THERE WILL BE AN EXTREME INCREASE IN TRAFFIC NOISE AT OUR HOUSE.
* WE WOULD LIKE YOUR GROUP TO DO THE FOLLOWING: HELP US BY SOUNDPROOFING OUR HOUSE AND SLIGHTLY ADJUSTING OUR INSULATION QUALITY TO ACCOMODATE THE INCREASE IN NOISE. I DON'T PROPOSE ANY SOUND BARRIER WALLS FOR MY HOUSE, JUST WINDOWS AND SOME SORT OF SOUND PROOF INSULATION. I WOULD LIKE A RESPONCE TO THIS LETTER AND POSSIBLY HAVE SOMEONE FROM YOUR GROUP COME TO MY HOUSE TO SEE AND DISCUSS THIS MATTER. I DO SOMEWHAT SUPPORT THIS INTERCHANGE EVEN THOUGH IT IS SO BIG AND CONSUMING. IT IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF MAKING THE AREA AND COMMUNITY MOVE BETTER AND HELP TRAFFIC. PLEASE TAKE THE TIME TO HELP US IN THIS HUGE PROJECT. WE WILL NEED IT. THANK YOU NEAL, SINCERELY, RICHARD & JENNIFER SCOTT

C77-001

Or send comments to:

Neal Campbell
WSDOT Design Project Engineer
6639 Capitol Blvd S, Suite 302
Tumwater, WA 98501

360-570-6602
Fax 360-570-6630

e-mail: campbea@wsdot.wa.gov

PAGE 2 of 2

due April 1 14

Comments

State Route 167 Extension from Puyallup to State Route 509 (Fife)

WE AWAIT YOUR RESPONCE TO THIS MATTER. I WILL BE MUCH CHEAPER TO SOUND PROOF WALLS! THANK YOU FOR CONSIDERATION.

Richard D. Scott

RICHARD & JENNIFER SCOTT
6724 12TH ST. E.
TACOMA, WA. 98424

253-922-2456 HOME #
253-222-5700 CELL #
253-922-1700 WORK #

Or send comments to:

Neal Campbell
WSDOT Design Project Engineer
6639 Capitol Blvd S, Suite 302

TRANSCRIBED COMMENT C77-001

My name is Richard Scott, and I live at the very most tip of Fife Heights closest to the new proposed interchange with I-5, 167 extension into the Port of Tacoma. My wife and I have a great concern about extreme increases in traffic noise that will occur at our residence when the interchange is built. Our house is the closest residence to this interchange than any other house in the area. I guarantee you, there will be an extreme increase in traffic noise at our house. We would like your group to do the following: help us by soundproofing our house and slightly adjusting our insulation quality to accommodate the increase in noise. I don't propose any sound barrier walls for our house, just window and some sort of sound proof insulation. I would like a response to this letter and possibly have someone come to my house to see and discuss this matter. I do somewhat support this interchange even though it is so big and consuming. It is an important part of making the area and community move better and help traffic. Please take the time to help us in this huge project. We will need it. Thank you.

We await your response to this matter. I will be much cheaper to sound proof than to put up huge sound walls! Thank you for your consideration.

RESPONSE C77-001

FHWA and WSDOT policy states that funding for projects will not be used to insulate private or commercial buildings. Insulation of buildings can be used in some instances for non-profit institutions or public use structures. A noise study has been conducted to evaluate the placement of noise walls along the project corridor. For more information, please see subsection 3.6.6 of the FEIS.

RECEIVED
APR 24 2003
TUMWATER DESIGN

Linda Payne Taylor
PO Box 23966
Federal Way, WA 98093

26 March 2003

I am all for completing Highway 167. It is good for the Port of Tacoma, where my husband is employed.

However, there has to be another simpler, *CHEAPER*, and *better* alternative to achieving this goal than building an 85' high bridge over I5, skirting Fife Height's hillside. C78-001

Fife Heights is a lovely slice of rural land between the Tide Flats and Pacific Highway South. We already have to endure more and more noise from I5 and Pacific Hwy S. due to the loss of more and more natural land being bulldozed under in the name of "progress." The filth that comes from the roadways, in the form of black tire dust and just plain dust is overwhelming now. Our decks must be washed off daily.

If we get an aerial, truck heavy, highway skirting the other side of our hill, we will be so inundated by noise (think acceleration and deceleration and jack brakes) and the filth of the freeways, that our land will be unusable, our property values will drop to less than our purchase prices/mortgages. This will be very easy to prove and simple for us to gather the evidence.

Is the State Dept. of Transportation set up to buy our homes? Is it set up to compensate us for loss of value? I can assure you that the citizens of Fife Heights will sue for either or both of these monetary compensations. C78-002

How do you plan to help the residents endure the noise of the building of the bridges? We have *very vivid* memories of the work on the Port of Tacoma Road bridges still.

And, finally, how will the Dept. of Transportation protect us from the dust that is laden w/ arsenic? The testing and study has been completed and the outcome is that the arsenic levels are above "background" levels and are harmful. Unless this is dealt with properly, again there will be more lawsuits. There is no denying that the dust levels will be awful. C78-003

RESPONSE C78-001

WSDOT held several design workshops and conducted a Value Engineering (VE) study for the I-5 interchange. All aspects of highway design were represented with technical experts from the local jurisdictions, highway designers, bridge designers and geotechnical experts. The preferred option for the I-5 interchange resulted from those meetings.

RESPONSE C78-002

FHWA and WSDOT policy is that we only model noise levels 500 feet from the FOG line at the edge of the paved highway. Fife Heights is over 1000 feet from the proposed new SR 167 highway alignment and outside of the project limits. Beyond approximately 500 feet from the highway noise reductions provided by noise barriers are negligible. Noise barriers are effective only for those homes that are immediately adjacent to the highway and a row or two of houses behind this first row. The noise discipline report (2004) modeled impacts at a total of 19 residents between the proposed highway and Fife Heights. Two noise barriers, numbers 4 and 5, were modeled to shield the residents in this area. The study determined that neither wall would be able to achieve the required minimum of 7 decibels noise reduction at one household, and therefore, does not meet the feasibility criteria.

RESPONSE C78-003

Construction will require mitigation measures to comply with PSCAA regulations that require the control of dust during construction and preventing deposition of mud on paved streets.

Our only conclusion is that the DOT (in your short-sighted thinking and with a few willing, retiring farmers) finds it cheaper and less troublesome, to buy out a few farms then some business locations.

If constructed logically, this roadway would be aligned w/ I5, meeting already constructed on/off-ramps where added traffic lanes (2 or 3) would move the traffic to north or south bound onto I5. A new overpass at Alexander or 54th would keep the trucks rolling over the traffic at Pacific Hwy. S. (Something that should have been done on the Port of Tacoma Road.) It would require the purchase of some businesses and only 1 bridge. There would be no issue w/ the creek, no issue w/ noise or pollution, no issue w/ residential land. C78-004

We also suspect that the Indians proposed closure of Alexander has some impact on decisions. Though the City of Tacoma has authority here, it would be a grave mistake to close Alexander. There would only, then, be one, 2-lane roadway leading on and off the Tide Flats and in an emergency it would not be adequate. Dumping many more trucks, at high speeds, would only make matters worse. The Port wishes to expand the use of this part of the Tide Flats but with no bridges, one roadway and now a freeway, this becomes a dangerous and foolish proposition. C78-005

It seems to us that you need to reconsider your choices: either buy Fife Heights out and turn the land into industrial land (don't tell this to all the owners of new homes) or re-align and redesign this interchange. The plan you are currently proposing is more costly than 3X the above alternative.

We chose to live in Fife Heights to be close to work, therefore relieving traffic on all roadways. We chose to be part of a solution and not part of a problem. Now you are taking that logical choice away from us. You say you want to relieve congestion on the freeways and roads. Prove it!

Thank you for your attention to my remarks.

415 66th Ave East
98424

RESPONSE C78-004

The proposed 54th Avenue interchange will allow trucks to access SR 167 and tie directly to I-5 northbound and the Port of Tacoma Road/SR 509 area without entering the intersection at SR 99. Trucks destined for southbound I-5 will have to use the existing configuration with the SR 99 intersection and then enter I-5. Alexander Avenue has been closed north of SR 509.

RESPONSE C78-005

The closure of Alexander Avenue north of SR 509 has been approved by Pierce County and the Cities of Tacoma and Fife. The two Port accesses via 54th Ave and Taylor Way and Port of Tacoma Road are accommodated in this project. Please see response to your comment above.

-----Original Message-----
From: Lari Ryan [mailto:lariryan@earthlink.net]
Sent: Sunday, April 13, 2003 5:41 PM
To: Neal Campbell
Subject: Hylebos Creek

Dear Mr. Campbell: I am writing in support of the Hylebos Creek Restoration Proposal, which hopefully will aid in restoring the wetland by allowing the return of the natural floodplain. In talking to other concerned citizens, i find we have a lack of information about the restoration methods and the total size of the proposed restoration area. As there seems to be a good deal of development proposed for the area, I am concerned for the several salmon species affected as well as other wetland creatures including mammals such as beaver and river otter. C79-001

Also the proposed SR 167 corridor is close enough in some places to allow major pollution. How is this all going to be addressed.

Sincerely,

Lari Ryan

RESPONSE C79-001

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.

-----Original Message-----
From: RevelCC@aol.com [mailto:RevelCC@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, March 07, 2003 11:16 AM
To: campben@wsdot.wa.gov
Subject: (no subject)

Neal,

I can't make the Public Hearings, but I wanted to give you my input on this plan...

For the most part I agree with transportation plans that will help reduce our congestion that we have to deal with in today's world. But, my only concern would be are we spending the money on the most important improvement that will return the most for our money.

I drive the 167 freeway on a daily basis to get to and from work. There's a tremendous amount of pressure on this freeway to deliver the capacity that it incurs. Is there any effort to evaluate alternatives to expanding it's capacity? C80-001

I think by connecting 167 to I-5, you might actually end up putting more load on an already maxed out capacity. Seems like we could extend the HOV lanes from Auburn to Sumner and then extend 167 to I-5 allowing for an additional load that will occur on 167.

Okay, now that I am on my bandstand, seems like we could get better through put on the system if we open up the commuter lanes to the general public on 167.

Like I've said previously, I've been commuting using this stretch of road (for many years) and areas that there's HOV provided, they are way under used. Opening these up would allow for increased flow....

One last thought is that if the HOV lanes are under used, has anyone thought of using them as the basis of elevated light rail. These lanes could be used for the foundation points to build this type of alternative. Just an idea that I've had for some time.... C80-002

THANKS for you time and willingness to hear others opinions!

Have a GREAT day!

Joe DeRosier
(360) 893-8902

RESPONSE C80-001

Capacity changes to SR 167 north to Auburn are currently being studied on an adjacent project. 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 C80-002

Light Rail is not proposed as part of this project.

-----Original Message-----
From: Yeilding, James H [mailto:james.h.yeilding@boeing.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2003 12:22 PM
To: campben@wsdot.wa.gov
Subject: Finishing 167

Mr. Campbell,

I was unable to download the EIS or other documentation concerning the completion of 167. The current project is just too expensive. And it will prevent any future expansion of I-5. Is one of the possible alternatives to go back to the original route and just cut a deal with the environmentalist and native Americans?

It has to be cheaper to mitigate the adverse impact to the salmon habitat and demolish the existing structures on the original route, than the currently proposed route. C81-001

I am one of those Edgewood residents who is going to fight any expansion of Meridian until 167 is completed. So unfortunately, I am part of the problem, not the solution.

But you have to come up with a cheaper solution. $ 1.6 Billion is just too much money.

Sincerely,

Jim Yeilding

RE: 0L3432, State Route 167
SR 167, Puyallup to SR 509, Tier II Environmental Impact Statement
Response to Your Comments

Dear Mr. Yielding:

I recently mailed you a letter thanking you for commenting on the Tier II DEIS for this project. As stated in the letter, it will take quite a while to incorporate all the comments into a final EIS. I'd like to take this opportunity to answer some of your questions that can be answered right now.

"The project will prevent any future expansion of I-5"

- Adjacent projects at Port of Tacoma Road and projects to widen I-5 through Tacoma will add an additional HOV lane to I-5. These projects are expected to take place before the SR 167 Interchange is built. Future expansion beyond that may still be possible.

"Is it possible to go back to the original route and cut a deal?"

- No, the Tier I EIS defined where the corridor is to occur. The preferred alternative had the fewest environmental impacts of the alternatives presented in Tier I. The original route still has higher environmental impacts than the current design.
- The original plan to connect at Port of Tacoma Interchange will not match City of Fife transportation plans and will overload the interchange at I-5 and Port of Tacoma Road.
- Too many environmental impacts were identified on the original route. It would not be cheaper to mitigate impacts.

If you have any additional questions concerning the project, please contact me at 360-570-6602 or Rae Bennett, the Design Team Leader, at 360-570-6613.

cc: File

RESPONSE C81-001

Adjacent projects at Port of Tacoma Road and projects to widen I-5 through Tacoma will add an additional HOV land lane in each direction to I-5. These projects are expected to take place before the SR 167 Interchange is built. Future expansion beyond that may still be possible. The Tier I EIS defined where the corridor is to occur. The preferred alternative had the fewest environmental impacts of the alternatives presented in Tier I. The original route still has higher environmental impacts than the current design. The original plan to connect at Port of Tacoma Interchange will not match City of Fife transportation plans and will would overload the interchange at I-5 and Port of Tacoma Road. Too many environmental impacts were identified on the original route, and it would not be cheaper to mitigate impacts.

RECEIVED
APR 14 2003
TUMWATER DESIGN

Mary A. Fries
620 North C St
Tacoma, WA 98403

To Neal Campbell, Project Engineer
WSDOT Tumwater Design Office

Dear Sir:

Many of us who are interested in the preservation of salmon were dismayed to learn that DOT's plans for SR167 do not do a good job of ensuring that highway runoff does not pollute Hylebos Creek.

The Draft EIS needs to be fleshed out with a great many more details about the protection of riparian and creek environments. You may need to acquire and restore more riparian area than is currently specified in your plans. Riparian and floodplain habitat needs to be acquired and restored before this highway attracts a strip of development which will add to detrimental effects on the creek habitat. C82-001

Have plant ecologists who specialize in riparian restoration, and fisheries biologists been consulted about environmental impacts, and how best to mitigate them?

I urge you to do a more thorough EIS.

Thank you,

Mary A. Fries

RESPONSE C82-001

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. These sections 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. WSDOT has assembled a team of experts to perform a comprehensive analysis of the project's effects on hydrology, channel hydraulics, and the geomorphology to assure that we address the impacts of our project on the watershed as part of the RRP for Hylebos Creek and Wapato Creek. We have hand chosen a team of specialists with expertise in Hydrologic Simulation Program Fortran (HSPF) modeling, floodplain hydraulics, geomorphology, and stream ecology. Please also see responses to comments G01-001 through G01-049.