

From: [Larry Howard](#)
To: [Krueger, Paul W \(UCO\)](#);
CC:
Subject: Released from eSafe SPAM quarantine: Mr. David Cooper 520 DEIS Letter
Date: Wednesday, November 01, 2006 7:26:46 AM
Attachments: [520 DEIS Oct-06.doc](#)

Dear Mr. Krueger:

Attached is the 520 DEIS letter that Yarrow Point Mayor David Cooper stated that would be sent to you per his email to you this morning. If you have any questions please contact me at Yarrow Point Town Hall, (425) 454-6994. Thank you very much for your attention.

Larry Howard

(Clerk/Treasurer)

*** eSafe2 scanned this email and found no malicious content ***
*** IMPORTANT: Do not open attachments from unrecognized senders ***

--

No virus found in this outgoing message.

Checked by AVG Free Edition.

Version: 7.1.409 / Virus Database: 268.13.21/509 - Release Date: 10/31/2006

TOWN OF YARROW POINT

4030 – 95th Ave NE
Yarrow Point, Washington 98004
Tel: 425.454.6994 / Fax: 425.454.7899
townhall@ci.yarrow-point.wa.us

October 30, 2006

Mr. Paul Krueger, Environmental Manager
SR 520 Project Office
414 Olive Way, Suite 400
Seattle, WA 98101

Dear Mr. Krueger;

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the DEIS for the expansion of SR 520. As you know, 520 crosses through a portion of the Town of Yarrow Point, adjacent to Clyde Hill and adjacent to the Town of Hunts Point. The existing Right of Way has hosted a popular 5.6 mile trail called the Points Loop Trail, that connects these three communities and Medina and Kirkland to valued habitat preserves and parks along the way.

Trail alignment

The Points Loop Trail is to return to "recreational use after construction". However, the August 18th DEIS on Page 7-18, Exhibit 7-11, shows the revised trail going through the private property of the proposed Fairweather Trail Short Plat. The graphic is unclear, and confused with the "Limits of Construction" line, so analysis and understanding are elusive.

Please clarify the intent for the Points Loop Trail; what is to be a temporary condition for the period of construction only, what is to be the final trail alignment, what properties are being impacted for both the temporary and permanent alignments of this trail and what actions are required to secure either the properties or easements to cross them.

We are mindful of the Section 4(f) Evaluation section that impacts to recreation areas, public parks and wildlife or waterfowl refuges are prohibited unless there is a feasible and prudent alternative, and the project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the property. What actions are proposed to minimize harm to the resources adjacent to this valuable recreation element? Is there to be a walkway on NE 33rd as partial replacement? How is the crossing of 92nd Avenue to be handled?

Noise, Screening and Vegetation Loss

The DEIS proposes to utilize the existing HOV lane that exists today on the north side of 520 through this area for the purposes of construction. During that period of construction, it is to be assumed from maps included in the DEIS that the limit of construction includes all DOT owned right of way. Today this area provides some protection to neighboring residents against noise and views of the highway. We are concerned about the loss of this vegetative buffer during the long construction period, yet find no remediation of these impacts during the construction period.

We also understand that the project proposes to move to the north in the right of way, and, in the long run, see no helpful discussion of adjacencies of residences to this final alignment, or of the final disposition of the north line of the highway with respect to these nearby homes, nor sections

L-015-001

Comment Summary:

Eastside Concerns

Response:

See Section 24.0 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

L-015-002

Comment Summary:

Eastside Concerns

Response:

See Section 24.0 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

L-015-001

L-015-002

L-015-002

showing vertical and horizontal distances between them and the roadway. Residences in this area are considerably higher than the highway, so we are concerned that sound walls adjacent to the highway would not have an effect on noise to adjacent residences west of 92nd Avenue NE.

We would request no further impact to those properties that were divided in the 1963 development of SR 520, and ask that provision be made in the planning for construction that noise and buffering be addressed with these residences in mind.

L-015-003

Lids

Included in the DEIS for the 6-lane alternative are two 500 foot-wide lids (should be 3 including the Evergreen Point lid in Medina) whose purpose is to "reconnect" the neighborhoods divided by the existing highway. The Town of Yarrow Point would like to discuss this proposal, as would the City of Clyde Hill and the Town of Hunts Point with WSDOT when a final proposal is made for the width of the highway. Should the 6-lane option emerge as a preferred alternative, it is likely that relocation of the proposed lid for 92nd Avenue N.E. and possibly also the lid for 84th Avenue N.E. be combined and situated in such a way as to more fully reconnect the neighborhoods with local parks and recreation elements in the area. This specifically may include lidding in between the two roadway crossings to provide an appropriate pedestrian crossing from the south side (Clyde Hill side) of the expanded roadway to Wetherill Nature Preserve. This would provide pedestrian access from the points to the south separate from the two vehicular crossings of the highway.

We see this as a potential opportunity to provide pedestrian access and recreation access to the parks and nature preserves associated with the Lake Washington wetlands for people coming down from Clyde Hill, Medina and the south portion of Yarrow Point. In addition, it offers the opportunity to link to regional trails within the Clyde Hill area and promote non-motorized access even to the downtown Bellevue area.

We ask that the three jurisdictions be solicited to discuss the disposition of the two 500 foot lids associate with 92nd Avenue and 84th Avenue, and identify an appropriate site for this crossing consistent with our respective Comprehensive Plans.

L-015-004

Traffic Impacts

Finally, we are concerned with the degradation of circulation into the Town of Yarrow Point from analysis of traffic impacts at offramps in our area. Exhibit 7-6, page 7-9, we believe, is confusing, and perhaps inaccurate, in that it suggests that the last off-ramp east of the floating bridge (92nd Avenue NE) could degrade to an "F" condition if the 4-lane option were implemented, or to an "E" condition should the 6-lane option become the preferred option for construction of the highway. We would ask that assistance be provided to the Town of Yarrow Point to understand the reason for this degradation and that mitigation be provided in the form of traffic management, lane size or alignment to ease this potential future condition.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to this DEIS and we look forward to further discussions with WSDOT after the preferred alternative is determined.

Sincerely,



David Cooper, Mayor
Town of Yarrow Point.

L-015-003

Comment Summary:

Eastside Concerns

Response:

See Section 24.0 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

L-015-004

Comment Summary:

Eastside Concerns

Response:

See Section 24.0 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.