

From: Andrew Strobel <Andrew.Strobel@PuyallupTribe-nsn.gov>

Sent: Monday, December 20, 2021 2:06 PM

To: Chris Beale <CBeale@PuyallupWA.gov>

Cc: Bryan Roberts <BRoberts@PuyallupWA.gov>; Ken Gunther <kgunther@cityoffife.org>; Greg Vigoren <gvigoren@cityoffife.org>; Brian Alvis <balvis@cityoffife.org>; City of Fife (sfriddle@cityoffife.org) <sfriddle@cityoffife.org>; Katie Baker <KBaker@PuyallupWA.gov>; Robert B. Barandon <Robert.B.Barandon@puyalluptribe-nsn.gov>; Jennifer M. Keating <Jennifer.M.Keating@puyalluptribe-nsn.gov>; Brandon Reynon <Brandon.Reynon@PuyallupTribe-nsn.gov>; Char Naylor <Char.Naylor@PuyallupTribe-nsn.gov>; Russ Ladley <Russ.Ladley@PuyallupTribe-nsn.gov>

Subject: Re: Traffic report Freeman Road warehouses Project #P-21-0136

CAUTION: This is an External Email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you are expecting them.

Hi Chris, Jennifer and Brandon should be coordinating any Cultural Resource issues directly.

Regarding the TIA report I will provide a few informal comments for consideration as we await further permitting and comment periods throughout the project development.

1. I find the TIA to not adequately address the Union Pacific Railroad Crossing. A 5 hour observation without a demonstrable train event is inadequate for the conclusion derived in the TIA.

"Video of the Union Pacific Railroad crossing south of Valley Avenue was observed for 5 hours during peak travel periods (6-9 AM and 4-6 PM). During those 5 hours of video no trains were observed and no gate closings occurred. Therefore, the rail crossing does not appear to significantly affect operations of the Freeman Road and Valley Avenue signal during the AM or PM peak hours." -Pg 24 TIA

2. The TIA safety analysis doesn't model properly for the truck trips generated by the project. Freeman @ Valley has had 10 collisions in the sample date, which I think is significant for the intersection. Freeman @ Valley currently restricts heavy haul traffic and contains the rail crossing 200 feet back. I feel like a more significant analysis including the newly introduced truck traffic queuing at Valley and the cargo lengths of trucks should be studied so that trucks are properly clearing the railroad tracks.

3. I cannot agree with the conclusions stated in the Channelization Warrants (7.2). I don't believe proper turn radii from the development provides that Freeman as a 2 lane, non-heavy haul corridor can accept truck traffic introduced by the project. The warrants state that no center turn lane is needed, which would mean likely trucks would be turning into oncoming traffic when making right hand turns out of their facility. It is my understanding that the ROW is roughly 20-ish feet and these types of trucks will require at a minimum 27 feet to make a 90 degree turn. These turn radii should be modeled.

4. In the Channelization Warrants (7.2), the applicant consultant claims state that there is no responsibility for widening ROW due to the project. I am confused of this statement because of previous public statements made at the Community Meeting hosted by the Vector where the claim was that Vector had responsibility to widen the frontage of the project site. In any case, I disagree with both statements as the type of traffic, the road construction type, turning radii, and safety concerns warrant that without a full length of road improvement to either Levee Rd or Valley Ave, there would be concerns that the current road would fail under the weight of the trucks, cause undue safety concerns of the turning radii of trucks, and safety concerns of the Union Pacific rail road crossing due to truck queuing at Valley. I believe the entirety of section of road should be a minimum requirement to introducing this type of traffic onto Freeman Rd to properly mitigate safety and traffic concerns.

Regards,

Andrew Strobel
Director of Planning and Land Use
Puyallup Tribe of Indians
3700 Pacific Hwy E #407, Fife, WA 98424
253-573-7879