

**From:** "Carl Stork" <[carl@ciconiaco.com](mailto:carl@ciconiaco.com)>  
**Date:** April 7, 2017 at 1:39:21 PM PDT  
**To:** <[mayor@ci.yarrow-point.wa.us](mailto:mayor@ci.yarrow-point.wa.us)>, <[mhgreen@ci.yarrow-point.wa.us](mailto:mhgreen@ci.yarrow-point.wa.us)>  
**Subject:** Clyde Hill Traffic Changes

Hi Mayor Dicker and Mona!

I just learned of the Clyde Hill proposals to restrict traffic through the neighborhood. I had not seen any previous discussion... and it seems non-productive for Clyde Hill to make unilateral changes without considering all the impacts on all the Points communities.

Are you dialed in to these discussions? Will Clyde Hill be taking input from Yarrow Point and others? What is the process?

All their documents can be found here: <http://www.clydehill.org/traffic-plan> I attached the two most relevant ones.

I don't know that there are any good solutions... And I don't even know whether they have identified and thought through which problem they are trying to solve. Creating new problems for others would not be a win at all.

As I see it, the main proposals that could have an impact on Yarrow Point are the following

- (1) Request WS-DOT to slow the ramp meter for the 84<sup>th</sup> Ave on-ramp to WB SR-520. Since the goal is to reduce cut through traffic, that means that the combination of the delay time plus stacked up cars needs to be enough to make it longer than accessing SR-520 via other ramps, and we can both continue to expect the 84<sup>th</sup> Ave roundabout, and Points Drive and 84<sup>th</sup> Ave to be backed up and limited function. Presumably Clyde Hill cannot do this unilaterally since it affects all our jurisdictions.
- (2) Reduce traffic flow from WB 24<sup>th</sup> Ave to 84<sup>th</sup> Ave by implementing "No turn on red" – if this works, then it would presumably divert more traffic to 92<sup>nd</sup> Ave to Points Drive.
- (3) Reduce incentive to use Points Drive, including Aqua Vista routes, by prohibiting left turns from NB 92<sup>nd</sup> Ave to Points Drive. Traffic would instead be required to continue northbound to the Roundabout on 92<sup>nd</sup> Ave, do a 360, head back south on 92<sup>nd</sup>, and then make a right on Points Drive. Needless to say this could create a substantial increase in traffic through our Roundabout and has the potential to increase deadlocks in the Roundabout as people heading south wanting to go to eastbound 520 are blocked by people heading north... or if Points Drive is backed up all the way to 92<sup>nd</sup>, to gridlock the Roundabout. (And given that WS-DOT swore that the 84<sup>th</sup> Ave Roundabout would never back up, based on their studies, I don't think these studies are ever reliable.)
- (4) There are other restrictions that Clyde Hill contemplates, including prohibiting right turns from WB NE 20<sup>th</sup> to NB 84<sup>th</sup> Ave, and limiting turns from WB NE 12<sup>th</sup> St to both NB 84<sup>th</sup> Ave and NB 86<sup>th</sup> Ave. These actions would redirect more traffic onto 92<sup>nd</sup> Ave.

Another effect of these changes could be to make WB SR-520 even harder to use to reach Yarrow Point and other Points communities. As it is, the loss of the right hand exit lane for 92<sup>nd</sup> Ave has made it much slower to reach the 92<sup>nd</sup> Ave exit... And sending even more traffic onto 520 from the Bellevue Way on-ramps is just going to make the right lane of WB SR-520 function much worse. And if the Roundabout is

congested or SB 92<sup>nd</sup> backed up, that will make the exit back up. A practical solution for other Points communities is going to be increased use of NE 24<sup>th</sup> St as an alternative to WB 520 and the 92<sup>nd</sup> Ave exit. It won't help reach Yarrow Point if NB 92<sup>nd</sup> or the Roundabout back up.

Beware of the unintended or unforeseen consequences of these changes. It seems like Clyde Hill is focused on reducing traffic on NE 24<sup>th</sup> Ave and maybe through Aqua Vista. However chances are that they are just going to create other bottlenecks and congestion points, and they may not even solve the problem they are trying to solve.

I went to many meetings with WS-DOT during the design phase of the SR-520 rebuild, and questioned them about how the Roundabouts would function if SR-520 backed up. They deflected the question entirely and claimed that there would never be a backup on the SR-520 onramp unless there were a blocking collision on the bridge. They never modeled or considered the traffic in our neighborhoods. So long as there are WB backups on SR-520, there will be traffic in our neighborhoods that is trying to beat that congestion. And the more delay we create on the WB SR-520 onramp at 84<sup>th</sup>, on the one hand we are giving up use of Points Drive and we are making it hard for our own residents to use 520. And sending all the Points Drive traffic through the 92<sup>nd</sup> Ave Roundabout seems like it creates a new problem at the entrance (and exit) to Yarrow Point. I trust that Clyde Hill cannot do that without our consent?

Here is a more radical idea: How about an additional toll for using the WB 84th Ave on-ramp, which could discourage cut through traffic, and perhaps is not assessed on cars registered in the Points communities for whom it is the logical on-ramp?

In any event, I would like to know how much Yarrow Point is participating in the process, and how I can have a voice and help.

Best  
Carl