

**From:** [Steve Broback](#)  
**To:** [SR520DEIScomments@wsdot.wa.gov](mailto:SR520DEIScomments@wsdot.wa.gov)  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** ECRD SR-520 Draft EIS Comments  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 31, 2006 4:29:51 PM  
**Attachments:**

---

ECRD, an eastside Lake Washington Citizen's Group concerned with maintaining and enhancing the livability of our neighborhoods. Our members represent neighborhoods ranging from South Bellevue to Woodinville. We have attended several SR-520 public meetings and has reviewed the draft EIS for the SR-520 bridge replacement and HOV project. We offer the following comments.

- C-035-001** ECRD strongly supports the four lane rebuild alternative. It improves safety, provides improvements to the environment, e.g. storm water runoff treatment, and is affordable. We strongly oppose the massive six lane Pacific Street interchange alternative. It would cause widespread environmental devastation to Lake Washington, arboretum, wetlands, neighborhoods, and protected species habitats. It would also cost an exorbitant 4.38 billion dollars, twice the estimated cost of the four lane rebuild.
- C-035-002** We have reviewed the OTAK 10/17/06 tech memo to the University of Washington which asserts, "Several important analyses of environmental effects are either not performed, performed using questionable assumptions or inappropriate analysis." This report raises serious concerns about the validity of the WSDOT SR-520 DEIS supporting documents.
- C-035-003** We also believe that the WSDOT must seriously study the "tube tunnel" concept, which is not now included in the SR-520 alternatives.
- C-035-004** Traffic congestion relief claims, especially for the six lane alternative, are not believable. The assumptions regarding the significant numbers of drivers who will leave their cars in favor of transit are unrealistically optimistic.
- C-035-005** We believe the WSDOT must include the cost of quiet pavement deployment in

**C-035-001**  
**Comment Summary:**  
4-Lane Alternative

**Response:**  
See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**C-035-002**  
**Comment Summary:**  
Format and Content

**Response:**  
See Section 23.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**C-035-003**  
**Comment Summary:**  
Tube/Tunnel Concepts

**Response:**  
See Section 1.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**C-035-004**  
**Comment Summary:**  
Methodology (Freeway)

**Response:**  
See Section 5.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**C-035-005**  
**Comment Summary:**  
Noise Walls

- C-035-005** | all alternatives that affect neighborhoods. State legislators have indicated they want to see this type of noise mitigation put in place to alleviate neighborhood noise concerns.
- C-035-006** | Seismic hazards are not well-defined. The OTAK report, concludes "there is no thorough analysis of potential risks associated with geologic hazards, such as earthquakes, and how they would influence the proposed roadway in its various potential forms." We are concerned that no reference is made in the DEIS to the 2005 Cascadia region earthquake work group report.
- C-035-007** | Throughout this process, we have been disappointed that no scenario for rebuilding of the current bridge structure has been included. The inclusion of a "do nothing" alternative while ignoring a "rebuild existing structure" alternative seems disingenuous to us. Noted highway engineers have assured us that floating in a new span and replacing the hollow-core pilings is a reasonable, phasable, and inexpensive alternative.
- C-035-008** | Total financing required to fund all alternatives are not adequately discussed. Considering that major personal privacy concerns exist with electronic bill collection, the assumption that tolls will be embraced is not realistic.
- C-035-009** |
- C-035-010** | The WSDOT has proposed stormwater treatment facilities/cells to replace wetlands. We understand these cells are an experimental design that may not have been proven to effectively treat polluted stormwater run-off. In addition, these cells (even if effective) are no panacea. To quote OTAK once more: "some pollutant levels under the proposed alternatives will actually be higher than the levels monitored in today's runoff."
- C-035-011** | We believe WSDOT should study/adopt the contents/approach of the SR-520 project corridor and status handbook dated 08/30/06, which emphasizes neighborhoods and context sensitive solutions (CSS) for the project design. WSDOT should proceed with LEED principles for application to the SR-520 project.

Thank you for your consideration,

Steve Broback  
ECRD

**Response:**

See Section 12.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**C-035-006**

**Comment Summary:**

Seismic Hazards

**Response:**

See Section 17.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**C-035-007**

**Comment Summary:**

Alternatives Development

**Response:**

See Section 1.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**C-035-008**

**Comment Summary:**

Funding

**Response:**

See Section 3.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

**C-035-009**

**Comment Summary:**

Tolling Technology and Infrastructure

**Response:**

See Section 3.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

