

So, while we like the freeway, we do not believe that any possible solution lies in the expansion of this valuable asset by way of further service construction for the use of single rubber-tired vehicles, or even mass transit, operating in the same stream of traffic, with the bus with the 60 passengers standing motionless along with the car with 1 passenger. In addition to which, we are concerned in Seattle, as all other cities, with air pollution, and it is quite apparent that until some solution is found to handle the emissions from internal combustion engines, vehicles gathered in great masses on freeways are going to aggravate air pollution.

The benefits of rapid transit are well known, and I am sure you will hear technical testimony on that, that would far exceed anything I can give. However, it is apparent that, if you can move, in our instance, in a subway fed by surface lines and by well-integrated surface transportation systems, tying into this mass rapid-transportation system, as many as 40,000 persons per lane, as compared to approximately 2,200 persons per lane in automobiles at $1\frac{1}{8}$ persons per car, which is about the average in Seattle, and it becomes apparent that rapid transit can and will serve the purpose and assure the economic health for the benefit of the entire city.

Now, while it is true that our particular configurations differ from others, I am sure it is no different at all in the concept and in the impact on the core in any other city that has had this same problem.

There is still time in Seattle to preserve an already existing healthy district. This is not a case of rehabilitation. On the other hand, time is running out, and we are quite confident if we cannot get about the construction of this kind of system, it will not be very long before we will start to see the decay by way of the exodus from this district of the headquartering type of activity which is really the lifeblood of our community.

Now, I am also here today to support the amendment to the Mass Transportation Act introduced by Congressman Adams.

At the present time, as I previously stated, we have completed the feasibility study. We have made application for \$850,000 under the title 702 of the Housing Act to engage in the engineering work upon which we can then base firm estimates of cost to go to our people, first for bond support for our part of the program and hopefully to come to the Mass Transportation Act for support to do the actual construction of the first section of the line.

The first two sections, the one leading to the north city indicated on the map, and the one across the lake to the heavy populated east side, which is the growing bedroom community, will cost in the neighborhood of \$170 million for construction. These are estimates, based only on the feasibility study and they could change with the engineering.

We are told that we are not going to be able to get the \$850,000. The most we can hope to get from title 702 would be in the general neighborhood of \$125,000, and while \$125,000 is considerable money, it is virtually useless for engaging in the engineering of a project of this type, because you can't do a bit of it at a time; you have to do it all.

It appears to us that the amendment offered by Congressman Adams is not only an answer to this particular problem in Seattle and in other cities but also makes a great deal of sense in general. Title 702 which