

STATEMENT OF CHIP BYRNE

1  
2

I-0315-001

I'm Chip Byrne, and I'm here to talk about the impact of the 520 -- the suggested one right now is the 520 and the HOV, and I totally disagree with that because of a couple of things: the impact to the University of Washington, both physically and the dollars lost for the University of Washington Medical Center, the stadium; the long length of the construction and then how it affects the Arboretum with that link coming in, and you're knocking out a lot of the Arboretum.

12  
13  
14  
15

The use of the corridors of the existing 520 would in my mind would make the most sense, and it keeps the sanctity of the campus and the University over a thousand years.

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

So the cost I think is three times as much as using the corridors and the existing, and it's incompatible with what the Sound Transit is trying to do given that you're trying to get buses on an HOV lane faster, and they'd have to sit in traffic for quite a number of time, and you're just moving the problem from Montlake to the University of Washington, which in my mind makes it even much more of a mess.

24  
25

So it's dubious as far as the traffic benefits. So I would say cost and just construction and just the whole

**I-0315-001**  
**Comment Summary:**  
No Build Alternative

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

I-0315-001

University, and what it's going to do to that area is just amazing to me that they would even consider that. So thank you.

This is Chip Byrne again, and the point that I forgot to mention was that the impact to the wetlands using that one that's being proposed is more obtrusive to current wetland properties. So by using the existing corridor, there's less impact on the wetlands. Thanks.

2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25