

**Comments on the Proposed Metro Service Change  
Received by the King County Council  
September 25, 2015 Through October 5, 2015**

On August 25, 2015, upon receipt of the Executive's proposed Metro service change for March 2016, the County Council launched a web page at which members of the public could submit written comments (<http://kingcounty.gov/council/testimony/testimony-backup2.aspx>).

People providing comments were asked to provide their name, email, street address, bus routes, and a written comment.

Between August 25 and September 10, 2015, the Council received **354** comments. Those comments were printed as part of the September 15, 2015, committee meeting packet. Between September 11 and September 24, 2015, the Council received an additional **74** comments. Those comments were printed as part of the September 29, 2015, committee meeting packet, and were reprinted in the October 6, 2015, committee meeting packet, as this item was not able to be presented on September 29.

Between September 25 and October 5, 2015, the Council received an additional **226** comments.

Those 226 comments are printed on the pages that follow. An updated database of all comments received, with contact information, is made available to Council offices each day so that Councilmembers and their staff can review comments as they are submitted.

Because many commenters addressed multiple routes, staff has attempted to organize these comments by general subject area. Although many commenters addressed numerous subjects in their comments, staff identified the following predominant themes in the comments and organized the comments by those themes:

- **Distance and Convenience.** A number of commenters (116) expressed concern that the proposed service changes would require them to walk farther to a stop or to change their travel patterns. Some (14) expressed support for the service changes, noting that the new route patterns would be more convenient for them.
- **Frequency.** A total of 29 commenters expressed support for the additional frequency proposed with the restructure. However, five commenters expressed concern that routes they use would not run frequently enough to meet their needs.
- **Network Connections.** Twenty-eight commenters expressed support for the connections to light rail and the overall transit network that would be provided through the restructure.

- **Off-Peak Service.** Nine commenters expressed concern that there would not be enough off-peak service.
- **Transfers.** The restructure as proposed would entail transfers to light rail or another bus for some transit riders. Fifteen commenters expressed concern about the need to transfer; and one commenter expressed support.

The remaining commenters offered comments on other aspects of Metro service, not necessarily related to the proposed restructure.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
<b>Distance &amp; Convenience</b>				
Scott	Kralik	68	1	I'm a big fan of the #68 bus, which I take to University Village to shop and to get deep-dish pizza at Delfino's. (Northgate was never much to cheer about, and it's absolutely tanking these days, while U Village offers a broader range of high-quality shopping options.) I no longer own a car, and getting from U Village to the Ave with a load of stuff so I can hop the #73 the rest of the way home can be a major chore. That #68 stop right at the entrance to U Village is extremely convenient when I'm loaded down.
Jamie	Tameno	65, 75	1	The proposed changes to the 65 and 75 would really help me and my family out as well as other coworkers. I would definitely be able to use the buses more often! Please please please make these changes
Leslie	Basel	65, 75, 372, 522, 41, 312, Link	1	I FULLY SUPPORT the NE reorganization plan as put forth by the King County Council. 15 min frequent service on routes 65, 75, in addition to the 10 min frequent route on the 372 to get to Link will allow Lake City to bloom. I live "on the way" as Jarrett Walker would consider it, very close to 125th and a couple of blocks from Lake City Way. As it is, the Lake City urban village is an affordable bedroom community to the University of Washington and that frequent service is vital to the transit in this neighborhood. If this re-org happens, I plan to shift my bus riding to take advantage. Instead of the 312, 522, I can now take the 65, 75, 372 to Link. Coming home, I can shift from the 41 to Link then the 65, 75, or 372. I have walked in the area of Link at Husky Stadium. Very pleasant, and even better if the re-org happens!
James	King	71, 76, 78	1	The plan proposed earlier in the year was just awful for people near me (on 55 NE at NE 74), since the "improvements" essentially removed our bus service. I am glad to see that the current plan with route 78 looks much better. It does seem to provide a connection to the light rail and also, from the south, to the U district without a mile of walking. It still seems odd to have no way to approach U. Way from the north without a long walk and transfers, but maybe the connection via route 73 will seem natural some day. If I understand the map, it seems that 78 will actually run from a nearby stop right to the Link station rather than the more distant 75 route on campus. This may make the light rail actually convenient, which in earlier plans seemed not true at all. To get to early flights to the airport (which is possible now with the 71 or 76 in the tunnel to the light rail), I gather one will still need to use the 76, since the 78 service is not an early service. Please don't let the plan for the 78 get weaker.
Donna	Shy	78	2	The new route 78 connecting us in Northeast neighborhoods to the new Husky Stadium light rail station will be great. I wish that it would also run on weekends. Also, an earlier start time would be so helpful for taking early flights out of Sea-Tac. ADDED COMMENT 9/27: To be truly effective, proposed route 78 should run 7 days a week from 5:00 am to midnight.
Melissa	Balmadrid	16, 26	2	I love the proposed changes to the 16 and 26 bus! Thank you!
theresa	Maloney	11	2	Thank you so much for the changes to the Route 11 bus. After replying to every survey I feel that my voice was heard and that I had an impact on improving my bus route. I really appreciate that the responses were listened to and changes were made to ensure that the Route 11 connects Madison Park/Valley with the Capitol Hill light rail station AND central downtown. I am really excited for these changes to take effect and to be better connected to the city.
Christine	Hawkins	31, 32, 70's, ST 512 ST 592 ST 594	2	Thank you for the ongoing improvements!
Dan	Crawford	65, 75	2	I live in Beacon Hill and work at Seattle Children's Hospital. I commute by car, alone, each weekday. When Link Light Rail comes to UW, I will cease driving if there is also convenient bus service between the rail station and Seattle Children's Hospital. I encourage you to adopt Metro's proposed bus package.
Rebecca	Ford	62	4	I think the addition of route 62 would be great for the Metro, and particularly those of us attempting to travel west to east for wor

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Christopher	Ford	16, 62	4	Changing Route 16 to new Route 62 would be a huge improvement for commuters to Seattle Children's administrative offices on 70th and Sand Point.
Mac	Hewson	26X	4	The new 26x will be very useful with one exception. There is no reason, after leaving north gate in a southbound direction, to encircle nssc. Just keep going on the street south of nssc with one or two stops for nssc
Maximus	Arealvos	68	4	Route 68 is a vital route for students commuting to and from Eckstein Middle School.
Kelly	Boughter	75, 65, 78	8	I think adding stops and more buses will make the commute to Children's Hospital much more desirable!
Victoria	Yund	64, 71, 76	1	Metro's proposal decimates bus service for commuters from Wedgwood to downtown Seattle. The express commuter bus 64 will no longer serve downtown core commuters but instead go to South Lake Union and then to the hospital area east of the downtown core--instead of a relatively fast and convenient trip, the 64 will be useless to me. The only other option is the 76, which runs infrequently and is slower. The 71 option disappears completely. I feel that Metro's changes severely disadvantage commuters, students and occasional bus riders in Wedgwood. The only way to get to good bus service from Wedgwood to downtown after the changes is to drive to the Northgate Transit Center and take the 41. I would prefer not to drive, but Metro is making it very difficult to commute from my neighborhood.
Paul	Ip	242	1	Me and a number of my coworkers at Microsoft (three people in my team alone) in Redmond rely on the 242 get to work in Redmond from Maple Leaf. This bus isn't as full as the 545 (which I used when I lived in Capitol Hill, or when going downtown), but it is as full as the 542. I understand the 242 is proposed for deletion as part of the changes related to the light rail service to Husky Stadium in 2016. While I'll agree that the 242 could use some optimization (such as increased stop distance at both ends), the new light rail station does nothing to replace the service of the 242. Perhaps in 2021, when the light rail reaches Roosevelt and Northgate, this would make sense, but ending 242 service in 2016 leaves us with no good alternative. As it stands, the best alternative should the 242 be removed as planned is to take the 542, which ends at 65th (Green Lake P&R). However, the 242 serves stops between the Green Lake P&R and Northgate along 5th Ave NE, and there is no other line connecting to the 242 that can bring us the rest of the distance home. It would also force us to sit through all the stops in the entire U district, which adds a ton of time to the route. The other alternative would be to take the 542/545 and connect to the 67, but that route has 30 minute headways and runs along Stevens Way, which makes a connection with the 545 very impractical (walking from Montlake to UW Transit Hub). Please reconsider keeping the 242 at the existing level or service, or at least provide some alternative for this route.
Patrick	Friel	71	1	My wife and I live in View Ridge and often use the #71 route to access the University District and Downtown Seattle. It will be a major loss for us if you discontinue this route. Thank you.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Ian	Newhall	242	1	Dear King County Council Members, As a loyal bus rider for the last 10 years, I have found the routes to be mostly useful and easy to coordinate. The proposed change to Route 242 is one that will negatively affect numerous riders daily. I have been on the 242 now for about 5 years and I recognize every single face I see, whether I take my usual bus or the later bus. I say that because it means there is a group of loyal riders that will need to find alternate transportation. In my case, and the case of those north of me along this route, it means potentially taking THREE buses to fill the void of the 242. That is TWO transfers within a distance of 3 miles. With coordinating arrival and departure times, it is quite likely I'd take my car rather than utilize the amazing service that is offered currently with the 242. I could, in theory, drive the Green Lake P&R, but that parking lot is already over-burdened and saturated by 7:30am. The 242 drives by at least three Park & Rides that I know of in North Seattle alone. For me, the 242 represents an easiness to the daily commute. I can hop on near my house and get off near my work. I don't have to rage in my little box on the freeway. I don't have to worry about accidents, breaking down, or even paying attention. With all the other things in my life I welcome the chance to sit quietly and read. Removing the 242 from the lineup represents inconvenience. Not just to me, but all the other familiar faces I see daily. With potentially TWO transfers and THREE different bus rides, you can be sure that a fair number of 242 riders will switch to driving cars full-time, myself included. I understand fully the need to find room in the budget and yet find routes that cover everyone as well as possible. According to this webpage for the 242("http://metro.kingcounty.gov/programs-projects/link-connections/recommendation.html#by-route"), the route would be deleted to reduce duplication. The truth is there is NO duplication because there is no other route that makes the trip from Shoreline/North Seattle to Redmond. If deletion of this route really does make the most sense, then please maneuver other routes so that there is only ONE transfer to make this trip.
Trevor	Satori	242	1	Please don't cut the 242! This bus has a stop 1 block from my house and another 1 block from my office. Without this route I would need 2 buses plus about a mile of walking to take a direct route, or 2 buses routed through downtown Seattle. Either way is far more time consuming.
Kevin	Chung	242	1	I use this all the time and it's convenient as it is other than that I would even ask for a later last route. If 242 goes away, I won't be able to take a bus that gets me to Northgate and to work easily and I would probably have to take on single occupancy driving again since no one works the same hours I do consistently. Please keep this bus route.
Robert	Gill	242	1	I have been taking the 242 since starting work at Microsoft around 7 years back. The route's direct access to where I work in the Studios has streamlined my commute on a daily basis for a long time now. The alternative for me would be to take up to an hour longer to get to and from work daily. Please keep this route active, I would prefer not to use my car if it was gone.
Terri	Anciaux	73	1	I have at least 3 other people on my block that ride the bus to the UW Tower daily from 135th & 15th NE. Metro is proposing to add more 73 buses on the route however the proposal also is to have the first morning route to start much later, after 6:am, this just doesn't make sense. You are adding more busses but starting later. why can't you just add more busses???
Deane	Bell	72X	1	I have carefully reviewed the suggested alternatives to getting from 130th and Lake City Way to UW Tower (45th Street and University Way). The suggestions clearly 'stretch' reasonableness. The ONLY practical alternative is using Route 372X and walking 7 blocks. The north end of Route 72X is NOT reasonably replaced by your suggested alternatives. The principle problem is GETTING to the alternatives. 15th Avenue is a LONG way from Lake City Way. Opening The Stadium Light Rail really should have NOTHING to do with replacing the NORTH END component of Route 72X. Once IN the University District, I agree there are many options to get downtown including Light Rail. The component you have NOT successfully replaced is getting from the North End TO University District. Please re-plan and maintain the NORTH END portion of Route 72X.
Michael	Mikesell	242	1	There is no "duplication" of 242 service, merely occasional overlap. People don't ride the 242 to get from the north end to Northgate, or from Montlake to Green Lake. They ride it to get from Shoreline to Redmond, a journey that would require two to three other buses to make up for. Cut even more runs if you must. But please keep this deliciously long commuter run alive in some capacity! Short routes through side streets are a recipe for stress and delays to commuters, the readiest alternative to which is driving a car. Thank you for your consideration.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Lewis	Baltuck	73, 16	1	<p>I am really sorry, but I will not be able to attend the Tuesday, Oct. 6, 2015 meeting, so I am submitting my comments. This is the second comment to appropriate Metro officials about eliminating weekend services for the Route 73 from Jackson Park to Downtown Seattle. I still cannot believe that eliminating the weekend service for the Route 73 is still in the plan. The link about the Route 73 <a href="http://metro.kingcounty.gov/programs-projects/link-connections/pdf/073-info-08-15.pdf">http://metro.kingcounty.gov/programs-projects/link-connections/pdf/073-info-08-15.pdf</a> My detailed comments. On the most recent proposals, weekend and holiday services for the Route 73 from Jackson Park to the Downtown Seattle via the University District would be cut entirely, and getting to NE 45th Street and Wallingford to visit my brother, his wife and kids via transfer from the 73 would be difficult or impossible. Senior Citizens living in my neighborhood and those living in the old 16 bus route neighborhood would have no way of getting around without having to walk a long distance or having to deal with a difficult transfer, which is extremely hard for them when using a walker or a cane. Even if I took the bus to Northgate, I could not get to NE 45th Street and Wallingford because of the elimination of the Route 16. The initiative to increase funds for the Metro Buses in the city of Seattle was passed by a wide margin. I thought this initiative would increase bus services in my neighborhood, but the proposals to cut the weekend services for the 73 bus route with direct service from Jackson Park to Downtown Seattle is a step backwards. If that happens, there will be no direct services from Jackson Park to Downtown Seattle or the University District and no easy transfer to NE 45th Street and Wallingford. The proposals says the route 73 will improve. This proposal makes it worst. I feel that my neighborhood in Jackson Park is losing out on the improved services. I don't own a car and must depend on Metro as my only source of transportation. I moved to Seattle from Shoreline several years ago because of the reliability of the Metro Transit System, and I bought my townhouse in Jackson Park because it is walking distance to the bus stop served by Routes 77, 347, and the 348 with weekend services for the 73 with direct service from Jackson Park to Downtown Seattle with easy transfers to NE 45th Street and Wallingford. I talked to Deanna Martin, the Community Relations Specialist at the King County Metro Transit Agency about the proposal for cutting the weekend services for the route 73, but the proposal keeps coming back to the table. This deeply concerns me and makes me nervous because I live in the Jackson Park Neighborhood will not have any direct services to Downtown Seattle or the University District. She said it is now up to the King County Council to review the proposed changes. Could you or someone on your team please send me a response letting me know that my email was received and to please reconsider the proposal cuts and changes and to please keep the weekend service for the Route 73 with direct services from Jackson Park to Downtown Seattle via the University District, and the easy transfer to 45th and Wallingford? With the proposals, I would be trapped in my neighborhood, Jackson Park at 15th Avenue NE and NE 135th Street during the weekend and the alternative proposals will not work for me. Thank you very much for reviewing my concerns about the proposed changes. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at work between 6:30 AM and 2:30 PM at (206)-615-2159 or at home between 4:30 PM and 6:30 PM at (206)-708-1461.</p>
Mike	Magnan	68	1	<p>The apparent loss of the 68 route would eliminate bus service on Roosevelt NE between 80th and Northgate Way. This would decrease not increase the accessibility to Metro services of those current riders.</p>

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Brian	Ellis	16, 62, 26X	1	<p>Route 16 was one of the routes to receive city funding by Proposition 1, and was intended to continue to run the route it has, not for Metro Transit to then completely reroute it away from Northgate, one of the Urban Villages which are supposed to be getting better transit options. That is NOT what I voted OR paid for. As I have stated before, the 26X is NOT an adequate replacement for the current route 16 service, since it completely bypasses the main shopping and entertainment stretch of Wallingford, along N 45th street and Stone Way N. Crossing NE 45th St at Thackeray PI NE abd Latona Ave NE drops passengers on the dirty, sketchy end of 45th, just before I-5. Going along N 40th brings passengers out onto Stone Way N in the industrial area - far removed from the shopping and dining. While the 16's current route around Greenlake is somewhat jagged, it still succeeds in serving the popular parts of N 45th St and Stone Way N. It also removes any service between 5th Ave NE on NE Northgate Way and Meridian Ave N, north of N 92nd St. It seems that you have absolutely no concern for the sizable disabled, low income and senior populations who live on the north side of Northgate Mall, on 3rd and 5th Ave NE. In the past 5-6 years you have removed the 66 &amp; 67 from north of the mall, having both terminate and start at the transit center, over a kilometer further south than their old terminus on 5th Ave NE &amp; NE 112th st. Now you also want to do away with the 16 that services this stretch of NE Northgate Way. So all the affected groups will now have to take the 41 to the transit center (Severely slowing the 41 down with all the wheelchairs needing to board), wait around for a connecting bus, only to double back all the way up Meridian Ave N on the 40 or 346/346, to get to their medical appointments at the numerous medical buildings which would have otherwise been served in much quicker fashion by the current routing of the 16. Also, during rush hour, the 41 is always full, so you would also be displacing passengers trying to get to work downtown from the 41 in order to accommodate the disabled passengers. Not a very bright move for an extremely busy commuter bus! So trying to get the entire population of that area onto just one bus route inconveniences everyone. That is why multiple routes are preferable. Please stop using the opening of the light rail at UW as an excuse for what is being proposed here - rerouting the 16 is in now way related to this, since it comes nowhere near ANY light rail station, either pre or post reroute, other than Westlake Center downtown, which does not change. At least have the 26X serve the same Northgate routing as the current 16, that would resolve part of the issue. In closing, please remember that the buses, which WE the taxpaying public are paying for, are supposed to run for OUR convenience, not Metro Transit's.</p>
Chris	Wells	242	1	<p>I will be extremely disappointed and angry if the 242 route is cancelled. The ST 542 is not a good replacement for me. One of the factors in buying our house was the ability to walk to the Northgate transit center, and catch the 242 which drops me off right outside my office near Overlake transit center. My quality of life and the ease of my commute will be notably lessened by my having to catch the 542 at the Greenlake P&amp;R. If the 242 must be cancelled, please extend the 542 up to the Northgate transit center. One of the things I'm proud of about Seattle is the fact that I commute to work everyday without the use of a personal automobile</p>
Marci	Burden	66, 63X	1	<p>I am concerned about the proposed change to the 66 which currently serves Northgate to downtown via Roosevelt and Eastlake, feeding the north end of South Lake Union, the University District, and downtown. If the 66 is removed, there will be one bus, the 70, that goes down Eastlake and Fairview where several large institutions (Fred Hutch, SCCA, various biotechs) are located. The 70 runs from the U-district only (and is crowded and unreliable), so the people who live North of the U-District will be forced to transfer, extending an already slow commute. The proposed 63x does not make clear where it will stop once it gets off I-5 (Mercer? Up Fairview?) so it's not clear if this is a good replacement route for the businesses along Eastlake. I can see making the 66 a peak-only (although many people use it to get from SLU to the U-district during the day) but taking the only bus on Eastlake away seems foolish and short-sighted for the many employees who commute there. Please consider retaining the 66, or at least make it clear to us where the replacement will stop and when it will run. The upper east side of South Lake Union is not served by any of the light rail lines, and the SLU streetcar will not be effective to go downtown until it is moved out of the main traffic lanes. The 66 is currently the only effective commuter line to this area.</p>

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
James	Stark	242	1	I ride the 242 from Ridgecrest to Redmond. The deletion of this route means that I'm on at least three bus lines - one to get into Northgate, one to get to Green Lake, then finally on to Redmond. Every day this bus is packed. I just can't understand the logic about deleting this route. There's no other service that goes between the Shoreline / Lake Forest Park area into Redmond. I will end up another single car filling 405.
Elena	Kasukonis	242	1	I ride 242 to/from work on the day when my vanpool doesn't operate, or when I have to stay at work later than usual. I'm commuting between Microsoft Campus and Haller Lake community. If this route is removed, my bus option would be to take a huge detour through downtown + lots of walking, or making 3 transfers and still quite a bit of walking. I don't see any good proposed alternative for the people who ride 242 for the whole stretch of the route. I love this bus. Don't take it away unless there is another solution that doesn't take 2 hour travel time an multiple transfers.
TA	Graham	73	1	Your public announcements indicate improvements to route 73 . So far as I can tell, the opposite is the case. The proposed "improvements" include the discontinuation of all weekend service, and service after 9:00 p.m. weekdays. It appears that this leaves the 15th Avenue NE corridor from about NE 143rd to NE 65th without any service during these times. While the public announcements indicate "more frequent" service, examination of the details shows NO increase in frequency during peak or midday hours. The only increase is for a couple of hours at night (after peak commute hours) - but night service from 9:00 to midnight is discontinued completely. The change in the weekday route (from north end to downtown, to north end to UW Link), will not save us time. When you factor in the time for the bus to get to the Link station, and the time for transferring from bus to rail, "only 8 minutes" from there to downtown will not provide a faster trip overall. It simply means that what was a simple one-bus commute will now involve having to transfer to get downtown. I don't think that the plan to discontinue buses to downtown in favor of routing them to link stations is well thought out, but I am aware that it will not change, no matter what testimony is given. However, there does not seem to be any reason for the actual loss of service in an area with heavy use of Metro. And the "spin" given to claim that these are improvements is disrespectful of the public. Especially if you want us to pony up with more taxes
Maggie	Steed	243	1	I would like to see the a route similar to the cancelled 243 back in use. I see service routes being discussed for , Wallingford, Green Lake, Fremont, and Sand Point but nothing that would service the riders coming from Lake City down through Ravenna and 25th Ave NE. For those of us that live due North of the new hub there is no direct service.
Anita	Sterling	71	1	I'm very concerned about the proposed elimination of this bus. Several elderly people I know in the area of PCC View Ridge depend on this bus and without it, I'm not sure what they'll do
Dennis	Lund	71, 62, 75, Link	1	Losing the #71 through View Ridge will mean 1) getting to UW campus will take more time (additional walking and/or waiting to transfer to another bus) AND 2) getting downtown might take more time because the express #71 from Campus Parkway is likely as fast as having to walk to light rail station from the UW campus (having already walked further to catch the #75), wait for train, stop in Cap Hill and then arrive downtown AND 3) also cost more money, although it's unclear from the website what the total cost of bus + light rail is. Frequency of service is marginally important to me since I can decide when I want/need to take the bus (just as I can with my car). I envision deciding to make more trips in my car. UGH.
Martha	Taylor	71, 72, 73	1	Apparently Metro is not planning to serve the northeast part of Seattle, in my case View Ridge, with any direct service to downtown, unless you travel during the peak commute times in the morning or the afternoon. So now if I want to go downtown outside the peak hours I will have to walk to a bus, ride the bus to transfer either to a slow bus or a train. So my transit rides will take MUCH LONGER and will be MUCH LESS CONVENIENT. Will they also cost more, since I will have to transfer from a bus to a light rail train? Perhaps this situation will improve when the Roosevelt Light Rail Station opens, but since that is not until 2021, I believe you should maintain the 71 and 72 routes. This is very disappointing and does not make me want to vote for more transit dollars. The new Route 62 that goes east/west will be a VERY SLOW way to get from View Ridge to downtown. Again, I am not supportive of the current plan to DECREASE Metro bus service in my neighborhood.



Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Jon	Howell	242	1	The 242 is such a valuable route for North Seattle to Redmond that it was a deciding factor in purchasing my home in 2004. I used it to commute to Microsoft for 13 years (even before I moved here). Its direct service made Metro vastly more practical than the alternatives. I've recently changed jobs, so now I have an inconvenient connection. I sure miss the 242 route. I hope we can preserve it for all the other east side commuters who can benefit from its direct routing
James	Schlotzhauer	72, 73, 522	1	I am a 50 year old male who lives in NE Seattle and who, with current bus service, has been successfully able to live without a car for the past 18 months. I use Metro, Light Rail, Sounder Rail, Uber and Car2go exclusively. I can afford to drive but choose not to. I don't like the fact that connectivity in my area will be bifurcated, forcing additional waits to transfer in the U District to another mode of transportation while en route to downtown; service changes also require much longer walks from our area (North Ravenna) to reliable, frequent service than is provided by Metro right now. East / West connectivity with Lake City, in particular, is also significantly reduced. HOWEVER, if the 522 (Sound Transit) adds a stop at Lake City Way NE and NE 85th Street, most of my concerns would be alleviated. Unfortunately, I have found nothing that ensures such a service revision, other than Metro's "request" that Sound Transit "consider" adding that single stop on the 522 route. As you review the upcoming changes, please keep the importance of the requested 522 stop at NE 85th St in mind. Requiring Sound Transit to add that one stop will go a long way to ameliorating reduced connectivity in the North Ravenna / South Maple Leaf area.
Sarah	Samnick	71	1	I am not pleased that the 71 is being canceled, as that will leave my neighborhood with no bus service on the weekend. Also, there will be no mid-day service during the week, as the 76 doesn't run all day. So, while I could get somewhere in the morning, I would be stuck there for several hours until the afternoon peak hours started. And on the weekend, I wouldn't be able to take the bus to the library or parks with my kids, or to go to the farmer's market. Please keep the 71 bus route. Thank you
Barbara	Hill	72	1	Currently I take the 312 from Kenmore to 130th and Lake City Way. There I transfer to the 72 which takes me to the UW Tower where I work. If you eliminate the 72 route, I can only take the 372 which is quite a bit further of a walk than with the 72. The 72 route is the only one that takes a rider from the north end of Seattle to the north end of the University District. The light rail has no effect on this route. Could you not have the 72 route go from 130th and Lake City Way to Campus Parkway and just do a loop every 1/2 hour by using two buses? Eliminating the 72 altogether would have a big negative effect on a lot of commuters who work and go to school in the U District. I ask that you please reconsider eliminating Route 72 and not make our commute any harder than it already is.
Deborah	Rohan	372, 65	1	My concern is about the walking distance between bus stops and the UW Stadium Link Light Rail Station. When I, for example, take the 372 or 65 from my house at 65th/29th Ave to connect with the Link Light Rail station, both of those buses will drop me off at Stevens Way, which leaves me with quite a walk to the Link Light Rail Station. It seems most of the buses that connect to the Link Light Rail Station from the north require this large walking distance. Why aren't there buses that travel down Montlake and stop at Pacific Place, which is across the street from the Link Light Rail station?
Pascale	Lelong	71, 242	1	My family will be very negatively impacted by the elimination of routes 71 and 242. I realize that the 71 will be replaced by the 78 but late evening and weekend service will be completely eliminated in Wedgwood. Have you ever been on the 71 on weekends? It is packed, standing room only! We use it to go to the Farmers' market, elderly people rely on it to get around. My son and his friends rely on it late at night to get home from the U-district. As for the 242, we are losing a direct route from Shoreline, through North Seattle to the Eastside. I do not work for Microsoft and do not have the option of riding their Commuter Shuttle. Funneling every route through the Light Rail Station at Husky stadium is a terrible idea. Again, someone should ride the 242 in the morning and evening to see how many people rely on it to get to work. It is a well used route. I hope that you will reconsider these drastic changes. Every bus commuter I know who lives in the north end of the city is very unhappy with these changes. We used to boast about having great service in our neighborhood and we are about to lose it.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Kimberly	Tate	71	1	I have long depended on the regularity of the 71/71X to downtown Seattle to connect me to the city when the 76 is not running (which is often). Deleting this bus route would be an extreme hardship. I would likely have to drive to work if this route were deleted. This move might make a bit more sense in two years when the Light Rail is connected to Roosevelt, but right now this is incredibly premature. Even in two years, there will still be no way to even get to the light rail from NE Seattle. This is nonsensical. I strongly oppose this cut. Biking and walking long distances is not a viable option for everyone (e.g. people with disabilities/mobility issues). Though adding the 16 is better than leaving this area of the city stranded during the day, the Route 16 bus would likely take a lot longer to make it from Wedgwood to downtown, making an already long trip unbearable. I thought the point of the bus levy was to ADD service, not cut off whole neighborhoods. Please, please do not cut the 71. Ideally, we would have the 76, 71, and 16 run through the Sand Point, Wedgwood neighborhoods.
Delia	Mulholland	71, 372	2	I have three concerns: Regardless of the scheduled frequency of the busses to the husky link station, they face the quagmire of traffic in the Montlake area, especially those coming from Sandpoint and 25th Ave, at most times of the day. Is there a proposed solution? I am not seeing a direct route from Bryant area to the west side of the UW (University Ave or 15th Ave). This is needed for work and commerce. Is there a plan to upgrade the Burke Gillman trail for increased bike traffic?
Denise	Fisk	16	2	you simply cannot change the #16 in any way shape or form! i have taken this route for 40 years, and it is very convenient when i need to go to north seattle community college, northgate mall, wallingford, not to mention downtown. if you folks change this route, even a tiny bit, you will leave many people on this route stranded. indeed, many people in seattle do not have cars, myself included. we depend on transit service to get us to our destinations. my other concern are the elderly who depend on this route to get them to their destinations. what if they have to walk further to get on the rerouted bus? especially if it's rainy and/or snowing outside? the answer is: they couldn't. so please .... when considering changing this current route, please keep in mind the many folks who literally depend on this. changing this route into a new, and waaaaay more inconvenient route, would be a bad mistake!
Susan	Peskura	43	2	Removing the #43 bus from service means that every trip downtown will more than double the time it currently takes to get downtown. The 8 minute trip time on the light rail sounds great until you factor in the time to get through Montlake, cross a busy intersection and wait for the next train. Montlake traffic can easily add 30 minutes or more to the trip. The 20 minute trip to downtown will soon be 50-60 minutes. In addition, it will be difficult to access businesses on 15th, 12th and the Pike/Pine corridor without transfers, long walks and increased wait times for transportation. The current 43 route allows people on Capitol Hill to use the bus instead of cars. It's a convenient and fast way to travel to and from downtown and to services on the Hill. Removing the 43 will mean increased travel times and decreased access. This is not an improvement.
Terri Ann	Pollock	16	2	I was very unhappy to learn of proposed changes to the Route 16, which would take it away from Northgate and also change the Southern part of the route. This will no longer be the same route. The route used to go by Seattle Center and that was taken away, allegedly for the Mercer Street construction. We were told it would go back to that routing when the construction was done. The 16 is a heavily traveled and buses are often crowded. I oppose the re-routing and am concerned that there has been little publicity about the proposed changes.
Emma	Brillhart	25	2	The 25 is the only easy route linking Montlake and South Lake Union. It would be great to have another option if 25 will be removed as a route. Additionally, it frequently has high ridership once it's out of Laurelhurst. Maybe a simple change to the route to make it more of a Montlake to SLU shuttle would be good.
Sally	Welch	25, 43	2	I shudder at the thought of loosing our 25 and 43 busses!!! Please come walk with me and experience first hand how this will impact me and all my Montlake neighbors!!! The older I get the less service, we are working hard to not use a car, but.....??. please help!!! As you know Montlake seems to feel the brunt of so many of these changes, wish we could have some positive news. Thank you very much for listening.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Maureen	DiGiacomo	43	2	Despite what Metro has said I can see no feasible access from the 48 bus stop to the University Light Rail -- it is a loong walk from the drop off to the rail station to then go back to Capitol Hill or downtown. Please do NOT eliminate the 43 bus - the only direct connection to Capitol Hill, Capitol Hill Group Health and to downtown for many aging Montlake residents.
Linnea	Hirst	25, 43	2	Public transportation. We use it. We care about the climate, plus we're getting older and one of these days won't want to drive at all. We walk a short block and take the #25 bus to UW, to downtown or to light rail to the airport when the #25 is running. At other times, we have to choose to go .4 miles up and over a steep hill to get on the #43 (further to go a less steep way to get to it), or .6 miles up the long hill to catch the #49. For the airport, we would need the #48, same stops as the #43. When the new light rail station opens, we evidently won't have the #25, and we will have to figure out how to get to UW and to light rail-a mile using the Bill Dawson trail or 1.1 miles using 19th. We much prefer the trail because we avoid having to cross fast-moving traffic on the entrance ramps to 520. If we get to the #48 to get us to the light rail station, that's .5 miles, then another .3 miles from where it stops, to get to the station. We might as well just walk.
Stacy	Jones	25	2	I am frustrated with the proposed deletion of Rt. 25 through Laurelhurst. With the link, we could finally make use of Route 25. Without the Link, the #25 was just not a reasonable option for us. Between the convoluted route to downtown, it often was not on time and with the schedule and the infrequency with which it ran, we just could not make it work. My husband would drive up to View Ridge and park near a stop there for a more direct bus. Now, with the Link, the #25 could see a lot of use in Laurelhurst, both for people working downtown AND people/families who want to use it on the weekend. Now that we FINALLY might have something that could work, please do not take it away. Also, eliminating the route through the neighborhood will reduce ridership. It is means people that some residents and workers will have to walk up to 1 mile to get to the 78 stop. Personally, we use college students to watch our kids, and none of them have cars and the last person I had could not walk that far. Please consider keeping the bus going THROUGH laurelhurst and PLEASE keep some weekend service!
Katherine	Getts	43	2	I am NOT in favor of the proposal to delete the 43 bus line. I live east of Capitol Hill between Madison Valley and Montlake. I regularly travel by bus to/from Capitol Hill, downtown Seattle, and the U-District. I am lucky enough to live in a triangle area that is within walking distance of the two separate bus stops for the 43, 48, 11 and 8 bus lines, so the proposed changes to Metro will not impact me too much. But with these proposed changes, neighbors who live north of me in Montlake who want to get downtown have no direct route to do so. They either will have to take the 48 south to the 8 or 11 line, or to the Cap Hill Light Rail station, instead of the completely convenient 43 bus as it exists now. I agree with many commenters in earlier Metro surveys in that I would much prefer to take one bus for longer ride than have to transfer, give up a potentially good seat, wait for another bus (or train), and lose time in the process. The 43 comes very regularly and usually has a seat available. Why would someone want their commute to change such that they have to transfer? Also, on a 2D map of the city it is not apparent that there is a very steep hill descending from 21st Avenue East down to 28th Avenue East & Madison. I don't think Metro realizes this at all, based on the suggestion that people who currently take the 43 bus to downtown Seattle can instead walk to the 12 bus on 19th Avenue. For anyone who lives east of 24th Avenue it is a 10-15 minute hike (seriously) up to the 12 bus line. For elders and folks with disabilities this hike may be literally impossible; for able-bodied people it is very inconvenient and might be enough of a deterrent that they no longer use the bus system. Deleting the 43 also means there is inadequate east-west service between Broadway and 23rd Avenue. To get from 23rd Ave E & Aloha to 15th Ave E & John (which is currently ~7 minutes on the 43 bus) one would either have to take the 48 to the 8 bus, or have two long walks before and after taking the 12 - assuredly at least double the time. This is so inconvenient, and people take the bus because its convenient. Or else, they drive. We need CONVENIENT bus service that meets riders' needs, especially as Capitol Hill area becomes more and more dense, with more and more potential cars on the road. We do not want to transfer more as you make things more "efficient" for the system. They will not be. Please do not delete the 43.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Robert	Elleman	16, 65, 71, 372	2	<p>In general, I enthusiastically approve of Metro's proposed bus network changes to come in March 2016 for Northeast Seattle. I am sad to lose the 71 to the University District, but I will take it considering I will get a frequent bus to Green Lake, Fremont and Magnuson Park with the 16. I am also pleased to see that Metro is diverting buses towards the Stadium station so that NE Seattle can take advantage of light rail. I have one major frustration about how the buses from NE Seattle will connect to the Stadium station, in particular the 65 and the 372. The 65 still takes its slow and little-used detour to 40th instead of going straight up 35th, but of most importance is that the 65 and the 372 don't go directly to the station. Instead, we have to walk from Stevens Way or, in the case of the 65, ride the bus around the university. This is an unreasonable waste of time for NE Seattleites who want to take advantage of the light rail station. Please modify the routes for the 65 and 372 to access the Stadium station directly, in both directions for the 372 and southbound for the 65. All taxpayers paid for the Stadium station, not just season ticket holders to Husky games.</p>
Sally	Liu	43, 25	2	<p>These bus routes provide essential service to the Montlake neighborhood, which has many current transit riders. The elimination of these routes makes it difficult for the many customers that currently use these routes to get to/from north Capitol Hill and downtown Seattle. Although the 48 preserves access north to the new light rail University station, the elimination of access by heading directly south (currently via 43 and 25 routes) will easily add 20+ minutes of commute time during peak times since the changes at the Montlake/SR 520 interchange as significantly increased traffic times heading north. In addition, 43 and 25 has stops in parts of both Montlake and Capitol Hill which will lose convenient access to transit services. The light rail should be viewed as a supplement to existing transit services, and not as a replacement. We need more transit services as well as convenient access to transit in order to handle Seattle's growing population and to encourage greater transit usage. Re-assessment of routes should be done once the new light rail service has been operational for a period of time (e.g. 6-12 months). I would encourage transit planners to (1) visit Montlake corridor, particularly during evening commute to understand the traffic issues and (2) consider keeping the current routes in place until we can assess the impact the light rail has rather than cutting routes in an attempt to force usage of the light rail.</p>
Kay	Humm	25	2	<p>My letter addresses the loss of the #25 bus from service next year and puts forth a suggestion for your consideration that could have significant impact on residents in the Roanoke Park/Portage Bay area. Most residents of the Roanoke Park/Portage Bay neighborhood will lose viable access to public transit with deletion of the #25 bus route, especially those living along a significant portion of the Boyer/Fuhrman section of the route and adjacent side streets. Rationale: After deletion of #25 route it will be a long walk to nearest transit service (on Eastlake Ave or 24th Ave) for many local residents and extremely challenging terrain to access the somewhat closer #49 bus route from Boyer/Fuhrman (very long, steep hill climb). Proposal: a DART route (similar to that planned in the Laurelhurst area to replace lost bus #25 service) be put in place such that local residents can connect to through routes serving 24th Ave E, Eastlake Ave E, 10th Ave E, etc. Such a route would offer much needed/desired benefits: ..Provides for much needed and non-duplicative local transit service to "fill in the gap" left after deletion of the #25 bus route. Better matches transit vehicle size to local street conditions and ridership. Avoids congested traffic areas, such as Husky Stadium, University Hospital, Montlake Bridge that are currently served by #25 bus by taking advantage of transfers to through bus routes (connecting to route #43, Link Rail, route #49, etc). Also provides residents along Delmar Drive with new, non-duplicative service. Perhaps this proposed DART route could eliminate or reduce the need for local MetroAccess Van service? Thanks for considering my comments. Best regards, Kay Humm. 206-329-1183. Below is a DART route proposal that illustrates a possible path to take. The route focuses on maintaining needed local access to public transit while utilizing transfers to through bus routes and proximity to UW Link Rail station, rather than duplicative service. Proposed local DART for Roanoke Park/Portage Bay, a loop route: Heading west from #49 bus stop at E. Roanoke &amp; 10th Ave. E. Right turn onto Harvard Ave E Right turn onto Eastlake Ave E (or right onto Franklin Ave E) Right turn onto Fuhrman Ave E, which continues on as Boyer Ave E Left turn onto E. Lynn St. Left turn onto 19th Ave E, which continues on as W. Montlake Pl E Right onto 24th Ave E Right onto Boyer Ave E Right onto E Lynn St, which continues on up a steep hill as Delmar Dr E, to arrive at starting point on E. Roanoke.</p>

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Frame	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Wayne	Kindsvogel	372, 68, 243	2	I commute by bus to Bellevue (Eastgate P&R). Currently I walk 10 minutes to catch 372 and then get off on UW campus and walk to Montlake (15 min.) to catch 555X to Eastgate. Your plan will not replace direct service to Montlake which was lost when 243 line was cancelled. Also your plan makes no provision for service to Link station at UW Stadium. I will still be forced to catch 372 and transfer to another line (271) after riding through UW campus. Can't one line go directly to Montlake Bridge from points north via 25th Ave NE? Its the same problem coming home from work. I get off at Montlake Freeway station and then must transfer to 271 or walk 15 min to UW campus to catch 372. At minimum two transfers, plus extensive delay going through campus. Also there is no direct route to go north on Montlake and 25th Ave NE from Link UW stadium station from any point north of UW campus on 25th Ave NE.
Sarah	McQuaide	43	2	Please do not take away the 43! My husband and I use this line to commute to work every day- me to UW and him to downtown and then on to SODO. We also use it very frequently in the evenings and weekends to go downtown or to other parts of Capitol Hill. We do not have a car and public transport is vital to us, especially this line. The light rail is not a substitute for us, as we live in the arboretum area where it is still miles to the CH light rail station. Thank you very much for considering keeping the 43 alive
Anna	Wager	66X	2	I use the 66x frequently to travel downtown, and it's a really, really great bus route--efficient and fast. It's also very busy in the mornings, showing a high degree of demand. Sometimes the bus isn't able to pick up people in Eastlake because it's so full. If it's removed, that leaves a lot of people without a good route downtown
Katya	Lobanova	43	2	I would like to officially give feedback for the proposed deletion of route 43 once Link Light Rail begins service from Capitol Hill to the University District. While I do believe that there is currently some duplication between route 43 and other routes running in the neighborhood, I do not think it would be advantageous to delete the route altogether. My reasons for this are several-fold: Currently, from my place of residence, route 43 is the quickest and most direct route to downtown Seattle. As both neighborhoods are high-density areas with a lot of transit traffic, I constantly ride full buses to and from downtown (the 43, the 10 or the 11). Deleting the 43 without increasing frequency of the other buses servicing Capitol Hill-downtown routes would increase congestion and rider discomfort on the remaining routes. Additionally, route 43 is currently the quickest and most direct route from my place of residence to the University of Washington, my place of employment. While the Light Rail would reduce traffic and current transit congestion between Capitol Hill and the University District, it would not be convenient to North and East Capitol Hill residents like myself. From my apartment, it would be a 1-mile walk to the Light Rail station on Broadway. I and the other residents of my area could continue walking to 23rd and taking the 48 to the UD, but even with a proposed increase in 48 frequency, I do not see congestion on that route improving. Currently, route 48 is very long and is constantly late, and the additional burden of being the only route between Capitol Hill and the UD along 23rd is all too likely to cause further delays and more crowded buses. Currently, during peak hours all buses on either route are full to the point of riders standing and filling the entire vehicle. Riders who live too far from the Light Rail station to make the trip worthwhile (or who do not want to add an additional bus trip to their commute in order to reach the station) will continue using 23rd and I don't imagine a slight increase in frequency of route 48 service will be able to keep up with the demand from riders who utilized route 43. As a frequent rider of route 43 to-from downtown and to-from the University District, I see the route well-utilized and especially crowded during peak commute times. I believe that the residents of North/East Capitol Hill (of which there are many, as it's a largely residential area of the neighborhood) will not be sufficiently supported by the Light Rail due to the inconvenience of its location in regards to our residences, and will continue to need and use route 43. I do not support this route being deleted entirely; I think a revision of the route may better serve the community instead.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Mary	Bartz	25, 43	2	The proposed changes are likely to add 30 minutes or more to what is currently an approximately 50 minute commute from home on Capitol Hill to work at Seattle Children's Hospital. Currently, I board #43 at 19th E & E Thomas to the University District and transfer there to #25 to Seattle Children's. If I were not disabled, the proposed changes would add 2 blocks to the distance I would have to walk in order to board #48 instead of #43. Since I am disabled and I use a walker, I cannot take the most direct route down a steep hill to catch #48; instead, I will have to either walk 7 blocks (versus current 3) to catch #48 at a different stop or walk 3 blocks to take #10 downtown and connect with something else there. The changes will involve not only longer distances to my bus stop but more transfers and therefore far more time. I have already written about what eliminating the #25 will mean for my commute, so I will not discuss it at any length here. In brief, it will mean more time spent commuting and longer distances to walk. I appreciate the goal of getting more people on mass transit, but your current plan provides frequency of service at the expense of time spent in transferring from one service to another, and, in my experience as a bus rider, this is going to limit your success. Simply put, I think most people would rather spend their time traveling on a bus or train rather than waiting at a transfer point. In addition, your plan serves commuters at the expense of those who depend on mass transit for all their travel needs.
Agnes	Burt	11	2	As an 88 year old senior who relies completely on bus service to get around, the re-routing of the 11 will significantly, and negatively, impact my quality of life. I would MUCH rather keep a less-frequent schedule that actually GOES WHERE I NEED TO BE. All this talk of more frequent service - who cares!? Currently it is my lifeline for visits to the doctor at Swedish. I can easily bus and walk. With the move that will be impossible for me. Also, it allows me to directly travel to Bartell Drugs and QFC at Harvard and Pike. My daughter lives on E Pine street as well and this is very very handy for her to meet me at the bus and help me out. Why do people come to Capitol Hill? It is NOT just for the Light Rail. It is certainly not for services and shops at Broadway and John. That part of Broadway is NOT the heart of transportation - Broadway and Pine is the heart. Seattle Central, Seattle University, the REAL shopping and a direct and quick route to downtown are all there. To move this route solely to make up for the removal of the 43 makes NO SENSE to REAL people! I and many others rely on the 11 as our route to Capitol Hill. It gives us the freedom to live our lives independently. Moving this bus will reduce my independence and that of many others. Please do not make this route change! Please think this through from our point of view and not from theoretical transit/light rail plans.
Marianne	Pettijohn	43	2	I am concerned about the proposed elimination of route 43. Getting to parts of Capitol Hill via the 48, then transferring to the 8 are highly inconvenient and time consuming. The current plans are inadequate and will lead to an increase in car trips
Su	Devan	43	2	Please keep this route! I am on foot with a bum knee and would have trouble waiting at bus stops for transfers. It's an easy commute to work. My only way to get to work
Larry	Engel	11	2	I object to the changes to route 11, it appears that 1000's of people are being inconvenienced, in time and accessibility, for the limited benefit of 10's of people to minimize a connection to Link. The existing 11 stops just 2 blocks from the Link station. It is easy to get to from the existing line. For a minimal improvement for the few people that want to make this connection, all riders are having to endure a longer end-to-end ride and all riders along the Pine St, sections of this line are losing a bus
Marjorie	Wilson	25	2	As a recent arrival to Seattle and a graduate student at the UW, I rely heavily on bus route 25 to get me to campus in a timely manner. It has also been very useful when traveling downtown. In fact, I wish it ran later so that I wouldn't have to walk as far in the dark (as I have to with the 75 or 65). Thank you.
Elizabeth	Sundem	11	2	Please do not eliminate our access to downtown Seattle by rerouting the the #11 bus. Many of us in the neighborhood depend on this bus for access to health care, cultural events, and work. The rerouting of a smaller bus straight down Madison would not eliminate these important options for us and would seem like a reasonable compromise.
Sylvia	Olveda	43	2	The removal of the 42 from my neighborhood will highly impact my commuting options and will likely make me drive and increase traffic and pillion in the neighborhood and our city as well as spend much more \$ than I would like to spend.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Richard	Anderson	66	2	I travel from my house to downtown on the 66 starting on Roosevelt. As far as I can tell, there will be no convenient way for me to get downtown with as single bus - so this makes things far worse for me. And its not that I want to walk to Husky stadium to take the Link boondoggle.
Aundi	Russell	16, 66, 26, 26x, 67	2	16, 66, 67--Please don't change these routes around the greenlake/Roosevelt neighborhood to the Mall. My teens rely heavily on them. 26, 26x-green lake to downtown -my husband uses this route to work and I use it for doctors visits. Please don't change this from Latona and 60th to downtown.
Aisha	Fairhoud	70 71, 72, 73	2	The proposed changes to the transit system of the University District sound terrible, at least until 2021 when the light rail will get extended. Few people live walking distance to Husky Stadium or downtown Seattle, so this extension is fairly useless except to those who already take 2-3 busses to commute. Most people's commute will get much longer since the 71-73 express busses will be discontinued, and we will have to rely on the 70 since it actually passes by where most of us live. That means that the already congested U District to downtown Seattle bus routes (formally routes 70-73) will become even more congested as the number of those busses passing decreases, and for those of us who want the convenience of waiting in the downtown tunnel (sheltered from the frequent rain and wind) will be forced to wait outside anyway for connections from Husky Stadium. I suggest keeping routes 70-73 as is until the full extension is completed in 2021, or at least keeping it as is outside of peak periods when the Husky Stadium stop may actually be used a bit. Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.
Ethan	Schell	242	2	I am writing regarding the proposed deletion of route 242 as part of the expansion of Link light rail service to Capitol Hill and Husky Stadium. Based on my review of the details available at <a href="http://www.kingcounty.gov/metro/LinkConnections">www.kingcounty.gov/metro/LinkConnections</a> , it appears that the deletion of route 242, in combination with the other proposed route changes, will result in a significant reduction of bus service to and from Seattle, during peak hours, at the bus stops located on 148th Ave. NE between NE 40th Street and highway 520 in Redmond. This change will negatively impact commuters currently riding route 242, such as those who work at Microsoft buildings 111 and 112, Honeywell Aerospace, HCL America, Pacteria Technologies and Azteca Mexican restaurant. These commuters' only alternative will be to walk up to one mile to catch the proposed route 542X at NE 40th St. and highway 520, since many of these commuters aren't able to use the Microsoft shuttle service, and may find vanpooling incompatible with their work schedules. Perhaps one idea to consider is adding stops for the proposed 542X on 148th Ave. NE at highway 520. These stops could also serve route 221. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Keith	Roraback	25, 78	2	Regarding Route 25 it is not a good use of resources to continue to service Route 25 through Laurelhurst. Current ridership is very low in the Laurelhurst loop. Several years ago, before the hospital expansion and roadway improvements, the #25 made more sense. However, post hospital addition and roadway improvements, there is no longer a need to provide bus service to the South East corner of Seattle Children's Hospital. There are several bus routes that serve the North side of the hospital on Sandpoint Way and 40th Ave NE. In addition, the current routing of #25 requires the bus to turn left in and out of a bus turn-around on NE 45th Street which disrupts the residential homes as well as the traffic flow on this road. The bus frequently is not able to make the turn has to back up which involves honking the bus horn and a beeping back-up alarm. This left turn and backing also creates a safety hazard for pedestrians that frequently use the side walk in the area to access the nearby park and elementary school. Route 25 in the Laurelhurst neighborhood does not serve the public and creates a significant disturbance for the neighboring houses. Please discontinue use of the bus turn-around near Children's Hospital and eliminate Route 25.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Kathy	Smith-DiJulio	43, 25	2	<p>Dear County Councilmember Dembowski, I cannot attend Tuesday's public hearing so would like to share my concerns with the proposed elimination of routes 43 and 25. Route 43 is a vital link from Montlake to Capital Hill, especially to Group Health Cooperative. There are many senior citizens in Montlake who use the 43 50 get to doctor's appointments. Many of them now or in the future would be unable to walk a mile or more to the light rail station and make transfers as is proposed. This would result in more and more people using their cars, clearly to the detriment of public transportation. The same is true for the elderly that live along the 25 route and use it to get downtown even though it barely runs and hasn't been available on weekends for years. Again, distance from the light rail station at Husky Stadium would preclude elderly folks or others with physical limitations from using the train. And again, that would put more cars on the road. The 25 bus could certainly be smaller but it should not be eliminated. I'd actually use it more if it were running on weekends! Thank you for listening to my concerns.</p>
Mika	Munari	73, 347, 348, 67	2	<p>Dear Mr. Dembowski, Thank you for holding a meeting regarding proposal metro schedule change. Due to schedule conflict, I won't be able to attend the meeting but would like to express my concern on bus route 73. I live at intersection of NE 123rd St. and 15 Ave NE and both my husband and I work at University of Washington. Route 73 is one of the routes we take for commuting. 1st concern: As of Sept 26th, 2015, Metro changed Route 73 Sunday schedule. With the new schedule, bus comes every 30 min and which is twice the frequency we had. I believe this change was made by neighborhood communities asking for better and more frequent service of direct bus line to University District as well as down town Seattle. Though the same neighborhoods are asking to keep this better service, Metro is proposing to eliminate weekend (both Saturdays and Sundays) run of Route 73. I do not understand why Metro increased frequency for only 6 months, only to take it away completely. If Metro changed the service due to demands, I believe we deserve to have the same frequency of service even after March, 2016. 2nd concern: My husband works at UWMC 6:45AM to 3:15PM including Saturday and Sunday. He is an essential employee and can't miss or late to work. Currently he takes Route 73 that leaves 15th Ave NE and NE 125th St at 6:00 am on weekends to go to work. As I wrote previously, weekend runs of Route 73 will be completely eliminated on proposal change. After the change, he has to catch Route 67 on weekends from a bus stop at NE Northgate way and Roosevelt Way NE. According to Metro, there will be Route 67 that would be arriving UWMC at 6:05 am and 6:35 am so that he can be at work on time. Metro also recommends him to take Route 347/348 from 15th Ave NE/NE 123rd St on weekends and transfer to route 67 on Roosevelt Way since this connection service will replace Route 73 on Sat. and Sun. However, Route 347/348 do not start early enough that he can't take those routes for transfer, meaning he has to walk to Route 67 bus stop on Roosevelt Way. On proposal change, Metro failed to provide the same accessibility for riders who are currently taking 1st Route 73 of the day on weekends and going to U. District. If Metro is pursuing with eliminating Route 73 on weekends, I believe Metro should provide all day connection between Route 347/348 and Route 67 on weekend.</p>
Cheryl	Strother	43	2	<p>I take this bus from Montlake to downtown and my doctor appts quite often starting at the East Montlake Place E and East Roanoke St stop to the bus stop in front of Nordstrom. My trip usually starts between 8 and 9 am. This bus is definitely popular as it fills up fast picking up or dropping off people at most of the bus stops to/from downtown. To have this route eliminated would be a hardship for many riders who live too far away to walk to Husky and Capitol Hill light rail stations. Another option commonly mentioned by King County is for riders to catch buses at the 520 Montlake flyer station (before they are eliminated). Keep in mind, often these buses are already full. It is common to be forced to wait for the "next" bus if a driver either refuses to stop or determines it is unsafe to take on more passengers. I anticipate this will only get worse once Amazon opens three full blocks of new office buildings starting late 2015 into 2016 in downtown Seattle. 43 route really fills a needed gap between light rail stations. This bus is always full during my commute. This has been my experience. I will be catching it tomorrow morning to go to my doctor's appt. 8 blocks from Broadway and E. Olive without a transfer which adds on too much time for a single trip from A to B.</p>



Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Cecilia	Moens	68	2	My son and other students in the International Baccalaureate program at Ingraham High School are transported via a shuttle bus after school to the Northgate transit center from which they take a Metro bus to various neighborhoods around the north end of Seattle, including the #68 to Ravenna/Bryant, connecting to the #71 to View Ridge. The proposed service changes (which include eliminating the #68 and #71 routes) would make it impossible for them to commute home from school on the Metro Bus. The consequences are dire for my son and many other students attending Ingraham. Please do not eliminate the #68 or add a new route that goes from the Northgate Transit Center to neighborhood in the northeast (Ravenna, Wedgwood, Bryant, View Ridge).
Irene	Thompson	68, 71	2	The 68 and the 71 buses are about the only buses that I take. I go Downtown, to Northgate, to Wedgwood, University Hospital, and to the Roosevelt District without transferring. Years ago, before we had the 68, it was very awkward to get to Northgate on the bus. I just hate having to go back to that. It takes twice as long when I have to transfer to get somewhere. It doesn't seem like there will be an easy way for me to get to the new Link stop at Husky Stadium, either. I don't understand why these routes have to be eliminated. I have also never understood why more buses don't go up and down 25th Ave. N.E. They could stop at Husky Stadium and continue across the Montlake Bridge to Capitol Hill.
Sandra	Vold	25, 43	2	Please give us what we specifically voted for in Prop 1: the preservation of our bus lines! This proposition passed, and our taxes have increased (through what, 2020?) and yet the service and the agreement we voted for is planned to be revoked! This seems like a deliberate bait and switch scheme! I wonder if it's legal. Telling me that the ride from Husky Stadium to downtown is actually a quicker trip is irrelevant if I have to walk 4 to 6 times as far (or more!) to get to the starting point! Your plan will leave residents of Montlake without useable service, even as our taxes have been raised significantly. This is unfair and inequitable! Please give us what we voted for, or give us our money back.
Jennifer	Sorenson	25, 78	2	Please stop the bus turn-around madness! I'm referring to the bus stop on the southeast perimeter of Seattle Children's, on NE 45th St. It is a current stop of route 25, and looks to be a future stop of proposed route 78. The only thing that has saved my sanity living adjacent to the turn-around is the reduced frequency of route 25 to once per hour, and that the route stops running by 7 p.m. Otherwise my family endures engine noise and exhaust as the bus waits to turn left into the stop, often a loud "bang" when the bus hops the curb trying to make the turn, followed by the bus back-up alarm when the driver can't make the turn OUT of the turn-around, and finally, the joy of the bus's horn honking to warn drivers as it navigates the failed turn. Being subjected to all that racket until 10:30 p.m., the timeline proposed with route 78, would greatly undermine my family's peace of mind, not to mention that of similarly affected neighbors. At least two of whom, by the way, have master bedrooms on the front of their homes, just a stone's throw from the turn-around. If indeed the route 78 comes to fruition as proposed, it would be a whopping neighborhood disturbance to use the turn-around during evening hours. Regardless of what is decided about route 25 or 78, THE TURN-AROUND MUST BE DECOMMISSIONED AS A BUS STOP. On a final note, why would a bus into Laurelhurst until 10:30 p.m. be considered at all? I can tell you firsthand that ridership in the "Laurelhurst loop" via route 25 is practically non-existent, which I know has led to the proposed canceling of the route several times. It's clear from the current route change comments the folks who depend on the 25 are in or around the Montlake area, not Laurelhurst. So please, use the money to help these folks out, and skip the unused route through Laurelhurst. And in any scenario, please, please consider eliminating the turn-around bus stop on NE 45th St.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Tamara	Turner	25, 43	2	<p>I want to add comments to the record concerning the elimination of bus service to the Montlake neighborhood. First, like many of the Montlake residents, I cannot walk very far due to severe arthritis in my knees and ankles. Currently, the #25 stops at the corner of my block. Without this bus, I am stranded. I don't think attention has been given to the age demographic in this area. Second, it is said that people can walk to the Montlake Freeway Station but it is due to be eliminated in its current form as part of the SR-520 construction, leaving only a stop on top of the lid which will be subject to Montlake Blvd/Bridge congestion and likely be skipped entirely by buses headed to downtown Seattle. Anyone using the 48 to head north to catch Link at Husky Stadium will be subject to Montlake Bridge/Pacific congestion, and outside of peak hours, bridge openings. Also the 48 will run less often than today's combined frequency of 43+48. I cannot use the "Link" because like so many others, I cannot get to it. Its speed is of no consequence to me since I cannot get to it. And the idea that we will all jump on bicycles to get around is a cruel fantasy. Montlake has been devastated by the indifference of WSDOT, and the reluctance of KC Dept. of Transportation planners to take our concerns seriously is compounding our quality of life even further. I do not have the financial means to take cabs in lieu of a reasonably planned bus service. The elimination of bus service causes a profound disruption in my life as well as the lives of others. Seattle desperately needs more buses, not fewer. Years ago, when I worked at Children's Hospital, there was pressure to take the bus to work. However, I would have had to catch a bus into the University District and then transfer to a bus going to Laurelhurst-adding 30 to 45 minutes to my commute going to work and more time than that in the evening because of traffic. I could drive to work in 7-8 minutes-thus, without better bus service, I continued to drive in those days. A truly integrated transportation system with bus, light rail, etc., is needed, not the piecemeal planning that is currently being pushed, which will leave so many of us stranded-despite the taxes we pay!</p>
Tamara	Turner	25, 43	2	<p>This is an addition to the testimony I just sent. The following King County proposal was approved: The Seattle Transportation Benefit District Board passed Resolution No. 12 concerning funding for Metro Transit service benefitting the City of Seattle. If approved, this proposition would fund preservation of transit service on existing routes primarily serving Seattle that are proposed to be cut beginning in 2015. A portion of the funds collected would support regional transit service and improved access for low-income transit riders. This proposition would authorize an additional annual vehicle license fee of \$60 per registered vehicle with a \$20 rebate for low-income individuals and authorize a 0.1% sales and use tax. Both the fee and the tax would expire by December 31, 2020. Legally, routes #25 and #43 cannot be cut!</p>
Brian	Werner	43	2	<p>Please do not discontinue Route 43. Route 43 is the only direct connection between the Montlake neighborhood, central Capitol Hill, and downtown Seattle. Transferring lines makes for a longer trip and it is not a good option for families. It would be especially difficult to take a bus from Montlake to transfer at the Husky Stadium light rail, with the significant traffic backup on northbound 24th Avenue/Montlake Boulevard by Highway 520 and the Montlake Bridge.</p>
Brian	Rhoades	43	2	<p>Eliminating the 43 is an absolutely terrible decision and makes the already poor transit options I really don't see how the Capitol Hill restructure improves connections to Capitol Hill Station for anyone east of Broadway. 15th Ave still has no service to the station. 19th Ave (north of Thomas) still has no service to the station. 23rd Ave LOSES service to the station with the deletion of the 43, and in exchange gains a transfer penalty to the 8/11 PLUS an additional 2-3 minutes delay due to the detour. The John/Thomas frequent corridor LOSES ALL SERVICE between 19th and 23rd, for some reason having it diverted Madison. This proposal continues to send almost every route on the Hill to downtown, with most of the service not even going to Capitol Hill Station first. Recently improved, busy stops on John and Thomas will no longer be served at all while a new stop will need to be built. The signals and curbs at 19th and Madison will have to be rebuilt. On 19th between Madison and Thomas buses going in opposite directions will both be going downtown. Service from the east to Meany Middle School is cut, apparently to have the 8/11 serve two different Safeways. Weekend service, especially on Sundays, is still significantly less frequent than today along John/Thomas. How is this proposal an improvement? What happened to the vision we saw back in the days of the original alternatives?</p>

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Adam	Berey	43, 71, 72, 73	2	<p>This comment is to dispute the notion that route 43 can be adequately replaced by LINK service. As long as University LINK lacks true urban stop spacing that leaves coverage gaps along its route, parallel bus service will continue to be necessary. (This is as true for the various routes in North Seattle now facing deletion as it is for the 43.) In the same way that four LINK stations could not replace bus service on MLK Jr Way, a single LINK station at Broadway in Capitol Hill cannot replace the bus service that carries riders between the University District and the dense region of Capitol Hill centered on 15th Ave, which includes a thriving commercial area, high-density residential buildings, and most importantly, Group Health's Capitol Hill Campus. Cutting service to Group Health is particularly detrimental: by making transportation harder on patients, it disproportionately affects the most vulnerable among us. I urge the Council to find a way to maintain bus service between the University District and Group Health, either by retaining 43 in its current routing, retaining only the portion of 43 east of Broadway, or extending another route, such as 10, to the University District.</p>
				<p>We have lived here for five years and have seen a significant increase in homeless youth living on the streets (University Way), in Cowen Park and in Ravenna Park. These young people use Metro to get to services downtown and elsewhere. Additionally, several of our neighbors are elderly individuals that rely on Metro's services for their main source of transportation as do both my husband and I. The service change planned for Metro in March 2016 has me very concerned. The vast majority of service that made the University District an excellent place to live in the city and not have a car will be eliminated or will now cost nearly twice what it did prior to the changes. We enjoyed bus service traveling down 15th Avenue or University Way with direct service to downtown via the University District core. The proposed service changes that are currently under review by the Council moves, truncates or completely eliminates this service. Service that used to travel down University Way (Routes 71, 72 and 73) then on to downtown is now linking up with Sound Transit's light rail. (71 and 72 are eliminated, Route 73 is shifted to Roosevelt Way and no longer goes downtown.) The service that was on University Way Route 74 is now shifted to Roosevelt Way. Route 48 that ran along 15th has completely changed. Metro claims that service is replaced by route 45. It is not replaced. Route 45 does not go downtown. It, too, terminates at the light rail station. Further, Metro fares are \$2.50 off-peak and \$2.75 during peak hours. Link Light Rail is another \$2.25. As you know transfers from Metro are not accepted as fare on Link Light Rail. A commute trip to downtown will now go from \$2.50 to \$4.75 during off peak hours and from \$2.75 to \$5.00 during peak hours. This is \$9.50 to \$10 per day for students, homeless youth and other commuters to get to and from work or other services. In general, the people using these services are working minimum wage jobs are on fixed incomes, or don't currently have employment. Seniors, like the majority of my neighbors, now have to pay \$1.00 for Metro and \$1.00 for Link Light Rail, a 100% increase. And, they have to walk farther to catch a bus. Metro is claiming that this service will provide improved reliability. They are not claiming that it is a service improvement. To be honest with you, I doubt that the reliability of the service will improve. As a regular bus rider waiting in the transit tunnel, I can attest that the light rail rarely runs on time. As a council, you are committed to equity and social justice. I think that we can do better than this service change/reduction. I am requesting as a resident of the University District that you think very hard about these changes, the impacts that they will have on low income people, students and the elderly. I trust your judgment and your proven commitments to do what is best for all people who live in King County. I need to disclose that I currently work for the King County Department of Transportation, but I am writing this as a resident of the University District and in no way as a King County employee.</p>
Laura	Federighi	71, 72, 73 74, Link	2	
Mary	Lamb	25, 43	2	<p>While I do not consider myself disabled, I am older and I do not walk as fast as I could when I was younger. It takes me fifteen or twenty minutes to walk from my home to the nearest #43 bus stop. I take this bus fairly often to Group Health on Capitol Hill, or downtown when it is not possible to take the #25 bus. Taking the #48 bus and transferring at Madison Street, where it will be necessary to cross that dangerous intersection, will be a serious disadvantage to older people like me. The #25 bus stops closer to my home, but the service has been cut so much over the years that it runs so infrequently, or not at all on evenings and weekends, that it is not as convenient as it would be with a better schedule. This may be why ridership on the #25 is rather low. Weren't we given the impression that if we voted for the transportation measure, service on routes 25 and 43 would be improved? I feel that Metro has performed a bait and switch on us riders.</p>

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Daniel	Eisenberg	25, 43	2	<p>Montlake transit riders have been reduced from having three bus routes down to just one route, and not one that goes downtown. I understand that unfortunately the 25 may be cut due to low ridership but I ask that you reconsider before also cutting the 43. Montlake needs this very important lifeline that connects all the stops in between the light rail stations. As it is now, it takes me 1 minute to walk to the 25 bus stop, and about 5 minutes to walk to the 43 bus stop. If these routes are cut I will have to walk for 25 minutes to get to the light rail station. I'm very excited for the light rail and ecstatic that the voters of Seattle got it right last year voting to expand Metro in the city! This is why I can't fathom deleting this very popular route. The more options that people have the less likely they are to buy a car. I don't have a car and I don't want to have a reason to purchase one. Please reconsider before deleting the 43.</p>
Lee	Peterson	71	2	<p>I think it's GREAT that Metro has extended #68 service to Sundays and apparently runs more trips in early morning. It would be great if Metro could do the same thing for #372 - run on Saturday and Sunday, long hours (perhaps, 8 a.m. to 10 p.m.?) Phasing out the #71 is, in my opinion, a terrible idea. How will those of us who rely upon that route to get downtown and to the U District have bus service late at night and on the weekends? How would someone near my address get to the U District during the daytime and on weekends, if the #71 is phased out? If night time #71 service is phased out and the #372 does not run until shortly after the last light rail train arrives at the Husky Stadium station, then everyone who needs to go farther north (i.e., on 372 route) is STRANDED. Has anyone thought about this eventuality? My point: anything connecting to that light rail station at Husky Stadium should run until shortly after the last light rail train arrives. Otherwise, there will be many stranded people in an area where it is unsafe to walk along the street. Drivers typically use 25th Avenue as a little race track at night, and pedestrians must walk down it at their own (considerable) risk. With no bus service from downtown late at night (due to opening of the station), our options for actually getting home become more limited - and the walks become longer and longer.</p>
Craig	Van Riper	25	2	<p>Why are we having to "save" our neighborhood (westside of Montlake, and Portage Bay) bus route seemingly every 6 or 12 months? We overwhelmingly passed a City initiative (Prop 1) last November for an increase in City taxes (0.1% sales tax plus additional \$60 vehicle tab fee, collected each year 2015-2020) slated not for some vague route "improvements", but primarily and specifically for restoring routes in Seattle proposed to be deleted by the County (Routes 25 and 43). For this central area of Seattle, these funds were voted to be used to preserve Route 25 (and 43) from being cut, not only to increase frequency and modify uncut routes decided by King County. Who at the City is accountable for misrepresentations of the Prop 1 description details in the voter's plamplet? It seems like, after its passage, King County now says it will not bring back any proposed deleted routes (beyond having saved Route 25 for a few months I guess), when that was the point of Prop 1. Do the new taxes then represent some kind of criminal taking by the City and County? Or will they expire them now instead of in 2020? Without Route 25, there will be a rather large area here in central Seattle with no service whatsoever, and it is too far a walk for most in that area to get to Montlake Blvd/24th or Husky Stadium with, say, a suitcase in tow to get to the airport. King County says the new alternatives will be faster, but they are only counting ride time, not also the half hour it might take to walk to the closest bus or Link station over 1.5 miles away from some areas here. It's one thing to have poor mass transit options in this day and age, but even worse that we in Montlake, Portage Bay, et al. are paying more in tax to receive a decrease in service. I have heard said that the real reasons driving the Route 25 deletion by King county are difficulty of long buses staying on their side of the road in curves and poor ridership, both of which can be solved by using a much smaller bus for this route. We should get something for what we pay for. Thank you for taking this testimony for me and my family.</p>
Mary	Digenan	216, 219, 218	3	<p>Service is terrible. Buses leave Issaquah Highlands for Seattle completely packed; with riders standing. Buses are constantly late leaving Seattle for Issaquah Highlands; often packed by the time they leave Westlake Center. It makes me want to jump in my car, but for the cost of gas and downtown parking. I'm tired of standing.</p>

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Paul	Dwyer	242	4	I do not think it is a good idea to delete route 242. That bus is always full and the alternatives are slower and require over 11 minutes additional walking each way for me to get to my place of work. Especially in the winter it will make it more likely that I will revert to driving my car which will only increase the already congested roads.
Deborah	Carstens	16	4	I think it's great that the plan is to increase the frequency of buses on this route but am very concerned about the proposed changes in routing. My primary concerns are with the deletion of service to Northgate and the shift to the Fremont Bridge. I know many seniors in this area use the bus to go to appointments at Northgate, and I think it will be unnecessarily difficult for them to have to switch buses to get this accomplished. I also don't understand the move from Aurora. I haven't seen any information about how the proposed change will affect timing, but it certainly seems like a trip across the Fremont Bridge will take longer than the present route. I think the route is fine the way it is, and hope you will consider keeping it. Thanks!
Nancy	Howard	26	4	We are very concerned about the proposed cuts to the 16 line, specifically those that cut the route north of Green Lake. This would make getting to medical appointments in Northgate much more onerous, requiring us to drive rather than take mass transit. This is not what we voted for when we voted for the levy. It is also very upsetting that these proposed changes are not even being publicized. Most of our neighbors are completely unaware of these plans.
Donna	Ellefson	16	4	I am opposed to the changes that are being proposed for the #16 bus. It's always been one of the slowest and least reliable buses in the city and now Metro is taking steps, i.e. moving the bus off of Aurora, that will significantly exacerbate these changes. I voted for the levy to improve bus service in Seattle. This is not an improvement. I will never vote for another Metro levy. I will obviously need to drive now, so I won't be using the bus and I won't vote for the service.
Christine	Randall	15X0	4	15X: we would appreciate your running the 15 Express at earlier times in the morning, and also in the afternoon. It doesn't match the commute times we need. 15: we would very much appreciate your being able to reinstate the 15 normal day bus route. We are very concerned that neighborhood buses are becoming less common and in the case of the 15 and others, disappearing altogether. We appreciate that people are living and commuting from major north-south routes in the city, but there are many, many people who live and commute from neighborhoods, where bus service is difficult. In order for us to take the bus outside of limited rush hour times, we have to walk over half a mile to the stop. This is not possible for us every day. Plus, we have people in the neighborhood who cannot walk half a mile on any day. Bus service is denied to them. It's a scary feeling to think that only people living on major arterials can easily take the bus.
Wendy	Tam	26, 26X	4	I would like to request reconsideration on the 26 bus route change. From looking at the bus changes it appears the 26 bus route is going away with the 26x re-route. I currently take the 26 bus downtown and board at the 35th and Wallingford stop. Currently in my morning commute (around 8-8:30am time frame) the 26 bus is full. If the 26 bus is cut to combine with 26x we're essentially combining two buses into one. The 26 bus allow those of us in the lower Wallingford area to get downtown and cutting this bus will double the commute time.
Stephen	Fickenscher	16	4	I am the Administrator for the Wallingford Chamber of Commerce. It has been brought to my attention that Route 16 is going to be eliminated. As a business organization, I would like you to reconsider this action. As part of a growing City that would prefer their residents to ride buses it is important for residents to be able to get to work and to go shopping. Taking away parking and not adding new parking and then taking away bus service does not seem like the right way to support residents and businesses.
Carol	Sorvig	18	4	The 18 bus through North Beach was the link that many seniors had to get to their doctor, to the grocery store or to other stores in Ballard. I was always thankful that I had that bus when I was working and knew it would be there for me when I retired and could no longer drive. Well I am almost there now but the bus had been taken away from our community and in a few years I will have no way to get to the grocery store, to the doctor, etc. We do not need every 1/2 hour as we were used to, but we should be able to have a bus periodically throughout the day to meet the needs of our community.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Josh	Lee	16	4	Routing the 16 over the Fremont bridge instead of Aurora Bridge would be a big mistake - the 31 and 32, which currently run similarly to the proposed 62 route, are almost always delayed during peak hours due to getting caught up around the Fremont bridge. As is, the 16 is typically on-time or close to it with its current route, and this is most important as in everyday experience, the majority of riders on the 16 are looking to get between Downtown and North Seattle - extra delays due to going through Fremont and the Fremont bridge area would drastically reduce quality of transit provided by this route.
Camille	Fisher	316	4	I was disappointed to hear that Route 316 was moving from the bus tunnel to the surface streets, but was optimistic that it would be fine. During the first week, however, it has not been fine and it is more difficult to get to and from work. For example, during the first week a number of the 316 routes heading from downtown to Meridian were cancelled. Not only were they cancelled, but there was less than 30 minutes notice of the cancellation before their scheduled arrival. Second, the distance between the Union/4th Ave stop and the Marion/2nd stop is long. It would be nice to have at least one additional stop in between. Third, it is my understanding that many of the light rail riders are from out of town or only periodically use the light rail. If this is the case is disappointing to learn that the city values those riders more than the riders that use the buses on a daily basis. I use to talk highly of Seattle's metro system but that has unfortunately changed and I will mostly likely have to start driving to work.
Kathryn	Osborn	41, 316	4	I have been commuting from Northgate area to downtown Seattle for the last 3 years and the commute is getting worse not better. We need more bus route 41 at the busy time in the morning and evening commutes. The 41 routes are always packed full. you know when the busy times are so get more buses on the road. Bus route 316 in the evening is not running. Every day I get a text alert that at least 2 times are cancelled - the 445 and 515 runs. I can't even depend on that one to get home. This probably effects the 41 being so full. Metro received more funding do use it to better our commute that we pay for.
Jennifer	O'Brien	28, 5, 355	4	I am frankly fed up with the way that you present proposed changes. I get a text that says there will be hearing on proposed changes. When I click through, I find that the nearest route to my home -- the 28 will be changed, but zero details on the proposed changes. Why can't I just click through and get an explanation of the proposed change? You have continually cut services to the North End, which resulted in one of my neighbors losing her life after being hit in the crosswalk at 3rd NW and 132nd because two of her bus stop options had disappeared. Not everyone is physically capable of walking from 3rd Avenue NW to Aurora. A Metro Trip Planner search from the North End to Downtown really ought to turn up the 5 as an option. I've personally moved into freelancing from home as much as possible, in part because I can't count on the buses to get me where I need to go in a timely fashion. We have a number of tech families moving into the Broadview who support green living. They'd love to take the bus if it was feasible. I'm fed up with watching my service options be slashed while my fares are increasing. And I'm truly fed up with poor dissemination of information. Thank you for your time.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Amy	--	43	4	<p>It doesn't make sense to delete the 43. First off, I use that route to get to my doctor's office on Capitol Hill. Making everyone use the 8 to go in the "same area" will make the 8 more congested. The 12 is NOT AN OPTION, because it does NOT go where I need to. I am DISABLED and cannot climb the hill to get to 19th and Republican from 15th, since you already cut off service that the 12 was running when it was going on 19th part of the time. I can NOT climb the hill downtown to get onto the already crowded 12 either. If everyone has to use the 8 or the 12 to get to the area I need to go to, there will never be a place for me to sit down. It is a lot better for me to get off at the 4-way stop at 19th and E. Thomas and to just walk on FLAT GROUND to get to the doctor's office on Republican. Forcing me to ride ONLY crowded buses to get to and from the doctor's office at this location is a major hardship for me: Bus drivers are NOT ALWAYS HELPFUL when I ask the driver to get someone to let me have a seat up front. Some drivers don't care one bit and flat out ignore me when I ask them to help me get a seat when the able-bodied won't move out of the front seats that are reserved for disabled and seniors. As it is, a very RUDE passenger with a baby stroller that she REFUSED to collapse was obnoxious to me when I sat in the front where she and another woman who was pregnant and had another stroller that she wouldn't collapse either and claimed that the front area was for people who are disabled and for baby strollers. It is NOT for baby strollers! Yes, the strollers don't always fit anywhere else, but the fact is, I AM DISABLED and cannot be forced to stand in the aisle in order to accommodate someone else's baby stroller. This was on the E line. I had to tell the woman that I AM DISABLED. Just because someone doesn't appear to be disabled doesn't make it not a fact. She glared at me for the rest of the time she was on the bus, which made it obvious that she didn't believe me that I was disabled. She expected ME to move for the woman who was pregnant who also had the other stroller that she was refusing to collapse. And, the driver did NOT make either one of them collapse their strollers. The pregnant woman could have, because the child that was with her was not a small infant but was an older toddler who could have gotten out of the stroller. I didn't deserve the dirty looks because it was clear that the woman had an attitude problem and expected everyone else to accommodate HER when she clearly was NOT DISABLED. I usually avoid travel during commuting hours because of bad attitudes that I get from other people when they REFUSE to move from the front seats when I AM DISABLED. OFTEN during the commuting hours, the drivers do NOT wish to help me get a seat in the front, because they assume the same general attitude that the commuters do that I'm taking up too much of their time by requesting a seat when I DO NEED to sit in the front. ESPECIALLY when the bus is CROWDED! And, now you want me to travel on ONLY CROWDED buses in order to get to my doctor's office, because you want to delete the 43? The 43 is NOT a duplicate route! It goes places that the other routes do NOT GO! And, it takes some of the load off of those other routes. It does NOT make sense to make me use the 8 bus to get to 19th and E. Thomas. The bus will be CROWDED. I deal with tudes enough as it is. Also, I have NO IDEA where you expect me to catch the 8 bus. But, I already know from someone who does ride that route that the 8 bus is a crowded bus. You will make me catch the bus near Seattle Center, which is a hardship for me, too. You're expecting me to catch a bus in an area of town that I know is a dangerous part of town because of how busy the roads in that area. Drivers act like pedestrians are "in the way". I will have to cross all that traffic multiple times in order to get to the unfamiliar bus stop for another CROWDED bus. Why do you want ALL the buses to be so CROWDED anyway? The 43 is NOT a "duplicate route" it is a NECESSARY route for me. It means access to my doctor's office. Deleting that route means a lot of hardship for me. #10 and #11 will NOT WORK as alternative routes, because they don't even go anywhere near 19th and Republican. So, no, the 43 is NOT A DUPLICATE</p>

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Kyra	Freestar	43, 48, 31, 32	4	<p>Metro buses have been my only form of transportation since I moved to Seattle in 1997. Good public transit is in my opinion a necessary pillar of a vital city, and on the whole, I have been happy to be able to make Seattle my city via the bus system. I have just spent some time looking through the proposed route changes. I can see some of the benefits of the new routes and connections. I have two primary concerns, however: (1) Difficulty reaching the University District by public transit, and thus also difficulty reaching farther neighborhoods for which I need to pass through the University District. Because of the new routes for the 31/32, I will now need to take two buses or walk half a mile to reach the U District from my house. Because of the cancellation of the 43, I will need to take 3 buses (or 2 buses plus the light rail) to travel between meetings at my colleague's home on 17th Ave E and meetings in the U District. (And then 2 more buses to get home from the U District.) Previously, all of these locations were connected by a single route: the 43. Note that I do not consider the terminus of the Link light rail to be "the University District." I consider the intersection of 45th St and University Way to be the center of the U District, and any trip that takes me to the stadium/UWMC only must be supplemented by another route in order to get me where I need to go. (2) Difficulty with long-distance (cross-city) travel. Although many of the new routes are said to run more frequently, they are also shorter and require more transfers. My perspective as an 18-year regular Metro rider is that any trip that involves a transfer takes longer, is less reliable, and causes more stress than a trip that can be accomplished on a single route. Any trip that requires 2 transfers, I avoid. I understand that there are hopes that frequency can make transfers more viable-however, one never knows, with a transfer, how long one will be waiting, which introduces uncertainty. One cannot be sure one will arrive at a certain time. One cannot be sure how long one will be waiting by the side of the road in the cold and rain. For this reason, I am concerned about: - The loss of the 43, which connected 5 neighborhoods with one route. - The shortening of the 48, which connected at least 8 neighborhoods with one route. - The overall reliance, in this new plan, on short routes combined by multiple transfers-given that transfers introduce the greatest physical and emotional strain and the most unreliability to any travel by public transit. In the 18 years I have been riding Metro buses, I have been a young professional working downtown and then in South Lake Union, a student, a friend, a self-employed businessperson, and a person with an invisible disability that makes certain physical actions incredibly fatiguing-actions that include walking up hills, standing for long periods, and waiting in cold weather. Even so, I have much more physical energy and capacity than many people who ride Metro, including people with infants and children, elderly people, people with injuries, and people with disabilities using assistive devices such as walkers and wheelchairs. For all of us, repeated embarkation and disembarkation of a bus over multiple transfers can be fatiguing, distressing, and slow-to the point of discouraging use of Metro and decreasing population mobility. Please look again at your route map for ways to encourage people to travel this wonderful city from one unique neighborhood to another. Because a map that requires 2 to 3 transfers to get from one neighborhood to the next (as from the top of Capitol Hill to 45th and University Way, or from 45th and University Way to 40th and Stone Way) is going to create problems not only for loyal riders like me but also to the city as a whole and it's vision of being a world-class place to live.</p>
Scott	Brown	44	4	<p>With rapidly increasing population, and lack of city investment in improved transportation, Ballard's transportation problems are worsening rapidly. Why is the city neglecting to invest in Ballard? There are lots of exciting improvements for the University District and central north-south areas, but none for us. Why not give us a Sounder stop at NW 57th St and 37th PI NW or somewhere between there and Golden Gardens to at least help us get downtown reasonably expediently while the heavy investments are all being focused elsewhere? Why not time our traffic lights to enable smooth east-west flow on NW Market St, NW 65th St and NW 85th St and north-south flow on 15th Ave NW and 99/Aurora? I've spoken with DoT employees who say that has been done, but living here I can tell you it is almost totally ineffective. I stop at most lights on all of those major thoroughfares. We get new homeless camps, but no serious transportation investments. Ballardites are people and taxpayers too. Please invest in benefits for Ballard in addition to the other high density city neighborhoods</p>



Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Frname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Melinda	Roll	75, 32, 65, 30	4	I don't feel my concerns have addressed, I live 4 miles from work yet the only East/West buses all go through UW campus and change routes...I would be more likely to ride the bus if it didn't take 45 minutes and often run 10-15 minutes late. There is no reason my route should take 45-60 minutes to travel 4 miles. Maps would be helpful in the proposed route changes, it is hard to discern how these proposed changes would effect my routes.
Jeff	Knight	31, 32, 16	4	I received a request from Rod Dembowski today and will be out of town for the public meeting so am writing to ask that you please vote no on the proposed changes to the Metro Link Connections. The proposed changes will have a negative effect on my neighborhood, Stone Way, which as you know is one of the fastest-developing parts of Seattle right now. Changing route 16 to slower service to downtown (along Dexter) and changing routes 31 and 32 to Wallingford Ave, outside the walk-shed of Stone Way and the area between Stone Way and Aurora, where all the development is happening, is a grave mistake and will lead to a car-dependent neighborhood. I have sent additional feedback through this form before, so please consult my previous statements for a fuller account.
Jenny	Davidson	44	4	As a Ballard resident, it has been frustrating to be so limited by the number of buses, in particular east - west, serving the community. Not only that, but the 44 has become so crowded since classes started at the UW, getting home is a challenge. Every day this week, at the end of the work/school day, the bus was so crowded people were unable to board and anywhere from 6 - 10 people were left waiting for the next bus hoping they would be able to get on that one, but no guarantees. It makes it challenging to take the bus if I have anything scheduled after work, as I can't rely on the bus and whether or not there will be room for me to get on. I really want to be a good citizen to the community and environment and I really enjoy taking the bus, which is a bonus. However, I can't take it as often as I like because either there aren't enough east - west options from Ballard or the ones that do exist are so overcrowded I can't rely on them.
Linda	Pigue	355	4	355 Southbound bus has an ideal route for individuals working in the downtown area, yet lives in the north park of Seattle. The population is extremely huge. And thank you for such route. I would strongly suggest to not end 355 Southbound route at 6th and Olive. Instead extended the last route near the bus terminal, which is on the same street, for a larger population working in the Metropolitan area for various hospitals. Also considering it is not detouring the buses from maintaining on their continuous route to Northbound. Your passengers will be greatly appreciative
Alex	Berezhnoy	26	4	1) I live on 35th St and Woodlawn and take 26 to work downtown and back. With discontinuation of 26 I won't have an option to go directly downtown. I can get on 31 and 32, but then I'll have to change buses in Fremont. This makes the metro service much less convenient for my main use. I'd really like to keep the 26 route as is. 2) Dexter Ave. Now that you'll discontinue 26 and 28 on Dexter, and will have only the new 62 run through it, I'm concerned that it will become insanely crowded. Dexter has become very densely populated with new apartment buildings in the lower part (just before Mercer). Even today with both 26 and 28 running on Dexter it gets very crowded towards the bottom on Downtown bound rides. Perhaps the frequency of 62 will compensate? Make sure to send only double buses during the peak times. 3) Can 31 or 32 to run on N Pacific St AND get closer to U-District Light rail station? Northern part (above Fremont stop) of routes 31 and 32 is mostly joined, so why not run one of them on 34th street and Pacific street instead, and then join again in the U-District? The route document actually contains an error, where it says that they'll use 34th st, but the map rendition shows them running on 35th. There are lots of new apartments and offices being constructed along the 34th near Gas Works park, so it would make sense to use that street instead of 35th (which is just single family homes). Additionally, past the U-district hub, can one of the routes swing closer to the U-district light rail stop?

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Janey	Elliott	16, 62	4	<p>I request that you reject the proposed changes to the Rte. 16, (proposed to be renamed Rte. 62) which has for many years provided frequent, direct service between Wallingford west of Meridian Avenue N. (and many neighborhoods north of there) and downtown Seattle - all the faster since the bus-only lane on Aurora was introduced and Metro re-routed the 16 to stay on Aurora to Denny Way, rather than meandering over to Seattle Center. Under the proposed changes, the Rte. 16 would operate all the way down Stone Way N., then over the Fremont Bridge, down Dexter Avenue through South Lake Union and then downtown - which will add 15-20 minutes to the travel time, assuming the Fremont Bridge isn't open. The proposed frequency increases in the 2016 plan don't begin to compensate for the longer travel time. This is a huge takeaway for our west Wallingford neighborhood. Yes, it's an option to walk to Aurora and get the Rapid Ride - unless you have a mobility impairment that prevents you from walking up the ramps to the zones on Aurora. Or you could walk to N. 45th &amp; Latona or to N. 40th &amp; Stone Way N., but once you did that, you might as well take the slower Rte. 16 bus. (Same is true of transferring.) The north end of the Rte. 16 now meanders around Green Lake to North Seattle College, ending up at Northgate, but is a route that many people use. Under the proposed changes, it will operate across NE 65th St. to Magnuson Park. Thankfully, the Rte. 16/62 will continue to operate to Green Lake and Ravenna, so I'll be able to use it to get to the Green Lake Community Center, although with a slightly longer walk. I can imagine that people might want to ride across town over 65th St. to the Roosevelt District, but beyond that? Not so sure, except to take the dog to the off-leash park? Although it would be so much faster to drive. There has been a huge amount of development on Stone Way south of N 40th St., which is currently served by the Rte. 26, but there is also a lot of growth along N 45th St. and in our surrounding "Urban Village" neighborhoods - perhaps much more if the HALA legislation passes. For example, within the next year, there will be approximately 250 new apartments on N. 45th in the three blocks between Interlake and Midvale. The Rte. 26 has had a notoriously inefficient schedule, so it definitely makes sense to revise this route. It is not uncommon to see a second bus arrive at the layover point on Ravenna Blvd. near Green Lake before the first bus leaves. The proposed change combines the 26 and 26X. I don't understand why that combined route couldn't continue to serve the South Lake Union neighborhood without changing service to those of us in "upper Wallingford", and then operate across 65th St. The proposed Rte. 26 will operate via the faster Aurora Ave. routing, but only half as often as the Rte. 16.</p>
Joel	Flank	28	4	<p>cancelling the 28 route without increasing frequency on the 28X will be disastrous for Ballard. The 28X is often filled to capacity, and if the 28 is cancelled, then the 28X will not be able to handle the amount of commuters. Also, the 28X only runs during rush hour, M-F. There would be no good commute option to SLU from Ballard during off - peak hours without the 28. Finally, without the 28, there is no good connection from N Ballard to downtown Fremont area, as the 28X does not stop in Fremont.</p>
Bruce	Busby	66X	4	<p>I don't understand your planned changes for route 66x. I have been taking the bus from Roosevelt Square to Fred Hutch (about 1100 Eastlake), for 10 years. The bus is always loaded, always full... I commute to and from work each day. Changing it to route 63 will make this not a good route for me to go to work. There needs to be a Northgate THROUGH North Seattle route, down Roosevelt. The Roosevelt light rail station doesn't open until 2021, so why mess with my commute... besides the light rail will not be a good way for me to get to work anyway. I urge you to leave the 66X alone. Its busy, its useful and nothing in the next 6 years will change that.</p>

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
				I am very pleased to see the change in route and service for the 16. Among other things, it provides direct service from Wallingford to Roosevelt High School - which was badly needed. I encourage the planners to coordinate with the school district and factor in bell times when doing the schedule for this reason. Unfortunately, we also fall in the middle of the proposed service changes on what we call the "70s" routes. Currently I can walk from my house in Wallingford to the 40th street bus stop and catch any of a number of buses getting on the express lanes and heading into the bus tunnel. Door to door, it's possible to get from my home to the International District in 35 min. With the addition of light rail, I need to get all the way to Husky Stadium (no longer a walk, but a bike ride or connector bus) and then it will stop on Capitol Hill before entering the tunnel. Essentially - it will take longer. The alternative is to simply catch the 26x. The increase in service frequency will not solve the reason why I don't take it today - that is - it's a hassle to commute on surface streets all the way through downtown to the ID. As Metro works through the plan, my thoughts are that we will need more "efficient" connector routes to the light rail - not just more frequent service. An alternative, is to try and maintain a version of the "70s" route level of service until the University District station is open in 2021 and can more effectively absorb the change for the area. Thanks for your time.
Sarah	Phillips	16, 26x, 71, 72, 73, 74	4	
Sharon	Scherer	16	4	Elimination of the efficient North/ South connection of the Wallingford Urban Village to the employment/retail centers of Downtown and Northgate is being proposed. When the Wallingford Residential Urban Village was designated by the City of Seattle, Metro Routes 6 and 16 provided frequent efficient transit service between North 45th Street and Downtown. Please reconsider elimination of the last piece of efficient North/ South service to Wallingford.
Kaitlin	McMichael	70, 66X	4	I have been a resident of the Eastlake neighborhood for many years, and hope to continue living here for many years to come. I want to express my concern about cutting bus service for #66E. I live on Eastlake Ave. and commute to work by bus near the International District station. Even though my commute is only 3 miles in length, it regularly takes me over 1 hour to take the bus. During rush hour, it often takes 1 hour, 45 minutes to get home. This length of commute for so short a length is unacceptable. It is faster for me to walk or bike. Increasing service with the 70 is unlikely to make up for the lack of the 66E. In fact, I strongly believe that Eastlake needs better, more frequent bus service during peak commute hours. Thank you for your concern and representation of the Eastlake neighborhood.
Richard	Letts	48	4	The proposed re-routing of the #48 down University Avenue is not a good idea: a) University Avenue is a single lane in each direction. A bus travelling on this route will increase, and be subject to, additional congestion over the current route on 15th Ave (which is two lanes in both direction and has peak-hour parking restrictions to alleviate congestion) b) the Current route overlaps with the Sound Transit 542 offering an alternative to people travelling to the Green Lake Park & Ride -- by removing the points of overlap you will reduce the opportunities for travelers to take the next available bus making journeys more challenging. c) the re-route removes a popular stop at the junction of 15th and 65th Avenue Do not re-route the Northern section of the #48
Dave	Swift	242	4	This route is not replaced by the ST542 from Green Lake. That route works well for folks who go from Green Lake park-n-ride to Overlake, but there are many people who ride the route from north of Green Lake and would now have to transfer at Green Lake to the ST542. That one transfer is not the end though as many people work along the path of the 242 route in Redmond and they would have to either transfer at Overlake or walk from there. The double transfers to replace this route is unacceptable. If ST542 took the same route as the 242 in Redmond or in Seattle, then this would not be as big of an impact, but it does not and until it does, there is a need for both routes.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Caroline	Bassett	16	4	Changing the 16 to an entirely different route will take away easy northbound access to health care facilities, the community college, and the mall. Also, routing the 16 through Fremont to downtown will only slow the buses because they will no longer have a bus lane and the bridge will be opening. Seattle Center will be farther away because one must walk farther along Denny to get to it, instead of having a stop on Aurora. One used to be able to walk about a block to get to the Center, now it's a hike. Wallingford residents have a better choice with the E line, but it is often standing room only, and the stops are very far apart. The stop at 46th requires a walk up stairs or up a rather steep ramp, which makes it difficult for seniors or disabled. This is in addition to having to walk 1/2 mile to get to the stop in the first place.
Dianne	Riva	16	4	I reside in a low-income community in the Northgate area. Bus number 16 is incredibly necessary. I can get on the 16, I can go to grocery stores, pharmacies, other shopping centers, the post office, and parks by only taking ONE bus. The benefit of only riding one bus becomes incredibly valuable when thinking about disabled riders (myself included). Removing this route, without replacing it with another similar route, would be detrimental to the livelihood of our community. The absence of this route would further isolate the elderly and mobility challenged members of our North Seattle neighborhood.
Summer	Jawson	28	4	Changes in the 28 route will increase pedestrian access needs at the intersection of Fremont Ave N, N 39th St, and Fremont Way N. Currently, there is access for ADA and strollers onto the island in the crosswalk. The free right turn, with obscured vision due to parking at the intersection, is a safety hazard for pedestrians. If this route change is approved, it must come with ADA, child, pedestrian and bicycle improvements to this intersection.
Lore	Rubin	16	4	I leave in an independent senior housing. Many of us no longer drive but are very active and use the bus. We also have many young people working here who use the bus. We are very concerned that you wish to cut off the northern part of the bus#16 route. This will cut us off from Community College, several large medical clinics (e.g. Northwest Hospital Clinic, Health department, Polyclinic, and dental specialists ) And also Northgate Mall and other shopping like Best Buy across the street from the Mall. We urge you to reconsider this route change.
Benjamin	Johnson	242	4	I applaud the intent to streamline transit, but the 242 is a vital commute for many users. I, and several colleagues, whose housing close to 5th Ave NE primarily because of how efficient the 242 is. Cancelling the 242 route will double or triple bus commute times for many users, as there are not applicable substitute routes. The 542 is an inefficient route for anyone consistently traveling from the greater Greenlake/Northgate area to any Redmond stop currently serviced by the 242. From experience and testing, my 30-minute 242 commute consistently takes 1 to 1.5 hours on the 542. In addition to a 5-10 minute walk or drive on either end of the 542 commute, the on-bus trip itself takes twice as long as the 242. This is mainly due to the single-lane bottleneck that is the UW campus. The 542 exits on a busy 520 off ramp, travels a congested 1- or 2-lane path through UW, then hops on I5 to take another busy off ramp. The overcrowded 542 means that many former 242 riders will be standing throughout the extended commute times as well. While the 242 and the 542 have some slight overlap in two places, this ensures that riders make it home in the evenings. If either the 242 or the 542 are unavailable for any reason, the other option is there. With only the 542, an event at Husky stadium, an accident on 15th Ave NE, or an incident at the hospital would all prevent 542 riders in or north of Greenlake from reaching their destinations without traveling downtown first. While we appreciate the intent to improve efficiency of metro transit, please find a way that doesn't involve cutting the 242. The 35+ riders on my one bus each morning (1 of 6 buses each way) will appreciate not spending 2 more hours on a bus every day.
Samuel	Jaffee	31, 32, 26X, 16, 62	4	Keep 31 & 32 on Stone Way N between N 35 & N 40 Sts instead of moving the routes to Wallingford Av N between those streets. Stone Way N is a documented source of considerable ridership on those routes, particularly to/from the stop at Stone Way N & N 40 St. A move to Wallingford Av N would represent a move away from the core ridership of those routes in that area. Riders could still transfer to the 26X and the old 16 (the new 62) in central Fremont.
Moly	Varghese	167	5	hello, I am taking this bus ,but i worked twelve hours really hard to go home.my request is ,if you arrange a bus from downtown to renton frequently .More convenient this light rail.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Sonya	Reasor	131, 125, 70	8	We really need more options to West Seattle, especially the 131 and the 125. The 70 does NOT need more buses. It already comes every 10 or 15 minutes, but the 131 (besides being consistently late) only comes every half hour or so. And the 125 is packed out of WS in the morning; it's standing room only into downtown.
Scott	Stangenes	43	8	Please preserve the 43 and reassess ridership levels once light rail has started. If ridership does not drop because of light rail the 43 should be preserved as is. If ridership does drop because of light rail, consider using a shorter bus and fewer late night runs.
Twana	Johnson	193 #1	8	The 193 #1 is getting extremely full, since more people are moving to the south end of King County. This morning we had to leave 8 people at the Tukwila stop, (9/14/15) and 12 that Thursday, because the bus was over capacity, and there was not any more room for any more people to get on the bus. The Tukwila park n Ride at the 5:58 time point to catch the 193, there are usually 40+ people waiting (except on Friday its lighter). This morning (9/14/2015) and every morning since is very crowded with 25+ people standing, and very unsafe to have that many people standing (as many as were sitting or more). If there were an emergency, there is no way all of the people would be able to get off of this bus. The 193 #1 is this full Monday - Thursday. I believe we need another bus. Maybe you can have an earlier bus starting 20 minutes earlier than the 193 #1. I believe this would assist, by moving riders to the earlier bus. (by the way, the 150's are also standing room only). Please consider getting another bus that will take riders from the south end, to first hill. (there are a lot of hospital workers).
Patty	Dougherty	16		Re: metro bus changes / 10/6 meeting. Your mailer indicates you are considering deleting the#16 route. You committee needs to coordinate w/other gov offices. An apodment was allowed on 46th& Meridian, with NO off street parking. The neighborhood was told it was allowed as it was on a bus line so those renters wouldn't need cars. That bus line is the #16. Now you are considering doing away with it & apodment dwellers will not have direct bus service to downtown. Our neighborhood is now stuck w/the extremely unattractive apodment building (again NO OFF STREET PARKING) AND now even more parking / traffic issues as we won't have bus transportation to either Northgate or downtown Seattle. If you allowed the apodment to be built then you need to leave the bus route that services it.
<b>Frequency</b>				
Chris	Nauroth	62, 63	1	I am writing to ask that you approve the proposed March 2016 Metro Transit service changes. Northeast Seattle needs improved bus service. During rush hours, the existing buses are frequently too full or delayed. Outside of rush hours, I often experience wait times of more than 30 minutes for a bus to get downtown. The proposed 62 and 63 routes specifically would improve the situation for residents of the Cedar Park neighborhood. Thank you.
Ian	Strader	66, 71, 72, 73, 76, 16, 67, 68	1	My home is 1 block from the bus stop on 5th Ave NE and 85th in Maple Leaf that will see significant service reductions. However, I am fully in favor of the proposed changes to add more frequent service to far more of my neighborhood. A bus route 1 block from my front door that comes every hour is not nearly as valuable to me as a bus that comes every 15 minutes, 5 blocks from my door. Please approve the Metro's proposed changes unaltered.
Julia	Bent	372X	1	: I appreciate the increased frequency planned for 372X as it is often over crowded. Today my bus was twenty minutes late, making me late for my class at the UW. With buses scheduled every fifteen instead of thirty minutes, this is less likely to happen. Additionally, the increase in night service will make it more likely I'll ride it in the evening and leave my car at home.
Andres	Salomon	71, 72, 73, 66, 67	1	I support the proposed changes. Please adopt them so NE Seattle can finally get frequent bus service. I also share Erica's dismay that Metro would hold a public hearing in a location that is so poorly served by transit right now. It's actually faster for me to get downtown than it is to go from my house to Magnuson, despite Magnuson being only half the distance. <a href="https://twitter.com/ericacabarnett/status/649733590733885440">https://twitter.com/ericacabarnett/status/649733590733885440</a>
Ken	Rudberg	65, 75	1	I'm greatly in support of increasing the frequency of 65 and 75 routes. These buses can get very crowded (or completely full) and more frequent service would help alleviate this. They are how I get to work and I appreciate the ability to leave my car at home and know that I can catch these reliably to pick up my kids after school activities

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Frname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Trey	Winter	75, 65	1	I would love to see the frequency of the 75 and 65 in the Laurelhurst/Seattle Children's Hospital area increase. The buses are standing room only every single evening and sometimes they are so crowded we cannot even get on and have to wait even longer for the next bus. This is a great improvement and I really hope it goes through
Jerry	Gronau	65, 75, 522, 41	1	I work in Security Services at Seattle Childrens Hospital and I ride the #75 and # 65 almost every day Monday - Friday and some weekends. I do get called into work for emergencies alot and have to take the bus. I use a bus pass provided by Seattle Childrens which is AWESOME! It would be even more great to have them run all day for every 15 min. and every 30 min on weekends instead of every hour. I am relied on the most to come in at a moments notice for my work. I truly cont on the #75 and #65 when it is work related. Thank you for taking this time and my statement
Elaine	Manion	75, 65, 78, 73, 62	1	I strongly support the more frequent runs of Route 75 and Route 65. I take the 75 bus everyday and this is very helpful to have frequently running busses The new Route 78 and Route 73 to Roosevelt Commons. new east-west connection on Route 62
Debby	Domingo	65, 71, 76	1	: I would be able to use the bus 65 more often from my work if it came every 15 minutes. Please approve this!
Tiffany	McIlrath	75, 65	1	I LOVE that you are going to add more frequent stops to the 65 and 75. The 75 is one of the worst buses to take because it is ALWAYS late; no matter what time of day it is, it's late. Sometimes by 5 min other times by 50 min. No buses will come and then 3 will show up at the same time. I'm not sure why it is so difficult for this bus to be on time, it goes from UW to Northgate only. The app "One bus away" sometimes isn't helpful with this because it will say it's coming and then the bus never does. The bus is always packed as well. This is going to be a HUGE step in getting people to and from Seattle Children's and UW on time! I think this is a great idea!
Stephanie	Church	75	1	Due to the large number of hospital employees and university students commuting via bus, please increase the frequency of Route 75 buses to every 10-15 minutes through peak, including evening hours
Karen	Tsuchiya	75, 65	1	I support the proposed Metro transit service changes. I prefer using the Metro bus system for commuting to work, and I would do so more often if the buses for the 65 and 75 routes ran more frequently
Mei	Kokeeko	75	1	I ride the bus most days I go to work. My ride in the morning is great, but my ride back home during peak hours in the evening is a horrendous wait time with unreliable updates on One Bus Away. The bus is always crammed and is unsafe for the passengers trying to hold on. I believe that buses arriving every 10 minutes would help with this congestion and rider safety as well as satisfaction. Thank you for your efforts to improve public transportation
Richard	Gordon	65	1	: I am aware of the proposal to have scheduled departures for Route 65 every 10-15 minutes all day. I emphatically support this proposal. I ride this route to and from work (Seattle Children's Hospital) every day. This route is highly utilized by professionals, students, and others in the public. It is frequently crowded, and more frequent options for travel on this route would help alleviate some of the crowding while also increasing overall utilization.
Jeff	Altman	522, 372	1	Honorable Councilmembers -- I strongly support the proposed revisions to Metro Transit's bus routes effective next Spring to complement the opening of Link at Husky Stadium. Trimming some of the existing routes in order to make other routes more frequent will be very helpful to bus & Link riders. Please approve the proposals just as they are presented
Tom	Faber	30, 74, 75, 48, 62	1	I am very supportive of the current restructure proposal. Almost every bus route that I take frequently will run more often. I'll miss the 30, but adding the 62 will more than make up for that. Furthermore, it will be much easier and I'll have more options for getting to Link once the University station opens. Again, this will make the bus system much better for me in particular, and for all my family and neighbors. I urge the County Council to approve this restructure.
Leslie	Vogel	65	1	Thank you for increasing the number of buses on the 65 route. I often work a have day and have waited more than 30 minutes for a bus to go home. It makes it very hard to commute to work in the middle of the day with the current bus schedule. I am also hoping that the increased number of buses will increase the consistency of the bus schedule especially in the morning.
Lindsey	Price	75	1	In full support of the 75 coming more frequently!

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Beth	Crispin	65, 75	2	I like the proposed changes to the routes 65 and 75. I especially like the increased frequency mid day. I also like the proposed change to have the 65 stop closer to Children's Hospital. I will ride this bus more often if that happens.
Tracy	Chen	372, 65, 75	2	Sometimes commuting from home (Kenmore) to work is challenging when my shifts start after 1000 or finish after 1930 as the buses that go between Children's and Kenmore P&D are not as frequently (transferring with infrequent buses means a lot more wait time.) Also, leaving after regular peak hour almost make it impossible to find a parking spot at the Kenmore Park and Ride. I'd gratefully appreciate the more frequently runs of these buses if possible to make those who try to utilize the public transit ride more confidently and satisfactorily
Drew	Porter	49	2	Please support the proposed restructure, which will give higher frequency and dependable bus service to NE and Capitol Hill. I recognize that you'll get some immediate opposition from folks who are skeptical of the changes or are amongst the small number who may be negatively impacted. Also the many thousands or tens of thousands of people who will gain better access to transit may not be aware of the potential benefits and less likely to comment on this proposal. I hope you'll have the political courage to push forward with these proposed changes, which will greatly benefit the city.
Louise	Maxwell	75	2	I ride the Route 75 bus almost daily to commute to work, as well as get to the University of Washington campus and other Seattle neighborhoods. I would greatly appreciate and use more frequent service along Route 75. The access and convenience the Route 75 bus affords my family is critical to us remaining a one-car family and reducing our environmental impact.
Charles	Bond	67, 45, 48, 16	4	Please go through with the NE Seattle restructure. We need to move to a frequent service model to make this city more accessible to everyone.
Suzanne	Gerrard	66, 67, 355	4	: I support this proposal - specifically in increasing the frequency of route 67, which is my key workday commute bus to get to the University District to the UW. The current service, especially after 5pm, is limited with 30+ minutes between buses, which makes it difficult to get home in a timely fashion for evening commitments
Michael	Jones	316	4	I support adding more busses during peak ours for the 316 route. The 316 busses are often crowded with standing room only especially in the afternoons.
Sutjipto	Nursalim	372, 522, 75, 65	--	I ride the bus from Kenmore to work at Seattle Children's Hospital on Sand Point Way NE. I will cut some of my commute time by 10 to 15 minutes each way if the Route 75 and 65 comes more frequently as proposed during the day, as it will shorten the wait in between transit. I also believe it will attract more people to ride the bus rather than driving alone to work at Seattle Children's as now they don't have to wait too long during Mid Day if they need to run a quick errand during lunch knowing there will be bus available to bring them back before lunch hour ends. Some of my coworkers don't ride the bus to work because of that reason that the bus during Mid Day is so infrequent that it's hard for them to time it to be able to get back to work within the given lunch break hour, because if they just missed it, they have to wait for another 30 minutes. Please consider and support to make Route 75 and 65 to be more frequent as proposed
Jennifer	--	522, 312, 75, 65	--	I work at Children's Hospital, and taking the bus to/from Bothell P & R can be somewhat frustrating. The bus times are not convenient at the current routes. the 75 & 65 leave Children's area at 724/730 and then not again for another 30 minutes. Most nursing staff do not even get off until after these times, which means after a 12+ hr shift we must wait for the next bus. Additionally, numerous times the 75 has been full or overcrowded, and I have had to wait an additional 20-30 minutes for the next bus. If on the odd chance I get to the 724/730 bus, it misses the connection at 125th & Sand Point by 1-2 minutes. Which means, once again having to wait another 20-30 minutes for the 522 or 312. While this might seem insignificant to some- it is VERY frustrating after a long 12hr shift to take almost 2 hours to get home! Additional times for the 65 or 75 would be a TREMENDOUS help
Vasu	Kotapati	75	--	I am supporting the new proposed and timing changes (Buses every 10 to 15 minutes, all day ).
Sandi	Staples	75	--	I understand you are considering adding buses to route 75 to run it every 10-15 minutes. I think this would be great; I often ride standing up as the bus is full and often people after me cannot get on due to no room - even standing. Thanks.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Frname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Joyce	Latino	8	2	Please upgrade the #8 evening weekday and weekend service to every 15 minutes from the current 30 minutes. This is the only route that goes to and from Seattle Center and Capitol Hill. If you truly want to reduce automobile congestion around Seattle Center, then offer more frequent bus service as an attractive alternative
Tiffany	Sevareid	16	4	The route 16 bus does not need more frequent service. I live on the route, and the bus is never full, not even during rush hour. I have used the 16, as well as other buses to go downtown during peak hours. The 16 is slow and indirect to downtown, whereas the 316, the 76, or the E are all fast, frequent, and usually overfull. In addition, the 16 bus travels along small neighborhood roads, polluting the homes with excess noise and fumes. The route should be decreased, re-routed to main arterials, and use electric-hybrid vehicles.
Shonda	Primeaux	75, 65	4	I would take the bus more often if the 75 ran every 10 minutes. It would make it easier to get from Children's to my family in the evenings. Creating a stop for the 65 that is closer to Children's would also help.
Gavin	Jones	75, 255, 522, 312, 372	6	: I commute from Kirkland around the lake to Sand Point Way near Magnuson Park. I currently have to drive into Bothell, and take the 522, 312, or 372 into Lake City, and then take the 75 down Sand Point Way. Having more frequent service on the 75 in the afternoons, around 4pm, would be very beneficial, as often the 75 gets bogged down, and the schedule becomes useless, with multiple buses "hop-scotching" each other. I would greatly prefer to see the 255 route expanded to go up Sand Point Way, as the 255 is very accessible for me, and would dramatically reduce commute time for me. I would likely not have to drive to a park and ride, either
Megan	--	167, 111	9	Please schedule the 167 bus more frequently during week day mornings 4:30am-8am into Seattle and afternoons 1:30pm-6:00pm to Renton! This is where most peoples' work schedules in Seattle fall and I hate that I need to take the bus hours and hours earlier when I am scheduled to start work 15 minutes earlier than my usual
<b>Network Connections</b>				
Michael	Cassady	372	1	I ride the 372 from Kenmore often. The proposal to end the east bound trips of 372 at U. of Wash. Bothell has merit. Having ridden this route east to Woodinville over the years I have noticed that the ridership to Woodinville is extremely light and is time consuming. In fact the number of passengers drops off significantly after arriving at the Kenmore Park & Ride. Many of us in Kenmore have wished for years that 372 would run on weekends. The fact is that Metro Transit abandons any service on the 522/Bothell Way corridor east of Lake City on weekends with the exception of the short run that 331 takes between Kenmore and Lake Forest Park where it turns off 522 onto Ballinger Way. It would be nice to have the 372 begin at the Kenmore Park & Ride on weekends but the end point at Lake City is understandable. We have Sound Transit route 522 and those buses are packed on weekends. The argument that weekends lack commuter traffic and so buses don't carry a lot of people is clearly not the case out here. The proposals being considered for March seem to reflect thorough study. Thank you for continuing to improve the transit system.
Ryan	Hursh	67, 73, 373	1	The Sound Transit light rail network is becoming more prevalent in King County and, as such, the Metro bus network should be thoroughly reevaluated in areas newly served by light rail. The proposed March 2016 service changes represent a significant departure from status quo and create new mobility options while also leveraging the reliability of the light rail system. Please use this opportunity to reshape bus service in NE Seattle and Capitol Hill by approving the proposed changes. Thank you!
Jeff	Altman	372, 522	1	Hi -- I strongly support the proposed changes to Metro bus service related to the opening of Link light rail to Husky Stadium. Beside making it easier to use Link to go Downtown, the changes provide more frequent service, even though some existing routes will have less frequent or no service. This is a good trade-off!



Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Nathan	Fulfs		1	I was alarmed by the tenor of Councilman Dembowski's request for further testimony (email sent 9/30) on the proposed Metro changes. In particular, I was concerned by the focus on "adverse impacts to current riders", especially with the fairly weak goal stated as "overall service is improved with any changes ultimately adopted". While minimizing adverse impacts is certainly a worthy goal, it is an unfortunate consequence of any route restructure that some riders will be affected in a way that they dislike. The only way to avoid this would be to maintain the current route structure in its entirety, and attempt to overlay an additional service that can be afforded on top of the existing schedules. Obviously, this would severely limit the additional service that could be afforded, limiting the overall effect of the restructure. I would urge the council to keep in mind that those most likely to speak out about the restructure are those who see themselves as adversely impacted, which can create a more negative perception of the public reaction than truly exists. To me, the number of people who will be positively affected by this restructure will vastly outnumber those who are truly negatively affected, but feedback may not reflect that balance. It would extremely unfortunate if a vocal minority was able to significantly blunt the impact of this restructure. Additionally, those who see themselves as negatively impacted may not truly be. They may be misinformed about the restructure, they may currently enjoy service beyond what ridership in their area truly requires, or they may simply be objecting to the loss of a one-seat ride, even though a transfer and two-seat ride may ultimately be better and quicker service for them. An efficient and effective public transportation system is essential to not only improving mobility in the city and county, but also to building confidence in the use of that system, thereby driving additional ridership. Crippling this restructure to address "adverse impacts" for a small minority of riders would be a tragic waste of the potential gains this restructures could bring about by taking advantage of the opening of U-Link. Unfortunately, based on the tone of the email from Councilman Dembowski, I fear that is exactly what is being considered. I urge the council not to squander the potential benefits from this restructure by spending precious service hours attempting to alleviate all "adverse impacts". This restructure increases availability of frequent transit across large portions of Seattle currently lacking it; it improves reliability of existing routes; and it significantly improves cross-town mobility in North Seattle. These are all extremely worthwhile goals, which are necessary for an effective public transportation system. Please implement the proposed restructure as close to currently proposed as possible.
Joel	Miller	65, 78	1	I like most of the changes. I'm disappointed to see that the 65 only has 15 minute frequency mid-day on weekdays. That greatly reduces the ease and simplicity of using Metro as a true network (still will need to plan carefully). I would like to see 15 minute frequency all-day. I've always felt these routes have too many stops. The planned 78 (and existing 71) stops every 1-2 blocks, slowing down the entire system and making the bus a more frustrating experience than driving. Please consider reducing the amount of stops to every 4-5 blocks. This would make the bus faster, and a less frustrating experience. If ADA access is an issue, maybe make some stops ADA only? Thanks for your hard work.
Carmen	Albert	65, 75, 62	1	Please approved Metro's proposed changes to the bus routes in King County and approve the additional routes, especially route 62 which will make a huge difference for our family's ability to use public transportation.
Carley	MacRae	65, 75	1	My understanding is that metro's proposed package includes many improvements to bus service that impact my individual commute. These include: ..Buses every 10 to 15 minutes, all day on Route 75 and Route 65. ..Closer bus stops at UW Station and the Forest Building at Seattle Children's Hospital on Route 65. ..The new Route 78 connects Seattle Children's Main Campus, View Ridge and the UW Station; ..A new east-west connection on Route 62 between 70th & Sand Point, Green Lake, Wallingford, SLU and downtown. These improvements would be greatly appreciated. Please approve Metro's proposed bus package
Eric	Shoettle	--	1	I just want to express my enthusiastic support for the proposed restructure of service for when link opens. It will absolutely transform getting around northeast Seattle. I grew up in the neighborhood, and it was consistently painful, waiting for buses that were both infrequent and frequently late. I've looked at the maps, and I could get around vastly more easily on the proposed network, to almost every place I go. My thanks to Megro for doing such an excellent job, and hopefully to the council for approving the plan without modification. It is excellent.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Deborah	Rohan	372, 65	1	(This comment is an addendum to the previous comment I submitted) Though my first comment was a small concern/criticism about bus stop walk distances, I approve of the plan in general and am for making these changes now, instead of waiting until 2021 when the Northgate Link opens
Susan	Wong	25	2	There has been discussion about eliminating the 25 route in place of one that links Laurelhurst with the new UW light rail station. I favor eliminating vs. revising the current bus 25 bus route. Past Laurelhurst elementary school, no one is on the 25 bus anymore and it take a lengthy circuitous route through Laurelhurst that no one takes. It is more a nuisance than benefit. That being said, I do use the 25 bus route often and do see a public need for a bus route that goes to this elementary school for the community and its teachers. Perhaps a bus line that runs on Sandpoint Way by can come behind the Seattle Children's Hospital to the elementary school and back out onto Sandpoint Way. Whatever the new route, I favor that the route have bus running at least every 15 minutes. 30-60 minutes is too long to wait for a bus especially for those like myself who have to transfer to other buses and modes of transit.
Tonya	Clegg	25	2	A big "YES" to the proposed changes to route 25. The current route is a slow and painful milk-run to downtown. Access to light rail, UW Hospital, U. District would definitely get my family on the bus.
Dolores	Prichard	25	2	If you build it we will ride it. It would be such a shame NOT to connect #25 to the Link. Pleases consider doing this.
Jeremy	Bacharach	25	2	I think the idea of having a short route 25 which connects to other lines is excellent.
Chetan	Chandrasekhar	--	2	As a bus rider and UW student, I would like to say that I fully support the changes in their current form. I urge the council not to modify Metro's recommendations. One change made by council to satisfy one interest group will have ripple effects around the area. Please pass the changes in full. Metro's service changes have lead to higher ridership in SE, NW, and West Seattle. Don't let a small number of loud people block changes which have proven effective in the past
John	Hinrichs	25, 65, 75, 73, 63	2	I support Metro's proposed changes and expansion.
Aaron	Owens	65, 75, 880, 860	2	As a Children's employee that takes the bus on a daily basis, the improvements mentioned by our transportation department are exciting! Buses every 10-15 minutes on the 65 and 75 routes would be great as these routes are notoriously late. It's difficult to plan for trips to and from work not knowing when the bus will actually arrive. There have been times I've been late to work because the bus was late. I use the One Bus Away app but it never fails that it says that a bus is late but then suddenly shows up early or on time. I'll miss it because I continued working at my desk expecting to have a few extra minutes before needing to leave. In regards to the 880 and 860 routes, these are my preferred routes as I live in Everett and can take these without having to drive more than 3 miles to the park and ride near my home. I don't use these routes because the timing of the Children's shuttle and the routes miss one another by only minutes. Can't count how many times that I've been standing on the corner of 45th and Roosevelt and watched the 880 or 860 drive by with the next bus not coming for another 30 minutes turning my 60 minute commute into a 90 minute commute. Driving the 20 miles (60 min) to the Children's parking lot and taking the 65/75 routes outweighs the 3 hrs I would spend on the "express" buses which is unfortunate as it puts a LOT of miles on my car. Thanks so much for making an effort to improve our commutes to work
Jonathan	McAferly	62,65,73,75, 78	2	Please approve the metro bus package proposal. It is currently very difficult to bus to Seattle Children's Hospital which is where I work and I would love to have more options that run more often! I'm sure the MANY employees who work here would also like to have the option. Seattle Children's Hospital offers incentives to take public transit and I think people would take advantage of the proposed route changes/additions

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Ryan	Hawkes	48	2	I am supportive of the changes listed and want to similar changes for the stations along MLK in South Seattle. With the split of route 8 into two sections, it would make sense to improve connections from Rainier Beach station to the neighborhoods nearby. Some sort of circulating routes that branch off all 4 of the stations in South Seattle are crucial for improving accessibility for all the communities. When I lived in Rainier Beach, the time it took for me to get to the light rail station, made most trips to downtown not feasible. I utilized the Route 7 Express (which has been canceled) but would have preferred a transfer to the light rail. I recommend helping these neighborhoods with improved service as well.
Thomas	Brown	542	3	Consider adding all-day and weekend service on ST542 for connection to UW light rail station
Jeff	Jordan	5, 28, 45	4	In regards to Greenwood/Broadview area service: The southbound 5 service is generally reliable, but something needs to be done (split from the 21?) for the northbound bus schedule. Reliable connections with east-west busses (& thus the new rail) are poor; in the case of the 40, this could be ameliorated by placing the transfer stops within a block, and one arterial-crossing, of each other. The 28X needs a Reverse commute routing for Broadview; using 125th between 3rd and Greenwood Avenue (for the Reverse) would better serve the Bitter Lake student and worker populations while making the route more efficient. The schedule-adherence of the regular 28 is lackadaisical, for the northbound rush hour routes it's horrendous. The transfer connections with the 48 (soon-to-be 45 running to the new rail) are poor; this could be ameliorated by moving the 28 bus stop from NW 84th to 85th Street. Ideally, other stops should be adjusted to be five blocks apart, rather than the current one to six block range. The splitting of the current 48 to create the new 45 promises to be an excellent improvement in terms of westbound schedule adherence. Finding ways to eliminate the bottleneck between 3rd NW and Green Lake should be a priority, especially since the express (skipping Green Lake) has been eliminated AND the 45 is intended to be a light rail feeder. The diagonal option between Aurora and Green Lake needs to be considered, while better traffic signal prioritization on 85th is vital.
Gerri	Goedde	44	4	THANK you for considering more options for east-west from Fremont to the U District
Mark	Stoner	8, 26, 28, 12, 10, 43	4	I strongly support the service changes proposed by Metro. It is crucial for Metro to modify service as new high capacity transit facilities like light rail begin service. The ability for the new facilities to move large numbers of passengers means that Metro has to stay ahead of the curve on how to best utilize these new pieces of the infrastructure.
Fernando	Apolinario	26, 26X	4	Route 26 is largely redundant with route 16 which already runs all-day and should be deprecated in favor of route 16. I would also suggest moving to smaller, less heavy buses in small neighborhoods. Also electric vs gas. Currently the noise, pollution and physical trembling that happens when these large buses come down small neighborhood streets at high speeds is dangerous. Finally, if possible I would also suggest routing large buses toward larger artery streets and again away from smaller, twisted streets. Using Ravenna instead of Latona accomplishes this if this line is going all the way up to Northgate and keeps the stops inline with other major bus connections under the 65th park & ride.
Jamie	Cheney	75, 65	4	Hi- I really like the proposed changes. I ride the 75 from work (turns into 31 and 32) and welcome the greater frequency to Wallingford. I also like the 65's close by connection to Link because I go downtown a lot too

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Vanessa	Casavant	62	4	First let me say I am very thankful for all the attention to needs with these changes. The one comment I have is that the new east-west route for bus 62 still has a lagging gap for those commuting to Sand Point way from Fremont and Phinney Ridge. The real problem right now involves accessibility because of all the many hills in the neighborhood. The way route 62 is currently running is no different an access point for those residing at the top of the hill in Fremont and Phinney than the current 75 route. With the way you have route 62 routed to Fremont is very similar to the 75, which is actually route 75's current hindrance of access for residents at the top of Phinney Ridge and Fremont due to the massive uphill/downhill walk from downtown Fremont. I propose that instead of routing the 62 along Stone way, you continue going up 46th St. along the same route as the 44, and then either turn left onto Phinney Ave along the #5 route or left onto Fremont Ave and continue down into lower Fremont across the bridge. This provides drop off and pick-up points for those living on top of the hill without having to take a bus transfer everyday, and still provides access to downtown Fremont and beyond with a nice alternative to the 75. There is currently no bus service along Fremont Ave between 46 and 43rd/42nd streets, and again between 39th St and and 34th St, which almost an entire mile all together of no service along a hard stretch of hill. So you would be adding accessibility options as well.
Melissa	Moran-Hodge	65, 75	4	Hello! I take the bus from Upper Queen Anne to Seattle Children's Hospital and back home every week day. For my New Year's Resolution I made the commitment to never drive to work again, and so far I have succeeded. More busses coming through the new bus stop outside the hospital make it easy for me to get home (or to the Ave to meet up with friends after work or down to Sodo to catch an Ms game). With the additional of light rail at Husky Stadium, I might never need my car again! Some days I don't get out of the hospital until after 8pm and it's so nice to not have to wait too long out in the cold for a bus. On behalf of myself and the rest of my team on Children's, we would like to support the passing of these changes, as we strive to be an organization dedicated to keeping our community safe and healthy
Anne	Morrison	11	--	I have seen and approve the suggested new route for the #11 bus. Good job of giving us most of the old route, including Madison Park, and also fitting in a stop at the Link on Broadway.
Julia	Peterson	75, 65, 78, 73	--	Buses every 10 to 15 minutes, all day on Route 75 and Route 65. Closer bus stops at UW Station and the Forest Building at main campus on Route 65. The new Route 78 connects main campus, View Ridge and the UW Station; buses will continue as Route 73 to Roosevelt Commons. A new east-west connection on Route 62 between 70th & Sand Point, Green Lake, Wallingford, SLU and downtown
<b>Off-Peak Service</b>				
Darrel	Cowan	71, 78	1	I have often used route 71 on weekends from View Ridge to the downtown tunnel to transfer to light rail to SeaTac airport. The March 2016 plan deletes 71 and replaces it with new route 78 to the UW rail station on WEEKDAYS ONLY. How are we to get to the UW station from Sand Point-lower View Ridge-bus stops near where I live-on weekends? The only possibility seems to be to use route 75, which loops the campus on Stevens Way. The nearest stop is 0.3 miles from the station. Imagine trekking this distance with luggage in inclement weather. I strongly protest deleting route 71, but if Metro must, I advocate providing weekend service on new route 78 OR frequent weekend shuttle service from the stops on route 75 to the station.
Nicole	Guenther	73	1	I would advocate to keep the 73 service on the weekends and not cut the evening weekday service. I rely on this busline to get home when I work evenings at the UW, and I frequently have weekend events and meetings. If these cuts are made, I will need to walk 20+ minutes to the 372 line in Lake City instead of walking 2 minutes to my current bus stop. I do not feel safe walking at night alone in Lake City, so this may end up limiting my access to my job. Last year, I invested significant time energy in canvassing for Proposition 1 to fund Metro and keep bus service to this area. This added additional service to my neighborhood on the weekends and evenings. I'm disappointed to learn that those benefits may be cut after a matter of months.
Dakota	Moran	73	1	As a non-driver in Seattle, I depend on the bus system to get to work and to social events. I rely on the 73 bus line if I want to go to U-District or downtown. Eliminating the 73 service to Jackson Park in the evenings and weekends would significantly limit my transportation options. Please maintain 73 service in the weekends and evenings.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Ethan	Hendrix	73	1	Members of my household rely on the 73 to travel between U-District and Jackson Park in the evenings and weekends. I have chronic pain including migraines and sometimes do not drive due to these headaches, so having reliable bus access on non-peak times is essential for being able to travel in safe ways. Please maintain 73 bus service to Jackson Park in the evenings and weekends.
Amy	Barnet	65	1	I ride the 65 to and from work at Seattle Childrens Hospital. Having a closer bus route would increase safety when I leave work @ 11:30 pm. I would also appreciate more frequent route times during the weekend, but realize that is not on the agenda at this time. Something to hope for in the future! Thank you.
Steven	Shaiman	78	2	I am writing because I own the house at 4331 NE 45th Street which is immediately across the street from the bus turnaround at Children's Hospital. My wife and I are planning to move into that house within the next few years. I am most concerned about the extended hours proposed for route 78 and its impact on the neighborhood. I would also like to see the use of the turnaround eliminated and the bus stop moved away from the residential portion of NE 45th Street. At this time, the buses are often quite noisy when they turn around because they often require backing up to make a second try. I am also very concerned about the additional number of people out on the street late at night. We have had difficulties in the past with a variety of objects disappearing from the front of the house and clearly additional foot traffic could exacerbate that problem as well as potentially adding additional safety problems. At a minimum, it would be great if the new route 78 could eliminate use of the bus turnaround and instead put a bus stop on the north side of NE 45th Street between 45th NE and 46th NE where there are no houses. This would also result in additional street parking for the residents on NE 45th Street, which is sorely needed (right now the bus requires parking spaces not be used to make its turnaround).
Ritva	Swartz	24	4	I am very pleased with the many improvements in Seattle bus schedules. However, they have not helped me or the people living in the end of bus line #24 in the evening after 8PM and therefore I continue repeating my request for the bus to the end of the line at Magnolia Blvd and Emerson. It is not much to ask, since the bus is already going to the village. Many others with me would be using it, if it is regularly available. Perhaps the bus would only need to take this extra mile whenever there is a rider wanting it past the village. This way we would not be captive in our homes. With all the increases in taxes and fees from us, we should be able to receive some benefit, too, I think. So far nobody has given me a reasonable answer to this request. Please consider this proposal carefully
Kevin	McGehee	66X	4	I am supportive overall of the recommended changes, but am disappointed that the 66X is moving to peak-only and there is no bus that is offering similar service during non-peak hours. I use the 66X currently outside of peak times to commute to and from my work in downtown Seattle (8th & Virginia). I do have some non-peak options nearby that run along 3rd Ave downtown (the 26X and 62), but these routes are slower (as they run west of Lake Union) than the 66X and do not drop me as close. I would like to see a bus that runs from Green Lake along Eastlake downtown during non-peak hours.
Deborah	Ritter	372	-	All I want to know is how do we make the connection from the light rail to the bus that will take us further north? Where is the bus stop and if it is on campus what will be done to ensure our safety. I come home from attending plays downtown and would never ever elect to walk across or on campus after dark.
<b>Transfer</b>				
Julie	Martina	75	--	I am a Seattle Children's medical provider, and I try to take the bus as often as I can to do my part in reducing the amount of traffic to the University district (and save my sanity!). Coming from Mill Creek, I catch one of many buses in Kenmore, and transfer to the 75 at 125th and Lake City Way. However, one of the drawbacks for me is that when I transfer buses, it can take up to 20 minutes to catch the 75. If it came more frequently, I would take the bus more often. Additionally, if I plan to leave work early one day, the 75 can take even longer in the middle of the day, which discourages me from using alternative transportation (i.e. bus service). Please consider the proposed route additions and amendments to help reduce the congestion and frustration of local Seattleites. Thank you!

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Brian	Ellis	16, 62, 26X	1	Further to my earlier comment on the folly of rerouting the 16 from Northgate, as a clarifying example, I live on 3rd Ave NE, north of Northgate Mall. If I currently want to get to the restaurants, bars and shopping on N 45th St and Stone Way N, I simply catch the 16 on NE Northgate Way. If this proposed change goes ahead, to make the same trip (being someone with walking difficulty), I would need to take THREE buses: the 41 to the Transit Center, the 26X to NE 45th St, then a 44 to the shopping/dining area. This will become the highly annoying and frustrating reality for ALL seniors and disabled passengers who want to access that part of Wallingford from Northgate. It is an utterly ridiculous change
Ryan	Newell	66, 71, 72, 73	1	Changes to these routes are horrible. Essentially my commute of ~25 minutes now turns into ~45 minutes and requires a transfer and additional walking to stops. I don't think you could have done any worse with these changes
Jeanette	Estberg	68, 71	1	Please maintain easy access between Northgate Transit Center and View Ridge Dear Council Members, My son Henry attends Ingraham High School. He relies on Metro bus service for his commute home after school, as do many other students. The Ingraham yellow bus shuttle takes students from Ingraham to Northgate Transit Center (NTC), at which point they hop on Metro buses to continue their afternoon commutes. Henry takes bus 68, transferring to bus 71, to get to stop #37560 which is a 10 minute walk from our home. It's not a perfect system because it takes a while with the transfer-- Henry arrives home about 3:45 (school is out at 2:20)-- but it works. Unfortunately, routes 68 and 71 are both slated to be deleted. None of the revised/proposed routes offer an easy way for Henry to get from NTC to our home. Please add bus service to cover kids like Henry who need to get from NTC to NE Seattle neighborhoods after school, in a reasonable amount of time and with as few transfers as possible.
Kathryn	Spaulding	72	1	I use the 72 to commute from lake city way and 95th and downtown and back when the 312E isn't running (f.ex if I have to commute mid-day). There isn't another bus option for this route that doesn't require multiple transfers during the day (off peak hours). Please consider providing convenient, one bus transportation on this route as not everyone only rides the buses during peak hours. The disconnect would force me to drive and parking downtown is ridiculous, as is traffic congestion.
T.A.	Graham	73	1	Re the change from a trip on a bus going straight downtown to a trip involving both a bus and the light rail: Does this mean that we will have to pay double now? A fare on the bus, and another on the light rail? So far as I know, the ORCA readers for paying rail fare do not accept transfer slips from the bus. Nor is there a way to receive a transfer slip from the light rail to apply to the bus.
William	Evenson	78	2	Do you get a transfer from the 78 bus to ride the light rail or is there a separate fee for that? If so, what the fees for riding the light rail from Husky Stadium to downtown. What is the fee from Husky Stadium to Seatac airport? Before arriving at Husky Stadium for the light rail, does route 78 go through the UW campus, south on 15th N.E., and east on Pacific? Another suggestion: Would it be possible for people to transfer (only) to buses in the U. Village or Safeway Parking Lot, that take them to the light rail through the UW parking lots, thereby avoiding the traffic on campus and on Montlake Blvd? Thank you for asking for comments.
Susan	Corwin	43	2	Reducing or eliminating 43 would force us to change busses when going downtown or to Group Health on 15th Ave on Capitol Hill. It would increase time on transit and probably compromise security on late night trips from downtown. An extra street corner bus-wait is certainly very poor for those going to Group Health for medical-related reasons and for those returning home late at night. I tutor at Seattle Central and would have to change busses to get there again increasing travel time; a serious inconvenience. This change carries serious disadvantages for all who live on the eastern side of North Capitol Hill and Montlake. Going to Univ. of Washington on the 48 is OK but the frequency will probably be lower than at present with two available routes (43 and 48). It is surprising that there will no longer be a direct bus from UW campus (near Medical Center and Oceanography) to downtown and Group Health.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Thomas	Sanford	71	2	I regret greatly the elimination of Rt. 71, which serves us so well for our travels in Wedgwood, View Ridge, Ravenna and U District on to downtown. I am an retired UW Faculty member and rely on this bus to get to UW, U Ave, groceries (QFC and PCC), shops and downtown activities and performances. My wife is disabled and uses a walker, so she uses the 71 bus now, usually without transfers. As I understand it, we would need transfers to do many of our activities and walk many blocks to get to Rt 65 or new Rt 78/76, instead of 1 block for Rt. 71 now. Yes, Rt. 78 is 1 block away, but we have to transfer to the 62 to get to View Ridge PCC and our interests on 65th St. Rt 76 is peak only. Some paths will require 2 or more transfers. With no weekend service on new 78, we are really disadvantaged. The multiple waits and transfer will be a real burden for both of us. We want to stay in our home as long as possible and public transportation is vitally important to us
Sarah	Deburle	16, 43	4	I have lived here for 50 years and have never been as angry about things happening in this city as I am now. The growth is terrible and now you want to change the route 16? It's a busy bus! Why I. The world should someone who lives in an inner city neighborhood have to transfer buses to get downtown, or take longer to get downtown? This is not okay!! People who live in the city should not have to transfer buses to go to work downtown! If people have to do that they will drive instead. You should be improving things not making them worse. With the number of people in the city now who are riding the bus you should be improving the bus system, not making it worse. The same goes for the 43!! People in montlake shouldn't have to go to the train to get downtown!! My mom is 80! Should she really have to go that far to get a bus!!
Susan	Aahl	16, 31, 32, 44	4	I ride the #16 bus to Northgate from Wallingford for my job. Transferring three times would make that route unreasonable for me. Using public transportation instead of driving needs to be somewhat comparable or people won't use it. Working at Northwest Hospital, I know that many of our patients also rely on bus service.
Richard	Vogt	31, 32, 26, 16	4	Please consider extending the 31/32 routes to the new light rail station by Husky Stadium. This would give direct access (without a bus change) to southern Wallingford, which would aid considerably in trips to the airport. Late night returns to the city currently have limited options re buses to the Wallingford area. Waiting for buses at midnight near 3rd and Pine are strange at best. It does at least look like the 44 would connect the new station to Wallingford, which would at least permit a downhill walk w luggage. A second option (32/33) would be helpful.
Mary	Vollert	16	4	: I read about the proposed two or three seat changes to the existing #16 bus route. I thought I must misunderstand this because the note on the Wallyhood paper was vague, without specifics. I have now read the details that have been published and I can not believe that this is being seriously considered. First, the #16 route needs additional buses to accommodate downtown workers. Rush hour in this city is obscene but particularly so going out toward Northgate. Why would you want to make it more challenging with multiple bus changes. The route goes through neighborhoods with a high property tax base, and you are going to lessen the public transit options. It also has been overbuilt and this is only going to continue. The new buildings are being built with fewer parking places, to encourage public transit. Why would you then make that option so unattractive. If you add in the medical, retail, educational services that are located in the Northgate area, why would you make it more difficult for the retired populations to get to and from this area using a single bus line? In my opinion and as a taxpayer, I believe changing route 16 to and from downtown to Northgate is without merit. Are changes being made to the #5 or #358?
LeMoyne	Mueller	16, 345, 346, 347, 348, 66/67, 68, 40, 41, 44, D, E	4	I am in my mid-70s and as near as I can tell the proposed changes will either add one more bus, a 20 minute walk or both to get me to where I need to go. As I continue into my senior years ease of getting where I need to go will become more difficult, not easier nor more convenient. The upside is hopefully more folks on buses at the expense of my mobility

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Frame	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Anna	Johansen	43	4	If the #43 is discontinued, my travel from Wallingford to 15th Ave. E and East John on Capitol Hill on Sundays will go from one bus (because the 44 continued as the 43) and a half hour travel to three busses and an hour plus because every transfer multiplies the opportunity for missed connections and standing in the rain. This change does not increase my motivation to ride the bus. It makes me want to buy a car.
Ann	Irish	71, 72, 73	8	Fairly often I travel from Vashon Island to UW. I walk on to a ferry, take bus 118 or 116 or C from Fauntleroy to downtown Seattle and then 71, 72 or 73 to campus. I understand that 73 will continue this service, but just once every half hour. If my timing makes the new light rail service more convenient, will my bus transfer (via Orca card) work? In other words, many riders to campus will be traveling from a Metro bus to downtown. Will such riders transferring on to the light rail train then have to pay the light rail fare PLUS a bus fare? How will this work? Thanks for answering my question.
<b>Miscellaneous Comments not necessarily related to proposed restructure</b>				
Rachel	Christiansen	7, 8	2	I have a few requests: All Metro Transit buses need to have functioning heaters during cooler weather. I got bronchitis last year sitting on freezing buses that the driver stated had no control over changing the temperature. I suffered greatly and missed many days of work. I think this is cruel to your customers and to me specifically. You need to have readable marquis so people know what bus is coming and what bus they just missed! The number 7 bus is generally an electric motored bus which does not have air conditioning. Imagine sitting or standing in 90 degree weather with no air conditioning on a crowded bus for 40 to 50 minutes. I think this is unconscionable, and cruel to people of limited means. Now that the temperature has lowered to mid 60's and low 70's the number 7 bus has gas motorized buses that DO have air conditioning. What is Metro Transit thinking???
Rachel	Christiansen	7, 8	2	This 7 route often misses runs making me late to work. What is going on with this? I depend on the bus to get to work and you say that you have made all these improvements. Hello, I do not see may tax dollars at work. I see overpaid administrators making decisions that seem irrational and at worst, vindictive when they cut the 7 express route when loosing the levy election. Does anyone at Metro Transit care about all this??? The number 8 bus has been rerouted to MLK JR Way which is now being used as a detour because of the construction on 23rd Ave. Can Metro Transit try to find another route for this detour because it is clogged with diverted cars?
Janice	Van Cleve	2, 11, 12	2	How does the Rapid Transit plan for Madison fit into this overall Metro plan?
Marco	Lopez	--	2	I don't ride the bus. Mainly because all routes lead downtown before going out to Bellevue. A typical commute can take over an hour, which is 40 minutes longer than the trip takes by car most times.
Charlene	Whitworth	26 28 31 32 40	4	Metro should try 24/7 Customer Service. I don't understand Metro thinking they can have an effective Metro service without 24/7 customer service.
Max	Severeid	16	4	: It is imperative that King County Metro increase the use of quieter/hybrid or electric buses as well as smaller/lighter buses during sleeping hours. My wife and I moved onto Woodlawn Ave in the last two years and were very surprised by the noise and vibrations from bus and truck traffic. We have already spent over \$15,000 in sound mitigation efforts to reduce sound and vibration from buses and trucks. This has included new fencing, sound absorbing synthetic materials and sound consultants; unfortunately, these efforts have not proven effective. While truck traffic dissipates during sleeping hours, bus traffic does not. We measure ~80 decibels of noise from metro buses passing our house in our bedroom. This doesn't account for the ground vibrations of the buses rumbling past. While we support and use metro, efforts to reduce sound and vibration need to be enacted.
Laila	Barr	26, 26X	4	I find the "X" designation on bus routes very very confusing. Why not reserve the X for peak-hour routes only, that will make such instantly identifiable. More than once have I been at the Northgate Transit Center and helped folks get downtown faster when I overheard them debating whether they should take the 66x (which makes a few limited stops on Eastlake and for that reason has earned the X) or the 41, which is the true express, making no stops at all between Northgate and downtown Seattle.
Heidi	Copeland	48, 542	4	Currently, I take either bus Metro 48 or Sound Transit 542 from the Ravenna P & R to get to work at UW/MC. I was wondering if the UPass/ORCA that is issued from UW & is paid from my check bi-monthly will be the means by which I would pay for the Light Rail trips that I would eventually take. Thanks for your input.



Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 25 through October 5, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Karl	Rodrigues	156	5	<p>I travel to work at the airport, which operates 27/7 , 7 days a week. Therefore I am obliged to work on Saturdays and Sundays. I live i Des Moines and therefore use Route 156 to get to work. However, i have great difficulty going to work on weekends as this route only operate once an hours. If the frequency of this route was increased to every hour in weekends, I would not have to wait an hour or leave for work an hour earlier. Thanks for your understanding</p>
Don	Burkhardt	--	6	<p>I remain deeply skeptical about Metro's Transit-oriented development (TOD) program. I am more inclined to see it as Metro selling off hard-won and increasingly scarce Park and Ride property in our ever-concentrating urban setting. Using the South Kirkland Park &amp; Ride lot as my most visible example, the cynic in me sees the program as providing public land to commercial interests who then provide minimal parking in support of their development. It's a real-life version of Monopoly's free parking space! Sure, they build a big garage to replace the displaced parking spaces, but I suspect that the hundreds of added residents and their guests soak up all that ballyhooed increased capacity and then some. It summary, large tracts of property in urban areas convenient to transportation corridors are scarce to non-existent, difficult if not impossible to replace once they're gone, and thus should be highly valued by KingCo for their primary purpose. They should be prized and protected public assets, not given over to those who gaze upon it with envious eyes and realize its true value even if their government does not. If there is room for development in these spaces, then that's room that by rights should be utilized for additional transit parking or transportation-oriented purposes, not commercial development. We keep hearing about our regions growth and the challenges that beings. These spaces are our hedge against that growth, today's excess capacity is tomorrow's urgent need. And it should go without saying that once lost, forever gone. All this soruces from my fear that Metro is setting the stage to do a TOD thing at the Houghton P&amp;R. They have cut all commuter service to/from that lot with one exception (#277), only local routes now use that facility and those routes by-in-large do not require parking. As such Metro is now reporting the lot has declining usage which will inevitably lead to the conclusion that it is underutilized. Metro's next step is looming in my windshield: "Let's sell some of that under-utilized property for TOD!" There is a real wolf / henhouse issue here. Those designing bus routes should not have the capability to render property excess by virtue of their routing decisions, and subsequently declare it surplus when they themselves have created that surplus! What is clear is that the region continues to grow by leaps and bounds, transportation will always be an issue, and so we should at a minimum hang on to what we've got, rather than dealing it away in bits and pieces until it is largely gone. The Houghton facility has a large P&amp;R lot, quick access on and off ramps in both directions, freeway "fly-by" stops, local route connector stops, and even that rarest of beasts as recently written up in the Seattle Times. an official Metro bathroom facility! With all that, it sure seems like Metro cannot decide whether and how to use this well-designed and comprehensive facility Lastly, the much recent investment rebuilding of the Houghton Freeway fly-by stations seems out of line with the fact that nearly no busses stop at those stations! Many Seattle-bound (and outbound) commuter busses drive on by to Totem Lake, Woodinville, and beyond, but do not stop at these freeway stations. Why that is remains a mystery to me. Use 'em if they're there, but don't spend a pile of money on them and then not use them.</p>

## **Deletions along large portions of Metro #16 bus route being proposed for 2016**

King County Council:

I suggest that deletions proposed by Metro Transit along the #16 bus route be delayed, reconsidered, or NOT IMPLEMENTED AT ALL.

### **1.) Metro has been less than fully forthcoming in their public notifications about proposed service deletions.**

The lack of adequate notification to route #16 riders prevented my timely feedback (and that of many others) from being heard. Metro has indeed done a lot of general outreach work, but I believe that they have generally omitted mentioning their proposed service deletions to our specific #16 route. Most Metro notifications concerned new and increased service to other parts of town, to the University District, to Link light rail, and to proposed new east-west bus service.

There may have been Metro notifications of service deletions somewhere, but I as a #16 bus rider, I DID NOT SEE ONE WORD ON POSTERS ABOUT PROPOSED SERVICE DELETIONS. I saw only posters proclaiming "more buses, more and changed services, thank you taxpayers". Such publicity would hardly have elicited full comments from numerous local folks unaware that they might be losing parts of their bus service.

**My suggestion:** Delay these service deletions until riders along the existing #16 route could be fully informed and allowed to comment.

### **2.) Moving the #16 route off of Aurora Avenue and onto the congested Fremont Bridge – recently increased congestion and delays.**

Moving the #16 route off of fast Aurora Ave and into congested Fremont, with its recently increased Fremont Bridge boat traffic and increased openings every day, makes no sense. Metro has asserted that bus travel via Fremont and Dexter Ave historically added only "5-8 minutes" of extra travel time. That was based on old data. Because of the recent and sudden uptick in population and boat traffic around Lake Union, The Fremont Bridge now opens an average (and growing) of twenty-two times every day! (Seattle Times, 9/1/2015).

With the current twenty-plus minutes of delay and traffic congestion at every bridge opening, with multiple "more frequent" buses stacked up both ways on this proposed new Fremont Bridge route, and with waiting almost constantly for that bridge and its increasing congestion, I believe that any kind of reliable #16 bus scheduling across the Fremont Bridge would become unrealistic at best, a shambles at worst.

Interchanging the #16 and #26 routings between 40<sup>th</sup>/Stone Way and downtown is disruptive and seems without any real advantage.

**My suggestion:** Leave the #16 route to Seattle Center/Belltown/downtown on relatively rapid Aurora Avenue.

**3.) Deletion of rapid Wallingford-to-downtown service. Metro’s statement, “Riders in Wallingford would continue to have all-day service to Downtown Seattle via Aurora Avenue on revised Route 26X” – is misleading and simply untrue.**

The proposed new 26X would take peripheral back roads around the outside edges of Wallingford. It would entirely avoid the presently well served and rapidly developing Stone Way corridor and the highly populated and busy downtown Wallingford business district.

**My suggestion:** Do not tamper with the existing rapid and massively used #16 service via Aurora Ave. between the Wallingford business district and Seattle Center/Belltown/downtown.

**4.) Loss of #16 services to Northgate and environs.**

The deletion of #16 services to North Seattle College, UW/Meridian Medical Centers, Northwest Hospital, and Northgate is unreasonably disruptive to those residents who have become dependent upon this route. Residents of several large retirement homes depend on the #16 for access to their medical care. For over forty years, residents along the #16 have chosen where they live based, in part, on the long term, stable, existence of that bus route.

**My suggestion:** Maintain existing #16 services circling Northgate.

**5.) Better east-west transit connections.**

Better east-west transit connections would certainly be commendable... but it seems that we could more easily solve the problem by simply extending the #26 out into northeast Seattle from its present dead-end at Green Lake. Metro could then have avoided disrupting all of our #16 riders who have lived near and depended upon that direct north-south #16 connection for so long.

**My suggestion:** Extend the existing #26 service into northeast Seattle, leave the #16 as-is. The #16 ain’t broke. Don’t fix it!

**6.) Overall, Metro’s proposed 2016 system changes are massive, numerous, and multi-faceted. Because of Metro’s highly focused and less-than-fully disclosive outreach program, many of their proposals (in addition to these #16 service deletions) cannot be properly vetted amongst affected and fully-informed transit patrons.**

**My suggestion:** Take these changes in smaller doses, announce them clearly, and take time to consider all of the various components separately and rigorously. One giant swallow for the entire City and County is very unlikely to produce much wisdom or a fulfilling legacy.

**To summarize:**

Seattle residents choose where to live based, in part, on stable, reliable public transit routes within walking distance of their homes. Metro should make transit service deletions that disrupt residents only with very significant and compelling evidence of necessity. Transit patrons should be clearly and fully informed of proposed service cuts. That has not yet happened. Each deletion should be considered separately, carefully, and with adequate time spent on each element.

Please don't just rubber-stamp these current Metro proposals for service deletions.

Thank you.

Richard Smallwood  
5311 Wallingford Ave N  
Seattle WA 98103  
206-633-0700  
rsmallwd@gmail.com

cc.: The Seattle Times  
Jesse Jones, KIRO TV

UNIVERSITY HOUSE  
4400 Stone Way N.  
Seattle, WA. 98103

September 12, 2015


Dear Friends and Colleagues,

Attached are copies of a petition we are sending to the King County Council in an effort to prevent the discontinuation of the Metro bus #16 N, and the re-routing of the #16 bus S. The #16 bus N goes to the Northgate Mall and various medical clinics Services, schools and businesses; losing the #16 bus would require changes and delays to important destinations for many. The re-routing of the #16 bus S. will create delays to many downtown concerts, events, theatrical performances and businesses.

We are requesting your assistance in having as many people as possible sign the petition. Since the Council is meeting regarding this issue on September 29<sup>th</sup>, it is important that the petitions reach them in advance so that all members will see them. We have enclosed a stamped, addressed envelope to:

Ms. Mary Bourguignon  
King County Council  
516 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave., Suite 1200  
Seattle, WA. 98104

Thank you for your support.

  
Amy Godes, U.H. Committee





TO: HON. EDWARD MURRAY, MAYOR  
 ROD DEDMBOWSKI, CHAIRMAN, TRANSPORTATION COMM.  
 LARRY PHILLIPS, KING COUNTY COUNCIL

FROM: UNIVERSITY HOUSE COMMITTEE  
 % AMY GODES, 4400 Stone Way N., #103  
 Seattle, Wa. 98103

PETITION

THE BUS ROUTE WE MUST SAVE!

We, the undersigned citizens of King County, strongly protest the routing changes projected for the Metro Bus #16, including and especially the discontinuation of the #16 North to the Northgate Mall. It will necessitate riders taking two and three buses instead of the #16 direct, creating a true hardship for working people, seniors, disabled people, students, and parents with baby carriages. Besides causing hazardous crossings to reach bus stops, it would extend travel time to many vital destinations, i.e. to Polyclinic, North Seattle Community College, Group Health, UW Northgate Clinic, PacMed, NW Hospital, high schools, Planned Parenthood and Northgate Mall shops and business, etc., adding delays to employees attempting to get to work in a timely fashion.

It is therefore imperative that the #16 bus be continued in its current routings to service these people and institutions; many businesses and stores at Northgate Mall depend on it to conveniently transport their customers.

The re-routing of the #16 bus south will increase travel time delaying passengers going to events at Benaroya Hall, Seattle Art Museum, the Public Library, theatres and other destinations in the busy downtown area. Access from bus stops would become perilous for many riders.

Please join with this effort to maintain the CURRENT ROUTING FOR BUS #16 by signing this petition below.

PRINT NAME	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS	EMAIL (Optional)
Kathryn Sæther	K. Sæther	2500 Dexter N #E	
Ashley Larson	Ashley Larson	9221 Greenwood Ave N, Seattle, WA 98103	
Victoria Dzenis	Victoria Dzenis	314 NE 57th St. Seattle, 98105	
Lynne Heverson	Lynne Heverson	307 NW 84th St. 98107	
Loretta Karsveter	L. Karsveter	1515 NW 57th St #405	
Michael J. Kopcho	Michael J. Kopcho	4715 NE 54th St 98105	
Kathryn Humphrey	KATHRYN HUMPHREY	501 NE Ravenna Blvd.	
GLADYS GREGG	Gladys Gregg	501 NE Ravenna Blvd #306 Seattle 98115	
Sarah Buckley	Sarah Buckley	5722 Keystone Pl. 98103	
Nikki Donofio	N. Donofio	4009 15th Ave NE #323 Seattle, WA 98105	
Candace Barnes	Candace Barnes	4532 Sunnyside Ave N Sea 98103	
Jean Passwell	Jean Passwell	4211 Woodlawn N Sea 98103	
Doreen Fuld	Doreen Fuld	1831 No 57 98105	
KL Fuld	KL Fuld	1831 No 57 98105	
Ramona J Memmer	Ramona Memmer	4224 Wallingford St 98103	
Gary London	Gary London	1820 N 52nd St 98103	
KAISALONDON	Kaisal London	1820 N 52nd St 98103	
Karen Volpe	Karen Volpe	2104 N. 52nd St 98103	
Diane Morgan	Diane Morgan	2122 N. 53rd St 98103	
Karen Dobbs	Karen Dobbs	332 NE 53rd 98105	
Terry Cook	Terry Cook	6718 Polabine Ave N 98103	
Jean Temple	Jean Temple	1701 E MARVEL ST. 98112	
Anne Wilson	Anne Wilson	1042 NE 9th St 98115	
Horna Brown	Horna Brown	5702 Woodlawn N. 98103	
STANLEY ERWIN	Stanley Erwin	2203 NW 62nd St 98107	
EUGENIE HARSIS	Eugenie Harsis	4530 MERIDIAN AVEN 98103	



