

**Comments on the Proposed Metro Service Change
Received by the King County Council
Through September 10, 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://www.kingcounty.gov/council/issues/2016-transit-service-change.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 are printed on the pages that follow. An updated database of these comments, with contact information, is made available to Council offices each day so that Councilmembers and their staff can review comments as they are submitted.

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 (14) noted that the proposed restructure would decrease their walking distance to a stop or would make taking transit more convenient. However, many (100) expressed concern that the proposed service changes would require them to walk farther to a stop or to change their travel patterns.
- **Frequency.** A total of 61 commenters expressed support for the additional frequency proposed with the restructure. However, six commenters expressed concern that routes they use would not run frequently enough to meet their needs.
- **Network Connections.** Nearly one-third of commenters (117) expressed support for the connections to light rail and the overall transit network that would be provided through the restructure. However, six commenters expressed concern that they would not have access to an adequate transit network.
- **Off-Peak Service.** A dozen commenters provided input on off-peak service. Four expressed support for additional off-peak service; but eight expressed concern about lack of off-peak service, particularly on weekends.
- **Transfers.** The restructure as proposed would entail transfers to light rail or another bus for some transit riders. A total of 10 commenters expressed support for transfers, noting that their total travel time would decrease due to the higher

speed of the light rail connection; but 21 commenters expressed concern about the need to transfer.

In addition to these comments, seven commenters provided miscellaneous comments that were not specifically about the proposed service changes but addressed other transit-related issues.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Distance & Convenience				
Colin	Chaddock	67	1	I could not be more pleased with the proposed changes to the 67. The 67 switches from being a specialty bus, only for those who want to reach the U-district into a vital link to downtown. My trip downtown might not gain much speed during rush hour, but it will be immensely better during all other times of day, and I expect it will be more reliable at all times. If Metro intentionally ignores the billions of dollars that King County Taxpayers have voted overwhelmingly to spend on University Link because of a few noisy objections, it will demonstrate a profound lack of leadership. Working together with Link is the key to allowing Metro to more effectively manage its resources while continuing to serve the Seattle public with frequent, reliable bus service. One-seat rides downtown every half an hour are not an acceptable use of my tax money, especially when they come at the expense of leveraging the huge infrastructure investment that King County taxpayers chose to make.
Tom	Faber	8, 11, 30, 62, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75	1	I'm super happy with the latest metro restructure proposal! I live in Sandpoint, and work in Pioneer Square. I have a child at school at Bush. All our commutes will be more convenient after these changes. The 62 will make it easier for us to get crosstown. I won't miss the 30, 71, or 72 as there will be reasonable alternatives. Having the 75 come more often throughout the day will be a huge help and make my family use it much more often. Thanks!
Daniel	Behrman	65	2	I commute to UW and/or downtown every single day. It is imperative that the 65 bus line goes as close to the UW stadium stop as possible while also running through campus.
Justin	Hansen	26, 16	2	I support the changes proposed to NE Seattle routes and particularly the 26 and 16 improvements. I expect these changes will improve the way I use the bus system.
Evan	Nelson	8	2	I support the proposed changes, with a couple of minor reservations. I'm not sure why the 8 needs to stay on Madison between 19th and 23rd, but it's a small distance and I can live with it as long as the transfer to the 48 at 23rd is improved over the current situation. I also believe the 8 absolutely needs higher frequency on Sundays. If Prop 1 funding is available this should be at the top of the priority list. Ideally, Link would run later on Friday and Saturday nights than it does now, but in lieu of this, key routes need to run until at least 2 am to help prevent drunk driving. The 8, 11, and possibly an additional run or two on the 49 would make sense.
John	Nicholson	30, 65, 68, 74, 75	2	I look forward to the completion of the Husky Stadium and Capitol Hill light rail stations. I live in the Sand Point/Laurelhurst area and hope to be able to access light rail regularly from the Husky Stadium station to access Capitol Hill, downtown, the south end, and the airport. But, it is critical that bus routes be increased in areas that are beyond walking distance from the light rail stations in order to get people to the stations. The bus routes I have identified are those that serve my area that I commonly use to get around, especially to and from downtown Seattle. I urge Metro to increase service in my area in a way that allows people to easily access the new light rail system. Specifically, Metro should add new routes to and from the Husky Stadium Station and/or reroute current routes to and from Husky Stadium Station.
Greg	Hardgrave	48	4	PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE reconsider the placement of where the 48 gets split in the U-District. It really should be at the U-Link/Husky Stadium station, not at 45th in the U-District. Someone traveling from Roosevelt or Green Lake shouldn't need to take two buses to get to the closest light rail station, particularly when there was a bus that WOULD have gotten them there that was removed/alterred. NOTE: ADDITIONAL COMMENT ADDED SEPT 1: After doing a little digging, I realized that I was mistaken, and that the new proposed route 45 was exactly what I was hoping for. So I'd like to withdraw my comment.
Andrew	Enfield	44, 62, 16	4	I'm excited to see the changes that Metro is proposing - this plan has a major and very positive set of changes that will improve North Seattle transportation for most people. As a Wallingford resident, the new 62 route looks really great - I know I'll be able to use it more than the 16, because it goes to Fremont and Sand Point: two areas for which I currently use a car. I'm also happy to hear that the 44 may be increasing in frequency - to improve connections to U-Link. Great job - please push forward with these changes. As council members, I think one of your jobs is to make the right choices to improve living in Seattle for most people... not just to listen to a loud minority that doesn't want to change from what they have now. The right thing for most Seattle residents is to go forward with these changes, and to encourage Metro to continue to improve service like they're doing now.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Gary	Simonson	48	4	The proposed Northeast Seattle changes to the system are excellent. I support them 100%. It will help me because splitting up the 48 will improve reliability and speed. As for Capitol Hill, I preferred the alignment in Alternative 1 to what is currently proposed, but if the current proposal is the only way to move Northeast forward than I'll support it. From what I've heard the main issues people have are with the Capitol Hill portion, not the Northeast portion, so if you do go back to the drawing board please spend more time on Capitol Hill (not sure the sharp turn onto 19th is necessary and seems to be a point of contention).
Geoff	Eseltine	8, 48, 70	4	I bus frequently in the areas that will be most impacted by these changes (U-District, Cap Hill) and believe whole-heartedly that they should be accepted. We need better transit and this is a good step in the right direction. Implementing these changes sends a strong message that Metro and King County are serious about addressing traffic, commute times and climate change. These changes need to take place and will benefit myself as well as the clients I serve. I hope to see them implemented in full.
Richard	Goldfarb	16, 26, 26X	4	I'm a strong supporter of the restructure in Wallingford. It will doubly make the 26X more reliable and more frequent (and the 26 will no longer be slowed down by the bridge or the crush of people on Dexter), plus it will end at a functional place in Northgate, instead of a random spot near Green Lake. I go to the doctor at Northgate and so will be able to get there by one bus ride. The change to the 16 will likewise make it more reliable by avoiding its long northern tail, plus connecting Wallingford and the neighborhoods along 65th street (and eventually the Roosevelt station).
Alexandra	Frackelton	16	4	In general, I'm supportive of the changes in the restructuring proposal. However, the changes that directly affect my commute will increase travel time on the 16 substantially between Wallingford and downtown. There should be a better option between Wallingford Center and downtown (and the E Line and the 26 are not really a good replacement for most people). The E Line is a decent option for me after the restructuring, but I would strongly recommend better accommodations for combining bike and bus trips to and from the stop on Aurora.
Kendel	Murrant	8	8	To the King County Council Members: I moved to Seattle two years ago and intentionally left my car behind, knowing that there was an excellent bus service here. I live in Capitol Hill, work in Queen Anne, and socialize and recreate all across this beautiful city and county. Today, I specifically want to address route 8. By comparison to the other routes I ride, route 8, as it stands now, is the most predictably late, predictably full, and predictably unreliable, which is a shame as it's the route I take to work every day. I find myself planning to take the bus 1 hour early for what should be a 20-minute ride because I never know how late it's going to be. Sometimes, walking the length of Denny is faster than waiting for the bus. This is a problem. I am hugely in favor of shortening the route; the current route being so long, I believe, is the main contributor as to why it so frequently runs 15-25 minutes late or more by the time it reaches me in Capitol Hill. I am also in favor of extending the operating hours later on the weekend. This bus is my ride home after a long day at work, and having more flexibility would make a big impact for the better. Thank you for hearing my thoughts on this matter. I love living here, and I am genuinely thankful for the Metro and am happy to use its services every day!
Eric	Herde	65, 71	--	While I was disappointed in the slight reduction in late night (after midnight) service to Wedgewood, I can clearly see that overall the proposed changes will greatly improve transit service for northeast Seattle. If the choice is between approving the proposed changes with no amendments and weakening the improvements, I strongly urge you to approve the changes.
Cheryl	Marks	72	1	Metro is eliminating the 72 and expects the current riders to walk up to a half-mile to get to another bus stop. I have mobility issues and will not be able to use the bus if this plan goes through. I work downtown. As it is now, it takes 45 minutes to get to work in the morning. In the evening it takes me close to an hour and a half. The 72 is packed during the commute times -- and Metro is getting rid of it. Please do something to protect the 72.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
William	Baslock	242	1	The recommended changes state that Metro would use resources saved by trimming bus service that duplicates the new Link service. This is not the case with the 242 bus. The Link service will not touch anywhere along the 242 route, and will provide no benefit to anyone who commutes on that bus. The proposed elimination of the 242 route would force riders to either drive or take time-consuming transfers: To drive from North Seattle to Redmond, a typical 242 passenger would have to commute on I-5 south to 520, or take 522 to 405. Both of which are already highly congested routes. Seattle highways do not have room for the hundreds of drivers this elimination would create. To ride from North Seattle to Redmond, a disenfranchised 242 passenger would have to take a local bus to either the Northgate Transit Center or the Greenlake Park and Ride, and then catch a Sound Transit bus (or two) to the east side. This is onerous in the extreme. It is often faster to ride the 41 downtown to catch the Sound Transit bus. The proposed mitigation (replacing the 66X with new route 63) adds 7-8 runs per hour on 5th Avenue NE, an already overburdened residential street. This is impractical and obnoxious. Furthermore it reduces available service to the University and to Eastlake. Metro' proposed a change that is poorly conceived and damaging. It seeks to reduce duplication where no duplication exists, at great cost to its riders.
Brian	Ellis	16	1	For years now Metro has been steadily reducing the buses that service the north side of Northgate Mall, along NE Northgate Way & 5th Avenue. The first to go were the 66 & 67 which used to stop and start in the Park & Ride at 112th & 5th, behind Target. That Park & Ride was turned into a mediocre park and the buses terminated at the Transit Center, on the south side of the mall, over 1km away. Now they are trying (yet again) to have the 16 removed from servicing the north side of the mall by diverting it at Green Lake and sending it off to Sandpoint. This will have a negative impact in several ways. Firstly there are many elderly and disabled riders who live along 3rd Ave NE and 5th Ave NE (at least 2 large retirement/assisted living complexes), who rely on the 16 to get them to the various clinics along Meridian. If this change takes place, then there will be no bus service between 5th Ave NE and Meridian Avenue along NE Northgate Way, and everyone will need to trek all the way down to the Transit center in order to catch a bus to Meridian. This is not fair on the elderly and disabled, who have mobility issues at the best of times. Secondly, if the 16 is diverted to Sandpoint, Northgate will no longer have a bus that services the shops and restaurants along 45th in Wallingford, Stone Way and Fremont over Aurora. The 26X (again, starting at the Northgate Transit Center), has been touted as a replacement route, but that crosses 45th just beside I-5, both in the sketchy part of 45th and also downhill from the main shopping stretch of Wallingford, almost a mile away from that point. Considering Northgate is considered an Urban Village, removing such an important route is in no way an improvement, and will only result in hardship for many residents living on the north side of the mall.
Mika	Munari	72, 73	1	I recently saw the latest information on proposed March 2016 Metro Transit service change. For the residence who live in North Seattle, the proposed change does not make much sense. I understand that Metro would like to make smaller changes once a while depending on the ridership. However elimination of 72 and change they are proposing on route 73 would result in decrease in ridership and further more, potential increase in car rides in this area to University District/Downtown areas. Northern most light rail station that would be opening next year is one at University of Washington by Husky stadium. None of UW-Northgate station would not open for years after that. Can't Metro wait till 2012, when Northgate light rail station opens, to make any major change on bus routes that serve North Seattle? Why do you have to change it now? Please see the change on 73. People who live in Pinehurst and Olympic Hill will loose direct route to get to University District on weekend completely. Metro may say that we can transfer. Well, as residence, I know the safety of these area is not longer very good, we don't have side walk and some street lacks street light. It is not just because of the convenience but due to safety issue, people prefer to take their car instead of transferring bus to get to U district/downtown. This, obviously, will beat the purpose of Metro Transit. As a residence of the area affected by route 72 and 73 proposed change, I sincerely ask you to wait to make this kind of drastic changes till 2012 when we have better access to light rail and when Northgate becomes one of the multi transit center.
Dina	Myers	68	1	Elimination of this route (68) makes it impossible to get from Maple Leaf to the east side of U W Campus, Husky Stadium and the new lite rail station, and University Village to shop or work without a transfer. We will probably have to buy a second car to accommodate our current schedules. Not the result I think you are looking for!

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Andrew	Becker	312, 372, 72	1	If the 72 is going to be cancelled, it would be very beneficial for Victory Heights bus-riders if the North and South-bound bus stops near 104th Street (technically stop #38200 and #38590) would be serviced by the 312 and 372 routes. As it is, southbound Victory Heights residents that take these routes have to cross Lake City Way, walk 7-8 blocks, and then re-cross LCW to catch their bus. Currently, the above stops are only serviced by the 72 route. I would like to request that the 312 and 372 routes be added to these stops as a matter of both convenience and safety.
Scott	McAlear	64X, 76, 71, 62, 78	1	i was expecting, possibly, to have to transfer to get downtown once the link station opens, but this convoluted plan is far worse than imagined. A huge swath of Wedgwood/View Ridge will no longer have bus service on weekends or later at night. Many residents chose to live in this area because of the bus service that has existed for decades at those hours. The 78 replacement for the 71 takes a convoluted route to get to the rail station. It appears to travel through campus (as well as boondoggling through Laurelhurst), and still requires a long walk to the station. Even worse, it doesn't run on weekends or after 10:30 meaning cars will now be needed to travel to evening & weekend events downtown. The 62, whilst at least running on nights & weekends is useless! It may eventually end up downtown, but it travels more like a ride the ducks vehicle via Green Lake, Wallingford, Fremont, Lake Union... Fine for tourists, but of little use for us in northeast Seattle. Presumably Metro want us to transfer twice, once to the 65, and then again to link to get downtown. I fail to see how detouring a bus across north Seattle is an enhancement. Finally, while increasing service in south Lake Union is a noble idea, you have detoured the 64x through there. The beauty of the 64x is that it is an express along 65th as well as up I5. By adding the detour into south Lake Union you are negating that advantage & slowing the trip into northeast Seattle again.
Matthew	Nicholson	71, 76	1	I live at the top of View Ridge and would like to see a route that takes me to the Husky Stadium station, at least at rush hour times. The 71 gets me the closest however it involves a 3/4 mile walk through or around the UW campus.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Alexander	Barber	41, 66, 67, 68, 71, 72, 73, 77, 373	1	<p>Dear King County Councilmembers, Today, because of an action alert post on the Seattle Transit Blog, you as a council will be getting a lot of feedback about how you should proceed with the changes because some change is better than no change at all. I would argue, on behalf of the members of our community who are less likely to be technologically savvy and respond to an online forum, that poorly thought-out changes can sometimes have more negative effects than keeping the status quo. Having been involved in the Link Connections outreach since the beginning, unsuccessfully applying to the sounding board, and then being invited to sit in on the meetings, I have seen firsthand how much time has been put into this restructure by metro staff. For that, there can be nothing but appreciation. However, based on the ongoing feedback I hear from fellow riders, students, employees, and commuters, this change is seeming more and more rushed and counterproductive. I do not doubt the process has had community input, but as recently graduated high school student and member of the Maple Leaf community, there is far too much anxiety about a change that is supposed to be a large improvement. These are the same riders and voters who just fought to approve Prop 1 to preserve and expand the bus service we care so deeply about. Even if a resident of North Seattle doesn't use the bus on a daily basis, the bus system helps alleviate traffic and congestion throughout the region. What we are facing with this new alternative is a proposal that in many cases degrades access to quality transit service for north Seattle residents. Examples of this include the loss of evening and weekend service along 15th Ave NE, requiring all Pinehurst and Jackson Park residents to transfer between infrequent service for a simple trip to the U District and the loss of any U District connection along NE 65th, prohibiting easy access to U Link and requiring an hour or more to get Downtown otherwise. University Link will transform the North Seattle and Capitol Hill transportation scene but until it opens, we have no idea how its existence will change the travel patterns of the riders who currently use metro and all of those who currently use a car. When I board the bus in Maple Leaf, I see a multigenerational family from Jackson Park on the way to the U District, I see a retired couple from Wedgwood on their way to the Symphony downtown, and I see a women with her dog on the way to the food bank at 15th and 50th. These are just a few of the many riders who will have to alter their travel if these changes go through. An eight minute Link ride is nothing to sneeze at, but wouldn't it be better to let University Link open first and then change the network once we have the facts and figure to support it. This approach would avoid generating mistrust among voters who passed Prop 1 to save and expand their service, and instead generate excitement to improve access to U Link once everyone realizes how easy, fast, and great it is. I am not opposed to these changes on principle, but in the interest of speaking for those in my neighborhood and community who would be most effected, I am advocating for a "wait and see approach," postponing these changes until a few months after U Link opens, until more can be seen on how they will affect rider behavior. In the meantime, focusing on improving existing bus stops and connections at Husky Stadium and Broadway/John would be a worthy task to minimize the inconvenience and walking distance for all riders. (i.e. a five minute multi-story climb between a Link Station and Stevens Way on the UW Campus is not acceptable for the vast majority of the non-youth aged population).</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration of the many opinions surrounding this divisive topic.</p>

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Ann	Testroet	66, 67	1	<p>Removing the current route 66 bus service from Northgate down 5th Ave NE to Roosevelt and downtown is a bad idea. This is making it impossible to get to the Northgate Transit Center from 5th Ave NE. I'll have to drive up to that Park 'n Ride in order to use the 41 in the future. These proposed changed to the 66 and 67 bus routes do not serve people on the west side of Maple Leaf well at all, especially those of us who live west of 5th Ave NE. Another problem with removing the current 66 bus is that there is no way to get to Roosevelt in the U-District, and to Eastlake. I have taken a close look at the proposed new route 67, and it's going to be a slow ride down to the Stadium light rail station. Roosevelt Avenue in Maple Leaf is really backed up already since there's a dedicated bike lane, only one lane of traffic each way with no place for buses to pull over, and a new, popular Maple Leaf Reservoir park that draws a lot of people who are crossing Roosevelt to get there. Then when you get to University Ave NE that is going to be slow going as well. This is a milk run bus route, and it is going to take forever. Looking at the travel times you have published, you are saying it's going to take 30-40 minutes to get from Northgate to the Stadium station on the new route 67. Add on the time it's going to take to get to the light rail platform, wait for a light rail train to show up and then get downtown and you are talking over an hour of travel time. This is not efficient! In contrast the 41 will get to downtown still much faster from Northgate, and in six years the light rail will be running from the Northgate station. I really, truly hope you'll be restoring bus service on 5th Ave NE up to the Northgate transit center by then!!! I get that you are trying to funnel people to the Stadium light rail station, and that makes sense from maybe NE 80th Street and southward. However if you live north of 80th, and certainly on NE 90th Street like I do it makes much more sense to go to the Northgate Transit Center and take the 41 from there, especially when the current 66/67 bus route is an efficient and quick way to get to the transit center. Just as the airlines say the closest exit may be behind you, in Maple Leaf the fastest way downtown is to go north to the Northgate Transit center and then take the 41 express bus from there. SDOT recently started to do a study called "Roosevelt to Downtown HCT Project Definition" and if you look at the map that shows their route you will see that it is the current Metro bus route #66 from Northgate down to Westlake!!!! I don't understand this duplication of effort between Metro and SDOT, especially when the current bus route #66 is already serving the exact corridor that SDOT is proposing. You could just leave the current bus route #66 in place and save everyone a lot of time and money. Here's the link to the SDOT project: http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/roosevelthct.htm In summary: Please keep the current bus route #66 intact!!!!</p>
David	Shelton	43, 8, 11	2	<p>I support the realignment of bus routes to take full advantage of the new light rail service between downtown, Capitol Hill, and the University of Washington. However, the current proposal actually REDUCES service and connections for my neighborhood (Miller Park in east Capitol Hill). The 43 currently provides direct access from the Miller Park neighborhood along John/Thomas to the new Capitol Hill LRT station. If the 43 is to be removed, then the previously proposed re-route of the 11 along this corridor, along with the current 8, would provide excellent connections from Miller Park to the station. However, the current proposal would completely abandon the Miller Park neighborhood along this very busy segment of John/Thomas between 19th and 24th Avenues, instead making an awkward jog along Madison Street. The jog, which would require a sharp turn at 19th/Madison which would be difficult for any bus to make (particularly articulated buses), seems only to succeed to making it even less convenient for Miller Park residents to connect to the new Capitol Hill light rail station. PLEASE, if you are to remove the 43, go with the previously proposed re-route of the 11 along John/Thomas and keep the 8 the same as it currently is through this corridor. Thank you!</p>

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Timothy	Mendes	11, 8	2	I still cannot believe that Metro is trying to reroute the 11 off of Madison St, before 15th Ave. The point of some of the "duplication" of some of the inner city routes is to address timeliness and capacity. By moving the 11 off of Madison and "duplicating" the coverage of the 8 (to make up for eliminating the 43), Metro is putting all of the ridership from a large chunk of East Capitol Hill/North Central Area all on the 10, which is already crowded and rarely runs on time. Not everyone needs the bus just to get to light rail. There are 2 highly trafficked grocery stores (Central Coop and Trader Joe's) that will now only have 1 bus that comes anywhere near them (12). And frankly, the 12 isn't very convenient, as it ends in the middle of the Financial District Downtown and has little transfer opportunities. As for the 8, I wonder if the planners at Metro have ever tried taking the 8 E bound after 3:30 PM on a weekday? It won't matter how many busses they add to this route, if traffic is backed up 6 blocks at Aurora/Dexter and 8 blocks at the 1-5 entrance at Stewart, the bus doesn't move. Again, there are still plenty of places that people need to go that the light rail DOES NOT service. I live at the top of the Hill, straddling Capitol Hill and the Central Area and work on Lower Queen Anne. It can take almost 2 hours to get home, a distance of just over 3 miles. Now Metro wants to make the 8 the only option of getting across the City at Denny with the 11 only partially adding in the amount of ridership. I fail to see the logic. The transportation issues in our County and Seattle specifically are enormous. Banking that 2 more light rail stations will suddenly make everything fine and that eliminating routes will somehow make it easier for current riders and attract new ones is short-sided. I urge you to ask Metro to take another look at their plan and consider doing more than just getting people to the light rail station.
Adrienne	Millican	11, 48	2	I strongly oppose the proposed change to the 11 bus route. The current route, down Madison and across Pine Street to downtown best serves the needs of myself and most Madison Park residents who use this route to access schools and businesses on Madison, Pine and downtown. We don't want the route detoured to the Capitol Hill light rail stop and the massive traffic delays that now exist at Broadway and Denny. We want bus service that quickly accesses downtown and Pine Street locations, not a time-wasting detour through massive congestion at Broadway/ Denny. Anyone who does want to access the Capitol Hill light rail stop can use the 8- don't make congestion worse by making all of us do it, and then requiring us to walk to our Pine Street and Madison destinations. I also strongly oppose breaking the 48 into 2 separate lines changing at UW. My daughter uses this line to get to school at Roosevelt HS. Breaking it in into 2 lines increases her commute.
Arthur	Kelly	43	2	The elimination of the 43 will eliminate access to the Pike/Pine corridor for those on 23rd or 24th, especially for those with reduced mobility. The only single possible connections are the 12 which is several long, uphill blocks away. At John the connection is uphill to catch the 8 then you have to change again to the light rail or another bus. At Madison the 11 will no longer get going to the main Pike/Pine corridor. For current route 43 riders used to a direct ride to the main area of downtown there will now be a large gap in coverage with no easy connections without a long walk or multiple connections. This will be very difficult for anyone that has any sort of mobility issues. There needs to be a bus that will continue to at least connect the current 43 riders with the new light rail station in Capitol Hill so there can be a single connection downtown. Other than this large gap the current metro plan seems sound.
Phyllis	Solem	8	2	For the past 4 years, I've depended on the 8 bus to take me from Rainier Beach all the way to Capital Hill once I've gotten off the 106 bus from Beacon Avenue. I live in south Seattle in the south end of Beacon Hill. I hope you won't change the 8 route too much in such a way as to make it less convenient for me to get to my medical appointments on Capital Hill from the south end of Seattle. This arrangement works best for me when I have an eye appointment at Group Health's Capital Hill campus or my ocologist appointments as well. I've never needed the light rail because it doesn't take me as close to my destination as the 8 bus. I hope you'll consider this when you tamper with that route.
Andrea	Perr	66, 67, 70, 73, 74	2	I am concerned that the changes to bus service within the University District will move buses off University Way, which is predominantly businesses, onto 11th Ave NE, which is predominantly residential. That moves bus stops from locations with shelters and benches to locations adjacent to homes where there is no room for shelters and benches and it would be a bad idea. The police have indicated benches provide an inviting place for homeless people to sleep. Shelters would block the view of residents trying to back out of their garages/driveways. I already have significant problems with people waiting at the stop by my house. They are loud, smoke, leave me their trash, sit on my retaining wall while crushing my plants. I have tried for 7 years to find a solution to the problems I've been having and it seems like this would only make things much worse. Every agency I have spoken to says it comes under the jurisdiction of the other (Metro, King County, City of Seattle, SDOT). Nobody has been helpful and I've been given much misinformation. As a homeowner and taxpayer I think I have the right to not have my property treated as a garbage dump, a public park, etc. If you aren't going to help me, then I beg you not to make it worse.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Barbara	Wright	25	2	We are concerned how we can easily get to the Light Rail station from Montlake. It appears the bus on 24th Avenue/Montlake stops several blocks away from the station. Is there a way it could stop closer to the station of take a loop at the intersection before turning east? The loss of the 25 will leave many people in the neighborhood a long walk away from transit. Would you consider a neighborhood circulator bus that runs at least hourly?
Tyler		25	2	I am writing to express my concern and disappointment with the idea of discontinuing Route 25 bus service. Yesterday Metro announced as soon as the light rail station opens on Broadway and at Husky Stadium that many buses will be freed up to use for connecting neighborhoods to the light rail station. They predict ridership from the neighborhoods to downtown is expected to plummet as the trains replace busses. They also stated these buses will run much more often so people can transfer quickly from buses to ride the trains with ease. It makes no sense to discontinue the 25 if the above press release is true and in nine months we have been promised increased bus availability. Parts of Montlake and Portage Bay will be over a half mile away from any bus route at all. The Route 25 has been around since at least the 1930's. We should be increasing access to transit --- not removing options. The City of Seattle was going to provide funding to increase service for the 25 with the passing of Prop 1 and deleting the bus line will result in lost leveraged funds. 110 people responded with concerns over deleting the 25 bus, but the recommendations make no acknowledgement of its support. We have an aging community that will continue to rely on closer transit options. I ask that you please reconsider and continue the existing Route 25 service.
Anne/Leon	Preston	25	2	Please reconsider elimination of route 25 and review one year after the light rail station at Husky Stadium has been operational. Metro has promised that there will be more buses available for connecting the neighborhoods to the stations. The neighborhoods of Montlake, Portage Bay and Roanoke park will need the 25 to take us to the station. Ridership will grow if you give the route 25 time.
Ellen	Wijsman	71	2	I have looked at the proposed changes to bus routes that affect NE Seattle (where I live and work). In general, they look pretty good. However, it looks to me as if there is a big black hole now in a section of NE Seattle that is currently well-served by the 71. This will make it much harder to use the bus between the U District and an area in which lot of people at the UW live that is currently well-served. Currently the 71 picks up passengers along University Avenue, and then deposits them along 65th, and then comes around to continue back along 75th for awhile. I realize that the revised bus schedules pick up these streets in pieces, but only with transfers or fairly long walks, which basically removes regular bus use from reasonable transit options.
Erik	Saganic	25	2	I have concerns that the Metro Route 25 has been proposed for deletion in the latest list of recommendations. This bus is the only service available for many parts of our Montlake community, and it's removal leaves only car and bus options to many of our community members. We have a number of aging individuals in our neighborhood (including my limited-mobility neighbor that can't drive) that relies on this bus regularly. The neighborhood is increasingly aging as well, and a number of folks will need to rely on this bus in the future. Additionally, the Route 25 has been around since at least the 1930's, and how in the 21st century, are we going back to only a single-occupancy vehicle option for our community? The results of the public comment period show significant interest in keeping the route 25 (110 were concerned of its removal), and no mention of anyone in favor of deleting it. Lastly, the route 25 was funded by City of Seattle's Prop 1 to increase service to every half-hour from every hour. Does King County want to lose access to this opportunity of leveraged funds? Also, ridership will increase to the old levels if frequency increases (I'll continue to plan for it more often as well). Thank you for your time in considering increasing transit in King County
Jo Ann	Brockway	25	2	I am asking that you keep Metro bus route 25. I do understand that it is not heavily used. I live in the Roanoke Park neighborhood, which runs from Harvard Ave downhill to Eastlake on the north and Fuhrman/Boyer on the east. For many of us, the traffic congestion downtown and the cost of parking are significant barriers to driving there and trying to find a place to park. While I can walk the distance uphill to catch a 49 or the distance to Eastlake to catch a 66 or one of the 70's (and then walk back uphill on my return), there are many seniors in my neighborhood for whom that would be a considerable difficulty. When the light rail is open, people will still need to get to the U or to Capitol Hill (walk uphill to the 49) to take the light rail. A different solution might be assigning a DART vehicle (as in West Seattle) to the 25 route on a more frequent schedule than the current 25. The smaller vehicle could be more cost efficient on a lower ridership route as well as more maneuverable though some of the rather tight spaces and turns on the 25 route. Thank you for considering this request.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Betty Anne	McCall	25	2	I just learn that Metro is planning on eliminating the 25 route entirely. This is really the ONLY bus route that serves my neighborhood (Montlake). Taking any other bus means walking 1/2 to 3/4 of a mile - possibly up a steep hill. This is a barrier to taking the bus. When it's cold and rainy, this is even more true. The 25 has low ridership because, over the past 30 years, service has been cut to the point that it's almost unusable - Monday thru Friday not quite hourly from about 6:00 AM to 6:00 PM just doesn't work for retail. I was offered a job downtown and couldn't take it because I couldn't get there by bus. My husband had jury duty and had to drive because the 25 would get him there an hour early or late. If you'd RESTORE service instead of cutting it, the 25 could get me downtown when I need to be there instead of a way early or late and, coming soon, not at all. Ridership wouldn't increase overnight but it would slowly increase if the schedule met our needs.
Denise	Lishner	43	2	I strongly object to the modifications proposed by Metro in the March 2016 plan as it would be disastrous for and completely neglects the needs of the residents of Montlake!! Where I now take one bus, the 43, to get to Group Health for medical services, 15th East for groceries, Broadway, downtown, and the UW, under the current proposal I would need to take THREE buses: the 48, 8 and 11 simply to get to 15th and E John (currently a 5-7 minute single bus ride). I would need to wait for connecting buses at each junction, in not the safest of neighborhoods when it is dark and rainy. I would need to allow much more time to get to any of these destinations. I might add that I am a senior so this makes life a lot more complicated if not potentially dangerous!! Changes must include continued access via E John to Capital Hill to prevent this very major disruption to bus service to and from Montlake! If not, my only option is... to take my car!!!"
Peg	Cheirrett	43	2	I am a 35-year resident of the Capitol Hill/Montlake area, and the 43 bus has been my most frequent method of getting downtown and to the University District. Eliminating the 43 would have a significantly negative impact on my life. My husband and I (both 66 years of age) would very much appreciate reconsideration of the elimination of the 43 line.
David	O'Hern	8, 11, 43	2	The latest proposal for routes 8 and 11 are disappointing. After my initial email, sent August 26, stating my dissatisfaction with routes 8 and 11 being placed on 19th Ave E, I read that Metro's reasoning for this was to give current Route 43 riders a single location to make the transfer to either Route 8 or 11. This seems like a significant change just to satisfy a small subset of riders, which comes at the sacrifice of everyone who currently takes the 8 or 11. After learning this, I'm thinking that route 43 should not be deleted. Too many other sacrifices are being made to accommodate those that currently depend on route 43. The network would be better off just keeping the current route in place. After all, if route 43 is deleted, all of the overhead trolley wiring along this route will be abandoned. That seems unwise considering a study was just done concluding that this trolley network is cost-effective and efficient resulting in a new fleet of trolley buses put into operation. Considering that this trolley wiring is already in place, it seems to make sense to keep it in operation, especially since it appears other routes would need to be sacrificed in order to fill the gap left by route 43's removal. Route 43 would remain a vital piece of the network even after Link is expanded to UW, since it would provide residents along 23rd Ave and John St a way to get to either the UW Station or Capitol Hill Station. The original "alternative 1" proposal was an ambitious attempt to remake the network, but the current proposal for Capitol Hill has so many compromises that would leave us worse off than what we have today. I think that the routing for routes 8, 11, and 43 should just be left unchanged, rather than accept what is being proposed now. The only exception is the route 8 split at Mt Baker Station, that is a good idea that should be implemented; but the remaining proposed changes in routing for these three routes should be rejected. In summary, please keep the 43 and maintain the efficient routing of 8 (north of Mt. Baker Station) and 11. Thank you.
Tara	Marino	64, 71, 76	2	After the proposed changes take place, only the # 76 will run up and down 65th NE. The # 64 will no longer go downtown. The # 71 will be eliminated. The # 76 is a rush hour bus only - it runs west and to downtown in the morning and east and to the neighborhood in the evening. Outside of rush hour, myself and my neighbors will have no bus on 65th. From my house it will be a 10 block walk to a bus - either up a hill to 35th or to Roosevelt way. I have off and on minor mobility issues that will keep me from walk that distance at times. And walking the 10 blocks is worrisome in the dark and when the weather is bad. I am worried that the bus will no longer be accessible to me. Please try to find a way to run something up and down 65th. Perhaps a van or a shuttle could be arranged.
Sandra	Kraus	25	2	I am very sad to hear that the 25 route is being eliminated. I understand that this is being done to encourage riders to use the Light Rail. Well, please explain to me how this is going to happen as the 25 route would have taken me to the Light Rail Station. Now I have no way to get there by bus! Am I supposed to walk over a mile to the station? Keep the 25 bus!

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Robert	Liebreich	11	2	King County Council, thank you for your efforts to revise the bus routes in a way that benefits the most in Seattle while planning for the future too. The discussion regarding the 11 is of particular interest to us at Aegis on Madison as we serve over 110 seniors and have a staff of over 140, many of the staff made up of students who rely on the bus to get to work. The hope would be for these 250 people that we can extend the 11 bus route further on to 12 avenue where it would benefit many of our workers who also go to Seattle University. This extension would also benefit our residents and other residents in the neighborhood, some of who appreciate the ability to take the bus to and from the various grocery store options. Thank you again for your consideration. Respectfully, Rob Liebreich General Manager, Aegis on Madison
Joann	Lund	43, 8	2	I am a 78 yr old female and have lived in Montlake for 45 years. My use of a car is limited and will terminate soon as my health deteriorates. You are motivating me to leave with your elimination of the #43. I'm familiar with the 48 transfer to # 8 as I use it to get to Group Health offices on Howell. It is a long walk to get from the 48 bus stop on 23rd & uphill to get the #8 stop on 22nd & John. It will be the same if #8 goes juv Madison. To take the 545 is difficult for me because of the walking distance & waiting for traffic lights and not get a transfer and the noise & pollution of the 520 freeway in addition to the Montlake blvd traffic which will be further increased when 520 is done. The #43 gets me to GH Capital Hill medical offices and exercise classes, & to the Safeway on 15th & John to get groceries and back home without two transfer waits. Are we losing the freeway stop too?
Peter	Newman	75, 65	2	While I'm looking forward to service from UW/Montlake Station, the connections with the 75 and 65, especially southbound are inadequate, especially on a cold, wet day. The elephant in the room is Montlake traffic, north of UW Station. How about either: a) replacing the center tree and grass strip with a reversible bus lane that would move buses in and out of Montlake station quickly. OR b) work with UW to use the road east of Montlake to carry buses only. As the proposal now stands, the bus/LR interface at UW Station is woefully inadequate.
Kevin	Connors	243, 271, 78, 273, 68	2	Please bring back route 243 that was eliminated during the funding cuts of 2014. This route went right next to the U-Link station and now would provide service to it from Jackson Park to South Bellevue. If you bring it back expand it's service hours. I am heavily in favor of the proposed Route 78. Why not go down Montlake right to the U-Link station, instead of having to transfer to the 271 or other U-District buses? Most people would have to walk from the U-Village to the U-Link station, If you do include the new route 78 increase it's frequency to 15 minutes and expand it's service days to Saturday and Sunday. BRING BACK THE 243!!!
Carla	Prater	43	2	Removing Route 43 will leave the residents of my neighborhood in a big, black transit hole. This neighborhood includes many seniors as well as residents of low income apartments who depend on transit to get around. I really don't understand why they are going to have to walk all the way to Huskie Stadium or to Madison Avenue to get onto transit facilities.
Alex	Kale	48, 43, 8, 11	2	Bus lines serving the east side of Capitol Hill should not be cut because the new light link station is not streamlining the commute for this community. Also, if at all possible we should extend and branch the link light rail system, so that one doesn't have to rent right next to the city center in order to have a manageable commute. As Seattle becomes more congested, transportation efficiency is becoming more and more important. Please keep fighting for robust and secure Sound Transit infrastructure.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Michael	Blatnik	25	2	I live in the Portage Bay neighborhood on Boyer Ave E, close to the Montlake border, on the very southern tip of Portage Bay. Currently the 25 is the only bus within a 10-15 minute walk, and it reduces my commute to downtown from about 30-35 minutes to 20 minutes and it reduces my commute to UW from 22 minutes to 13 minutes. It is a great bus route although it currently operates on a reduced schedule (only during the weekdays up until about 6:30pm), which I believe is part of the reason for low ridership (low reliability and frequency). Unfortunately, due to low ridership, the Seattle Metro has decided to cut this route altogether. Looking at the map of affected roads, Boyer Ave and the roads on the 25 route in Laurelhurst are the only roads that will have no bus service whatsoever starting March 2016. Each time I have taken the 25 route, it was never empty, and there is a small population that relies on this route as their only convenient route (including the 2 large apartment buildings next door to my house: 2400 Boyer Ave E and 2410 Boyer Ave E). Getting to the airport from my house via public transit will now be much more difficult (since I would have to carry my bags, 15 minutes walk into Montlake or Eastlake). In addition, those students commuting to/from UW from this region will now have to either walk all the way to UW (30 minute walk) or walk 10-15 minutes to a bus stop to ride the bus for another 5-10 minutes into the UW. The Laurelhurst side of the 25 route has had some restructuring (new Rider Options are listed as: "In Laurelhurst, use new Route 78 or go to Sand Point Way to reach revised Route 65 or Route 75, which would have more service.") while the Montlake/Portage Bay/Boyer Ave/Furman Road side have seen no beneficial restructuring (the only region in Seattle that has seen no restructuring besides the removal of the only bus route servicing this thoroughfare). A better alternative would be to simply focus the 25 route on the UW Husky Stadium Light Rail station, rather than cutting it altogether and rather than having it go all the way to downtown. Decreasing the frequency to once an hour and/or removing bus stops along the way (there are 3 bus stops within a 3 block stretch of my house) could be alternatives to cutting this route. I enjoy living in my vibrant and affordable neighborhood across the water from UW, and I think in order to keep this as quiet alternative for students and grad students, bus service must be retained in the area. Thank you for your consideration.
Mike	Foster	25	2	I currently live in the Portage Bay area and work in SLU. In the last two years I voted for and helped pass a new tax with the specific goal of maintaining our current service. I now see that this service will be cut despite my tax dollars being taken. When combined with the light rail's failure to station at SLU or Eastlake, I feel it is unwarranted to abandon service through areas like Portage Bay and West Capital Hill. I hardly envisioned whole routes like the 25 being deleted when I opened my wallet last year.
Tina	--	8	2	More buses should go to prentice street. I have to walk a whole lot from rainier beach station all the way to taco bell! Sometimes at night too. Please make it more convenient for me because walking around the block really discourages me from taking the bus. Plus 8 is never on time
Pat	Naughton	11, 43	2	After Seattle voters passed the transportation initiative I was happy we were going to finally get better service down in Madison Valley. But now I find out that my everyday ride, the #11, is going to be rerouted away from my destinations in order to make up for the loss of the 43. And the 43 is my second go-to bus! Metro clearly doesn't understand the value of the 43. This bus is the glue that holds the whole system together. On Capitol Hill it crosses every other route, connecting downtown, all of Capitol Hill including the eastern slope (not just Broadway) with The Ave (not just the stadium) and even Ballard! It's everybody's most useful bus at night, or when their 1st-choice bus fails them. In my case the 43 is a godsend when the 11 goes missing, or when the 8 is 25 minutes late again. I can count at least seven destinations I head to regularly on the current route 11. The most important is Central Co-op at Madison & 17th Ave, which is, coincidentally, a stop that I've noticed is heavily used by elderly and disabled passengers. It's maddening that you are using the deletion of the trusty 43 as the excuse for rerouting the 11. Just keep the 43! At least this proposal is an improvement over the all-Madison idea, which stranded #11 riders at the ferry terminal, not even close to a link station. But I respectfully request that you keep the 11 route as it is, at least until you see the effect of the new Link stations. Thank you.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Karen	Portzer	8, 11, 43	2	As much as I would love a direct bus to work only 2 blocks from my house, I think it's a problem to reroute the 8 and 11 to go westbound on Madison and then turn at 19th Avenue. As you are probably not aware, Madison runs at a diagonal relative to the other streets between Puget Sound and Lake Washington. As a consequence, there are certain streets that have a sharper angle making it difficult to turn. So buses would have to make a 135 ??? degree angle turn not the normal 90 degree of a perpendicular street. Have you actually tested this by running a bus on the proposed route? I don't understand why you are discontinuing the 43. It's the route I use to get to Husky Stadium. the stop is 1/2 mile away, but its flat to get there. Taking a 48 is not convenient because it's uphill and I would have to cross at an unmarked busy intersection on 23rd which will be more difficult to cross once you (the all inclusive city/county decision makers) narrow it. Light rail is over a mile away in the opposite direction of the stadium. which is only three miles away.
Richard	Marks	43	2	I am a senior who lives in the Montlake neighborhood. I have used the 43 bus for a variety of needs over the past 8 years. I have used it to commute downtown for work, to go to my doctor at Group Health on Capitol Hill, and to go to the Broadway shopping area. The service has been very convenient, and even though the bus is sometimes late, especially returning from Downtown in the early evening hours, it is sufficiently convenient for me to use it. The proposal to discontinue the 43 route will make using the bus much less attractive. Now I'll need to take the 48 to transfer to the 11 or 8 to get downtown or to the doctor. The route is supposedly not needed because the light rail station is opening at Husky Stadium. Unfortunately, light rail is more than a mile away from my house whereas the bus stop is 3 blocks from my house. Although I don't mind walking, sometimes I don't have time or the weather is bad. It seems misguided to reduce bus service at a time when our roads are more crowded than ever. Offering alternatives that require transfers simply degrades public transportation services. The County should be encouraging greater bus use by maintaining or expanding routes not eliminating them. Please keep the 43 Route.
Julie	Congdon	43, 11	2	Esteemed Councilmembers - I would like to express my concern and disappointment in the changes proposed for bus routes on and along Capitol Hill. Specifically, the loss of the 43 bus route will be significantly impactful to my family. This bus route enables me to commute to downtown from the eastern slope of Capitol Hill (from 24th Ave E) using one bus allows my sons and I to take trips via one bus to downtown to arts and culture activities, as well as to UW to the Burke Museum for educational opportunities my spouse uses it in his commute home from the Bastyr Clinic in Wallingford. This one bus, the 43, has taken us to and from so many destinations seamlessly, with no transfers needed. The proposed alternatives are not alternatives for us. We will not be using the Capitol Hill Light Rail Station as it does not take us where we need to go. Making multiple transfers with small children on buses or having them walk 6 or more blocks uphill is very frustrating. I have to be honest in saying, these changes will cause me to use the bus less and either bike more (as for my work commute) or drive my car more (for running errands, especially with my children, or in taking my children places that were once easily accessed by bus). While the 11 might be an option, I do not see that it will necessarily be more reliable than the 43, especially with the changes in its route. Considering the amount of residential development, specifically the "small efficiency dwelling units" and increased density on the eastern slope of Capitol Hill, it seems quite shortsighted to eliminate a bus route like the 43 that would serve many of these coming residents. I think many of the developers have built these units and are marketing them under the assumption that they will be well-served by the bus lines, but I don't think they realize what lines are being eliminated that their demographic will be using. For those of us on the east side of the Hill who have cars, we will likely be using them in preference to the more unpredictable transit situation. However, what about those with mobility issues yet lack a vehicle or are unable to drive-transfers and hikes up steep grades to get to buses make it further challenging. Thank you for your time and consideration of my comments. I ask that you look at the transit situation holistically with the increased density along these bus routes, other proposed changes like the Rapid Bus line along Madison, and in changes to the transportation corridor (i.e., the road "diet" of 23rd Ave being reduced from 4 lanes to 2). Should these changes be implemented, PLEASE review their efficacy in 6 mos.-1year's time to see how they are functioning, and how they have impacted the communities they were intended to serve. Thank you.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Dianne	Ramsey	11	2	Reroute of the #11 would create a hardship for passengers and businesses along Madison that depend on that service. The most important impact would be to Community for the Blind, Safeway, Trader Joes and LWW to name a few. The #11 provides the most direct route to the downtown core from this area. This route, #11, provides for a transfer to the Cap Hill Station at the Seattle Central Community College Campus, which is a 1.5 to 2 block walk. To get from Madison Park to the U-Link station would be just as quick to transfer to the #48 at 23rd Avenue East. Except to improve link rail ridership, I'm not sure why Madison Valley/Central Area riders are being taken so far out of their way and subjected to Group Health traffic on 15th Ave East. When evaluating these proposals, please be mindful of those who are elderly or disabled and need this service the most. Also, making local routes longer to accommodate link rail will discourage ridership, not increase it.
Scott	Hennes	43, 8, 11, 48	2	I am concerned about the deletion of route #43, specifically the loss of a direct ("one seat") connection between Montlake and Capitol Hill. My elderly mother has lived in the Montlake neighborhood since 1966. She receives medical care regularly at Group Health hospital on 15th Ave. E, and has relied on bus #43 to get her home after appointments. My brother or I usually drive her up to the appointments, but we can't afford the time to sit and wait while she sees her various doctors. Losing the #43 will therefore impose a hardship on our family-- not an insurmountable one as there are van services and so forth. But it is a real loss that all of us will feel strongly. You may argue that we have an alternative by riding the #8 or #11 from Group Health to 23rd Ave. E, where we could transfer to the #48. However I myself am quite uncomfortable with this transfer due to the dangerous nature of the 23rd & Madison intersection. I've crossed this intersection in every direction many, many times, and I have to tell you every time I do I feel like I'm taking my life in my hands. People drive very fast, the crossing times are short, and there is always someone wanting to turn right and "pushing" with their cars to get into the intersection while pedestrians are still walking across. For my elderly mother crossing such an intersection is out of the question. The stress alone could kill her. I understand the need to trim service. For those Montlake residents who are relatively fit the Husky Link station will be a real boon, and may make up for much of the bus service we lose. But for those who are elderly or disabled, the 1/2- to 1-mile walk to the station is probably going to be out of reach. Please reconsider deleting the #43 or, if deletion is necessary, please consider modifying the stops and/or crosswalks at 23rd & Madison to make this important transfer point safe for pedestrians.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Eric	Maloney	43	2	<p>I have a degree in Transportation & Distribution Management from Syracuse University. Having grown up in Boston, previously lived in New York, New Jersey and Chicago, and eleven years now as a Seattle resident, I continue to be disappointed with our public transit. The proposed changes are not an improvement for city residents. I don't have a car. I use the 43 more than any other bus route. It is the most convenient way to get to the north end of downtown, the Pike-Pine corridor, and the waterfront where I work (though, from the end of the line to Alaskan Way, you still have to walk a half mile and then down the Pike Place stair climb; late at night when I get off work, that walk back up the stair climb and then a half mile up to Pike and 4th is a chore, not to mention the sparse owl service after midnight). Once the 43 is gone, I'll just have to walk a couple extra blocks to get on the 10 for downtown and the waterfront. In the other direction, to the U District, things will become far less convenient. Now, I'll walk to the 10, or walk 3/4 mile to the Capitol Hill light rail stop, take that back in the opposite direction to Husky Stadium (not exactly the heart of the U District, the stadium is a place that people go to 5 or 6 times a year for football games), then get on another bus to get to the Ave., the Neptune Theater, etc. What one bus used to do virtually door to door, will now require two buses + rail, or one bus, rail, and enough walking to work up a good sweat. When I look at the proposed changes to the bus and rail systems, what I see is a transit network becoming possibly more convenient for people who don't live here to use our city and its neighborhoods a couple or few days a week, but far less convenient for the folks who live here, the longtime residents who use the city seven days a week. Our transit system was already challenged with low on-time rates and by major city standards, greater walking distances and longer wait times for transfers than any other city I've lived or spent significant time in. When I look at routes and schedules on the One Bus Away app and the online Metro Trip Planner, the two rarely offer the same information. Almost every day, as I wait at the bus stop, One Bus Away tells me that multiple buses have come and gone when in reality none have. At times, downtown buses have been re-routed to the 5th & Jackson terminal without any announcement (they just turn south on Broadway and keep going). Other times, the 43, instead of going down Pine to 4th as published route shows, the bus turns south on 9th, then west on Union to 3rd, and south to Virginia, with no announcement and zero stops, leaving me a half-mile from my scheduled destination. Whenever I've asked a driver why they do that, the answer I've been given each time is, "Sometimes we do that." I have been late for work, social engagements, concerts, and plays because of these things. Curbing bus service on some lines and eliminating others altogether to drive traffic through the light rail stations is an outdated and inefficient hub and spoke approach to the physical distribution of passengers. One of the core tenets of supply chain and logistics is, "the best material handling is no material handling." As an example, consider goods in a warehouse: do you want the product there just in time to ship it to retail or consumer, or do you want it to sit there for a while, picking it up and moving it a few times in the meantime? The new system will create more transfers for many people. Every additional (unnecessary) time a passenger de-boards one bus or rail car to then board another creates more traffic and more human bottleneck, extending door to door time spent in transit. For a city resident who uses the city every day, the proposed changes are making an already lackluster transit system worse.</p>
MaryJane	Gasdick	43	2	<p>I believe this route of the current bus line 43 is critical to a wide area of residence in Seattle that would be very adversely affected if the 43 line were to be eliminated. Many of us use this bus frequently to get to and from the University District, Group Health hospital on Capitol Hill, and downtown Seattle. With the mayor's plan to eliminate parking downtown and try to create a better city with less car pollution, I feel it is imperative to keep the 43 line as the elimination of this line would only encourage more driving- especially since most of us along this line are not close enough to the proposed light rail to make use of that as an alternative to driving.</p>
Edith	Hilliard	43, 25	2	<p>Please do not cut these two direct-to-downtown bus lines! Montlake is a dense neighborhood that needs direct transit service to/from downtown. Dropping the 43 and 25 buses will add at least another 10-15 minutes, likely more, to the four mile commute for Montlake residents. Most Montlake residents live 1/2 mile or more from the UW light rail station, many (including me) more than a mile. That's a long walk to get a direct ride downtown; it's also dangerous because of the heavy traffic at the 520 intersection. This proposed move isn't fair to Montlake. Most of us have supported transit increases. Taking away direct service is a lousy way to thank us for that support--or to keep it!</p>

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
William	Sobieralski	43	2	Do not eliminate Bus 43! This bus provides the only viable way for people in our neighborhood to use Metro to get from Montlake area to downtown and greatly reduces service to the University of Washington and Ballard. Assuming city policy is to encourage people to use public transportation to get downtown eliminating local bus service is counter productive. How can you eliminate parking; extend meter hours; increase parking fees and bridge tolls; close lanes for autos to provide for bikes, buses, and trollies, all in order to discourage use of cars and then turn around and eliminate the only reasonable bus alternative for our neighborhood. Without Bus 43 route I would be forced to transfer twice just to get downtown from my house. Commute time would at least double. You can bet I will drive if this bus is eliminated. For those who cannot drive the situation will be even worse. Thanks for your attention to this matter.
Stephanie	Cooper	43, 25	2	These routes are critical for many people in our Montlake neighborhood going both directions. This includes teenagers, of which there are many in Montlake (with lots of smaller children who will grow to be teenagers!). If the bus routes are made more long and complicated by having to transfer, rather than more people walking a mile to catch a direct bus there may be more cars on the road. My family and I personally take the 43 to get to capital hill and to get to downtown. Quickly. Taking any other route would be slow and cumbersome by having to transfer. Didn't I just agree to pay increased taxes to help support Metro? And my service is going to be cut?? The 25 also provides useful service to a part of Seattle north of here that would be hard to get to otherwise. Many people actually choose to buy homes in Montlake specifically because of the ability to get places from Montlake with good public transportation.
Suzanne	O'Kelley	25, 43	2	As a resident of the Montlake neighborhood, I'd like to express my concerns with the impending elimination of several bus lines that take myself and my neighbors directly downtown. The construction on SR 520 has increased traffic to the area, and the ongoing work is expected to bring even more cars through our quiet, residential neighborhood. To counterbalance this influx, it's really important that we have easy, quick mass transit options to give citizens a good alternative to driving themselves downtown and elsewhere. The light rail isn't going to work for everyone. Please consider retaining the #25 and #43 bus lines. Traffic is a huge concern for the Montlake neighborhood and buses are one of the best solutions we have to mitigate the problem of too many cars in our area.
Mary	Davis	25, 43	2	I am writing to express my concern with eliminating all the possible bus routes through The Montlake district of Seattle. I live on 18th East and Boyer East. The 25 stops one block from my house. The 43 stops 1/2 mile from my house. Both of these routes travel to downtown Seattle. Eliminating these routes makes it impossible for me, or anyone else in my neighborhood to get downtown without changing buses. The light rail station at the UW is one mile away, and getting to it requires crossing the 520 highway and many busy intersections, as well as the Montlake bridge over the ship canal. It is not a simple walk for anyone with mobility problems. The projected traffic increase from the additional 520 bridge bringing 4 more lanes of traffic to Montlake makes the journey even more hazardous. I encourage you to rethink these issues and maintain the bus service to the Montlake Community.
Philo	Hall	43	2	I just heard about the proposed elimination of the 43 route. Since it's been the bus I take downtown, both for work and other activities, for over 35 years, this feels like a loss of a family member. I have spoken with Reg Newbeck, a person who lives nearby and who has been following your proposed changes very closely. I want to heartily endorse the alternative he has suggested to you. Thank you for listening. Philo Hall
Matthew	Weatherly	43	2	I travel using the 43 Bus almost 7 days per week. It is the only option that I have for travel from my home (just off of 23rd Ave and Valley St) with direct access to both Capitol Hill and the U-District. Elimination of this route will mean that I'll have to walk 6-7 blocks for transportation into/out of Capitol Hill going forward. I'm also concerned about the volume of riders that will be forced onto the 48 Bus from Montlake Interchange to get arrive at locations along 23rd Ave/Montlake Blvd. Currently both the 43 and 48 serve that route, but it seems that will be consolidated to a single route (48). These buses are completely full every afternoon between 5:00-6:30pm. Please keep the 43!!!!
Alison	Park-Douglas	43	2	Please do not eliminate the 43 bus. I take that bus regularly (twice daily starting next week), and it's such a useful route. Using that route, I can get from the Arboretum neighborhood to Capitol Hill, to South Lake Union, or to Downtown. I've lived in other parts of Seattle, and I've never had a bus route that was so useful and versatile in terms of the number of places that one route could take me. With the proposed changes, I'd need to take at least 2 or 3 buses to get to any of those areas from here. It would force me into driving, rather than using the public transit option that I prefer. I have no complaints about the bus 43 service as it is now, and I hope that you'll consider keeping it intact.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Brandi	Pritchard	43	2	The removal of bus route 43 will add substantial time to my commute. Where as now I can get around the city pretty easy from our house it will make my route have multiple bus changes and transfers. With the removal of the route it will also cause me to rethink my bus commuting as before I could take my kids to school and pick them up on the bus but now with the proposed changes I would now be unable to do that because of the multiple bus changes
Annalisa	Gironi	43, 25	2	I'm writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed cut to service in the Montlake Community, i.e. elimination of bus routes #43 and #25 that have direct service to downtown. Under the proposed route changes, people in Montlake will have either to walk 1.15 mile to the Light Rail station or take route #48 and then transfer to #11 to get downtown. It will take longer to get downtown, which is only about 4 miles away and it will be hard, not to mention unsafe for people from Montlake to get across 520 to the light rail at Husky Stadium. Furthermore it does not make sense that Capitol Hill neighborhoods are keeping low performing routes #10 and #12 and Madison Park will get a one-seat ride downtown, but Montlake gets nothing but elimination of two highly used bus routes. Please reconsider the proposed bus cuts and please provide neighborhood service to Montlake.
Sarah	Rafton	43	2	I am writing to respectfully urge you not to eliminate route 43. This route is a timely and effective way to get to and from downtown from Montlake. As you well know the Montlake neighborhood is very often a place of impassable gridlock for our city. It is critical that we provide alternatives to SOV's in this neighborhood. The alternative of walking 1.15 miles to the light rail or the time and hassle of transferring buses will quite simply result in more people travelling alone in their cars which is bad for our congestion and bad for our environment. Please keep the 43!
Barbara	Klube	43	2	I am a bus rider and am very concerned about the scheduled loss of the #43 next year. Please reconsider this move. Both the #48 and #43 are well used.
Lisa	Coughlin	43	2	Please keep the 43! It is the only way to get up Capitol Hill from Montlake !!
Dan	Smith	43	2	The cancellation of 43 is most disturbing. Having lived in Montlake for more than 40 years the 43 has been my live line to downtown. It is realistic to expect me walk more than a mile to use the light rail considering my physical issues. Please reconsider not cancellation the 43 bust route
Kerry	Clayman	25, 43	2	Please don't cut the #25 and #43 in Montlake. I used to ride the #25 to get to work and will again when I go back to work (I have two young children). I use the #43 to get my kids to activities on Capitol Hill and downtown. I consider these routes essential for my everyday life. My husband and I just talked about selling one of our 2 cars. If these routes are eliminated, that will not be possible. We rely on the bus, direct routes without transfer, to get to downtown and Capitol Hill on time. The going logic seems to be that we in Montlake can just walk to the new light rail station at Husky Stadium. It is a 20 minute walk from my house. This just isn't feasible. As our community grows denser and we try to whittle down our dependence on cars, the solution is not to cut essential routes, but to add to them. Please keep bus service in Montlake that goes directly downtown.
Veronica	Dave	43	2	I just moved to this neighborhood and one advantage to the location was the accessibility afforded by the buses that stop at the 23rd Ave E and Aloha intersection. It would be disappointing to lose one of those buses, and would definitely hurt transit times to important parts of the city such as Downtown and 15th Ave East, where many shops are located that are important to people in this neighborhood. I would prefer to take the bus rather than drive, but losing the 43 bus service would make it more difficult to use public transportation.
Tanya	Sheremeta	43, 11	2	Please do not eliminate the 43 and 11
Yoojin	Ivanovic	25	2	I heard that the 25 bus line is getting cut/changed so that I can't use it at the montlake bus stop. Please do not do this - I use this bus line to get to UVillage and the grocery store all the time.
Timothy	Burkart	25, 43	2	The elimination of the 25 & 43 will make my commute worse, not better. I either take the 48 backwards to Husky Station and then take the train downtown. Or take some unknown combination of buses to the Capital Hill station and take the train downtown. Right now I usually take the 25 and it drops me off at 3rd and Madison. I often take the 43 and it will take me to the Westlake station where I switch to the train. I really don't know how the folks who take the 25 south of the UW will benefit at all from the new plan.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
David	Woods	43	2	The 43 bus provides a main route between the university district and central downtown. It is heavily used by school children, college students, and job holders, as well as senior citizens who no longer drive or can walk very far. Forcing small school children to walk to the nearest light rail station (they are some miles apart) would place their safety in jeopardy. Having to bus to the light rail station and transfer there will put an added cost burden on school children and workers, many of whom have low wages. This would be detrimental to poor people. It would also constitute a poor response to the tax increase which was to fund increased and better service. Take a ride on the 43 during rush hour and see for yourselves how heavily it is used, and who the passengers are. We need to keep the 43 bus running.
Neil	Wechsler	43	2	Please do not eliminate the 43 bus. It is very important to me and many in the community
Roz	Barnett	43	2	The #43 bus has served me well for more than 40 years. Many, many people will tell you the same thing. It's the nearest bus stop for many in the Arboretum neighborhood, as well as East Capitol Hill : our go-to bus for getting directly to Downtown and the U District. If it ain't broke, don't fix it! Not only is the #43 not broken, it's beloved by so many people, with good reason: it's done its job well for a long time. Thanks for reconsidering.
Michael	Peskura	43	2	I want to protest the elimination of the Metro 43 bus route. This route is heavily utilized at most times of day, and is not just point-to-point service between the University District and Downtown Seattle, but all points between. For many of us who live along this route, its elimination will make transit travel much more difficult. Thank you.
Awo	Ashiabor	25	2	I am writing to express my concern about the proposal to delete the 25 bus route in 2016. The bus #25 is the only route that serves the Portage Bay area. Without this bus many of us resident in the area will need to walk about a mile up steep hills to catch a bus. It is sad that after painfully passing a bill to increase taxes in exchange for more access to public transit, we in the Portage Bay area will have to contend with less public transportation, and for the many aged in the area, zero access to public transportation as the geography of the land is very prohibitive to options further away. I sincerely hope that you will consider giving the residents of Portage Bay same or increased access to public transportation.
Malaika	Schwartz	43, 8, 12	2	I am not a fan of this new proposal and here's why: 1. Basically, by eliminating the #43, you're taking away quick, easy access to downtown for everyone who lives in NE Capitol Hill (Stevens Miller neighborhood) without providing any replacement. The light rail is not going to pass through this neighborhood. Those east of 23rd/24th will have to take at least 2 buses to get downtown instead of 1 (#48 to the #12 maybe, which ends in a different part of downtown than the #43), and those west of 23rd/24th will have to walk uphill all the way to 15th to catch the #10, or again, take 2 buses starting with the #48. I have no plans to go downtown if it takes me 2 buses or a walk farther than a half mile to get there. Why are you eliminating a quick, accessible, direct line downtown for a whole neighborhood? Light rail will go from the UW to downtown, but it's not covering the whole route for the #43. 2. Right now, most of the bus stops in my neighborhood are within 2-6 blocks. People in NE Capitol Hill are generally older, so making bus stops farther away or taking away stops are going to make it harder for them to leave their homes to get to doctors appointments, activities, etc. 3. Moving the 8 from John to Madison again takes away close buses to downtown. It's an extra 2-3 blocks depending on where you are in relation to Madison. 4. In general, I know everyone's in love with the speed of the light rail, which is awesome. However, taking 8 minutes to get from the UW to downtown does those in-between no good. We have to be able to actually GET to the light rail, which adds in another bus and nerve-wracking transfer. If Metro buses were more reliable (and they mostly are), this wouldn't be a problem, but having to time multiple bus rides is a challenge compared to having to take only one bus. 5. If you're going to eliminate the #43, increase the hours of the #48/#45 to go until 1am on weekdays and weeknights. Access to downtown without having to deal with the nightlife is why many of us live in Stevens Miller, but we still have to be able to get home at night. 6. I am thrilled the #12 would run until midnight. Thank you.
Ellen	Kam	43	2	Need the 43 to get to Montlake and other places where light rail won't suffice! Buses on 23rd east are used heavily and often. My rides vary whether to the Montlake library, catching the bus at several locations, etc. Light rail won't help me!
Rachel	McLellan	43	2	Please keep the #43 bus route. My young children and I frequently use it to get from Montlake to downtown. I don't see a reasonable public transportation alternative for us if the #43 is cut. This is an essential route that connects my neighborhood and Capitol Hill to downtown.
Carol	Troup	43	2	Please do not decimate bus transit passing through the Montlake neighborhood. What I hear from neighbors is that the impetus is to have Montlake residents walk to the Link station at Husky Stadium to get downtown. Nice dream, but it's about a 20 minute walk to get there from most points in the Montlake neighborhood. The 43 bus is always crowded. Please do not remove it.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Freya	Skarin	25, 43	2	As a retired person with an eye injury, these 2 buses are my necessary transport to the city. I don't understand the removal of BOTH lines. Please reconsider, and keep one of them.
Ingrid	Wheelock	25, 43	2	I am shocked that the transportation department is considering cutting the 43 and 25 bus routes. The 43 line, in particular, is an essential line for many people who work downtown. I take the 43 bus five days a week, and the 6:30AM bus is often fairly full of people heading downtown. The afternoon bus from downtown to Montlake is always packed. The bus leaves frequently and is always filled with people, so I can't imagine what the rationale is behind cutting this route. You will be cutting the neighborhood of Montlake off from the downtown area. While some of us could drive our cars to work (a economically and environmentally unsound solution), many cannot. While I use the 25 bus only once a week, my 80-year-old in-laws use it very frequently. It is no longer safe for them to drive, and they rely on this bus line, which goes down their street (East Lynn). If this bus is cut, they will have no public transportation option for getting around
John	Coons	43, 8	2	I've been a resident of 529 21st Ave E for 4 years now, and I depend on the 43 and 8 to get downtown on a daily basis. While the light rail will help many Capitol Hill residents get downtown, we still need to get to the light rail in the first place (a 20-25 minute walk for many of us). Revision of the 8 route and deletion of route 43 would negatively impact my whole household. Public transit has been consistently reliable for me and my household, and I would hate to suddenly be cut off from a host of transportation options simply because *additional* options (light rail) are being made available and convenient to others.
Matt	Wenger	43	2	I would like to voice my objection and concerns regarding the planned elimination of the #43 bus route. This is a critical route that connects Montlake residents with Capital Hill, downtown Seattle, and the U-District. Elimination of this route will have significant impact on local travel patterns, encouraging many who live close to the 23rd/24th Ave. E. corridor to resort to using private transportation. Doing so will add further congestion to the Montlake area along 24th Ave. E., encouraging impatient drivers to cut through parallel side streets. The increase in traffic along our residential road (25th Ave. E.) has already been noticed since the recent changes to the Montlake/WA520 intersection. Please reconsider the decision to eliminate route #43. I encourage you to formulate plans that encourage local travel on public transportation instead of plans that erode its adoption.
Ann	Patterson	24	4	Never anything to improve Magnolia. Or West Seattle, or Ballard. The I-5 corridor gets all kinds of love, but I still can't get from Magnolia to anywhere except downtown, and even that has 35-40 minute headway during rush hour. No metro bus should have longer than 20 minute headway during rush hour. The fact that you think 15-20 minute headway on the Rapid Ride buses counts as "frequent" service is kind of telling, though, so I guess I shouldn't expect that to change.
Shannon	Brown	242	4	I am very distressed at the potential deletion of my bus route (242). This is the only route that goes between North Gate and Redmond. It is often standing room only and also has disabled riders who have no other route. The Link changes from the University District to downtown have absolutely nothing to do with this route. It doesn't go to or through those areas. It's perplexing as to why this route would be deleted because of this change. Metro fares were raised in 2013/2014 (I'm not exactly certain of time-frame) and then they asked for more money via voter approval. I voted in favor of more funding for Metro. If my bus is eliminated, I will no longer vote in favor of any future increases for Metro or those who support the deletion of my route. I will ask my friends and family to do the same. More money for less service is not a good way to garner support and frankly, it's infuriating. Thank you very much for your kind attention to my concerns and for allowing me to submit this testimony. It is appreciated.
Laila	Barr	26, 62	4	Both these routes could be made faster and more efficient by using 65th/Ravenna Blvd instead of zig-zagging around Latona/Woodlawn. The 26 will no longer terminate at East Green Lake, so using the current routing with very tight turns does nothing but slow the bus down. By having stops for the 62 at Sunnyside and Latona, riders on Woodlawn would still be more than adequately served.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Bob	Harrington	16, 62	4	I use a power chair. I have regular medical appointments near Meridian Ave N, south of Northgate Way. I have long used the 2 / 13 to get downtown, transferring to the 16 at 3rd & Bell. This provides the minimum need for transfers (I am visually impaired, and live in fear of injuring another rider with my chair getting on and off the bus.) The proposed revision of the route 16 to 62, and accompanying reroute makes it useless to me. I really don't like going into the Bus Tunnel, and this would require two transfers and more opportunities for missed connections. From researching your route map, the best I can see as an alternative is using the route 40, which takes an even more circuitous route than the current 16 - but I at least keep the transfers to one, and get to (sort of) see another part of town. I am a bit disappointed that the same "attack" on the route 16 was used as a threat during recent funding shortages, and now appears as an "improvement". My 2 cents, and I expect change... ;^{\ Thanks,
Jason	Wohlgemuth	242	4	The proximity to route 242 was a key reason that I purchased a new property in the north east part of Green lake roughly 1 year ago. Unfortunately, route 242 has consistently showed up on cut lists related to budgets, and now this - even though the route is heavily relied upon commuter route between Northgate/GreenLake and Redmond. Over the past decade, I've supported levies and tax increases to fund King County Metro, and I'm disappointed that the 242 is again under fire without a reasonable replacement. I've discussed alternatives with Ted Day, to which he recommends the 542 or the Microsoft Connector bus as a replacement. These options would increase my commute time by more than 50%, and would likely push me to drive to work, and reconsider my support for future transportation tax levies. As an example, here are my options for the morning leaving early enough to dodge traffic -- door to door: 1) 20 minutes - Driving - Commute time ~20 minutes w/no traffic. 2) 32 minutes - Route 242 - 27 minute bus ride, 5 minutes total walking. 3) 49 minutes - Route 542 - 27 minute bus ride, 22 minutes total walking. 4) >60 minutes - Microsoft Connector -- >45min bus ride (to Commons), >20 minutes total walking. The aspect of this that I struggle with the most, is that it seems like the Link Connections effort is being used an excuse to cut the route, even though the new light rail stations don't provide any viable public transit to Overlake. I urge the council to push back on the changes to route 242, and at most reduce the frequency of service on the 242 instead of completely cancelling this community resource without any reasonable replacement. Thanks for your attention to this matter.
Sally	Sibson	26	4	Including the local route 26 in this exercise is a fallacy. King County Metro has been trying to get rid of this route for several years now, for reasons that are not clear to me. This is just their latest attempt to justify an action that is patently wrong-headed. The current 26 runs right through the middle of one of the fastest growing areas of the city - Fremont and lower Wallingford - count the cranes, if you can! Contrary to Metro's claim, this area is not served by the new Link, which is miles away to the east, so this is not a duplicate service. The buses are patronized day and night (I know - they run past my home), and they are full during commute times. As all of the new apartment blocks fill up down by the north end of Lake Union, this service will be more essential, not less - unless you want all of these new residents to drive their cars to work. They will not walk all the way up to 40th and Wallingford to catch a bus. Please consider growth, current usage and future needs, and keep the 26 local as it is.
Peter	Ruplinger	28X	4	I currently live around NW 85th and Greenwood and often take the 28X downtown. The current route has a last stop for the Express route at 8th Ave NW and Market St. in Ballard. Then the Express goes up Market/45th with limited stops to downtown. If the proposed route continues into Fremont, then down 39th, how many new stops will be added to the Express route? Will it even be an express route anymore? Has anyone looked at the time it currently takes to get from say NW 85th to Downtown compared to the time it will with (I'm assuming) additional stops in downtown Fremont? It would not make sense to add time to a route in a city that is already difficult to use transit in. One of the frustrating things about Metro is how long it can take to get somewhere when the bus stops on virtually every block (not including stop lights). Express routes are supposed to be just that, and it looks like that will no longer be the case? Unless there is a 28 local that still makes all the stops and an Express that only makes certain stops. Thank you.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Suzanne	Babayan	48, 28	4	<p>I was very disturbed to read about proposed changes to these two routes. I feel that many of the recent reroutings and abbreviations of routes, though perhaps fiscally attractive, defeat the purpose of serving all the members of our community. The farther one needs to walk, the more times one needs to transfer buses, the more securely our transit system becomes one primarily for the young and able bodied. I am recently retired and still consider myself "young-ish" but I have physical issues that sometimes make walking difficult and carrying things (like groceries) more than a block or so frequently a challenge. I live north of 85th, already a disadvantage since I must drive 5 blocks and park to take my 28 and have to drive a bit further to park near my 48 stop but I believe strongly that we all need to get out of our cars and use public transportation. I would far rather use a little bit of fuel and take public transportation if I can. In spite of the discomforts of riding the bus, waiting at a bus stop without a bench, or with a bench already full of people sitting, waiting for a bus in inclement weather or with a constant stream of traffic (noise and horrible air), etc. I think it's the right thing to do. I love the 48 bus because once I am on it I can ride it straight through to my destination, whether I'm going to the Southend or the U district. It is stressful and uncomfortable to switch buses midway through a journey. I need to sit but often in the transfer process there are no available seats on the bus I'm transferring to. I also love the 28 because I can ride it to the Fremont PCC, and only have to walk about 3/4 of a block to get my groceries. It's a great busline to downtown, too. If it's redirected over to Aurora instead of through downtown Fremont it will be much harder for me to get to my PCC. The 40 is a much longer bus ride, and the parking near the stop isn't as good. I know these are minor concerns to you guys but I am certain that there are numerous similar concerns that folks throughout the region have. I know many elders who have suffered because of changes to their bus routes. Not to say that Metro hasn't also done terrific things to make service better but I feel that the biggest PR problem Metro transit has remains the fact that it keeps trying to slim down the number of routes instead of providing more service to more people. I ride the bus, and have always been a bus rider, because it's part of my value system. I grew up in a big city with terrific transit options and I believe passionately that we all must radically reduce (radically!) our use of fossil fuels.</p>

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Jeffrey	Knight	31, 32, 16	4	<p>Testimony provided three times, in all three phases of public outreach, to King County Metro, which did not respond: I am writing to voice my concern about the impending "Link Connections" re-routes for buses 31/32 and 16 on Stone Way in the Wallingford-Fremont area. I filled out the questionnaires in time for the deadlines earlier this year, but wanted to send one last message about this, knowing of course that my input won't likely matter, as it didn't in earlier stages of the community feedback programs. I am a teacher and a first-time homeowner who lives in Seattle happily without a car. IF King County Metro goes through with its proposed changes for the 31/32 and 16 bus routes, my property value will go down instantaneously, and I will have to purchase a car for the first time in my life. More importantly, my fast-developing neighborhood arterial -- Stone Way between 35th and 45th -- will suffer drastically. You may know that this section of Stone Way is among the fastest growing areas in Seattle. The area was re-zoned and put on a road diet recently, which has brought massive development and growth potential, with all kinds of people moving in and terrific businesses to serve them. Right now I count five multi-family building developments, some of them spanning entire city blocks, all from my front window. Only South Lake Union and Capitol Hill rival this degree of growth. When I bought my condo last year, as a first-time homeowner, the primary factor in my choice was proximity to bus lines that could get me north-south (to/from downtown, for transfers) and east-west (for my daily commute) easily. I only had to walk outside onto Stone Way and there was a bus that would take me to school or to downtown right there. Metro's proposed changes will transform the fast, convenient north-south option into a slow, inconvenient one, making it difficult for the residents of my neighborhood to get downtown. Worse, it will **eliminate** the east-west option, moving the 31/32 to Wallingford Ave. In contrast to Stone Way, Wallingford Ave has no current developments, is 99% residential with only one or two businesses, and therefore has exactly zero development potential. Moreover, the distance between Wallingford Ave and Stone Way is just outside what studies have shown to be viable walk-shed for public transportation. People simply will not walk to Wallingford Ave to catch the east-west bus. Why Metro would want to make these changes is beyond me. But one thing is for sure, Metro will not receive many complaints about it. The simple reason is that nobody lives on Stone Way yet, as the multi-family, city-block-wide developments are just going up and will not be open to residents until later this year. The effect is that Metro is making changes that will render this area less desirable for those without a car. The developments will suffer, fewer people will move here (compared to competing fast-developing neighborhoods of SLU and Capitol Hill), and the people who move here will have to own a car. The businesses along Stone Way, including award winning restaurants and bars that have only recently opened up, will suffer -- as customers will not take a bus to Wallingford Ave. and walk outside the walk-shed to get to these businesses. In essence, you will be taking an area of Seattle that has been completely revitalized by progressive thinking about city planning and transportation -- with road diets, greater density and rezoning, etc. -- and you will roll back those progresses, rendering Stone Way a worse place to live. Put simply: please keep the 31/32 on Stone Way instead of Wallingford Ave., and please keep the 16 on Aurora instead of Dexter.</p>
Jessie	Karp	48, 43, 45	4	<p>I am against the proposed changes regarding splitting the present Route 48 into 2 routes: the new Route 45 (Loyal Heights to the University district) and the present Route 48 (University District to Mt. Baker Transit Center). I am also against deleting Route 43. Your proposed changes may be wonderful for people in the northeast corridor of Seattle, but they do absolutely nothing for people who live in the northwest section of the city. I can now take 1 bus (Route 48) when I travel from Greenwood to the Group Health complex on Capitol Hill. I get off at 23rd Avenue E. and E. John Street and then walk up the hill to Group Health. If I choose not to walk, I usually change buses in the University district to Route 43. I change there because there is more seating while I wait for the 43 bus. I am willing to change buses once, but I will not change buses once in the University district just to bring me to 23rd Avenue E. and E. John Street and then have to change again if I choose not to walk up the hill. I have been a mass transit user since I was a teenager on the East Coast and continuing here in Seattle, but if these proposed changes go into effect, I will no longer take the bus, but will drive to the Group Health complex on Capitol Hill. Your prior change eliminating the Route 5 bus to Northgate has resulted in my driving there. I will not change buses to go a total distance of 2-3 miles. It's not worth it and the same thing will happen if you split the 48 and eliminate the 43. It won't be worth my time to take that many buses when I have other options.</p>

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Lewis	Baltuck	73, 16, 62	4	<p>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 would be difficult or impossible (because of the 16 being changed to the 62 skipping Northgate). 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. 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 and changing the 16 bus to the 62 which eliminates services from Northgate to Wallingford 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. 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 wish there would be more bus services in the Jackson Park Neighborhood on Weekdays and Weekends with direct access to other neighborhoods. 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 and the changes to 16 eliminating services from Northgate to Downtown Seattle via Wallingford, 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 and with the proposed changes to the 16 route, I will lose access to Wallingford and the Seattle Center. 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 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 please do not change the Route 16 going from Northgate to Downtown Seattle via NE 45th Street and Wallingford? Thank you very much for reviewing my concerns about the proposed changes. Please see proposed links for your reference below my email message regarding my concerns about the bus route 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. Sincerely, Lewis D. Baltuck (206)-708-1461 Link to The Proposed Bus Route 73 Eliminating Weekend Services: http://metro.kingcounty.gov/programs-projects/link-connections/pdf/073-info-08-15.pdf, Link to The Proposed Bus Route 16 Renumbered to 62 Skipping Northgate and No Access to NE 45th Street and Wallingford: http://metro.kingcounty.gov/programs-projects/link-connections/pdf/062-info-08-15.pdf</p>
Reyes	Ojeda II	43, 49, 71, 72, 73	4	<p>Metro has done a good job at addressing inefficient, low-productivity routes. This service change places Metro in the right direction. However, that does not mean the proposed changes are acceptable. Metro must revisit the following issues that its changes have produced: 1.) Cutting off the Montlake neighborhood from downtown 2.) Eliminating fast & direct service between U-Dist & downtown 3.) Duplication of service along Broadway and Pine St (Metro said it was going to reduce duplicate service, but the new change causes it instead). 4.) Poor transfer area between buses and trains at UW station. Some transfer requires more than a 1,000 foot walk.</p>

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Kristin	Dubrulle	44, 66	4	The proposed changes will increase my 3.7 mile Wallingford <--> SLU commute time by 50% - from a 30 minute commute to a 45 minute commute, and will likely result in me driving to work more often (driving takes 13 minutes). This is because of the "replacement" of the 66 with the 63. It appears that the 63 will not stop in the Udistrict. Your suggestion is to take the 70, which takes significantly longer due to many more stops, the additional time spent in the Udistrict on Campus Parkway and 15th, and the significant traffic on Fairview south of Valley. Google maps suggests that it's faster for me to take the 49 to Capitol Hill and walk to work from there, rather than take the 70. Surely that suggests something is not right. I'd suggest that you take the 66 to see the actual ridership patterns. Most riders get on & off between N 45th and Mercer St - stops that seem like they will not be served at all by the 63. All of these riders could be taking the 70 now (which runs more frequently), but they aren't, indicating that the 70 won't be a reasonable replacement for them either. Even for those riders than can use the 63, the trip will not be efficient or reliable due to traffic getting on to and off of I-5 at Mercer. I have a great view of that traffic from my window, and it is quite terrible. Finally, I do not understand why you are changing routes from the Udistrict to SLU at all, when LINK service has little to no impact on commuters to SLU. You should be adding *more* commute options to SLU from nearby Seattle neighborhoods. SLU is already incredibly traffic choked during rush hour and will soon get worse; we need more (and more efficient) service, with dedicated lanes. Until you build a light rail spur to SLU, you shouldn't be taking away the options we already have. I have always voted in favor of funding the transit projects that have been proposed in my 8 years in Seattle, even coming to public hearings and speaking in favor, and having heated conversations with friends and coworkers. But honestly, having chosen to live in a centrally located neighborhood, on 2 major bus routes, to have my commute to a major Seattle jobs center so negatively impacted by "progress" has left me feeling quite betrayed and doubtful of your planning effectiveness.
Devon	Abdallah	26, 26X	4	I live on Latona street in Green Lake; it is one of the streets the 26 and the proposed 26x travel. I strongly urge you to move the 26 to Ravenna where the 48 and other buses travel. Latona is a residential street where not only do numerous small children live but also an elderly persons home is. While it is not a narrow street, if a bus is on the street, a car cannot pass. Latona is also the end of the 26's route and bus drivers have a tendency to drive faster than usual down our street. This is a concern with all of the school age children and elders on our street. Similarly, Green Lake Elementary is two blocks away and a preschool/after school care is across the street. I hope you take our children's and elders' safety and potential for bus noise level into consideration when you are rethinking the the 26's bus route. Ravenna is a large street with established bus routes.
Susan	Linehan	73X, 73	4	Is there going to be some sort of shuttle around campus? The light rail station isn't exactly near the central campus, not to mention the north campus. In fact it is at the bottom a a big hill. Not everyone riding metro to campus is going to a football game! It might be within a half mile, but it is a very aerobic half mile. I live on top of Queen Anne on the northwest side. To get TO campus is relatively easy: down the hill and catch the 31 or 32. Getting back is a whole 'nother matter--it is straight up really steep hills. I've been taking whichever of the 70X busses comes first and transferring to the 1 or 2. It looks like service to downtown from the central campus will be severely curtailed. (Alternatively Metro could really increase transit riders from the top of Queen Anne by providing a shuttle that goes up the hills on the north end. One that goes up Dravus and down Bertona and loops back via Nickerson would be ideal for me. I'd love to be able to come home from downtown via the rapid ride, or from the U via the 31/32. I'm sure folks on other parts of the hill would feel a shuttle route useful, too.) Without a shuttle through campus, there are going to be a lot of very wet students, faculty and staff on the downtown-bound Link for much of the year. Wet and pissed.
Devotia	Moore	242	4	Please save the 242!! It is a gem of a route, it gets me from Greenlake to Redmond in under 30 minutes. It's a heavily used line, giving those of us who work on the east side more options when we think about our transportation. I see the 542 every morning at our stop, and it is consistently overcrowded and lacks available bike rack space. The 542 is essentially the Microsoft bus, and the 242 gives the rest of us to have a comfortable and available ride to work everyday. The 242 gets on the highway immediately and is a direct route to the east side. The 542 zig zags through neighborhoods and adds almost 15 minutes to the ride. When dealing with traffic in Seattle this is a substantial difference!! The 242 is the closest experience to driving my car to work. It's swift, efficient, reliable, and I always have a place to sit. Please don't take this bus away from us, it's the one of the good things about Seattle public transportation.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Jeffrey	Knight	31, 32, 16	4	Please reject King County Metro's proposed changes. I am a strong believer in an efficient, rationalized bus network, but Metro's proposal makes too many assumptions about car ownership in Seattle neighborhoods and will cripple fast-developing, walkable neighborhoods like mine. I am a teacher and a first-time homeowner who lives at the corner of Stone Way and 40th St. without a car. I bought my condo because of its bus connections: the 31/32 gets me to/from work in the U District and the 16 gets me to/from downtown. The neighborhood is great: this section of Stone Way is among the fastest growing areas in Seattle; the area was re-zoned and put on a road diet in recent years, which has brought massive development and growth potential, with diverse people moving in and terrific businesses to serve them. Right now I count five multi-family building developments, some of them spanning entire city blocks, all from my front window. Only South Lake Union and Capitol Hill rival this degree of growth. If Metro restructures as proposed, all of this progress in my neighborhood will be rolled back significantly: the future residents of these multi-family buildings will be car-dependent, and first-time homeowners like me, who invested in the future of Stone Way, will watch the values and marketability of their properties sink. Currently, the 16 runs from Stone Way to 99 and gets downtown on the 99 express lanes in 10 minutes. Metro plans to reroute the 16 into clogged Fremont and then downtown along Dexter, nearly tripling the amount of time it will take riders in my neighborhood to get downtown or to points of transfer (worse during rush hours). Similarly, the current 31/32 runs the length of Stone Way in its most developed area -- between 35th and 40th -- and onward to the U District. Metro proposes to reroute the 31/32 from fast-developing Stone Way to Wallingford Ave, which has no current developments and is 99% residential with only one or two businesses, and therefore has exactly zero development potential. Worse, the distance between Wallingford Ave and Stone Way is just outside what studies have shown to be viable walk-shed for riders of public transportation. People who live on Stone Way and east of it, in the area of multi-family housing between Stone and 99, will no longer ride that bus. Metro has conducted outreach efforts, and none of the complaints from me and my neighbors on Stone Way have been loud or frequent enough to be considered in their revisions. The simple reason is that Stone Way is currently at only a fraction of its fully developed population, as the multi-family, city-block-wide developments are just going up and will not be open to residents until later this year and next. Because Metro does not take into account the future of neighborhoods, only their current composition (and residents who are already there to publicly comment), it is proposing to make short-sighted changes that will render my area less walkable and more car-dependent. Please reject these proposed changes.
Jeff	Ledolter	242	4	I use the 242 bus almost every day to get to work. Please do not terminate the route! It's a central line that brings King County together.
Molly	Hankins	242	4	Thank you for the opportunity to submit personal testimony in favor of route 242. I am very unhappy that my main and ONLY route to work is on the list for termination. I have lived in Greenlake and worked in Redmond for the last 3 years and this bus route to and from my home and places of work is a godsend. While the proposal to take other buses (including 41 and 63 (which I've never heard of or seen) and 542 (which is farther away from my work than the 242 stop) is appreciated, it is still not enough to make taking the Metro worth it for me if 242 is eliminated. I take the 242 route because I do not want to pay the 520 tolls and because the morning and afternoon routes make it so incredibly easy to get home in a timely manner. If this bus route is eliminated, King County is essentially forcing many people who live from Lake City to Redmond to pay daily 520 tolls and increase the already awful amount of traffic at the day's end. Many Microsoft employees and vendors take the 242 buses too- while Microsoft employees can utilize their Connect shuttles, us Microsoft vendors do NOT have the same opportunity. Instead, we rely on the 242 route solely to transport us to and from work. While I do appreciate the building of the Light Rail, this WILL NOT replace the 242. Instead, those who live in northern Seattle will experience much longer travel times to and from work. The 242 is excellent because it is incredibly quick and goes straight from Greenlake, over 520 and straight to Redmond. For everyone who is in the same situation as me (living in northern Seattle and working in Redmond), this bus route is a blessing. PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE consider keeping this route. King County would maintain the prevention of adding more singular occupancy vehicles to the already awful traffic and make their riders VERY happy.
Levi	Ingersoll	72	5	I think the loss of the 72 would be a hassle for a lot of Ravenna neighborhood residents who live in between other routes that would remain also I believe there are enough riders to at least keep the route between the U-District and Lake City to serve the stops that the 372 doesn't currently serve along the shared corridor

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Garrison	Bromwell	47, 49, 43	8	Metro's proposals for route changes are very weak in the Capitol Hill neighborhood. For example the Bellevue / Summit area currently served by a very lame 47 route could be best served by re-routing the north tail of the 60 to cover Bellevue / Summit along with a re-instated stop at Bellevue and Denny to allow a transfer to an 8. This would give people living in that area a direct link to the Capitol Hill light rail station, the 49 Broadway bus, or first hill medical centers -- all only accessible now with a 4 block UPHILL route. I'm also uncomfortable with the demise of the 43 -- until Link is completed to Northgate transit to the 15th Avenue area is again an 4 block uphill walk to Broadway (49) OR a walk uphill to Link, a ride to Husky Stadium and then a transfer to a 44. None of the options are appealing. KEEP THE 43 UNTIL NORTHGATE LINK IS COMPLETED.
Patricia	Hart	70, 71, 72, 73	--	: I work in the Law School and commute from Bainbridge Island. If I understand the map for recommended service correctly, and I'm not sure I do... the loss of the current 70, 71, 72 and 73 buses would be absolutely devastating for folks who work at north campus and need to commute to downtown. Considering the numbers of folk who travel this corridor, I can't see how the current recommendations can possibly work without a lot of hardship for a lot of people. For myself, what was already a difficult commute, with a transfer from boat to bus, will become nigh on to intolerable with an additional transfer. Also, it looks like there will be a serious problem for the elderly and disabled who will have to deal with transfers and connections. I'd appreciate having a better understanding of the plan to accommodate the large numbers of people who now need to transit between University Ave/45th and downtown? Has there been any consideration of the impact of transfers on the elderly and disabled? Thank you.
Eric	Nordheim	74	2	This bus goes right by my house. I have only used the bus for Jury Duty for two weeks a few years ago because getting downtown at 8:00am is the only time a bus has made sense for my transportation needs. I do keep looking though because driving in heavy traffic is stressful and boring. If there's ever express service to Sea-Tac, CenturyLink Field or to one of the malls, I'll be on the bus and out of my car. I just can't justify it when I can afford to drive and driving takes less than half the time of the bus.
Frequency				
Richard	Fuhr	16, 65	1	Having more frequent and more extensive east/west service on NE 65th Street via the route 16 is going to be good. Having more frequent north/south service on 35th Avenue NE via the route 65 is going to be good. But southbound Montlake Boulevard in the vicinity of the new Husky Stadium Link Light Rail station has been chronically gridlocked for years. Therefore very serious consideration should be given to either 1. Building a southbound transit only lane on Montlake OR 2. Constructing a busway through the Montlake Parking Lot to provide access to the Link Light Rail station. Finally, we need to closely monitor usage of both Link Light Rail and the Link Connection buses after service starts in March, 2016, and we need to make adjustments to service based upon actual usage data, especially in cases where we notice overcrowding. For instance, it may be a mistake to have eliminated the traditional routing of the 71, 72, 73 in deference to the availability of Link Light Rail. There is a risk that the trains and connector buses may get seriously overcrowded, leaving non-rush-hour North Seattle patrons with few alternatives to get to and from Downtown Seattle. If that happens, we need to react sooner rather than later
Kari	Nathan	72, 73, 312, 48, 49, 44, 41, 40, 75, 68, 522, 372, 45, 62	1	I am extremely hopeful that this proposal goes through as is. I would like to rely on transit more than I do now, and a bus network that runs more frequently than 30 minutes (or 1 hour) would be a huge improvement. As it stands in NE Seattle currently, it is difficult to get around unless you happen to live near a route that happens to go exactly where you want to go -- transfers are difficult because of the low frequency of many of the routes and their purpose being mainly to get people between one neighborhood and downtown. Trips that take 20 minutes by car take at least 3x longer by bus. The proposal would improve things tremendously for those of us who live or move around in NE Seattle. I especially appreciate the effort that has gone into getting people traveling between NE Seattle and downtown efficiently. With the light rail as an option, I would hate to be stuck taking a bus traveling on surface streets like I do currently. Currently, I rarely go to Capitol Hill because it takes forever to bus there and parking is a nightmare. To be able to take a frequent bus to the University of Washington station and get to Capitol Hill in just a few minutes on the train is something I am very much looking forward to. I ride all of the routes listed above, and more (except the 45 and 62, which I am looking forward to utilizing). I know there will be some growing pains for the public in order to adjust to the upcoming changes, but I hope the changes are made so more people can use, and rely on, the bus system.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Emilie	Bishop	372	1	I am excited for University Link to open next year, and I love that 372 will run more frequently in order to better align with it. That gives me another option to get downtown that would avoid the often-congested freeway and would be available mid-day. Thanks for considering the needs of Northshore area riders in your planning!
Charles	Bond	67	1	I strongly endorse the proposed frequent 67 route. The previously proposed 10 minute frequency was much better, but the new 15 minute frequency is also excellent. Please keep the newly proposed high frequency routes for NE Seattle. We want all of our major routes to have this 15 minute or better frequency as much as possible throughout the week. Please use this opportunity to make Seattle a much more accessible place by allowing frequent buses that connect to light rail stations to come to fruition. Don't listen to the angry voices that would prefer no change to better service.
Charles	Bond	67	1	I am in favor of all of KC Metro's proposed changes to the routes I've listed including both for the Link restructure and for the additional service hours Seattle is paying for. I would like to see all major bus routes in north Seattle running at 15 minute or better frequency. All of these routes should also connect to at least one light rail station. The more direct connections we have to light rail stations, the better we can utilize this regional investment.
Nathan	Fulfs	45, 48, 62, 73, 75	1	Please approve the proposed Metro service changes. The new routes and increases in frequency in Northeast Seattle to take advantage of U-Link are fantastic and MUST occur to avoid wasting a huge amount of service hours. I am particularly excited about the east-west bus proposed as the 62, and the split of the 48. As someone who frequently takes the 48 from the U-district up to Green Lake or Aurora, the idea of a 48 (to be 45 under the proposal) that is actually on time is astounding. I'm less excited about the changes to Capitol Hill, although the frequency improvements are good, but even if these are held off on (and I'm not saying they should be), the Northeast Seattle changes MUST happen.
Mike	Knezevich	75	1	Hi, I think, for the most part, that the changes for NE Seattle are great. Making the 75 every 15 minutes during the day is great. However, I sure do wish that the 75 turned around and went to the new Husky Stadium Link station instead of continuing on as a different route. As it stands, we will have to take a significant walk from the closest 75 stop on campus to the Link station at Husky Stadium. That becomes problematic when it is raining or dark. I am getting elderly and have a health issue, and it seems unreasonable to ask me to walk about 1/3 mile with luggage if I am going to the airport. To encourage transit use, it is imperative that transfers happen within a very short distance of each other. The 75 -> Link transfer is not really a transfer. It is a hike.
Aaron	Lichtner	67, 73, 66, 68	1	I am very excited about the dramatic proposed changes for NE Seattle. My current bus, the 68, only every 30 minutes from about 7am to 7pm. This bus takes me to the U District where I must transfer to go to Capitol Hill or Downtown (my two most common destinations). With the proposed changes, the new bus 67 will come EVERY 15 minutes from 5am to 1am. This will take me straight to the U District (on a less roundabout route than currently there exists) and to the LINK station where I'll be able to get to Cap Hill, Downtown, the airport etc., easily without worrying about traffic. I won't have to worry nearly so much about how I'm going to get home if I'm out past 7pm. Currently, if I'm out late I always have to go downtown to catch the once an hour 73 bus. Thank you for being aggressive and I look forward to using the new system.
Isaac	Mann-Silverma	71, 62, 48	1	My wife and I are frequent users of public transit to travel from our home in Ravenna to Fremont, Sand Point, Capitol Hill, and downtown. We are both extremely excited to read the proposed changes to the buses that service our area. The increased frequency and reliability of those lines will make commutes much more manageable and pleasant, and promises to free up significant portions of our day. We commend the King County Metro and encourage the City Council to adopt their plan quickly, for the benefit of those of us who rely on quick and reliable public transportation for their livelihoods.
Ross	Bleakney	--	1	Overall, I think the changes are good, and should be adopted. The increased frequency will save people a considerable amount of time and frustration with transit.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Leslie	Basel	62, 65, 75, 372	1	I am Jazzed about this restructure for NE Seattle. I am very much looking forward to a much more frequent 372 especially for the commute. 15 minutes on Saturday and 30 minutes on Sunday is just mind-blowingly good to get to the Husky Stadium LR station. In addition, a much more frequent 65 and 75 means that my night commute, while a 5-10 minute walk to Stevens Lane, means only a 1-2 minute wait for a bus to Lake City. I am slightly sad at the loss of the 72 and the loss of the 73 at off-peak, but let's face it, a 1x hour 72 and a only slightly more frequent 73 on Sundays means it was the walking dead to me anyway. I expect that if I want to get to Roosevelt, I would take the very frequent 372 and the also very frequent 62. In my mind, Metro is doing EXACTLY what they should be doing to use the Husky Stadium LR station effectively, Kudos to the planners working on the NE Seattle line.
Joseph	Zagrodnik	75, 30, 74	1	I am highly in favor of the proposed changes to the bus routes that run along Sand Point Way NE. Currently there are not enough buses during daytime hours and the 30/74 are redundant so it makes sense to go forward with this restructuring. It will benefit the system in the long run.
Jeff	Altman	522, 372	1	Hi -- I strongly favor the proposed changes to Metro Transit bus service that will accompany the opening of Link light rail to Husky Stadium. I am especially in favor of reducing the number of Metro Transit bus lines in order to have more frequent service on the remaining lines. Not having to wait excessive lengths of time when transferring from light rail to Metro bus service will make the new system much smoother and more acceptable.
Andres	Salomon	71, 72, 73, 66, 67	1	I support and applaud the proposed Metro restructuring for NE Seattle. I used to live at NE 62nd and 39th Ave NE, which is served very infrequently by the 71. One of the reasons I chose my current house near NE 75th and 15th Ave NE is because it had better transit service. If the Metro restructuring had happened a year ago (with the proposed 62 service of every 15 mins), I would've stayed in the same area as opposed to moving to better transit. Others in NE Seattle who do not have the option to move should benefit from the proposed service improvements. At my current home, the 72 and 73 are frequently late and bunched together. In theory, they should come about 30 mins apart and offset. In reality, it's often more like every 45 mins, with both arriving at the same time. The alternatives that I can take, the 66 and 67, have similar problems. I see no problem with dropping the (redundant) 72, and am excited about *real* frequency (service every 15 mins) for the 67.
Charles	LaPorte	65, 78	1	I support increasing the frequency of the 65 bus route. It is our main route to/from UW campus. I also support maintaining the on-campus stops. I also support the new (proposed) 78.
Colette	Moore	65	1	I take the 65 and the 71 routes from 85th and 35th to UW. As long as the line from Wedgwood to the University is preserved, I am on board with changes. It'd be great to have the new line 78 replace the service that we would lose on the changed 71 route. We'd love more frequent service.
Michael	Byers	67, 242, 71, 72, 74, 77, 41	1	Please keep thinking about connectivity and frequency!
Joshua	Newman	67, 73	1	Love the new changes; trading geographic coverage for frequency and trips into the evening is what we need!
Bruce	Landon	75, 65	2	I think the Metro Transit service has done a good job in focusing on public comments from users of buses in NE Seattle that we are willing to walk further to a bus stop if busses arrive more frequently. Metro's proposal does indeed provide more frequent service during rush hours and midday. However, I would like to suggest that frequency of service is more important at night than during midday. Let me explain. People using buses during midday in general are not going to or coming from work. They have more flexibility with their schedule. If they miss a bus, there are shops and other activities open to keep them occupied. Finally, waiting 30 minutes for the bus while it is light out, is much less daunting than than waiting in a deserted area at night. From my own experience, I can say that I used to take buses to an from events in downtown at night, but no longer do so due to infrequent service. I would suggest that if there is insufficient funding to provide for more frequent service for both midday and night buses, that priority be given to more frequent night service.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Ray	Bernstein	71, 72, 73, 76, 64, 316, 31, 372, 74, 66, 67	2	I am a frequent rider of the bus network in ne Seattle, both commuting to downtown, at peak hours and evening and weekends I take trips with my two young kids. I am very much in favor of the changes proposed. The frequencies of my commute routes the 64 and 76 will be improved and the 64 will actually get me closer to my work by shifting to mercer/fairview. Outside of rush hour, I have no problem with transferring in Roosevelt. In fact I prefer it to transfers on the age, since it is a safer place to wait with the kids, and will get me and other riders ready for the light rail station. I also like how the feeders down 25th will get close to the stadium station. In short. Please institute the proposed changes in northeast Seattle. Thank you. Ray
Lee	London	76, 48, 66	2	I live in NE Seattle, and I wanted to praise the changes in the U-Link restructure for my area. The added frequency and streamlined routes will make it easier and more timely to move around via transit. The added frequency help make transit something to be used for more than just commuting. Please implement the NE Seattle proposal as soon a possible.
Amy	Taylor	8	2	Please increase evening frequency of the #8 bus. Work to provide bus only lanes on Denny in South Lake Union to increase speed of this bus, it is always stuck in traffic behind those waiting to get on I-5 South. Thanks for working to make these changes!
Mark	Newman	8, 65	2	Seattle desperately needs to rationalize its bus network. I fully support these efforts to improve frequency and reliability of the bus routes, as well as legibility for the network. As a new resident, I want to emphasize the importance of having a bus network that is understandable and makes sense to new users - surely a good way to attract riders. I suggest that, as much as possible, bus routes should correspond to the streets on which they run, so that the bus and the street become inextricably linked. This allows for a grid of high frequency, easily accessible buses at the expense of increasing transfers. As an aside, since transfers are a penalty to rAiders, may I suggest discounts or rebates on their fare when riders make transfers. This seems feasible with Orca. Thank you, and keep up the good work!
Grahm	Satterwhite	70, 71, 72, 73, 48, 49, 271	2	Please approve the March 2016 Metro Transit service change as proposed. These service changes provide increased frequency and improve the distance a rider can travel by reducing wait times. The majority of the routes involved in the service change are high performing routes and these changes will only serve to increase efficiency and better serve Metro customers. Please approved the service changes as proposed and encourage Metro staff to continue these commendable efforts in improving the efficiency of the transit system and the mobility of the riders.
Gus	Catalano	65, 71, 545	2	I really like the proposal because of the increased frequency of buses in northeast seattle. Please use the proposal! The only updates I would make to it is more night time routes.
Drew	Porter	49	2	The proposed changes make a lot of sense -- I recognize that concerns over major changes but they make good sense and I hope Metro will show the political courage and confidence in its plans to go ahead with them. I prefer the initial proposed changes to Capitol Hill routes over the watered-down second version, but I think the highest priority is to implement the Northeast vision with dependable 15- and 10-minute frequency on major routes. The city has changing quickly and needs a more modern and logical mass-transit layout that people can depend on. As an example, as the 49 bus has become more consistent and frequent with Prop. 1 funding, my family has been more likely to use it for commuting and downtown trips -- and less likely to use our car.
Matthew	White	16, 76, 372, 64, 45, 44	2	I'm writing to support the NE Seattle bus restructure. I frequently travel on a bus with a four year old and the hardest part of doing so is the unpredictable time it takes to get to the bus stop. The increased frequency service is going to be a godsend, even if it does mean that we have to change buses more often (preschooler considers getting on a bus to be lots of fun, so this is actually a win in the short term).
Lloyd	Adalist	8, 11	2	Please send the westbound 8 and 11 up John St from Madison without the jog on 19th Ave east and vice versa. Saves many minutes for those going to Link on Cap Hill and to downtown. Thanks for the increased frequencies on the 11!

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Lucas	Simons	11, 43, 48, 12, 44, 8, 10, 70s, 49	2	This restructure enables higher frequency and easy trips to more locations by. It also leverages the enormous time advantage of transferring to U-Link from many parts of Northeast Seattle. I'm excited with the opportunities it will afford me to reach more parts of the city in shorter time living at the intersection of the Capitol Hill and UDistrict neighborhoods. I've heard you are getting a lot of push back from curmudgeony voters who are afraid of change. Please don't give in to their pressure. This restructure is a great move in the right direction to make the bus system in northeast Seattle and beyond more usable to more people. More broadly, for the whole system and agency, it sets an important precedent that planning will happen with the mindset that Metro is out to build the best possible bus system it can in terms of ride time and serving as many people as possible. If the Council strangles this proposal it will only make Metro even more reluctant to rationalize the network County-wide. Not moving forward will mean we are telling future generations we are to afraid of change and push back from certain voters sets who get slightly inconvenienced by service changes and cannot provide a better system. I hope that is not the message you want to send. The planning and outreach up to this point has been really great. I'm excited with the proposal and newfound usability of the bus system I will have if it goes through. Please don't scuttle it and leave a mess for future generations to clean up.
Alicia	Eyler	48	2	I really like the changes contained in the U-Link bus restructure. I think it will make the bus system more frequent and better integrated with the new lightrail extension. I'm most excited about the possibility of more frequent bus service, even at off-peak hours.
Eric	Jackson	8, 48, C, D	2	Splitting the 8/48 is great, thank you! As is the C/D split. More frequent service to N Seattle is also great! Can't wait for these changes, well done KC Metro.
Susan	Keown	--	2	I support the proposed changes to the Metro bus routes. These changes will significantly increase the utility of bus routes by making lines more frequent and more reliable, and also connect bus riders to the new light rail train stations. As a 48-bus rider in particular, I appreciate how the proposed changes will increase this route's reliability. Please implement these changes as proposed.
Megan	Karalus	555, 373, 271	2	Any improvements in frequency are appreciated. Please do keep buses off streets where light rail is already running. Connect me instead directly to the new light rail stations!
Anna	Feldman	8, 11	2	THE NUMBER EIGHT I ride the #8 to school every day. The 8 is regularly 5-10 minutes delayed, and when it is more than 10 minutes late I am late to school, for which I receive an unexcused tardy. In addition, I take the 8 home, and I commonly have to wait 30 minutes for it to come because it's always late (I wait in the rain and cold weather in the winter, which is not very pleasant). I am super happy about these changes, because I'll be able to get to school on time and get home quicker because the bus won't be as late, and I'll have more options for when I can catch it! Also, I frequently take the 8 to Seattle Center and South Lake Union. I am very happy that these changes will preserve this service. The last way that I use the 8 is by taking it to the light rail, and the light rail to the airport. Again, I am very happy that this will still be an option for me. The 8 is overwhelmingly the bus I depend upon the most to get me around the city, and so I am excited to see better and more frequent service on this route! THE NUMBER ELEVEN I often use the #11 to get downtown. Just today I wanted to take it downtown, but it wasn't coming for another half hour due to infrequent service and delays, so I ended up walking half a mile up a steep hill to get the 43. I much prefer taking the 11 - it's so much more convenient for me - and so I'm very happy that there will be more frequent service on this route! Overall, I think that these proposed changes will mean a lot for better, more frequent service and fewer delays. I strongly urge the council to approve the proposed changes. Thank you!
Nathan	Machida	62, 65, 75, 49	2	Please move forward with a plan that provides a grid of frequent all day routes in Northeast Seattle where there aren't any as of now. Please move to retain options for the restructure that emphasize frequency and ridership over coverage. Simplifying and improving the frequency of the bus system, while integrating with the new Link service should be the guiding priority with this restructure, rather than listening to the loudest, most conservative public feedback that comes in. For late night service to Capitol Hill, i.e. after 11PM, span becomes marginally more important than frequency. Reducing frequency earlier in the evening in order to offer 2:30AM and 3AM service would capture a segment of riders that presently aren't catered to in the schedule. This concept applies to other entertainment districts as well, such as Ballard and Fremont. The lack of orientation to these slices of the ridership market allow Lyft and Uber to snatch up potential business from Metro. Thank you.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Brandt	Scanlan	45, 48, 62, 65, 68, 76, 78, 372	2	Overall, I enthusiastically support the U-Link restructure proposed by Metro for March 2016. I strongly support the changes proposed to Metro service in NE Seattle. There are a lot of things to like - frequent service across 65th St on the new route 62, increased frequency and span of service on the 65 and 372, the split of the 48 with increased frequency and reliability, etc... Frankly, I would prefer to see most of these changes happen tomorrow, rather than wait until March, but Link is critical to support many of the network changes. I am less certain that the changes proposed for the Capitol Hill area represent a significant improvement over the current service - I preferred the network concept shown in the first U-Link restructure proposal for this area. However, the changes proposed now make sense, and the increased frequency and span of service on many routes will be nice. Please approve Metro's U-Link restructure proposal. Thank you.
Melissa	Kerson	48, 8	2	I want to speak out in strong support for the proposed restructure of bus service once the University Link opens. This restructure will enable higher frequency and easy trips to more locations. It also leverages the enormous time advantage of transferring to U-Link from many parts of Northeast Seattle. Some people will complain about losing a one-seat ride, but they miss the point that the overall trip will be just as fast (or faster), plus the network as a whole will be so much better. The Northeast Seattle changes are a huge step forward for transit connectivity and frequency. Don't let this restructure get watered down. I was very disappointed with the outcome of the central area bus restructure.
Jim	Stearns	11, 43, 12, 8	2	<p>Route 11 is my main bus (I live in Madison Park). I support the increased frequency - thank you! I support the route modification to go past the new Capitol Hill Light Rail Station (CHS). CHS is the nearest station to east Madison neighborhoods. Getting downtown will be faster taking light rail from CHS, as will getting to Husky Stadium and UW Medical Center in the opposite direction. Fellow transit enthusiast Reg Newbeck has raised six concerns over the proposed change to 11 at the Seattle Transit Blog. I am sure he has raised them with you. Here are my responses: 1. Yes, the proposed 11 is about a quarter mile longer than the current 11. The increased frequency will help some. But the extra quarter mile is a price worth paying for access to CHS. Suggestions for Metro and SDOT: consider signal prioritization at the two quick turns near Group Health and Safeway, and for west-bound traffic, consider extending the length of the right-turn only lane on Olive for traffic heading west on Denny. 2. The transfers between 11 and 12 are no longer step-off/step-on, but nonetheless reasonable. The west-bound transfer entails about a 100 pace walk, and the east-bound transfer about 200 paces. No steep terrain is involved. I would urge Metro SDOT to consider either (1) painting a cross-walk across 19th Avenue at Howell, or (2) adding an east-bound bus-stop on Madison just east of 19th. The latter change would cut the east-bound transfer distance in half. 3. Route 8 is indeed removed from John/Thomas and placed on Madison/19th. With this shift, 8 matches the route of the proposed 11 all the way from MLK and Madison to Olive and Denny. The same route over that distance will simplify transfers and will reduce confusion if the two buses shared a route, then deviated, then shared a route again. 4. The current 11 does not provide "seamless" access to all parts of the Community College. It drops students off at the southern end of the campus. The West Station of CHS provides access less than one block from the northern end of the campus. With respect to businesses on Pine between Madison and Broadway, it is true that the proposed 11 will no longer provide step-off access. But all route changes involve a trade-off: the new 11 will provide one-seat access to Group Health, Safeway, and the 15th Avenue business district. The new 11 will also provide good access for students attending the Meany Middle School opening in 2017. 5. Yes, moving 8 off of East John between 19th and 23rd Avenues does eliminate direct access to this neighborhood - riders will have to walk a few blocks to the bus stops on 19th or Madison. But East John between 19th and 23rd is residential, in contrast to Madison and 19th, which are major roads. The current 43 bus service is electric, and going away. 8 is fossil-fueled. The new route change to move 8 off of East John will make for a quieter neighborhood, perhaps worth the longer walk to a bus stop. 6. Yes, the west-bound turn from Madison onto north-bound 19th is sharp, less than 90 degrees. But the turn is no sharper than what 8 currently negotiates east-bound on Madison turning south on MLK. I think Metro and SDOT agree with Reg's statement that changes will have to be made at this interchange to make the turn easier. I am confident that Metro is already considering such changes. The changes to Route 11 that Metro is proposing will make it easier for east Madison riders to connect with the new Capitol Hill Light Rail Station. That is the goal of Metro's Link Connection project. Go for it!</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENT SUBMITTED ON SEPT 3: May I make one correction to my submitted comment? I understated the difference in distance between the current and proposed 11 route. The difference is a half mile, not a quarter mile. Measured from 19th and Madison to Pine and Bellevue, the current route is about 5000 feet; the new route about 7500. At 10MPH the route difference expressed in time is about 3 minutes. I apologize for the inaccuracy. Lesson learned: measure twice, blab once :-)</p>

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Kathryn	Oseen-Senda	--	2	I approve heartily of the increase in bus frequency in University District. One of the biggest problems in Seattle transit is that the buses are often so infrequent that transit times are many multiples of driving times, which serves to discourage transit.
Kevin	Duffy-Greaves	62, 45, 8, 16, 26, 28, 26X, 28X, 44	4	As a resident of East Ballard/West Woodland and daily UW-Seattle commuter where I attend the law school, I want to express my strong support for the proposed restructure offered by Metro. It is very important that we concentrate on providing frequent and reliable transit on a simplified network instead of trying to provide one-seat rides from everywhere to everywhere else which reduces frequency and reliability. In order to get people to switch to transit and out of their cars, they need to be able to walk out to the street without having to look at schedule or get frustrated when a bus is delayed for long periods of time. The proposed restructure in NE Seattle is an aggressive vision which we need to adopt. Please support the changes as proposed which focuses on funneling passengers to the new UW Link station which provides far greater speed and reliability despite the transfer penalty.
Jon	Gunther	16	4	I love the new routing and frequency proposed for the new 62, which will take over for the 16. Please enact the proposed ULink Metro restructure. It enables a more cost effective and efficient Metro system.
Zachary	Lubarsky	8	4	The ULink restructure, while not perfect, is good. Alternative 1 would have been better, but the increased frequencies in NE Seattle and CapHill are game changers. Get it done!
Frank	Schmitt	8	4	I'm really excited to see these changes take effect and transform mobility in northeast Seattle, but on a personal I'm most excited to see more frequency on route 8, which is the only direct route between where I live and Capitol Hill. The vast number people who will benefit most probably don't realize how much they will benefit, and the minority who may have an extra transfer or a block or two extra to walk are going to be the most vocal at the present time. With that in mind I hope the council has the vision and courage to approve this restructure.
Bill	Kelly	48, 316, 16	4	The changes proposed by Metro are great to see. I especially like the increased number of trips for the 316 and think the splitting of the 48 will help with its reliability. I'm glad to see the 48 having 15 min frequency (or less) at all times of the day, every day of the week. I hope at some point the 48 can be as frequent as every 10 minutes to make connections to U-Link (and eventually the Northgate Extension) even that much easier. Good work!
Dale	Menchhofer	16, 62	4	I am in favor of the Northeast Seattle changes. Although my commute on route 16 to Belltown will be slower on route 62 and one stop further from work, I like that it will be more frequent, and that I can use it to get to Magnuson Park, and that it will provide a direct connection to Roosevelt High School from Wallingford, and that it will directly connect to the Roosevelt light rail station when that opens in a few years. Running 62 on Dexter instead of the 16 on Aurora should also improve ridership in South Lake Union. Every morning on the 16, a huge crowd gets off at the Denny Way stop and almost all walk east. Because of better stop location on Dexter, route 62 will save up to 1/2 a mile of walking for trips to/from SLU. When combined, all of the Northeast Seattle changes make the network of routes more grid-like and more frequent. This will make more trips at more times of the day reasonable by transit. The same service hours will result in higher ridership, which is the reason why they should all be done.
Brian	Ferris	16, 26, 28, 31, 32, 62, 65	4	* In general, I am in favor of the NE Seattle network changes. I appreciate the increased frequency and the connections to the new light rail station. * I spent seven years living and working near UW and I've spent a lot of time waiting for infrequent routes like the 65 and 75. The new increased frequency and connection to the light rail station will make getting around the neighborhood and getting downtown a lot less painful. * I like the new 1-seat ride on the 62 from Fremont to Green Lake to Magnuson Park. * The split of the 48 makes a lot of sense. The route is so long in it's current form. * I ride a lot of buses through Fremont. The changes to the 26 + 28 seem reasonable to me.
Kevin	Werner	49	4	Hello: I am writing in support of the proposal to realign services to fewer but more frequent routes following Link's service start to UW. Metro's proposal makes a lot of sense to me and I would utilize the proposes services frequently in combination with bicycling as my main commute.
Skylar	Thompson	31, 32, 62, 44	4	The entire set of changes will improve transit for me in the Fremont/Wallingford area, and make Link much more accessible. I commute to UW from upper Fremont using the 44, and the frequency improvement will speed that trip, make it more reliable, and provide a great alternative route to downtown during the frequent WSDOT-caused congestion on SR99. Please keep /all/ these changes intact.
Michael	Davis	8	4	I want to voice my support for the proposed changes to the 8 route. But I also support the changes in the northeast and the resultant increase in frequent service throughout the area.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Nishant	Thakkar	--	4	I appreciate the increased frequency that'll come of these changes. Switching buses is easy if we have that frequency.
David	Lawson	62, 65, 67, 75, 78, 372	6	Please approve Metro's proposed restructure of service in connection with the opening of U-Link. The new service patterns will make it far easier to use transit throughout Northeast Seattle, doubling frequency along almost all major corridors and substantially speeding off-peak trips to downtown and Capitol Hill, without affecting riders' peak-hour commutes. For me personally, because of the replacement of infrequent route 71 with frequent route 62, the doubling of trips on Route 76, and the doubling of frequency on route 372, I expect to visit the Ravenna and Wedgwood neighborhoods far more frequently than I did before.
T. Gordon	Court	49, 8, 75	6	I think the restructures are great! I really look forward to not having to check the schedule for the buses now that they run so frequently, honestly if there was a complaint I wish the 75 could be converted to a Rapid ride bus, like the D line and the E line. The increased frequency will really help me get around. I can understand why some people are concerned with the changes, but those concerns are out of irrational fear based on misinformation, the proposed changes to the bus network are great, and they must go through.
Matt	Leber	75, 65, 73	6	I strongly support Metro's proposed service changes. The proposed changes increase the frequency of buses on the most used routes and dramatically improve connections among high frequency corridors - especially Link Light rail. While I currently have access to frequent bus service, I often choose to drive due to a lack of frequent bus service that connects to the Sound Transit 550, the bus line closest to me. I am confident this new network will allow me to convert trips I currently drive on into transit oriented trips. As Link is expanded to the Eastside, the frequent service connections I will have access to will expand as well. I urge you to not water down the proposal in favor of inefficient "one seat ride" routes that are a legacy of a past where everybody went to Downtown Seattle. The city has grown up - Our transit network needs to as well.
Janice	Tufte	25, 8	8	I appreciate your continued work on evaluating our bus riders input on the upcoming cuts and changes. I had used bus 25 route often when I lived in Roanoke Park area, it was my primary bus to and from my work at Metropolitan East. I also used the 25 bus to get to City/ KC focused meetings downtown during week. During commuter hours 7-9 and 4:30-6:0 the 25 bus can be full any day of the week. I believe that a smaller commuter type bus (like Dart) could help many who will not be served at all in the Mountlake area. The number 8 bus I take often too, and it is UNBELIEVABLE how crowded they are during rush hour, where drivers line up for freeway access at Olive is crazy to say the least. The Island where us bus riders want to get off or on at is near impossible to get to at certain times of day because if drivers waiting for access to I-5 entrance at Olive. Please, Please only increase bus service on 8, take a ride yourself some Friday from Amazon area at SLU up the hill, packed even at 3PM. So many riders going to and from Capitol Hill to SLU it is amazing.
Kellen	Donohue	65, 75, 372, 62, 8	8	I used to live on Lake City Way and I wish I had the 65/75/372 changes then. It was frustrating having the 65/75 at 30 min frequency, especially when they left from the bus stop near my apt at the same time! Doubling the frequency would have made it much easier to get around and much less stressful about leaving at the exact right minute. Expanded 372 service to nights and weekend would have been great as well since the 372 is much faster when I'm just going to UW. I'd also like to comment on the 62, this is great routing connecting many pairs, and makes trips to Magnuson Park much more attractive. Before I wouldn't want to take transit to, for example, the summer movies, because the 75 hour frequencies when the movie ends are simply unacceptable. 15 minute serve over the whole span would be amazing. Also the 8 improvements are game changing and needed for this important route.
Andrew	Walker	71, 72, 73, 372	8	I greatly support Metro's proposed changes in the north end of seattle to better coordinate with the opening of Link and the rest of the changes Metro is suggesting for the north end. WE need a more gridded system with better frequencies with good intrgration with Link and other transit, and this is a great step in that direction.
Chad	Newton	--	8	I strongly support the recommended transit services changes to coordinate with the opening of University Link. The recommended changes will bring increased transit frequency to many areas of Seattle, including frequent transit service for the first time to portions of NE Seattle. As a car owner, I usually can't justify using transit service where headways are 30 minutes or greater. Expanding the areas with 15 minute transit service will increase the quantity and types of trips where transit is a reasonable option.
Benjamin	Robbins	8, 43, 49	8	Increased bus frequency is essential to maintaining a transit system that people want to use. This restructuring will be very helpful in this regard. Please see that it is implemented.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Eric	Hutcheson	2, 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 12, 43	8	I support the changes proposed especially to routes 8 and 11. Currently the route 8 is almost always late making it unreliable for making it to work on time. The route 11 needs more frequency it currently runs every 30 minutes which is not enough, and it tends to always be late so at least more frequent service would help alleviate the poor on time performance of these routes and allow those of us commuting to work to get to work on time.
Joe	Kunzler	48	--	Support strongly as a tourist to your area and a regular STB reader the King County Metro proposed changes. More frequency and links to light rail will be helpful to making buses & light rail work together.
Michael	Manderscheid	62, 372	--	The proposed March 2016 package is great, especially the new route 62 with the much-needed frequent east-west connections that it provides, and the improved frequency on route 372. The 62 and 372 changes will make it much easier for me and others to travel between our office in Bothell and Green Lake or Sand Point/Children's Hospital.
Lauren	Campbell	41, 73, 71, 72, 70, 347, 40	1	I take the bus everyday, and for years that has been going well for me. I don't have a car anymore. Two years ago I got rid of my car. But now I live just a bit further from downtown and to rely on the busses alone is impossible. The further you get from downtown the buses run less frequent and now, with traffic being so horrible everywhere, it makes the busses run late. I rely much more on ride sharing apps like lyft and uber. But those cost me so much. So my decision 2 years ago to give up my car is now looking more and more impossible to maintain. I was a driver who chose to get off the road, one less car, yay! But now I will be buying a car and that's just one more car on these already congested roads.
James	Smyth	26, 16, 28	2	The reduction of service from Greenlake, lower east Wallingford and vicinity to South Lake Union is a seriously flawed strategy. The freeway drastically impedes access to U District routes. The 16 proposed frequency is not nearly high enough to replace the 26 and 28 needs for Dexter Avenue and South Lake Union. There is massive infill occurring from upper Stone Way North all the way downtown on the 26-28 local routes. This proposal does not recognize any of that development. Rather it is a business as usual approach focused on downtown only further reducing South Lake Union access. The 16 northbound has serious reliability issues on North 45th Avenue and is not a serious substitute for the 26 which runs on a much less congested routing. The 16 would be acceptable with artics and 5 minute peak hour frequency and 15 minute off peak frequency. The proposal is not responsive to the needs.
Joyce	Latino	8	2	Here's 2 truisms about commuting: 1) People do not want to get cold and wet as a result of using public transportation. 2) People do not want to waste time standing around waiting for public transportation. Regarding the #8 evening and Sunday frequency, 30 minutes wait time is a looser. It's a looser now & will continue to be if the frequency isn't reduced to 15 minutes. The #8 is the only way to get from Capitol Hill to Seattle Center and return. Weekends and evenings are when people want to commute to and from the Hill to Seattle Center to see dance, opera, film and theater performances. People do not want to stand around waiting a half hour after a performance in the dark, cold & rainy night for the bus to get home. 30 minute frequency is a non-incentive and the reason people drive. A general comment regarding bus connections at the UW Husky Stadium station -- it blows my mind that the buses are not stopping directly at the station to load/unload commuters, rather the commuters have to hike to and from the connecting bus stops several minutes. If you want to encourage people to use transit you have to eliminate the hassle factor because there are less-hassle alternatives. People do not want to get cold and wet as a result of using public transportation. People do not want to waste time standing around waiting for public transportation. Therefore, please reconsider increasing the frequency of the #8 to every 15 minutes during evenings and Sundays, and work on bringing buses directly to the light rail stations.
Tetesa	Kottcamp	50	2	The south end still can be better served with more frequency or some close looping of the route 50 bus so it connects more frequently with the Columbia city light rail station. Especially in the evening it can be unsafe to wait for any length of time at Alaska St for a 50 heading eastbound. I know many people who drive and park in Columbia City because of the poor connector service. It would also be advisable to start adding a 3rd car to link lightrail trains as the commute times are getting quite crowded especially in the summer as so many people are riding to the airport. And please add wifi in the tunnels. They do in other major cities like DC. Why is our technology driven metropolis without this capacity?
Saffron	Igo	26X	4	I'm concerned that the bus will be too crowded since you're getting rid of the 26, adding riders from Northgate and because of the influx of Amazon workers now ind increasingly in the future. We'll need to dramatically increase bus capacity and frequency. My current 26x ride has been downgraded to a small bus and it's like a sardine can. And that's when the driver doesn't have to skip stops because the bus is too full. Not satisfied!

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Michele	Thornquist	15	4	If we had a rail/subway running along Holman and/or 85th, there should be a more frequent schedule for the 15 to get people to that connection. Right now it is only an express/commuter bus, but that leaves the rest of us out.
Network Connections				
Ints	Luters	74, 75, 71, 30	1	The proposed changes provide much needed improvements for NE Seattle and gets the most use out of the LINK station coming online at Husky Stadium. This restructure will serve a user base of single parent families in Magnuson Park, elderly and students in the condos and university apartments surrounding Magnuson Park. Improved transit gives these people much needed access to goods and services they did not have before. Finally an east-west connection from Magnuson Park/Sand Point will be available to those whose only choice was one bus (75) to either get them to U-village or Lake City.
Andrew	Oberdeck	71, 75, 271	1	I support the proposed changes as submitted by Metro.
Peter	Stewart	66, 67, 16, 73, 72	1	The U-link bus restructuring is a long overdue change to our out-dated bus system. We need a multi-nodal system for our multi-nodal city. Please adopt these changes.
Jonathan	Howard	--	1	Please implement all of the proposed service changes. This will revolutionize transit in North Seattle. This is a must-do.
Kayleigh	Schickler	8, 10, 43, 66, 67, 68, 73, 271	1	I support Metro's proposed changes to routes in NE Seattle when Link opens at UW. I live in NE Seattle, work in either Capitol Hill or Bellevue, and my daily commute is an average of 4hrs/day by bus. I believe the proposed changes along with Link's service to the new CHS station will support more ridership as a bus/rail commute would afford a less hefty commute.
Matthew	Johnson	72, 312, 77, 372	1	Route 72 is the closest bus to me, but I typically ride 312 or 77 because they are so much faster than the 72 for trips to downtown. Starting in March, I am really excited to start riding the 372 to the new Link Light Rail station at Husky Stadium. With the higher frequency of 372, I know that I will be able to depend on it 7 days a week to connect me to Link, and downtown Seattle. For the reasons above, I support deleting route 72, and increasing service on 372. My support of the restructure reaches far beyond my own local routes. The entire NE Seattle restructure is well thought out and prepares us well for the next 5 years until Northgate Link opens. I strongly support the proposed changes and can't wait to start riding the improved routes!
Ian	Strader	66, 71, 72, 73, 76	1	I support the proposed changes to integrate the bus network with the new Link stations. We need as much frequent service as possible in North Seattle.
Lee	Damon	71, 65, 76	1	I am generally in favor of these changes. I am <u>slightly</u> concerned that needing to take 2 buses just to reach the husky stadium station will mean trips downtown will take even longer than the 55+ minute trip end-to-end I have now on route 71 but over all I am much happier to take LINK than a bus whenever possible. NOTE: ADDITIONAL COMMENT ON 9/2/15: It appears my comments were in error. I've reviewed the map for route 78 and it completely removes the small objection I had to the changes to route 71. Please mark my comments as obsolete (presuming you can't just remove them from the record entirely).
Keith	Jerome	75	1	I'm very excited about the proposed changes to Metro service in Northeast Seattle. Increased frequency on core routes and better integration with upcoming Light Rail will be fantastic for public transportation in our neighborhood.
Ronald	Pike	71, 78, 62	1	I fully support the proposed changes in NE Seattle. Metro staff has done an awesome job of integrating the new light rail station with existing and proposed bus routes. I live adjacent to Sand Point Way and will certainly use the new Route 78 as part of my daily commute. I also look forward to the increased east to west connectivity provided by the new route 62 to get to and from Green Lake and Fremont.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Brian Patric	O'Rand Zumeta	66, 67, 68, 72, 73, 77	1	As a rider from one of the areas most affected by the impending light rail expansion, a graduate student at UW, and transit commuting employee of a downtown firm, I support aggressive adjustment to bus lines to maximize our investment in Link. It will improve congestion into downtown, and improve Seattleites ability to move around areas not served by rail, especially going east to west. Please do not keep routes the same as this important infrastructure is put into place. Rationalize bus service to make maximum use of Link when it comes in 2016 and again in 2021.
David	Koutroulis	--	1	As someone who lived in NYC for MANY years I can say without a doubt that Subway's are the absolute best mode of transportation. Seattle is getting TOO crowded with Auto traffic and desperately needs more Subway Lines !!!
John	Strick	67, 71, 72, 73	1	I'm generally in favor of the overall changes to NE Seattle. While eliminating most one-seat rides to downtown is less convenient during off-peak hours, re-routing most routes to end at Husky Stadium makes total sense for peak hours. I want this routing during peak hours to take advantage of the reliability and speed of light rail. I'm all in support of this! The only change I would make to the NE Seattle routes would be to the 67 and 73. Instead of the jog at 65th to go from Roosevelt to 15th, I would route both of them to continue on the street they are on (either Roosevelt or 15th). I get that when Roosevelt station opens, this routing across 65th will be advantageous. But until then, it adds a few minutes or more for a trip to the U District and Husky stadium. Since all residents of NE Seattle will now likely need to transfer to get downtown, making the ride to Husky Stadium as direct and fast as possible should be the priority.
Paul	Franklin	73, 76, 64, 67	1	As a resident in Ravenna (near 75th & 17th), I'm looking forward to these changes. The expanded 76 service will give me more flexibility with my regular morning commute; the revised routes 73 and 67 give me good options for connecting to downtown at other hours. Terminating routes such as 73 at UW Station instead of having them continue to run downtown like the former route 66 will allow service hours to go towards increasing the frequency and reliability of those routes instead of having to cut them back or find additional funding when many of them can no longer run in the downtown transit tunnel. My only concern with these changes is the shift of route 67 on to Northgate Way; in the past, I have taken route 347; those few blocks of Northgate Way significantly slowed that route down, and I suspect it will be no different with route 67. However, that isn't likely to significantly affect my use of Metro, and I support the intent to serve the apartments along the proposed routing.
Linda	Kurij	372, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 64, 65	1	I'm not sure what bus #s you wanted - the ones I listed are closest to my house. Whatever connections/changes King County Metro wants to make to have these KCM routes meet the soon-to-be opened U-Link are wonderful, and I see those as being positive things. I don't own a car. I am low-income.
Peter	Durkee	78	2	I just want to say that I like the new proposed 78 route. That will be perfect for me when the Husky Stadium link station opens.
Diane	Grover	78	2	It appears the new 78 will make it possible for us to make a trip to Sea Tac airport entirely via transit. It will also make travel to downtown more efficient. Thank you.
Jane	Hadley	8	2	I like the new proposed No. 8. It is definitely a huge improvement over the earlier proposed changes to the No. 8. I live near 30th and E. Howell St. The new proposed No. 8 meets all my needs: it gets me to Group Health at 15th and Thomas; it gets me close to Trader Joes and Madison Market and Anytime Fitness; it gets me to South Lake Union, northern Denny Regrade and Seattle Center. And it will even get me to Rapid Ride on Madison, should that ever occur. Also, importantly, it gets me to light rail, either at the Mt Baker Station or at the Capitol Hill Station. No complaints about the proposed revision to the No. 8.
Jeffrey	Hammerquist	10, 43, 49, 11	2	The proposed service revisions for U-Link are crucial for providing better connections to light rail and for getting the full value from our light rail investment by allowing duplicative service to be reallocated to better frequency on more routes. Change is hard, but Capitol Hill will benefit from increased connections and NE Seattle will receive frequent transit service for the first time. To fall short of Metro's excellent recommendations would be to deny appropriate service levels to an entire quadrant of the region's largest city. Please don't let the noisy minority take a once-in-a-decade opportunity away from a silent majority.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Scott	Stidell	11, 75	2	I am writing to ask you to support the proposed Metro service changes under consideration for March 2016. Although my local bus (11) did not exactly get the changes I would have preferred (Madison to John to Capitol Hill Station) due to a vocal minority of Madison Park residents, it is still an improvement that will allow direct access to the regional transportation network. Additionally, the bus service to NE Seattle, including Wedgwood and Lake City, where I have family and property, will improve immensely with the proposed service changes. They are truly a game changer and a move towards a city with very frequent buses on grids, making it possible to quickly and easily transfer to rail/bus to any other part of the city. I've used transit in enough places to know that such a grid is by far the easiest and quickest way to move around. The NE Seattle changes are enough to overlook any small shortcomings Capitol Hill service may endure. Please also have a look at the Seattle Transit Blog, where these and other changes are discussed at length for further information.
Tom	Marshall	550	2	The proposed changes are good for NE Seattle and the whole transit system. Please implement them as written.
Matthew	Johnson	8	2	Good morning. I'm writing in support of Metro's rationalization of service at U-Link's opening. One of the benefits of investing in rail transit is that it has the capacity to be a 'trunk' service allowing buses to then be feeder service. It makes no sense to have a train AND a ton of buses all heading downtown. It's a waste of resources on redundant service PLUS downtown streets are already congested enough as it is. Even though I'm not happy with how watered down the Capitol Hill changes became, overall the restructures are a huge step forward. Metro staff should be congratulated on their work. The Council should implement the full restructure in the March service change.
Adam	Schechter	8, 11	2	First a general comment -- the restructure in Northeast Seattle is brilliant, and should be implemented as proposed, without further changes. This work is the result of a good (if long overdue) process. Slam dunk. Regarding Capitol Hill: Metro went through multiple iterations, from a truly innovative and forward-thinking initial proposal, to the final, more incremental approach. Metro is to be commended for its work, dealing with hordes of angry citizens on both sides of the debate -- Metro should go full-speed ahead, Metro shouldn't change service at all. I prefer the forward-thinking approach, and while I would have preferred something closer to the original proposals, the Capitol Hill restructures should be mostly implemented as planned, but for one strange and minor change: the 8 should remain on John St between 23rd Ave and 19th Ave, and the 11 should follow this path from Madison St to 19th Ave. Using Madison and 19th don't seem to have a clear purpose, and should be eliminated from these routes as an efficiency. Other than that, a job well done. Splitting the 8 at Mount Baker was a long time coming, though capital efforts are still absolutely necessary to improve eastbound service from Denny Way in the afternoons. Downtown service from all points east of Broadway should improve dramatically. I am eagerly awaiting the opening day of the new Link stations.
Erin	Tighe	30, 31, 32, 65, 71, 74, 75, 76	2	Metro's proposed step forward for the Northeast Seattle bus network will truly improve connectivity in this area of the county. Reduced duplication means that Metro and SDOT can focus capital improvements on those corridors where buses move frequently. Leveraging the light rail connection means that the bus hours spent slogging along I5 and Eastlake to get downtown are redistributed to Northeast Seattle neighborhoods, where they can focus on getting people around to new destinations. Fewer corridors headed to the same place makes the system easier to understand and remember. And this increased frequency means that where transfers will become an opportunity to reach ever greater portions of the city. I'm particularly happy that the bus corridors serving my neighborhood, Hawthorne Hills, will receive increases in service. Sand Point Way, home of the 75 and the new 78, will see 15 minute or better frequency all day. 65th St will see 15 minute all-day service on the 16, AND an almost doubling of trips on the 76. Along 35th and 40th Avenues, the 65 will also see double its current frequency. These improvements open up much more of the city to transit riders. For the same average amount of time waiting at a bus stop, riders will be able to reach portions of the county from Shoreline to Renton. The network we have now is infrequent and unreliable, and to take transit to anywhere except work during normal commute hours is both a commitment and a hassle. Though the network we have now is very efficient at getting commuters downtown and back (and under this plan, those peak-only routes are actually getting a service increase), but the network now is less good at capturing more informal trips. For spontaneous outings to shop, explore, or meet with friends, the network now is less friendly, because a "spontaneous" trip may require up to half an hour of waiting for the bus. Faced with such a choice, many will choose to drive their cars. The proposed network in Northeast Seattle is a huge step forward for transit frequency, legibility, and connectivity in the region, and I strongly encourage you to pass it without amendment.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Brett	Youngstrom	8, 43, 49, 48, 60, 9X, 7X, 70, Link	2	I fully support the proposed changes in NE Seattle. Even though I don't currently ride a lot of the routes affected, I think the changes bring about much greater service levels and radically improve mobility in NE Seattle. I wish the proposed changes in Capitol Hill more closely resembled the proposals in Alternative 1. The currently-proposed changes are *very* watered down and have a lot of drawbacks. Please ignore the vocal minority who don't want anything to change. Please implement changes that will leverage the great improvement in connectivity that University Link Light Rail enables. Please listen to your planners and not the fear, uncertainty, and doubt that the vocal minority pushes. We need better bus routes that enable increased reliability, frequency, and connectivity with the light rail system we are investing in.
Sean	Peterfreund	8, 10, 11, 12, 48	2	This restructure is fantastic, if anything it is not aggressive enough. The northeast Seattle proposal is very well thought out and I envy their complete network. The Capitol Hill changes are a small step but eventually should go even further. We don't need to maintain the same amount of service along the Pike/Pine corridor near downtown, everyone is going to hop on the train when they realize it's 2 minutes from Westlake to Capitol Hill, or 4 minutes from University Street Station, or 6 from Pioneer square, etc. Some of this service should be reduced and added to the 8 sometime in the future. This ordinance gets us going in the right direction, and I can't wait until march when I can get home from work (ULink University Street to Capitol Hill, then catch a #8 or #11 home without ever having to check schedules). I am sure it will save at least 10-20 minutes of my life every day. A frequent network on well defined corridors is so much easier. Any resistance against this is just a result of human nature, where people only know what they have and can't imagine something better. That is understandable, but creating legislation based on this approach will get us nowhere. Imagine for a minute if we had this revised network and then told people we were changing it back to what it was. BE BOLD!!
Anne	Johnson	Link	2	Please connect neighborhoods to Link with good bus connections. Support the Metro restructure.
Griffin	Bouwens	71, 65, 48	2	Connected and efficient bus routes are essential. Please don't let short sightedness cloud your judgement. Do what is best for the city in the long run.
Duncan	Robinson	26X, 62, 64, 76, 316	2	I wholeheartedly approve the service changes proposed by Metro in response to the opening of U-link. These changes dramatically improve transportation for those of us in NE Seattle by making a connective network that allows folks to move quickly and efficiently wherever they want to go. I was born in Victory Heights and have lived in NE Seattle my whole life, and this is the first time that this area has had the level of service it deserves. These changes will allow my family to remain a one-car household, and will help ensure that our investment in Link pays off by leveraging the time advantage of grade-separated rail. The frequency and coverage of the new and revised routes (26X to Aurora and 64X avoiding Downtown especially) will impact our lives tremendously. I urge the Council to strongly consider adopting these changes so the citizens of NE Seattle can finally enjoy the benefits of a connected transit network.
Martin	Pagel	25, 7X	2	Buses should make it easy to get to Link so that I can continue anywhere, not just downtown. Metro, UW, and ST should have worked much closer together to make the transition from bus to UW Station easier. We're repeating the same problem as we did with Mt. Baker station! More light rail and better bus/LR transition is necessary as buses just get stuck downtown and SLU. Nevertheless the new (fewer but more frequent) routes are a great step in the right direction. Ending Eastside buses on Mercer Island is another important step.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Eric	Feiveson	66, 71, 72, 73, 372	2	The proposed service changes for Northeast Seattle are a big step in the right direction. As a regular rider of the 71/72/73, I can say that the existing service pattern is a confusing mess, and I look forward to using Link instead and having more frequent service on the north end to connect with Link. While some people may initially complain about needing to transfer for a trip that is presently a one-seat ride, it is important to remember that, at the end of the day, total travel time matters a lot more than number of transfers, and the vast majority of people will gladly accept a transfer, provided that it actually speeds up their trips. Not only does Link save time by avoiding stoplights and traffic jams, the increased frequency provided by truncating the bus routes also saves time because total travel time includes wait time, not just the time actually on the bus. As you read the rest of the comments, you will no doubt find your fair share of negative feedback about the changes, including horror stories about needing to make a transfer or walk an extra couple of blocks. As you read these comments, you should consider them in context and make sure you are judging the proposal by its rational merits (e.g. travel time, number of riders, cost per rider, etc.) rather than the emotional appeal of a few people who take the time and trouble of submitting a comment. The human mind is naturally inclined to fear the unknown, and as long as the network exists only on paper, rather than actual buses on the street, it will always be an unknown quantity to fear. As a result, the natural inclination is for those afraid of change to submit comments, and for those that would benefit from the change to sit back and say nothing. As council-members, you represent the entire public, which includes not only the commit-submitters, but also the silent majority who simply wants a faster and more reliable trip, and a bus that comes frequently enough to not have to plan every trip around a schedule. You also represent potential riders - people who could ride the bus, but drive today because their bus is too slow, too infrequent, too crowded, or doesn't run late enough. The vast majority of these potential riders are not keeping up with the latest transit news, and are completely unaware that a service restructuring is even being considered. They will never leave any comments about the proposed changes, but they will still eventually learn about the changes, if they are enacted, and many will benefit from them. As the restructuring of a few years with the C and D line shows, any time a change is proposed that makes the bus network more efficient, people initially complain and complain loudly. Yet, when the change happens and people forget about the old network, ridership goes up. I urge you to remember this when considering this restructure and judge it rationally on its merits.
Rob	Smith	71, 74, 65, 271	2	I've been a near-daily bus rider in Bryant for 22 years. The proposed changes to bus routes in northeast seattle ahead of the opening of the Husky Stadium station look like they will be a significant improvement and rationalization. I fully support these changes.
Robert	Norheim	31, 32, 45, 48, 62, 64, 65, 67, 75, 76, 372	2	As someone who lives in NE Seattle, works at UW, and goes downtown frequently, I cannot say enough how excited I am to see the recommended transit network for NE Seattle implemented. The connections between my home and the UW, my home and the new Link light rail station, my home and downtown, and my home and other points in NE Seattle are all significant improvements. The increased frequency and the new routing to the Link station on the 65 and 75 are great. The new route 62 now allows me to finally access Green Lake and Magnuson Park by transit. The new frequencies and routing of the 64 and 76 will be great for getting to SLU and downtown in the mornings. It will be easy to get from my UW office to the new Link station given the many buses that will run between the U-District and the new station. My daughter's school commute from Capitol Hill to home will be improved by splitting the 48 into the 48 and 45, increasing reliability (plus their increased frequency). Neighbors of mine will enjoy the increased frequency provided by the 372, 67 and their connection to Link. The new Link light rail service demands a complete restructuring of NE Seattle transit -- clearly routes like the 71, 72, and 73 need to go away. The old network has not been updated for decades to properly serve destinations such as Magnuson Park; it's also appalling to me that I cannot reasonably get to Green Lake by transit under the old network. I heartily endorse the recommendation for NE Seattle and hope that the Council adopts it in entirety.
Hannah	Chapin	49, 10	2	As a resident of Capitol Hill and enthusiastic public transit proponent I am fully behind this proposal as a way to make meaningful change in the face of coming system expansion. I think paving the way for an adaptive transit system is the only way we'll be able to keep up with the growing region, and this seems like a good start.
Sean	Munson	43, 49, 10, 8	2	I am writing to support the changes as proposed by King County Metro. Overall, this is a strong proposal for adapting the network to include ULink. There are parts of the proposal that I do not love (for example, I lose my single-seat ride to work or downtown on the 43), but overall the changes balance providing better and more frequent service for many while being a good steward of resources. Further, as someone whose daily commute and general mobility around the city are affected considerably by these changes, I felt that Metro did an excellent job of running an inclusive process, releasing drafts and providing ample opportunities to comment. Thank you.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Ian	Barrere	10, 11, 47, 48, 49, 60, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 16, 66	2	We finally have a real shot at functional transit in Seattle. Change is sometimes scary, especially when it affects a transit line you use every day. However, the type of changes proposed in Northeast Seattle (and originally proposed for Capitol Hill) allow for the kind of spontaneous mobility never before achieved in Seattle. U-Link will provide a huge time savings for many of the trips in the area, and it's time we capitalize on its capacity, speed, and reliability by encouraging people to transfer to and from it. With current service in Seattle, making a transfer can add an unfeasible time penalty to a trip, but it doesn't have to be this way. Look at the bus systems in LA, San Francisco, Portland, and Vancouver; a grid of frequent services prevails to allow for easy mobility all over the city with a quick transfer. We're the last big city on the West Coast to embrace this type of system. We're outgrowing our current system design and feeling the pain of less and less capacity and frequency where we need it most. U-Link will help us past this hurdle if we let it, but first we need to let Metro do their job. Save the restructure, give Metro the chance to make a system that will not only get us from home to work, but one that will allow us to get anywhere we need to go.
Matthew	Tilghman-Havens	8	2	I support the fundamentals of Metro's proposed March 2016 Metro Transit service change and strongly urge the Council to approve it. It is critically important to streamline service and optimize the use of the new University Link service. U-Link creates vast opportunities for efficiency system-wide, providing the opportunity to reduce trips on certain routes in order to expand service hours elsewhere. While I recognize that single-seat trips are a priority for some, in a collective-based transit system, it is critical to find efficiencies at all times. I applaud Metro for doing the difficult work required to complete this proposal, and I urge the Council to defer to Metro's expertise in this area and approve the proposal as presented. Many thanks to Metro and Council for your service!
Christopher	Wells	7, 14, 8	2	Better subway system through the main corridors of the region with better bus lines bringing people to that subway (light rail) system!
Christopher	Casso	43, 48	2	I wholeheartedly support the proposed March 2016 Metro Transit service change and hope that the King County Council will support it. Change is difficult, but change is also opportunity - U Link provides an excellent opportunity to change and streamline the system, as well as focus service hours where they can be the greatest use to the most numbers of people. I have been an eager participant of the various stages of feedback, and I have seen Metro respond to comments and pare back changes while still keeping a goal in mind of frequent service to Northeast Seattle. Please support the outreach process and support these needed changes to a transit system that impacts us all.
Nicole	Minkoff	49, 48, 43, 8, 71, 72, 73	2	Please support the U-link restructure and help us get it in place as soon as the University Link opens. In my opinion as a former capitol hill resident, a UW employee, and someone who takes many of these buses frequently, I'm excited to see the improved NE frequency and service, the moving of the bus stops closer to the Husky Stadium station, and many of the other changes. I wish we were seeing more drastic changes on Capitol Hill to get people to the Capitol Hill station faster and more effectively, but I understand some people opposed that so vehemently that it put the entire restructure at risk. I say, let's get this restructure done, and then once people see how much they want what NE Seattle has - quick, frequent service to light rail, we'll be able to make more changes. Thanks!
Adam	Dodge	Link	2	While the NE Seattle and Capitol Hill bus restructures have unfortunately been watered down already (especially the Capitol Hill restructure), these restructures are still a great opportunity for Metro to provide much better overall and useful bus service. The proposed restructures will much better utilize bus service hours than at present while also making connections to Link much easier, creating a positive ridership feedback loop between the bus and train aspects of our transportation system. I'm very happy to see the results of Metro's work, and I look forward to these changes being implemented in NE Seattle and Capitol Hill as well as eventually having similar restructures done throughout the rest of Seattle and King County.
David	Schraer	--	2	We need subways and more light rail and a great bus system that gets us to them.
Chris	Fiori	74	2	I am very supportive of the restructure plan. I am looking forward to frequent, fast connections to Link as well as increased service on the 74 express. Thank you Metro staff for all of the good thinking in this plan.
Andres	Conwa	44, 48, 49, 43	2	I support the changes. It will make the system more efficient overall. Change is hard and scary but it is important to operate the system based on knowledge and expertise so that we maximize potential.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Andrew	Kidde	8, 48	2	Please promote good bus connections to light rail stations. Thanks.
Brian	Van Abbema	--	2	After hearing of the proposed restructure of KCM bus routes as an effort to integrate service with Link coming next Spring, I took the time to review the proposed routing. I am very please with what I saw. This new network provides a more robust service for northeast Seattle and neatly ties Link in with current routes that go into downtown. While not a Capitol Hill resident, I was also pleased with the restructure in the area. I am concerned however with the turn the route 8 & 11 would make from Madison to 19th, this will be difficult for buses to achieve given the acute angle.
Keith	Leiker	--	2	Having visited Singapore and Japan I can attest to the benefits of subway transit decluttering major downtoen streets. Please make this happen.
David	Bates	--	2	I support the U-link restructure plan!
Scott	Bonjukian	48, 49, 71, 72, 73	2	King County Councilmembers, As a U-Link Connections Sounding Board member and northeast Seattle resident I am writing to express full support for the proposed U-Link bus route restructures. In cooperation with Metro and partner agency staff we carefully and collaboratively crafted a new bus system that will provide much more robust service, greater connections to fast and reliable light rail service, and provide more transportation options throughout the day and week. As an example: To reach downtown from my residence I will be personally affected by the changes to the 71, 72, and 73, but the proposal to catch the new route 45 from the same stop will allow me to get downtown much more quickly. Currently the 70-series buses are plagued by congestion on Interstate 5, Eastlake Avenue, downtown Seattle, and even in the Downtown Seattle Transit Tunnel. I encourage you to work amongst yourselves to adopt the proposed reroutes in full in time for U-Link's opening next spring.
Frank	Kroger	34, 48, 7, 36, 14, 545, 2, 3, 4, 120, 125, Link	2	I am an almost daily rider of Metro and or Sound Transit. I use the above bus routes. I use the "bike on bus and train" feature. With the opening of the Montlake Link Light Rail Station I support the need for changes in existing bus routes to create a more efficient overall transit experience. I understand that this may involve changes to and discontinuation of some bus routes that would no longer serve a useful purpose as they would duplicate Link Light rail service. In addition without such changes, reduction in surface street buses could not be made, leading to extra, unnecessary congestion and expense. You have my support to create a bus system that is efficient and integrates our new light rail facilities to best advantage.
Kristin	Poinar	75, 78, 45, 48	2	I support the full proposal. I particularly notice, since I live in northeast Seattle, that it much improves the northeast Seattle network and frequency for getting downtown from here.
Kate	Thorma	71, 72, 73	2	I commute to work from U-District to downtown. Most days the bus is so crowded during rush hour that it skips stops or leaves people behind. Although it means I will have to cut my commute into 2 pieces instead of 1 express bus, I'm looking forward to the new changes being implemented. I hope that the increased frequency between buses going to the new UW station and the Link trips downtown that missing a bus due to overcrowding won't be an issue anymore.
Patrick	Lennon	71, 72, 73, 44, 48	4	I support all of these outstanding changes to make commuting much easier in Northeast Seattle! I also encourage further efforts that can be made to ease the transfer between buses and the new light rail station.
Mark	Yellen	70, 10, 71, 66	4	I strongly support the changes proposed in NE Seattle. It will provide a much better experience and allow faster travel to more destinations and take advantage of the speed and reliability Link offers. The changes in Capitol Hill, while not perfect, are a good start toward moving to a gridded system with fast, reliable corridors. More work needs to be done in Capitol Hill. That being said I urge the Council to move forward with the restructure as proposed. Don't let the minority of riders who are afraid of change ruin it for the thousands of potential new riders this restructure will enable.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Matthew	Gemmill	8, 11, 48, 49	4	With the opening of University Link Light Rail, some significant changes to bus service will need to be in order as a means of streamlining service efficiency, and delivering the quickest ride to transit customers. The council should enact Metro's proposed service revisions for the NE Seattle area. These changes represent a critical increase in transit service that will be needed to funnel riders to, and away from, the University of Washington Link station, and the Capitol Hill Link Station. Very high bus frequencies are a must, as the transfer penalty will drive riders away who have to wait too long for a bus to show, or find buses to be quite packed with several train loads of people trying to fit on board.
Weston	Brinkley	C, D, 522, 28, 11, 8, 48, 45, 62, 65, 67, 372	4	Please move forward with the proposed restructure as planned. The changes are critical for making the most out of the Light Rail station openings. Regardless of the new station each of these changes is a vast improvement to the bus network. Frequent and reliable routes are the key to a bus system that is well used and depended on. I am very much looking forward to the March Service change. Thank you.
Matthew	Fewins	45, D	4	I am in support of the redesigned network as a whole. The proposed network makes a few sacrifices to shore up frequencies of well used routes. A couple comments I would have are as follows: The proposed 45 (like the pre-split 48 before) currently has a layover at 85th and 32nd near the upper Golden Gardens entrance. Metro should consider turning the route south and having it layover on Leary Way, between 20th and Market, where the old 75 used to layover. By doing this, you are adding ~10 minutes to the trip time, but opening up Ballard to a good chunk of North Seattle and vice versa. I also can't give enough praise and support for decoupling the RapidRide C and D. This was something that needed to happen since the beginning.
Rebeckah	Johnson	7X	4	Thank you for making the bold step to reduce duplication of the 7x buses running downtown after Link opens!
Andrew	Haase	48	4	The proposed changes are critical for ensuring the future of North Seattle's effective transportation. Aligning bus routes to maximize the value of our collective investment in light rail only makes sense and should be implemented as recommended. Having extremely high frequency service connecting residents to high frequency rail service will create an ongoing virtuous cycle making transit more effective and will allow Seattle to support its quickly growing population in a more sustainable way.
Matt	Brannock	255, 8, 43, 10	4	Metro MUST make the difficult decisions needed to reroute buses so that they are useful and provide a proper transit network -- not just a series of independent routes with little inter-connectivity. I strongly support any and all major changes required to improve service throughout the region, even at the expense of some currently-served trips. As a frequent commuter to the Eastside by transit (on the 255) and up to Capitol Hill (via the 8, 43, 49, 10, etc.), I strongly support all restructuring. I was concerned about the UW transfer for the 255 from Kirkland but am pleased to hear that Metro is planning for improvements here. As for restructuring in Capitol hill, I am excited for increased frequency and better reliability from the buses which climb the hill. The 8 in its current form is useless -- it is faster to walk from my home at Denny and 1st to the top of Capitol Hill when traffic is at its worst. ANY improvement is a good one!
Ben	Mitchell	5, 28, 48, D, E	4	I'd like to convey my strong support for the Transit Service Changes proposed by King County Metro. As a resident of North Seattle I am hugely in favor of the proposed restructures in NE Seattle particularly, and I see the changes as a great step forward to improving connectivity and frequency in Seattle. Additionally, I think it is vital that King County Metro and Sound Transit continually look for ways to coordinate and align their respective services, and the proposed changes I think take great advantage of the soon-to-be-opened University Link stations. I think this is great work by King County Metro on this, and I urge the King county council to approve the proposed transit service changes. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
James	Ferguson	E, 28, 345	4	Please make sure that bus routes go from the neighborhoods to the Link Light Rail stations. It is essential that the bus lines deliver people from areas not served by light rail to such light rail stations. Busses should circulate regularly from within the neighborhoods to these high-capacity transit options (light rail).

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
David	Watkins	48, 28, 5, 62	4	Thanks for the outstanding proposal for NE Seattle (as well as the express routing for the 26/28. I travel a number of places in NE Seattle and my journeys will be much easier and more convenient with this restructure. I want to call out for special praise the connection available between the 48N/new 45 and the 62, with good frequency for both, these two routes offer much better crosstown E-W service in North Seattle--a major shortcoming of the current network. I don't have any strong views on the Capitol Hill portion, as I rarely travel East of Broadway there, but the North Seattle section improves service immensely to many potential riders, and I very much hope you approve it intact.
Kristian	Szobi	--	4	Please provide good bus connections to Link Stations. Bus restructure is essential for a modern and reliable transit system in a modern city.
Ben	Boden-Miller	5, 48, 124	4	With the opening of new link stations it is critical to the success of public transportation in our region that we restructure our bus routes to better serve the link stations. Bringing excess buses through downtown creates further congestion and wastes valuable bus hours. Please funnel people to link stations.
Andrew	Reed	16, 26, 31, 32, 44, 70, 71, 72, 73	4	Please, please adopt the suggested changes by Metro. It will significantly improve connectivity and overall transit times. As I write this I am finishing up a short trip to Sweden, Denmark, and Germany, and this is exactly how their fantastic public transit systems are designed - frequent bus services meant to move people to/from subway stops.
Alex	Bailey	65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 30, 75, 43, 44, 45, 48, 38, 10, 11, 12, 49, 31, 32, 372, 62, 28, 2616	4	<p>I write as a citizen concerned about the efficacy of the public transit system as a whole. The restructure proposals by and large are very very good and rest on sound transit (not the agency) ridership generation principals. As such the proposals, along with U-link, will greatly enhance mobility within and to and from the updated areas of service. In particular, it is excellent to see the emphasis that Metro is putting on frequency and crosstown mobility in NE Seattle. New route 62 is an excellent example of this as it greatly improves mobility between NE Seattle and Roosevelt, Green Lake and Wallingford. Similarly, routes 372, 65 and 75 all become frequent and route 48 and the U-district-Husky Station corridor becomes more frequent. This is extremely helpful for making transit useful and convenient for the broad swath of people who value their time. There are a few nitpicks to be sure, such as the absurd 8/11 Madison deviation. But again by and large the restructure should greatly enhance mobility in the region and a perfect plan shouldn't be the enemy of a good plan. Moreover, Metro should move forward with confidence that riders will quickly see the benefits of this arrangement. Simply put I believe most of the protest against this measure is based off of ignorance to the benefits of frequency as well as just how fast and convenient U-link will be as compared to buses that get stuck in traffic. Such ignorance shouldn't dissuade Metro from making these changes.</p> <p>I already submitted testimony before but I wanted to add one additional point. It may be easy in the short term to stick to the status quo for political reasons. But in the long term failure to modernize and improve the system with best practices will erode public trust in the competency of the agency and those who run it. That is why is critical, if you believe in the efficacy of these changes, to take a stand, which will in the long-term demonstrate great competency in providing service.</p>

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Aleksandra	Culver	All	4	I'm extremely happy with the Northeast Seattle restructure, in full. I love that it creates a super-frequent network in a part of the city that currently barely has any routes that even come at 15-minute intervals. The ultra-high frequency between the U-District (45th/the Ave) and UW Station is a game-changer. I love the new route 62. I think it will add an important and valuable connection between central Fremont, central Wallingford, and Ravenna / points east. I definitely prefer that the 62 goes east rather than going north; given the "unique" street network, I think this is a simple and more efficient route, and it will see higher use. I'm disappointed that the 26 and 28 are being diverted away from Fremont, but especially so because Greenwood loses its only direct connection to central Fremont. I think Fremont is extremely well situated to be a major connection point for service from the north. In my ideal world, the E Line would use Aurora, and every other bus in the area -- the 5, 26, 28, 31, 32, 40, and 16/62 -- would all go through Fremont. In addition, Dexter and Westlake would both benefit from more service (especially Dexter), while the stops on Aurora between Denny and the ship canal are virtually unused. But if Metro definitely needs to change the 28, the least they can do is to send the 5 through Fremont. I have mixed feelings about the Capitol Hill changes. I like that Metro is trying to align service with CHS. I love that the 8 is being split. I also think that the 19th Ave cutover for the 8 and 11 is probably the best that can be done, given the community's expressed preferences. And I'm really super happy that the 43 is being eliminated, and its service hours rolled into higher frequency on the 8 and 48. That's probably the single most important change in the whole network. On the other hand, I'm disappointed that the 10 is maintaining its current routing, rather than providing service to CHS. I'm also disappointed that Metro is keeping the 49 unchanged, rather than taking the opportunity to create a new N-S corridor with the 9/36/49/60, though I understand why Metro doesn't want to take that step yet. I will still support the current changes, since I think they're an improvement on today's network, but I would prefer to see the following changes: - Reroute the 12 to use Pike/Pine to get between downtown and 19th Ave, following the 11's route today. Create a full-time "turnback 12" route, to continue providing service to First Hill. (Or just reroute the 2, but I understand that many in the community do not support that option.) - Reroute the 10 to follow today's 43 route between Bellevue and 15th.
BJ	Kaysen	--	4	I don't use the bus currently but will if I can get to The rail system that takes me downtown, to Bellevue, the airport and the stadium and Key arena
Ben	Broesamle	19, 33, 24, 31, 71, 72, 73, Link	4	Please provide good bus connections to Link Stations. Connections to Link will save me time overall, increase transit reliability, and make my life better. Support the Metro restructure!
Forrest	Alvarez	48, 49	4	I only listed these route changes because I ride them the most. I think the changes are excellent, and if I could I'd take the even more drastic changes that were proposed before!
Erik	Blazing	26	4	Please enact the proposed NE Seattle bus route changes to orient busses towards the new light rail station at Husky Stadium. Additionally I am strongly in favoring of the proposed changes to route 26 to run on the current 26X route all day long.
Joe	Erickson	48, 71, 72, 73	4	Please approve this most needed changes to Metro transit. These changes are absolutely what our community needs. It will greatly speed up my bus ride and connect to Link too. This plan is awesome!! Thank you so much
Keith	Kyle	Link	4	I'm writing in support of the bus restructures for U-Link. A bus and train system should act in concert as a network. Increases in frequency and network gains afforded by the bery frequeny and fast Link system are critical gains for our transit system.
Mark	Brannan	E, 316, 76, 5, 41	4	I have the option to drive but I value and prefer public transit and rely on it daily to get to and from my job downtown, and to a once a week appointment in the green lake neighborhood. When possible our family uses public transit on weekends (supplemented by bikes) to get to/from recreation. The new changes seem to make sense. Though our primary route is the e line, this would make it easier to use transit to get around the u district, capital hill, and possibly give us better access (with bikes) around green lake or other parts of N Seattle.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Wes	Mills	48, 48, 67	4	Hello, I am writing generally in favor of the restructuring plan put forth by the Metro planning department. The improvements to transit service in north Seattle are very good, in my opinion, and do a lot to address many of the bottlenecks and inefficiencies experienced north of the university for many years. In addition, I feel that, with one moderate exception, all of the changes are worthwhile and should be pursued. The opening of Link to Capitol Hill and UW gives back a lot of service hours that should be put to good use instead of having the same buses slog through the same streets they've done for years. My lone exception is as follows: First, I'm very disappointed that the through-route of routes 48 and 67 that was included in the first alternative put forward by Metro Transit has been deleted. Route 48 is the only north/south route the Central Area has that crosses the ship canal. Right now we can go all the way to the northern end of the University District and to Roosevelt. Both of these are neighborhoods that will be well-served by Link in six years but are growing and adding new businesses and services today. I understand the need to split the 48 for reliability reasons but to have it come so tantalizingly close to these areas without continuing to them is frustrating. Opening up direct access to Northgate, at least until the next phase of Link opens, would be very good. In addition to serving trips that exist today, we should be finding ways to serve new destinations while we wait for Link to be ready. Even if not every trip can be connected together--like how the 43 and 44 today don't always join--please strongly consider through-routing at least a couple of trips per hour of the 48 and 67. If this is carried through, myself and several people I know in this area would use this service quite often. The rest of the overhaul is great and I strongly support it. Thanks to Metro for being bold and getting the needed work done.
Garrett	Black	48, 17, 18, 40	4	Without frequent and rapid service, I would essentially be forced to get a car or a bike in order to get anywhere in a timely fashion. Helping connect to U-Link could also be a game-changer for when I have to go to anywhere outside of downtown Seattle.
Nicolette	Stenger	64, 16	4	I want good bus connections to subway stations
Matthew	Trecha	8	4	I fully support the entire restructure package. After 1.5 years of living in the City (half of which without owning a car as I still do) I have never made it to NE Seattle as it's currently so difficult to do so and the bus service lacks the frequency proposed in the restructure. The work done on the 8 is to be applauded. Living in Lower Queen Anne makes it incredibly difficult to reach Capitol Hill and the 8 is my only true option to do so without a transfer. However, its unpredictability and my lack of a smartphone/one bus away makes it more reliable to catch a 3/4 Downtown to transfer to a 10/11/43/49. The 8's restructure is sorely needed as is the increased frequency. Unfortunately, Metro is not proposing to run more late night service (until at least 2:00 a.m. Friday and Saturday as is standard in large American cities) on the 8, continuing to treat Seattle as an equal part of the County and not the reason both King County and King County Metro are able to exist at all given recent voting patterns. Please approve the entire package and begin working toward an entire County restructure in the same vein at Houston, TX's Metro and Omaha, NE's Metro systems. It's time for more frequency, more cross-town routes that don't pass through Downtown Seattle and more late night runs. Thanks for your time and keep up the great work.
Michael	Mouhanna	13, 29, 32	4	I would like the buses near me to connect to subways/light rails so I can use the subways when they are built.
Jeremy	Real	8	4	I frequently use the 8 to access Capitol Hill and find that it is often delayed, particularly in the early evening when I'm trying to use it. While I would love to see greater frequency on Sunday, I believe the proposed changes will make the route more reliable. As such, I strongly support the proposed restructure.
Chris	Rodde	--	4	Please provide good bus connections to Link Stations. Support the Metro restructure.
Kyle	Jacobson	8, 48, 62	4	I believe in and trust the opinions of Seattle Transit Blog. And I appreciate the efforts of King County Metro to make public transit more effective in Seattle!

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Jason	Knichel	8, C, D	4	The goal of transit should be to move people quickly and efficiently to where they need to be. Since the link light rail is in its own right of way and underground, it can do this more effectively than surface buses for the same trips from origin to destination. Restructuring the system in northeast seattle to feed people into the light rail to get to downtown instead of using buses to get there will frequently get them there faster than the existing bus service, even with the transfer, assuming light rail frequency is high enough. Changes to make these transfers as painless as possible, such as the proposed moving of bus stops closer to the light rail station in the u-district, are a good change. Route 8 - as a frequent rider of route 8, I think the change to split the route is a good one. Trying to catch Route 8 in capitol hill or south lake union to go west, it is frustrating, since it is often late and by unpredictable amounts. Routes C and D - As a sometimes rider of route D from Lower Queen Anne to West Seattle (with through route as C), splitting the route will mean I will have to make a transfer. However, with both routes being somewhat frequent, the transfer time should be minimal. I think the increased reliability of these routes by splitting it is worth it and the increased capacity of transit to south lake union by the C continuing there will help improve transit in that growing neighborhood.
Gregory	Zwisler	26	4	I strongly support these important changes. The route and schedule changes proposed by Metro to accommodate the new U-Link light rail asset are sensible and will support an improved, more efficient bus service.
Chris	Force	--	4	Each proposal for Capitol Hill looks worse than the last, but the Northeast Seattle re-alignment is crucial. It takes an hour to get anywhere from most of Northeast Seattle, with low-quality transfers forced in the U-District. Pushing that transfer to U-Link would make a huge difference and make transit competitive with driving for countless trips. Please enact the proposed changes and keep working to improve over time.
Ken	Anderson	5	4	Bus routes to future subway stations will be absolutely critical to solve our traffic problem.
Dave	Schuldt	--	4	As a member of the Transit Riders Union I support the changes to NE Seattle bus service. I know that any change to service will cause problems for some but a majority of residents will get better service. There hasn't been a major shake up of service in this area for many years while the U Village and Children's Hospital have grown hugely.
Glen	Buhlmann	255, 16, 48, 66, 67, 72, 73	4	Metro MUST make system changes to integrate with ULink. Prioritize connectivity and speed over single-seat trips. As someone who travels daily from NE Seattle to the Eastside through Montlake, I want the proposed changes to be made. I will be able to more quickly get to and from the Eastside during peak periods even though the majority of my trips have nothing to do with Link.
Adam	Wilson	62	4	This new route will dramatically improve connectivity and reliability. Personally, I know in our household this will eliminate four peak hour commute trips by single occupancy car!
Otis	Blanchard	101, 169	5	We need more connectivity, and my household supports the expanded metro. We also need expanded hours to service the Landing. Retail in the area is troubled finding workers with traffic and finding workers who can arrive at early hours when busses are not running. Seattle is a 24 hour metropolis, and there is a faction in the city council that is in denial of this. We will have 24 hour gridlock due to inaction if we don't support metro and increased residential growth inside 504 soon. Everyone moving to Kent and commuting will choke Renton, and fill the skies with smog just as what happened to the old Houston downtown and inner wards.
Trevor	Reed	205	6	Please undertake the maximum restructuring possible for U-Link to make the system as efficient and reliable as possible.
Adam	Braun	--	7	As a taxpayer of King County, I am writing to recommend the major restructure being recommended by the staff at King County Metro. As a former resident of the Green Lake/Roosevelt area, former commuter to Kirkland via bus (usually the 242 or 48/ST540) and patron of many University District businesses, I understand the structure of the bus system in the University District area. As a traveler, I have seen how good transit systems work, such as those found in Barcelona, Madrid, Hong Kong, and Chicago. A major restructure that centers the system on the Link stations is a change that will benefit commuters and taxpayers, resulting in a more efficient bus system that respects the time of commuters and the money invested by taxpayers. As a former resident of the area, I can genuinely say that, while the bus system gets you where you need to go, it certainly does not do it in an efficient manner. This major restructure will certainly improve the reliability of the system.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Robert	Erickson	48, 66	8	I am very positive about the bus changes for Northeast Seattle. The are super and will encourage me to rider metro move often to work. Metro has done a great job. It is very important to utilize Link lightrail for the main trunk line and free up Metro buses for local connections. The increase in frequency is very important and provides freedom to just show up at the bus stop and know a bus will shortly arrive. Again well done.
Brent	White	44, 62, 65, 67, 75, 372	8	Honorable Councilmembers, Thank you for the opportunity to testify online, as I cannot generally take time off from work to testify in person. The opening of Link Light Rail to UW brings the opportunity to convert lots of bus service hours sitting in traffic on I-5 into neighborhood service. The refrain I've heard for years at U-Link open houses has been "What is the plan for getting to the station by bus?" Metro now presents the plan to you, and it is one that significantly improves transit connectivity and frequency, not just to the station, but all over northeast Seattle. The introduction of weekend service on route 372, and increasing the mid-day frequency to 15 minutes, including on Saturdays, will be a significant improvement to the transit grid. Route 75 would have its midday frequency doubled to every 16 minutes on weekdays and Saturdays. Route 67 would be re-routed to directly serve UW Station, and move to 15-minute all-day/all-evening service on weekdays, and 15-minute all-day service on Saturdays. Route 65 would be re-routed to directly serve UW Station, and move to 15-minute all-day service on weekdays. Route 44 would get bumped up to 10-minute frequency throughout the peak period. To add to the improved north/south connectivity to Link, new route 62 would introduce new east-west connectivity for North Seattle, coming every 15 minutes all day, seven days a week. There is no plan that could get close to 100% agreement from all riders, but this plan has gotten unprecedented levels of support, as route restructures go, especially for the northeast Seattle portion. I urge you to move forward, and convert those thousands of hours of bus service that would be wasted sitting on I-5, if nothing is done, into neighborhood service. Thousands of northeast Seattleites have waited years for a quick ride downtown. It's time.
Greg	McKnight	8, 43, 49, 48, 70	8	Please ensure the years of outreach, planning, and many compromises move forward for the proposed U-link restructure. Many government agency, including you, have pointed fingers at King County Metro's inability to serve the needs of the county efficiently and effectively which is a result of too many groups, such as you, watering down their efforts to be efficient and effective. Do not continue to stand in the way of professional system planning when you are not qualified or have the training to understand system planning. The initial route restructure had some great ideas, many made it to this final proposal after even further comment periods, including time your group had to provide input. Pass the restructure and give Metro the tools and authority to make good routing decisions moving forward, especially when a major restructure can take place due to the 'game-changing' addition of actual, grade separated rail through Capitol Hill to the U-District. The days of slugging through Montlake and Capitol Hill for anywhere from 7 to 45 minutes on a 43 to get to and from my eastside accessible bus route for work are being replaced with a 3 minute train ride. Let Metro make the new system actually be new given how much of a change this is.
Kris	Shaw	8, 49, 67	8	I strongly support the changes proposed by Metro in response to the opening of Link to the U District. I attended both the Capitol Hill open house and the U District open house and saw the time and effort Metro put into smartly revising and improving its service in Capitol Hill and North Seattle. To ignore the huge impact Link will have on mass transit in North Seattle and not take the rare opportunity to build on that and improve the flow, frequency and connect-ability of the system would be a waste of both valuable bus hour resources and hamper the impact of the new Link system. The improvements to frequency, the splitting of very long delay prone routes, and changes in routing to direct busses to the new station will have tremendous benefits for a wide range of users. I only wish Metro had done more to streamline, reroute and improve service in Capitol Hill. I believe the limited changes in the proposal for Capitol Hill represent a missed opportunity to redeploy limited resources.
Christopher	Rose	C, 116	8	I use busses daily. I support strong and big transportation that includes ST3 subways and bus access to get there. I live in Fauntleroy and work downtown. My experience riding is that if you provide it people will use it. People love it and as a property owner I'm happy to support paying for these quality improvements to our shared city. Go big!
Kjersti	Egerdahl	C, D, 8, 26, 28, 43	8	Please make sure we get good bus connections to Link stations! It's essential to make the most of our system. Support the Metro restructure! I'm encouraged by the plan to serve South Lake Union better by splitting the C line to run to Fred Hutch. But this plan doesn't do enough to improve service on the 8 line along Denny Way, between SLU and Capitol Hill. When I lived on Capitol Hill, I would walk uphill 30 minutes in the rain just to avoid the frustrating experience of waiting for a bus that never came. Usually walking was faster.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Kyle	Brown	43, 49, 66, 71, 72, 73	8	I support the proposed changes; though, I'd like to see more restructuring of the Capitol Hill routes to better take advantage of the new light rail station.
Spencer	Bear	11, 43, 48, 12	8	I'm looking at the U Link modifications proposed for Capitol Hill. It seems to me that they are generally well-thought out and will provide better service on most lines. They significantly improve service north of the ship canal, but that's the way Seattle works. The area north of the canal always gets the better stuff.
Charles	Cooper	2, 8, 10, 11, 12, 47, 49	8	Linking our bus system with the expanding SoundTransit Link Light rail is critical to mobility and overall system efficiency. Change is never comfortable but change is the key to moving things forward. Please do not be dissuaded from approving these changes to the Metro Transit service. People will discover that by transferring to Link from a frequent bus service will provide them with significantly faster transit times to downtown and the University and other Link Destinations than their current bus offerings.
Alexander	Brennan	8, 49, 65, 67	8	I am very excited about the U-link service restructure. This restructure will make it easier for me to get to northeast Seattle, especially Wedgewood and Maple Leaf by taking light rail to the 65 and 67. It would also improve the reliability of the 8 and 48 that go right by my house.
Jay	Fredlund	26, 28, 31, 32, 62, 10, 11, 43, 48, 49, 70, Link	8	Over the course of the last year or so, Metro has come up with some brilliant plans that restructure the network to make it substantially more efficient with the opening of U-Link. While most of their initial plans have been tweaked and watered down, the proposal before the King County Council SHOULD ABSOLUTELY BE PASSED. The restructure of the NE network provides improved travel times and substantially increases the frequency of buses to get from place to place. As a bus commuter from Capitol Hill to the Gasworks Park area, my bus routes will be changed and I will have to transfer in Downtown AND Fremont, rather than simply Downtown. However, the increased frequency of the buses mean I will get to work faster than my current ride on the 26. It's important that we continue to improve bus service as the County grows and new LINK stations open up. While the Capitol Hill restructure isn't as great as initially proposed, it should be passed to gain the improvements it provides in addition to the MAJOR BENEFITS of the NE restructure. The Council should allow Metro planners to build the system to maximize ridership, minimize commute times, and generally build a smart system to move us quickly from points around the County. Please vote "YES" to approve this service change.
Jeffrey	Tucker	65, 67, 75	8	I am writing to strongly support the proposed Metro service changes. As a graduate student at UW commuting from my new home in West Seattle, I will rely on the Husky Stadium Link station to reach the campus, and Metro's proposed frequency additions for routes such as 65, 67, and 75 will greatly improve my mobility in the UW vicinity. I teach classes on NE Campus Parkway, hold office hours and meet my professors on the upper quad, and meet up with my classmates at cafes or their homes in the U District and U Village. Frequent bus service connecting these points to each other and to the Husky Stadium station will make it possible for me to continue my education while leaving my car at home. Please vote to approve the proposed service changes.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Mike	Orr	8, 11, 43, 49, 62, 67, 75, 372	8	Please approve Metro's U-Link restructure in its entirety. It makes some very good improvements to Link access and crosstown service, especially in north Seattle. In Capitol Hill its impact is mixed, but Metro went through two rounds of modifying it to address riders' concerns, and this is the best balance it believes it can achieve. There's something more important than the mixed impact in some places, and that's the goal of making more frequent grid routes. This proposal increases the all-day frequency on the 8, 11, 12, 44, 48, 49, 62, 67, 75, and 372. That's a major step in the right direction, and will help myself and many others get to Link and across the city more conveniently on transit. A frequent grid is the #1 factor in maximizing ridership and the usefulness of the network. The biggest achievement is the 62, a new crosstown route from Magnuson Park to NE 65th Street, Greenlake, Wallingford, Fremont, SLU, and downtown. The Magnuson Park area is isolated from most of north Seattle; the existing routes (30, 75) are indirect, slow, and don't go very far west. The 62 will connect it to the nearest east-west arterial (65th) and future Link station (Roosevelt), and will help people throughout 65th and its periphery (55th to 75th) get to all of north Seattle and SLU. I have had difficulties because of the isolation of Sand Point, 65th, and 55th, and this will help with those. The biggest achievement on Capitol Hill is the increased frequency on the 8, 11, 12, 48, and 49. I ride all of these except the 12 regularly, and I also ride the 10 and 47 and current 43. There has been a lot of debate about the 11 and 12. None of the alternatives were perfect, and probably nothing can be perfect given Capitol Hill's geography. The densest areas are shaped like an 8-gear stick shift. In that environment, all you can do is something, so let's do something, and *ask Metro to review Capitol Hill again in 2017 or 2018* after the Link station has opened. The 372 is also a major improvement. It connects Lake City, Wedgwood, and Ravenna directly to Link, and is full-time frequent. It compensates for the deletion of the 30, 71 and 72, with more useful and reliable service. The biggest compromise in north Seattle is the 67 and 73, which dilute the frequency to two streets to avoid losing coverage in Pinehurst and lower Roosevelt. This was in response to public input in rounds 1 and 2. You will doubtless receive testimony to keep the 43, which is deleted in this proposal. Doing that would reverse the 45/48 split, the 8/38 split, and the frequency increases on the 49 and 44. It would endanger the ultra-frequent service where the 45 and 48 overlap, which is needed to connect UW Station to the U-District until U-District Station opens in 2021. Metro's Alternative 2 had a reduced 43, running half-hourly. That's too infrequent to be very useful. So please approve Metro's restructure, so that we can build a better transit network step by step.
Chris	Simmons	Link	8	I'd like to encourage the expansion of streetcar, subway, and light rail throughout Seattle and King County. The more dedicated rail lines we can create within and connecting the densest urban areas, the few busses filling those busy streets and the more busses that can be diverted to provide service to less-dense areas.
Robert	Sepler	65, 67, 75, 372, 62, 71, 43	8	The proposed changes in the U-Link restructure are a fantastic first step toward better transportation in Seattle. I particularly want to applaud Metro's bravery in going big on the proposed changes as, frankly, such large-scale changes are the only way to finally solve the public transportation problems created by Seattle's unique geography. As a University of Washington alumni, I took full advantage of the U-Pass program when in school and Metro was my primary means of transportation (still is today). While living in the U-district, my greatest issue with Metro was frequency. There was legitimately a bus to anywhere I wanted to go but more often than not the bus would only come once or twice an hour, meaning that if I overslept or a class ran long I was doomed to wait in the rain. Changing key routes so that buses arrive every 15 minutes is brilliant. Funneling downtown traffic to the U-District light rail station through extremely frequent bus service is brilliant. Make Metro a system based on frequency of buses on any particular route. It's time to abandon the plethora of low-frequency routes and focus instead on consolidating service on key routes and making it a reality that people can expect a bus at any particular stop on a key route within 5-15 minutes.
Adam	Parast	255, 10, 11, 12, 49, 43, 71	8	I support the proposed changes. These changes will make the transit network faster and more frequent for me. Unfortunately, this changes DON'T go far enough. The watering down of changes on Capitol Hill and complete abandonment of Eastside changes has resulted in less than ideal results. I ask that the council approve these changes AND initiate two processes. The first should look at how First Hill bus routes should change with the opening of Madison BRT. The second should look at how bus service across SR 520 can be integrated with Link at UW Station. This study should look at both service and capital investments necessary to make this work.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Bill	Zosel	2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 43, 48, 49	8	I want to thank Metro planners for working to make reasonable changes. I know that change is difficult and there are some riders who perceive that the proposed changes may be negative for their particular ride. On the whole, I think the proposed changes will be for the greater good. I ask the King County Council to adopt the plan proposed by Metro.
Lorraine	Carlucci	--	8	I am in favor of Metro's proposed bus route changes.
George	Gonzalez	111, 114	9	Public transportation is vital for Seattle. Most especially during these times of rapid growth. Traffic already severely congests the city and this everything from the business, pedestrians, and bikers. Time that is spent stuck in traffic could be better spent somewhere else. Yes, transportation is going to be a big investment but one that is necessary and one that will pay off. Please don't add to the mistake Seattle made 45 years ago with the rapid transit system. Add routes that will lead to the subway and ease congestion in the city. Thank you for your time.
Jeremy	Roberts	44, 48, 32	--	Neighborhood busses to the Transit Tunnel will increase my mobility both north and south bound, as well as help me get into the neighborhoods from the I-5 corridor. Re-designing bus routes to the light rail in the U-District will mean I get better seating when headed south of Seattle by train. Additionally, there are a number of boutique shops that I like, yet rarely go to currently due to the bus routing and congestion. These neighbor shops are vital to our growth and I enjoy them. Coming up with new bus transit patterns that touch the small business corridors in neighborhoods and homes in those areas will get more people out from the lightrail and will help local folks get plugged into this valuable resource.
Lacey	Pierce	--	--	Please support what the locals are asking for, which is subways and bus routes linking the subways. Let's make Seattle less congested and more efficient. We need to catch up to other cities who have this infrastructure built already.
Gerald	Gieseke	--	--	I believe that the full restructure focusing around u-link is the way to go, leaving the buses as they are now fails to properly utilize the new tools available with the opening of link in the university district. I believe that the Capital hill restructure should be more like the u-district restructure, eliminating duplicative service, and providing more coverage between the neighborhoods and the spine.
Corrie	Adams	--	--	I support the proposed changes that Metro is making! These changes are very important with supporting the Link Light Rail project that King County has already invested millions of dollars towards, and we as voters, need to ensure that we are setting ourselves up for success as a transit oriented city!
Sarah	Guthrie	25, 31, 65, 75	--	The light rail will make an enormous difference to how people move around the city. Let's not duplicate efforts and instead emphasize running buses to the light rail stops.
Thomas	Hudgings	78	2	I listed route #78 because it appears to be the only route to tie into the UW Link Station, although my comment pertains to a route that doesn't exist. 25th Ave NE is a logical transit corridor from the new Husky Stadium Link Station - literally a straight shot north from the station would serve University Park, Ravenna, Bryant, Wedgewood, Maple Leaf and Meadowbrook. There does not appear to be any sort of consistent bus service between this area (specifically along 25th) and downtown. I do not understand why a Link Station adjacent to Husky Stadium is served by a single route (#78) serving NE neighborhoods running on a 30-minute recurrence, when Link trains are scheduled every 8 minutes.
Christine	Yokan	25	2	I am writing to urge you to preserve bus route 25 in the Montlake neighborhood. This bus is a critical link to downtown and to other major routes, including to buses across Lake WA, and there will be no reasonable alternative without it. Parts of Montlake and Portage Bay will be over a half mile away from any bus route at all. - With a light rail going in at Husky Stadium and increasing neighborhood density, we should be increasing, not reducing bus service that provides a key link from the neighborhood. 110 people responded with concerns over deleting the 25 bus, but the recommendations make no acknowledgement of its support. We have many older residents and an increasing number of residents without cars who rely on this service.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Joe	Story	38, 14, 50	2	<p>I generally support the restructure, especially the reconfigurations of Route 8 and 11. I do have one concern: The new Route 38. The design of the new Route 38 merely connects residential areas in SE Seattle (with a few small shopping areas at Mt. Baker, Othello and Rainier Beach). I am concerned that this route will not be well-utilized because it is going to mostly connect only residential areas, and that service frequencies will eventually be cut to make the route barely tolerable to wait for. The termination of Route 38 at Mt. Baker Station also reduces the number of direct destinations that residents along the line can reach without a transfer. SE Seattle bus services are generally structured to not provide a good community "circulator" between the many businesses and residents because either routes only run along Rainier Avenue S or they mostly just cross Rainier Avenue S. A good example of the limitations of this structure is with Route 50, which is designed to run every 30 minutes at midday and has very low ridership. With this restructure, there is now an opportunity to increase accessibility in SE Seattle, especially for Route 38 residents, rather than to make access more difficult for these residents. I would like Metro to consider making Route 38 more of a circulator route for SE Seattle. A minor restructure in this area is badly needed to better balance the system functions to improve direct connectivity. Between the MLK and Rainier Avenue corridors. As one option, I would propose that Route 38 replace the Route 14 bus service segment between Mt Baker Transit Center and Hunter Blvd -- and the line could extend southward as Route 38 to Genesee Street and circulate in Columbia City -- to provide direct access to the many community facilities there (clinics, community center, recreation areas) as well as more supermarkets and pharmacies. I realize that although this segment of Route 14 is currently an electric trolley bus, Route 38 diesel capabilities provides a chance to easily replace service on this segment and extend it for better utilization and local access. Drivers could have a layover At Mt. Baker Station (Route 14) or in Columbia City (Route 38), providing them a more appropriate place to take breaks than the current Hunter Boulevard end point offers. This restructure could even someday allow the main Route 14 segment to be extended from Mt Baker Transit Center southward down Rainier Avenue by supermarkets, pharmacies and community facilities, providing more options for connectivity for CD and Leschi residents (if more service hours were made available). While the service planning resources at Metro will be quite busy addressing this wonderful and once-in-a-generation opportunity to restructure NE Seattle and Central District/Capitol Hill service for the next several months, I hope that I can inspire the Council to direct staff to systemically examine enhancing service in SE Seattle for both Link connectivity and community circulation.</p>
Jon	Howland	8, 36, 60	2	<p>Theres not a great link between 23rd street (from the Jefferson golf course to college street) and either beacon ave or rainier ave.</p>
Stephen	Siciliano	271, 48, 542, 242, 545	6	<p>The current proposed changes are lackluster and not as comprehensive as they should be for such a dramatic change as opening a 2 new light rail stations. Specifically, with the changes on the 520 bridge, there is going to be less connectivity between the Eastside and U District/Montlake due to the removal of the Montlake flyer stop. The original proposal had improved the connectivity by routing all-day routes from Kirkland and Redmond to the UW station. However, the final proposal completely omits any such changes. In particular, the biggest improvement had been the interlining of the 271 and the 45. This was a big change -- it, for the first time ever, would offer a one-seat ride between the northern parts of Seattle and the eastside. More importantly, it would have changed circuitous 3-seat rides into simpler 2-seat rides for any route that interests with the 45. Unfortunately, the situation is much worse now. Not only will the 271 not serve north Seattle, but with the elimination of the flyer stop it will be impossible to transfer between the 545 or the 255 and the 271 (since the 271 does not serve any of the 520 freeway stations). This means there will be **no all-day or weekend connection** between Redmond or Kirkland and the U District (short of transferring through Downtown!). With these changes there should have been a dramatic improvement in the connectivity between the Eastside and Seattle -- this is in fact a step backwards. Additionally, by not interlining the 67 and the 48 there is again another opportunity missed. Having short routes with fewer connections (e.g. the 67) doesn't benefit anyone.</p>

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
J	Altman	373, 73, 41, 72	1	My message is about public transportation in general, as opposed to specific routes. As we know, traffic congestion here is terrible and getting worse by the day. If we really want to reduce congestion, we need to get people out of their cars onto buses, bikes, and feet. To do that, we need to invest in public transportation -- not in a chintzy way, but in a bold and creative way. People need to see, experience, and understand that getting where they need to go is faster, more convenient, better by bus. That's not the case now -- even if you need to travel between downtown, Northgate, and the U District. Buses need to come more frequently, and closer to on time as opposed to 15+ minutes late. Use One Bus Away. Your passengers use it and it works. Coordinate departure times so that passengers are waiting for more than 15 minutes to transfer. I strongly recommend that you send some folks on a field trip to Tokyo and find out how the private subways, the buses, and the Japan Railways East lines (including the bullet train), all coordinate. Outside of the rare accident, I never have to wait more than 5 or 10 minutes to make my next connection. Ride the buses there too -- you'll see that all passengers board from the rear door (taking tickets if the fare changes based on distance), pay and exit the front. It's incredibly efficient and everyone can say thank you to the driver, which people in Seattle seem to feel a strong need to do.
Off-Peak Service				
Benjamin	Chiles	62, 372	1	I would like to register my strong support for the proposed changes especially in the north east area of Seattle. The proposed changes would provide, for the first time, frequent all day connections from NE Seattle to Downtown and Capital Hill (via Light Link Rail). In addition to Green Lake, Wallingford and Fremont via the new 62 bus. As a frequent transit rider I sincerely hope that you pass the proposed changes.
Rick	Russotto	65, 71	1	I currently commute from Wedgwood to UW on the 65, and usually after peak hours when the service is every half hour. The doubling of midday frequencies on the 65 is fantastic for me, because I will no longer have to deal with the frustration of having to wait another half hour if I miss the bus. I also like the fact that it will loop around UW to directly serve the light rail station. That will make getting downtown and to the airport so much easier. I really hope the changes to the 65 are approved. Currently, when I go downtown, I usually walk 10 blocks to the Wedgwood QFC to take the 71. While it's nice to have a one-seat ride to downtown, it takes almost an hour (including the walk) and I'd gladly give up the 71 in favor of a more frequent 65 with a direct connection to the light rail. However, if the 71 is eliminated AND the 65 stays the way it is (as in the original Alternative 2), that would be horrible. It would be a net reduction in transit options for me, and would probably make the 65 more crowded.
Melody	Winkle	372, 522, 73, 71	1	The proposed changes to NE Seattle look good. Please have as many 372 runs as possible, including evenings and weekends, until midnight. Also, a stop on 85th on the 522 would be very nice (or on 95th, which would be even nicer).
James	Whitehead	--	6	The NE Seattle restructure with much more all-day frequent service is a big step forward. Effective transit must be reliable, available, and frequent in order to be a primary means of transportation.
Nancy	Holcomb	73	1	I fail to see how removing all service from the north Pinehurst neighborhood on the weekends is going to encourage people to give up their cars and ride the bus, which is what I thought you were trying to do. For those of us with mobility issues, you have left us no way to get to downtown Seattle or the Seattle Center on weekends. The new continuation of Rt. 73 as Rt. 78 to Link is great, but it will only provide service Mon-Fri. What is your plan for getting people downtown on Sat/Sun? Please reconsider. Even service once an hour is better than NOTHING!
Patsy	Shuler	73	1	I still do not understand how cutting evening and weekend service on the major daily route on 15th Ave. NE can be considered an improvement in service. The 73 is the only easily accessible route for riders from Pinehurst, Victory Heights and Maple Leaf neighborhoods to reach the U District and Downtown. This change will result in having to take two buses to get anywhere. The commuter oriented light rail will be of no use to folks who just want to get on a bus and get where they need to go and back home again during the day, in the evening and on weekends.
Barbara	Hannon	73	1	Please don't get rid of the weekend schedule for the 73 bus. It's the only way to get to the University District without having to spend hours transferring. There are so many people who rely on the weekend service to the University from this area. We won't have the Link Rail for another six years in this area. It's not fair and places a hardship on many. Thanks
Jen	Spanswick	73	1	73 needs to run on the weekends, please

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Maggie	Connor	73	1	I would urge the council to allow the 73 to continue weekend service between Jackson Park and UW. In the area it now serves, students and staff would still need an efficient way to get to UW and access the light rail station on weekends. Perhaps less runs on the weekends would be a good compromise.
Amy Dunn	Caldwell	73	1	I understand you propose limiting the hours of the 73 on weekdays and eliminating the route on the weekends. I work night shifts at UWMC, and if I take the bus to work on the weekends, I generally take the 73 home because the 68 doesn't run till 9am. Without the 73, I'd have to take a 67 or a 75, both of which stop half a mile from my house - and it's an uphill walk. On the rare occasions when I work day shift (7am - 8pm), the 73 is the best bus home, although if it stops running at 9pm I better not work late. I have to say I'm not excited about your plan. Thanks,
Timothy	McGinnis	150, 11, 10, 47, 49, 550	8	Hello, Respectfully, I love riding the bus everyday to work and school. It has been very good to me so far. However I would like to have more frequency for the 150 bus to Kent station also more late night service to from Seattle and Kent station on the 150 bus. Also it would be helpfull and safer for everyone if we had a late night service more frequent on the 49, 8, 11, 550 to take me home after late nights on the town instead of driving a car or taking a taxi cab. Also sometimes I go to work really earling in the morning like around 0026 in the morning to catch the 150 to Kent stations and It would be nice if the 150 became an all-night bus. The other bus line I would like to have more frequent and later is the number 41 because I like to go to Northgate I think the number 41 could become a 24 hour bus service that would help a lot as well.
M.	Gauri	66X	--	As a regular bus user, I'm excited that the Link Light Rail station in Capitol Hill and Husky Stadium is opening up soon! However, I live in the Norhtgate area and often have to travel to the Eastlake/South Lake Union area and the revision of route 66X to be route 63 and only provide service during peak hours would not meet my need to attend public/global health activities in the after work hours.
Transfer				
Timothy	Fliss	65, 75, 30, 66, 70	1	My main Meadowbrook-Eastlake/SLU commute is 65 to the U District, then transfer to the 70. The return trip is 66-70-65. I currently do not have parking at work, and my family has become a one-car family. This commute is rarely less than 70 minutes and often approaches two hours. For reference, I regularly bike this same short 7 mile route over the summer in 40 minutes or less. North East Seattle desperately needs a modern high-frequency bus network. When the UW is not in session, my preferred route, the 65 will often leave me waiting for a full half hour if I miss-time my departure. That delay cascades at the U district as all of the peak hour buses are taken off the road. My alternate route is the 65 going in the other direction, so no improvement there. The 75 is way over at Sand Point and also low frequency by that point. On the return trip, the 66 is often very late coming out of downtown and it is often over capacity. My alternate route is to walk down the hill to the 70, which is also often late or not picking up passengers because it is too full. By the time I get to the U District (especially during summer) there is a large gap in the schedule for the 75 and 65 and my commute stretches to 2 hours one way. At this point I have found the Pronto bike share to be a more reliable option to get to the U District. I also have to keep One Bus Away (I've nicknamed it One Hour Away lately) on constantly to decide on alternate routes. NE Seattle might have barely adequate coverage in theory, but if you don't know exactly which set of transfers to make at exactly what time, you're stuck. This was also true a few years ago when I lived in Wedgwood and commuted to Fremont. I find 66x to be a very useful commute route, but not currently frequent enough at peak hours. It provides coverage that other routes to SLU/Eastlake do not. I completely agree that the route is best concentrated as a peak-only commuter route until the Roosevelt HCT corridor is in place. As far as East-West connections, I completely agree with the new 62 line. I used to find myself with very long waits at transfer points to get home from Fremont. I don't mind transfers as long as the service is frequent and reliable. The 62 route will also serve the Roosevelt HCT line and it might even provide me a transfer to the 66 that doesn't send me through UW or Northgate. East-West service is currently terrible in this area to the point that I don't even go to Ballard or Phinney Ridge or other neighborhoods anymore. The 62 would at least be an option to get to Greenlake reliably. As someone who often spends nearly three hours commuting a day (comparable to when I used to live in Chicago), I think these changes are needed regardless of whether the Link is put in. I know several other one car families in the area. Many people have bought houses in the area in recent years who have similar commutes. That trend is not going to change. We can all aim for the narrow rush hour window and clog the buses and roads even more, but we'd prefer to take advantage of a more efficient deployment of bus service hours for everyone's benefit.
Brian	Henry	--	1	I fully support the recommended Metro restructure for NE Seattle, especially Route 62/63x. I am in favor of rationalizing our system to be more efficient and faster, even if there are more transfers.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Timothy	Gihring	312, 72, 75, 271	1	The proposed changes are extremely positive and I'm very happy with the choices Metro is making in the U-District. I take Metro from my home in lake city to the U-District and transfer to get to Bellevue on a daily basis. These changes would have a significant positive impact on my daily life as it would mean more frequent transfers. The biggest pain point in my daily commute is traffic crossing the lake causing me to miss a transfer. With the current schedule it may be close to 30 minutes before my next bus comes around. Making buses run more frequently to take away that transfer penalty would have a significant positive outcome on my life.
Jacob	Nelson	8, 11, 48, 49, 44, 45, 67, 271	2	I think the proposed Metro service changes are great. I work at UW. This change would eliminate my one-seat ride (the 43), but that's great! The additional frequency on the other Capitol Hill routes and the connection to Link will provide better mobility for me overall. The reroute to 19th on the 8 and the 11 seems a little odd, but it's close enough to the old route that I'm not worried. The changes north of the cut are even better. The strong connection between the UW Stadium Link stop and the future U District stop (44, 45, 48, 67, 271) is vital until the next phase of Link opens. The increased frequency on the 65, 67, 75, and 372, and the new 62, will make a big difference.
Kenneth	Trease	25, 30, 74, 31, 32, 65, 75	2	I take all of the bus routes from time to time. If we can fix the issue of transfer penalties by making the connecting lines come much more frequently, transit gets much more useful. The proposed changes in NE seattle are great. I can't wait to have frequent bus service near my home all day long. It will make it that much easier to skip using the car. It's true that some areas lose an infrequent, marginally useful line. But, far more ridership will be gained with this change than lost. I would gladly pay more in taxes to get this plan, but the idea that we are repurposing less efficient lines to get these hours, is wonderful.
Bill	LaBorde	8, 48, 75, 78	2	I'm thrilled with these proposed changes. As a frequent rider of light rail and Metro buses, these changes will make it easier for me to get more places from home and work by transit. I don't mind a transfer at all if the connections are easy and frequent. For example, with the proposed changes in NE Seattle, my wife will now be able to get to work at Seattle Childrens' by taking light rail and making a quick transfer to a bus at the UW Station. She would just drive rather than taking transit if she had to take a bus for the entire trip, or transfer to a bus downtown. We don't want to see our tax dollars wasted on duplicating light rail service. Prioritize buses to create a greater, more frequent network. Add more reach and access to the light rail system rather than duplicating it. Finally, I'm thrilled to see the changes proposed for the 8 and 48. Splitting these routes will make them much more reliable. Even my 12 year old son has started calling the 8 "the late." Let's move forward these changes to put an end to that legacy.
Adrienne	Parks	545, 542	3	I am excited about the option for travel from Redmond-ULink-Capitol Hill/Downtown. Although this takes away a 1 seat ride, it offers riders from Redmond a more efficient and consistent method of travel. I look forward to skipping the I5 traffic by using the lightrail. When traveling to Capitol Hill, I've tried to transfer buses at Montelake but have been frustrated by the poor timing of the buses. The 48 and 43 are too often caught in UW commuter traffic to be a reliable option. The Link and frequent 542 stops near the station will be more efficient, more reliable, and ultimately less frustrating.
Gary	Nelson	45, 48	4	I fully support the proposed change to split the 48 into two separate routes, with new route 45 serving the North end of the route, as well as increasing the frequency. The current 48 route is often standing room only and often is backed up to the point where during rush hour the wait can be a half hour or longer and then 2, 3 or even 4 buses will come one right after the other.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Alexander	Kvenvolden	71, 72, 73	7	I strongly encourage the council to accept the proposed changes that King County Metro has submitted. While normally I oppose eliminating one-seat rides to downtown Seattle because downtown is the only part of the city that has a fast and direct connection to Federal Way, where I live, the travel time improvements enabled by University Link from husky stadium to downtown alone justifies the truncation of the southern portion of the university express routes at the UW. Also, because of the saved bus service hours, Metro has nicely reallocated them to increase frequency on practically every route in NE Seattle. Metro is also reorienting NE Seattle service around the UW station, which has a frequent connection to downtown Seattle with U-Link. The transfer penalty generally adds travel time and variance, but with the fast connection to U-Link, the transfer scenario will mostly be from a frequent route to another frequent route, and the added frequency from the saved service hours only makes that better. Furthermore, while a few places north and east of the UW have one-seat rides to downtown now that would no longer have them, their travel time would either stay the same or be reduced because of the relative speed of Link, and every existing two-seat ride would get faster. In addition, once north of the U-District, the downtown expresses are sensibly preserved, while connections to the U-District get frequency improvements, (e.g., route 41 is still there). Also, can't forget Metro fixing route 8.
Ian	Crozier	71X, 72X, 73X	8	I am excited about the proposed restructures for NE Seattle and Capitol Hill. I think they'll bring better service to these areas of Seattle and leverage our transit system resources in a more effective way. Provided that transfers take place easily and intuitively at light rail stations, the proposed restructures will allow riders to easily get downtown from a much greater number of points quickly, just by transferring to light rail.
Erin	Gibbons	73	1	My daughter has a metro pass rather than a school bus. She uses the 73 to commute to NE 125th St. Please do not add a second transfer to her route! From what I hear, the changes to the north end put people back in cars. The idea is to increase bus ridership! Many of the proposed changes are just seattle shooting itself in the foot. Please contract someone with some sense and do not cancel these routes, or whatever you might be calling it when services north of northgate are removed.
Colin	Sachs	73, 373, 41, 16, 71	1	The extensive changes King County is making to Metro in 2016 in advance of the both the 2nd UW Light Rail Station and the Northgate Light Rail station opening is premature. Overall bus service to North and, in particular, NE Seattle to Downtown and, in particular, routes through downtown, will be negatively impacted well in advance of light rail service to the Seattle's north side. If the intent of the changes is to reduce commuting, I fear that these changes at this time will have the opposite effect -- especially since routes that riders rely on from neighborhoods such as Pinehurst will be eliminated or terminate at the UW Husky Light Rail Station which will only take riders down town, necessitating additional changes to buses once they arrive to get to their destinations whereas before, a single bus ride was all it took. Why the changes are not being phased in over time as different light rail stations come online is beyond comprehension as doing so would seem to serve the best interests of the commuters... indeed, maintaining multiple means of transit, as is done in New York City where both buses and the Subway overlap, to the same destinations would seem a more reliable and customer friendly way to meet commuter needs -- rather than channeling commuters to light rail whether or not it gets them to their destination in a timely and efficient means (as it seems that Metro is trying to do with many of these changes to the North Seattle routes.) Please consider phasing these changes in over time, rather than all at once, with changes coinciding with the opening of the light rail stations (i.e., don't make substantial changes to NE Seattle until the Northgate light rail station is open and ready for business) as this would better serve the needs of commuters.
Jack	Papegaay	72	1	Route # 72 currently provides direct service to downtown and the upper part of the University District. With the planned cancelation of this route riders will lose their direct service to the University District and would have to transfer to go to the same destination where today it is direct and requires no transfer. That is NOT an improvement in service and is contrary to what Seattle voters were promised when they voted to increase their taxes to support Metro. Also to get to downtown current riders of route #72 would be forced to walk according to Metro's own estimate for 5 to 7 minutes to transfer to light rail. That is absurd to force riders who currently have a direct non transfer route to downtown to have to walk across the UW Campus. Route # 72 NEEDS to be continued and be routed directly to the light rail station at Husky Stadium from the U district. Metro told the voters that if they would vote to increase their taxes to support Metro they would be able improve service. Cancelling route # 72 is not improving service but it is taking service away.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Jiayun		45, 67, 48, 43	2	The current proposal will change multiple bus routes to end at the university of washington station near husky stadium to transfer to the link light rail to downtown. However, there are many people who need to transfer at the Montlake freeway station. The current proposal doesn't take into account people on these routes that need to transfer at Montlake. It seems that bus routes from u district to Montlake are reduced due to cancellation of bus 43 and 25 and no increases in other bus lines going to Montlake. I would like to make a recommendation that instead of terminating bus routes at university of washington station, instead terminate it at Montlake freeway station to allow people who need to transfer there greater frequency of buses.
Reg	Newbeck	8, 11	2	I've have reviewed the August 25, 2015 Metro proposal and I am sorry to say it fails since: 1. It lengthens the runs of the 8/11 which are already among the most unreliable routes. 2. It does not allow for seamless transfers between the 11 and 12 going east and west. 3. It removes the 8 from John/Thomas. 4. It does not allow seamless access to the Community College on Broadway and other places on East Pine. 5. It duplicates service on East Madison from 19th to 24th which does solve any problems, but eliminates access to bus service on East John between 19th and 23rd Ave East. 6. It will require changes in the 19th Ave East and East Madison intersection for 60 foot buses to turn west or north. I know that Metro has spent the last two months trying to work this out and I believe that plan could be made palatable by moving the 8 back to East John/Thomas and by having the 11 continue west to 12th Ave East where it would turn north to John and light rail. These are easy fixes and would leave the rest of the plan intact! Amazingly this plan has united the users of the 8, 11 and 43 in opposition to the Metro 2016 Capitol Hill restructure! I look forward to talking to you about these issues. If this plan can't be modified then I would suggest like others are, that the Capitol Hill changes be postponed until after the implantation of Light Rail so that the impact of it and the Prop One changes can be reviewed!
Denise	Lishner	43	2	The August 25 2015 Metro proposal IGNORES THE NEEDS OF AN ENTIRE NEIGHBORHOOD and would be disastrous for residents of Montlake!!! As a senior who lives in my own home near the Arboretum, to get to Group Health for medical care or the grocery on Capitol Hill I now take one bus. Under this proposal I would be forced to take three separate buses with associated wait times: the 48, 8 and 11! In addition I would need to wait to transfer in areas that I consider to be very unsafe, especially when it is dark (4 PM in winter!) It is imperative for Montlake residents that you continue to provide access to Capital Hill and downtown via Olive or Denny or John!! My only alternative: get back into my car!
Catie	Chaplan	43	2	Please don't eliminate the 43. It provides a vital and direct connection from Downtown, Capitol hill (and group health)' to the u district and all points in between. Much of Capitol Hill and mint lake are not served by link light rail and the 43 provides this service. For many people, not having to transfer buses is much more important than a multi-ride trip. Either physical limitations, inability to walk up steep grades, not wanting to wait at night in the rain for connections, etc. thank you for this consideration
Russ	Pengelly	11	2	I ride the 11 from Madison Park to Downtown Seattle almost every day. The majority of riders who get on the bus want a quick, direct route to Downtown. This is based on personal observation. A few disembark at Madison and 23rd to transfer to northbound buses and some at Seattle Central College, but the majority of riders continue to downtown and either get off at 9th and Pine, 5th and Pine or 3rd and Pine. To make this commute longer because you think that riders are going to want to transfer to the light rail is shortsighted and likely has no merit. Why don't you delay any re-routing decisions until the light rail transit center opens and then do a study to see how many riders are actually transferring from the 11 to the light rail? My guess is not many.
Connie	Chaplan	43	2	Please vote to keep the #43 bus route as is. It is currently on the list for routes to be eliminated. For this part of Capitol Hill (which is rapidly growing in density, and includes a high school, middle school, college, and hospital), the loss of the #43 would mean rather than taking one bus downtown or one bus to the main campus of UW (and all neighborhoods in between)--we will now need to take a bus to a light rail station to another light rail station to a bus. The walk to the Broadway light rail station is down/up a very steep hill. The walk to 23rd to connect with the #48 is up/down a very steep hill. The places to connect on Broadway and on 23rd are unsafe at night, in the dark, for young people. The #8 is routinely late due to traffic at Denny and Mercer. The #43 is one of the best routes in the city--it makes it easy to take public transportation if you have small children, physical disabilities, have luggage, groceries--because you just need to get on one bus. Please don't reduce bus transit in favor of light rail stations that are few and far between--and that don't go to all places people on public transportation need to go.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Barbara	Wright	43	2	Both the 25 and the 43 are being canceled and both serve the Montlake Community. Now a resident living in Montlake has to either walk 1 mile to Light Rail or transfer to get downtown. And Madison Park gets a one seat ride to the downtown. Even the low ridership of routes 10 and 12 keep neighborhood service. Please give us back a one seat ride to downtown. We are a very dense neighborhood that has endured incredible traffic and commotion from the University, SR 520 and now we are receiving a big cut in transit AFTER we voted for additional transit service. This makes no sense at all. And the final insult is to call the new Light Rail Station at Husky Stadium the "Montlake Transit Hub". It doesn't serve our neighborhood. It will take me longer to get downtown with this proposed service cut than it does now AND I have to transfer. Please put one of the buses back in service. Thank you.
Dwight	Gee	43, 25	2	Both the 25 and the 43 are being canceled and both serve the Montlake Community. Now a resident living in Montlake has to either walk 1 mile to Light Rail or transfer to get downtown. And the new routing will take a person longer to get downtown than it does now. Madison Park will have a one seat ride to the downtown in the new proposal. Low ridership routes 10 and 12 keep neighborhood service. Please give us back a one seat ride to downtown. We are a very dense neighborhood that has endured incredible traffic and commotion from the University, SR 520 and now we are receiving a big cut in transit AFTER we voted for additional transit service. This makes no sense at all for a neighborhood that is about 4 miles from downtown. And please rename the new Light Rail Station at Husky Stadium. It is being called the "Montlake Transit Hub" and It doesn't serve our neighborhood. It will take me longer to get downtown with this proposed service cut than it does now AND I have to transfer. Please put one of the buses back in service. Thank you.
Karin	Huster	25, 43	2	I am writing to express serious concerns about the proposed cuts to metro services in the Montlake Community. Currently, routes #43 and #25 have direct service to downtown. Under the proposed route changes, both routes have been cut and it means people in Montlake now have to transfer to get downtown. Transferring from the #48 to the #11 at 23rd and Madison is quite dangerous! Drivers at that intersection pay no attention to pedestrians. Route #43 is one of the most used routes, taking students from lower capitol hill to the University of Washington or taking Montlake residents downtown or the UW. I have long been a transit user and actively supported the transit increases. Now I am stunned to find that my neighborhood will receive less service. My choices are to walk 1 mile to the Light Rail station or take route #48 and then transfer downtown. It will actually take me longer to get downtown than it currently does. It boggles the mind how Capitol Hill neighborhoods can keep low performing routes #10 and #12 and suddenly the low metro-use Madison Park residents get a one-seat ride downtown, but Montlake gets nothing. We are a very dense neighborhood that uses Metro services very heavily. Please take a strong look at this proposed re-routing and please provide neighborhood service to Montlake.
Karin	Woods	43	2	Please do NOT eliminate the 43 bus. It provides the ONLY means of reaching downtown (which isn't very far away) from Montlake without a transfer and the light rail stations are simply too far away to be useful. It's constantly packed. If it's eliminated more people will simply revert to cars. PLEASE retain it.
Susan	Stowers	43	2	I think the elimination of the 43 line is a very bad idea. Many people in the Montlake area rely on this line to travel to capitol hill and then to downtown. Making people transfer twice to achieve this coverage is NOT an improvement in efficiency.
Phyllis	Chan	43	2	The loss of the #43 bus would mean taking 2 buses to get up to 15th Avenue East (Group Health, Safeway etc) with a transfer on 19th near Madison from the 48 to the 8 and yet another bus to get to downtown from the area I live. It is inconvenience.
Helen	Harmetz	25, 43	2	As a Montlake resident and a proponent of public transit, I urge you to keep route 43 and 25. I am writing to you to express my concerns about the proposed cuts to service in the Montlake Community. Currently, routes #43 and #25 have direct service to downtown. Under the proposed route changes, both routes have been cut and it means people in Montlake now have to transfer to get downtown. Downtown Seattle is only about 4 miles away. I have long been a transit user and actively supported the transit increases. Now I find that my neighborhood will receive less service. My choices are to walk 1 mile to the Light Rail station or take route #48 and then transfer downtown. It will actually take me longer to get downtown than it currently does. This proposal will increase car traffic into downtown which is a bummer given the congestion Seattle is experiencing already. Please take a strong look at this proposed re-routing and please provide neighborhood service to Montlake.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Christopher	Macks	43	2	I, as well as many fellow riders, use the 43 route every day to commute to work in the downtown area. That route provides an efficient and direct route for the University and Montlake neighborhoods to get downtown. Ridership, at least during morning and afternoon commute times, can standing-room only and would be a major loss for those of us who depend on it.
Mary	Benjamin	43	2	I am concerned about the proposed cuts to bus service in the Montlake Community, particularly route #43. I, and other family members, have used the #43 over the years to get to Capitol Hill and to downtown, (either occasionally or regularly) and I can't imagine not having the ability to rely on this direct service that my family has often depended on. My oldest daughter used the #43 bus every weekday during her two years in Running Start, at Seattle Central Community College, (and I have another child beginning Running Start at the end of this month.) Having the direct connection (within blocks of her departure and arrival locations) is one of the reasons she chose SCCC and found it to be such a convenient and positive experience for her. I also felt much more comfortable with her commute (than I otherwise would have), knowing she would be on one bus the whole way. Montlake is a very dense neighborhood and I would like our needs to be considered in a serious way. We already have upheaval (with it being harder to get in and out by car, due to all the 520 impacts.) Please don't make our bus commute that much more arduous too. Taking two busses to a destination feels WAY more daunting and unpalatable than taking one. It makes a much bigger difference to me than you may realize. Please reconsider these actions. Thank you!
Kathryn	Person	8, 32	4	As a resident of the Uptown neighborhood (Lower Queen Anne), the portions of the 8 & 32 routes that connect my neighborhood to Capitol Hill and the U District directly are very helpful. Elimination of these routes forcing us to go downtown and transfer would make it much harder to get to those neighborhoods. Also, I work in Kirkland and transfer from the 255 bus to the 8 at Stewart & Denny every afternoon to get me home. Having to go through downtown every evening would significantly lengthen an already long commute. Please preserve these vital connections for my neighborhood!
W.	Condiotty	64, 71, 76, 65	4	My concern is for those who have no cars. The elderly, especially women, are the ones dragging their shopping carts over broken up sidewalks, coming in harms way against cars and bikes. You will leave them more vulnerable, as well as those of us who have to work well into our sixties and maybe into our seventies because Seattle is taxing us to death. Your plan calls for more transfers, taking people in round-about routes to get to a transit tunnel way out of the way in the high traffic Montlake Hec-Ed area. We will be out in the inclement weather, and every time we must get off the bus, we are subjected to the higher incidents of crime we are experiencing. Your routes to the hospitals are not improved. It is pretty sad, as it has been for years now.
Ronald	Siemens	242	4	I ride the 242 daily to get to work. The suggested substitute routes are not realistic: possibly having to ride 3 buses (41, 63, and 542) is cumbersome and slow. Also, the 542 is slow, going through the U district, whereas the 542 takes I-5. The 542 also makes many stops along 148th in Redmond. The two stops the 542 makes along 520 are nowhere near equivalent: it's difficult to walk from those 542 stops to areas the 242 services. This is not a reasonable solution, we need the 242 bus. Please do not cancel it. I will certainly not vote for anyone that is for terminating this route.
Miscellaneous				
Amy	Wheless	Link	4	Please support the Metro restructure! Also, please consider off-board payments and random fare enforcement in downtown Seattle - that would make things go so much faster!
Laila	Barr	26	4	Are bus drivers invited to give comments on proposed changes, or only the bus-riding public? I have often heard drivers grumble about having to cross 65th, a busy arterial without any stoplights to speed up the procedure. It would make more sense to have it turn right onto 65th then turn left on Ravenna instead of zigzagging.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes through September 10, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Machiko	Threlkeld	41, 312	1	I grew up in Tokyo. I never understand how Metro works (I mean, I don't know how you can operate the way you do). 1) Pricing is wrong (people should pay by distance from where they live. If I have a "1 zone ORCA," that should be 1 zone from my house. If I am in Bellevue, no matter what distance, I should pay for a use of Metro. Same token, I shouldn't pay extra just because I am going to Lake Forest Park from my NE Seattle house. It should be by distance!!!) 2) Redundant routes no matter how you say you fix. 3) Local and express buses go through a completely different route ("express" means less frequent stops of local!), ie. #5, #26, etc. 4) Not enough "central location" or HUB. Routes are too skewed. All NE buses will go down on Union/Pike while all NW buses go down from north of Belltown. 5) No buses that go West-East in north Seattle. Hello? People travel everywhere. If you keep accommodating ONLY people who commute to downtown Seattle, you will be out of business in no time. High school kids should take it off hours to relieve the congestion. High tech people should be able to travel from north Seattle to Fremont/SLU without going through downtown and/or sitting for hours in local slow buses. 6) Too many bus stops for some lines. Ex. #65 & 75 7) Education on how people should get off/get on buses. Manners, people! I don't know why it's so difficult to do things right. If not right, change/fix it. Improve and progress! Never regress.
Tiana	Garrett	--	2	My experience is that the buses as well as the lightrail ate interruptive and obnoxious to the current traffic that already exists. Please let vid be the city we proclaim we are and evolve in the necessary ways. As a small business owner we appreciate anything we can get as far as convenience.
Sumit	Kaur	545	3	--
Lauren	Hernandez	E	4	Please make a subway!!!
Eugene	Kramer	121, 122, 156, 166, 180, 906	5	U Link and Angle Lake should open at nearly the same time. I think we should put a little effort into improving service and connection to the Link in South King County. I suggest creatively taking on routes 121, 122, 156, 166, 180, and 906 to maximize daily commuter transfers to Link and address access from homes to stores in the local community. 156: I suggest running the 156 south on South center Parkway, up the hill at the new road at South 184th Place, west on South 176th, north on 30th street, south on Military all the way to 200th. This last part with the run along Military is the part I want to see the most. Makes a lot of sense to use Military and 200th to connect the 156 to the Link. 180, 574 and A are already connecting to Link at 176th so we don't need the 156 to go there too. Military south of 176th could benefit from new bus service. And the stores around Best Buy will LOVE the service improvement 156 rerouted will offer. 906 is insufficient and doesn't run late enough for local shoppers to use after work. Additionally, the 156 and 122 duplicated the same route from the 509 termination to 216th. If 156 used 200th to cut west, that duplication would cut in half. But if the 156 used the 28/26/24 Ave South extension (airport road?) the 156/122 overlap disappears. And the save on mileage south of the airport would offset the loop I suggested through McMicken Heights. Finally the future industrial park south of the airport would have a dedicated bus that is offset but parallels the A-line. 906: I think 906 (as a commuter) should climb the hill that the 156 does currently to facilitate a transfer to the Link at 176th or the Tukwila INTL Blvd Link staion. 166: This bus route could connect with the Link at 200th Street Angle Lake Station shortly after it leaves the Highline Community College. 166 and 121 stronly duplicate the same routes locally too. While I understand the 121 is designed to go downtown, the 166 is a local bus but copies 121 too much. Now IF my recommendation on 156 along 28/26/24 Ave South is taken seriously, 166 should be rerouted with a snaking pattern. Ideally from Kent to HCC, west on 240th, north on Marine View, east on 216, north on 24th Ave South, connect to Link at 200th, then west on 200th to resume heading north on 1st Ave. After Link makes it to HCC in 5 years, the 166 route may need to be adjusted. I wish there was an online tool where I could draw my recommendations on a map. Thanks.