

**Comments on the Proposed Metro Service Change  
Received by the King County Council  
September 11, 2015 Through September 24, 2015**

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

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

Between August 25 and September 10, 2015, the Council received 354 comments. Those comments were printed as part of the September 15, 2015, committee meeting packet.

Between September 11 and September 24, 2015, the Council received an additional 74 comments.

Those 74 comments are printed on the pages that follow. An updated database of all comments received, with contact information, is made available to Council offices each day so that Councilmembers and their staff can review comments as they are submitted.

Many commenters addressed specific bus routes, including routes 25, 43, and 242.

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

- **Distance and Convenience.** A number of commenters (54) expressed concern that the proposed service changes would require them to walk farther to a stop or to change their travel patterns.
- **Frequency.** One commenter expressed support for the additional frequency proposed with the restructure. However, one commenter expressed concern that routes they use would not run frequently enough to meet their needs.
- **Network Connections.** Three commenters expressed support for the connections to light rail and the overall transit network that would be provided through the restructure. However, five commenters expressed concern that they would not have access to an adequate transit network.
- **Off-Peak Service.** One commenter provided input on off-peak service, expressing support for additional off-peak service.

- **Transfers.** The restructure as proposed would entail transfers to light rail or another bus for some transit riders. A total of nine commenters expressed concern about the need to transfer.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 11 through September 24, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
				I use bus 242 everyday to get to my office in Redmond. I moved to the Lake City area specifically because I can take the 242 bus route across Lake Washington, without switching buses and get dropped off right in front of my office. Route 242 saves me time and money and I wish to continue riding this bus route. Also, the driver on the 7:05 bus is always cheery and kind. Something nice to have in the morning. In case you were wondering, I'm in favor of keeping route 242. If this route was eliminated, I would have to take 542. Route 542 is incredibly inconvenient. I would have to drive further from my house. By that time, I would be half way to work. Then, should I actually take this bus, it would drop me off about a mile away from my office. Normally, I would not complain about walking that distance. Walking is good for me. However, the point of having a transit service is to create more efficient, convenient ways for people to get around the city and eliminate some of the very prevalent traffic issues that plague the city of Seattle. Eliminating route 242 would push many bus riders to join the hoard of drivers that are already on the road, increasing travel times, not only for themselves but for other buses as well. Please take all of this into consideration when making this decision. Thank you.
Alli	Kolick	242	1	This bus provides a direct route from Greenlake Park and Ride to my building at Microsoft. The options proposed in place of this route would mean such an increase in time and inconvenience that I would no longer ride the bus but would drive every day. The bus is always full indicating that it must be profitable, so I fail to understand what problem it would solve to delete the route. Please reconsider this proposed action and retain route 242 service as it is.
MK	Galvin	242	1	I use the 242 bus to get to and from work almost every day. the elimination of this route, will require me to transfer busses. I will almost certainly begin driving to work every day. The 242 has decent ridership on the way to work (toward Overlake) in the morning. The 242 often looks quite full when coming home on the busses around 4:30 to 5:30. I can adapt my schedule to schedule changes, but elimination of the route would not be favorable to me.
Brian	Cross	242	1	I have been a patron of route 242 for nearly 8 years now. It is the most convenient way for those of us who live in NE Seattle and Shoreline to get to the east side, particularly Redmond. I would be sorely disappointed to see it go. I have reviewed the transit proposal and the suggested replacement routes lack the timing and direction the 242 offers. I understand Metro's need to maximize its budget and provide transit to underrepresented communities. However the impact of losing this route would be woeful. Could some sort of compromise be reached? Instead of cutting the 242 altogether, could there simply be a reduction in service? There are six daily runs from NE King county to Redmond. This could be cut to say three, reaching its destination around 7:30am, 8:30am, and 9:30am. That would cover the prime starting hours for a vast majority of people, Thank you for taking the time to review my concerns.
Raymond	Quan	242	1	

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 11 through September 24, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Katie	Guess	242	1	<p>I'm extremely upset upon finding out that part of the proposed 2016 Metro service changes includes canceling Rte 242. It is my only way of getting to work, at Allegro Pediatrics in Bellevue (14711 NE 29th Pl Bellevue, WA). I've researched other ways of using the metro system with the "suggested routes" that were offered and none of them would be sufficient. In my experience of riding this bus to and from work, 5 days a week, it is ALWAYS full. A lot of people, including myself, are dependent on this bus route because we live in the Seattle area and work on the eastside of Lake Washington but not in downtown Bellevue (where the other routes will take you). The main reason why we all take this bus is because it's our ONLY alternative to driving across 520 and arriving within a 2 mile radius of our workplace. The suggested route you put on your website only travels along I-5, so it's a little concerning that you advised the use of that "new route" as an adequate option, seeing as we are not using this bus to travel on I-5, but rather as a way to cross Lake Washington. I understand that the new light rail will bring about the need to reallocate resources and adjust the current bus schedule, but for a commuter bus that is always full, it doesn't make any sense that you've chosen Rte 242 as a route to CANCEL all together. Please let me know of my alternative to getting to and from Greenlake (@ 65th and I-5) to Bellevue (@ 148th and 29th Pl) that doesn't require 3 different busses and 2 hours of my time, each way. If you can do that, then I would understand why this bus route has been marked as a "duplicate route" and support your proposed changes. But after researching all available metro routes on my own, it seems that without this route I'm going to have to buy a car or find a new job if you go through with your proposed changes. Please consider my testimony as a serious concern for a regular user and commuter of Route 242. I would hate for this change to cause an influx to the already increasing number of drivers crossing the 520 bridge during commuter hours, because we're all trying to do our part to help with decreasing our impact on both traffic and the environment.</p>
Marcia	Rutan	72, 372	1	<p>I catch the bus at Lake City Way and 95th St. NE. During the day, the only available bus direct to downtown is the 72, other than commuter times when the 312 operates until 8:45 am. There is a proposal on the table to cut the 72, with the assertion that people can easily get up to 15th to get other buses, or take the nearby 372 and then transfer to another bus to get downtown. First of all, the idea that people can easily get to 15th is not appropriate for many folks on the east side of Lake City Way. It is a long steep hill almost the whole way. I recommend that one of the planners attempt it on a rainy day, and possibly with a small child. Secondly, 95th is a primary arterial and while currently well-served by the 522, the 522 does not stop at the 95th bus stop where quite a few people catch the bus. Cutting the 72 will eliminate a direct route downtown, requiring significant extra time for transfers. If the 72 must be cut, which I truly hope will not happen since it also nicely serves the Roosevelt and University District areas, please at least consider adding the 95th stop for the 522 all day long, all week long, so another option is available to residents without driving or transfers. Thank you for considering my needs and suggestions.</p>
Douglas	Potter	242	1	<p>Metro plans to cut this route - as it has many times before. They claim that its service is duplicated by other routes. Route 242 is not underutilized. Often there is standing room only on the ride home until after Green Lake. Metro's report when it was going to cut the 242 as part of the budget crisis also stated that it's not underutilized. Part of its route became duplicated by the 542 a few years ago - and it's still popular and not underutilized. As far as I can tell, there is no additional duplication in the proposed route changes. So there is no reason to believe ridership would change if Metro implements its proposal. For much of the 242's route in Seattle, there is no reasonable alternative. If one is north of Northgate TC, as I am, Metro's stated alternatives are routes 41 or 347. I fail to see what Metro has in mind with route 41. It can get me to the transit center - but then it immediately goes downtown - where I connect with the 545? Or am I supposed to transfer to the 66X at Northgate and then to the 542 at Greenlake? And route 41 won't help at all if one is north of N 130th street. Route 373 run ten blocks to the east of 5th NE - an extra 20 minute walk - and the route goes through the University District, which likely takes at least an extra 15 minutes. Metro seems to be of the opinion that traveling through the U district is as fast as going around it - as the 242 does. I don't think Metro can sustain this position based on actual data. I think the real reason Metro wants to cut this route is that it doesn't fit into its route catalog and hub and spoke model. It's Eastside based, but goes to Seattle's north end. And although they've had all these public hearings, it's not clear to me they even listened - as we've seen no change or further explanation.</p>

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 11 through September 24, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Donald	Argus	43	1	I am writing to protest the impending elimination of Route 43, a route with a very high ridership. 1. The new light rail tunnel is no substitute for the 43 for those living between Husky Stadium and the new Broadway station, but not within walking distance of the two stations. The 43 is still necessary to get between places along its route! 2. In particular, the 43 is the way for people along 24th Avenue E to get to the Group Health hospital. Eliminating the 43 will make it much harder for those who depend on transit to reach Group Health, requiring going out of the way and a very awkward transfer at 23rd and Madison to reach it and the 15th Avenue business district. 3. People just won't do that awkward transfer, and will abandon transit in favor of cars. Eliminating the 43 is a very counterproductive move. I am again writing to protest the impending elimination of Route 43. As a trolley route, it is free of carbon emissions. Eliminating it in favor of a patchwork of routes that run diesel buses will increase emissions and decrease air quality along the route of the 43.
Eric	Kunze	242	1	I object to the plan to discontinue route 242. At the moment, I walk 16 blocks to catch it on 80th and 5th (while a direct route west might be shorter and quicker, it would require crossing 3 busy streets, 15th, Roosevelt and 5th at locations where there are NO lights). My typical wait is 10 minutes but can be 20: I have tried arriving later only to miss the bus. 242 takes me directly to my place of work on 40th and 148th, just north of the Microsoft campus. With the proposed changes, I would have to walk the same distance to catch the 63, then transfer to the 542 under I5 at 65th where I would have to wait again, then have to walk from the 540 stop to 40th. This would add half an hour to 40 minutes to a commute that already can take an hour each way. My bus in at 7:00 AM is not full but the one back at 4:00 is. When Seattle voted for more bus service, I thought more was to be provided, not less.
Peter	Russo	43	2	As a person who voted for increased transit funding, I am not happy that it appears to mean that my main transportation source to downtown Seattle is about to be cancelled. I am a 30 year Montlake resident and ride the #43 bus downtown frequently. Your plan to cancel the #43 means that my travel time to downtown will likely double, and that I will be required to transfer either to another bus (#48 to the #12) or the light rail as part of the journey. This is not acceptable, especially in inclement weather. Moreover, increasing congestion around the 520 interchange makes bus travel to the UW light rail station via the 48 too unpredictable. It is a one mile walk from the Montlake neighborhood to the new UW light rail station, so that is not acceptable, either, particularly in rainy weather. If you cancel the #43, I may be forced to return to my car, which surely is not what you intend.
Jacob	Bartholomy	25, 43	2	Please, please keep these bus routes. Both are extremely important to our neighborhood.
Dale	Wilson	242	2	The 242 is without a doubt the most convenient and expedient way that I have ever traveled to work. It has saved me an incredible amount of money over the years both in toll fees and gas across 520, while providing a direct route to my office. The 242 bus is by far the most utilized bus within our entire office, with a majority of our hires coming from the west side. The 242 has become so frequently used and internally that we even have a group known as the 242 crew who travels together at the same time every day. The 542 bus would add a substantial walking distance to everyone's commute and not provide the direct route everyone has come to know and love. Direct bus routes to our office was a substantial factor in purchasing our new office and with the 242 removed, this would have been all for not. Please keep the 242. It's hands down the best and most convenient route I've ever ridden.
Jody	Schultz	43	2	Please don't eliminate the bus 43 route. Many folks pick up the bus at Aloha and 23rd to go downtown. There will be no good alternative if you eliminate this route.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 11 through September 24, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Martha	Keck	43, 25	2	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. I don't understand how Capitol Hill neighborhoods can keep low performing routes #10 and #12 and suddenly Madison Park will get a one-seat ride downtown, but Montlake gets nothing. We are a very dense neighborhood and between the impacts from the University and SR 520, we are feeling very impacted. Please take a strong look at this proposed re-routing and please provide neighborhood service to Montlake.
Lars	Omberg	25, 43	2	Please don't turn me into a car commuter! I have chosen to go without a car since I arrived in Seattle three and half years ago as public transportation has been excellent. I regularly commute to work on the 25 line and always take the 43 line when going down-town. The proposed removal of these two lines seem to go contrary to Seattle's goal of reducing car ridership. I am a cancer researcher working at the Fred Hutch Cancer Center and have an easy walk to the 25 bus stop. Currently my daily commute consist of about 15 minutes of bus ride and 5 minutes of walking. With the removal of the 25 line I will have to walk further and switch lines making a car ride shorter, quicker and more convenient. More damming is the removal of the 43 line which my family has become dependent on for frequent visits down-town. The new University Light rail connection is an exciting addition to the Seattle transit system but is not a replacement for us living in between stations. It is over a mile walk to the station and taking the 48 to the station will increase the transit time by more than double. Again making an expensive car ride more convenient even when considering parking. I am proud of Seattle and its transportation network and happy that I have been able to rely on it instead of my own transportation but removing the only two bus lines I use on regular basis will likely make me into a car commuter again - one of the main reason I chose to live where I live.
Carol	Oliver	43	2	I was appalled to hear that Metro is considering removing the #43 route when the light rail opens on Broadway because that will provide access to downtown. Many thousands of us do not live within walking distance of the light rail and use the 43 daily. In addition, in order to USE the light rail we need a way to get there and back. Yes there are other routes that go downtown but none will connect with the light rail leaving them bereft of passengers save those that live within walking distance of the station or on the 49 route. (No, don't get me started on the #8 route as a light rail station feeder. We all know how undependable that one is and how it is the first to shut down on a holiday or late weekend.)
Vicki	Omberg	43	2	As a resident of Montlake I find it troubling to hear that the #43 bus route is under consideration to be cut from service. This is the bus that I regularly take downtown, as do many of the visitors and guests we have visiting us in Seattle. The bus stop is only two blocks from my home, and because I do not have to transfer I feel comfortable taking my two year old child with me as well as explaining the route to out of town guests. If this bus route is cut it means that instead of using public transportation I will be driving downtown, in order to avoid having to make a transfer and inevitably spending more time using public transportation. Please reconsider removing this popular bus line to downtown from Montlake.
Lynn	Rowland	43	2	30 years as a dentist in U district and 30 years living on Capitol Hill. I will be very upset and so will my patients if this route is cancelled. Please take the time to consider all those stranded in the middle by lite rail links . It will be of no value to me . The 43 bus is a valuable route to me and many of my 3000 patients
Mary	O'Meagher	43	2	Losing the #43 Route would work a hardship on so many people. It covers such a wide area and locations that have collect large groups of people. Schools and hospitals in particular. As a non driver but active senior, many routes have some importance to me personally. Thank you.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 11 through September 24, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Erika	Douglass	43	2	I've heard this route might be cancelled. This is a great route for getting from the Madison valley and Capitol Hill area to the u-district, Capitol Hill, and downtown. I know it's used frequently by students and employees at UW. I have used this bus frequently in the past. I really hope the route is not gotten rid of. Especially if the number 11 route is possibly no longer going to run all the way down to Madison Park.
Deanna	Kalinoski	11, 12	2	I ride to work on first hill unfortunately it could be a different time each time. Hospital workers do not work on regular schedules. When getting to Polyclinic on Madison ,even now you must walk several blocks to catch a bus which could be uphill or across the freeway. I thought when we voted for increased transportation it would not be bait and switch.
Mary	Cate	43	2	The 43 is currently the most reliable bus that gets me to work downtown on time. I need a bus that will take me from Thomas and 17th. The 8 is unreliable and sometimes never comes. The 8 is overcrowded already.
Natania	Dumont	43	2	There has been some talk about taking away the 43 bus line. Please don't do this. It is a crucial line connecting me to Capitol Hill and Ballard. I cannot imagine having to take two or more buses to get to Ballard and the walk is too far to catch an alternate route to the hill. Please leave it along 23rd!!!
Marcio	Fanti	25, 43	2	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. I don't understand how Capitol Hill neighborhoods can keep low performing routes #10 and #12 and suddenly Madison Park will get a one-seat ride downtown, but Montlake gets nothing. We are a very dense neighborhood and between the impacts from the University and SR 520, we are feeling very impacted. Please take a strong look at this proposed re-routing and please provide neighborhood service to Montlake.
Betty Anne	McCall	25	2	I urge you to keep the 25 bus route. It is the only bus that serves my part of Montlake. Without the 25, to get downtown my choice is to walk three quarters of a mile up a steep hill. This is not an attractive option especially when it is dark and raining. I further urge you to increase service on the 25. Currently, it runs Monday thru Friday, approximately 6:00 AM until 6:00 PM not quite once an hour. A few months ago I was offered a retail job downtown. I couldn't even consider it as I would need to work evenings and weekends. I would love to drive less and take the bus more if only I had a viable option.
Liz	Nichols	43	2	Please do not get rid of the 43. If you want me to use light rail how will i get there? The 12 doesn't help. Am i going to travel away from downtown across montlake cut? No i will have to drive. How will my kids get home from school? They currently take the 43 from john/15th to 23rd/aloha. They aren't big enough to walk a mile 2x day. The 43 connects me to the grocery stores on 15th, the library in montlake. Removing the 43 makes inter capitol hill/ montlake very problematic. Make it less frequent if you must, but we need a way to get to the ightrail and the 43 travels that path now and will continue to be needed.
Jennifer	Hawkins	43	2	As someone who ride the 43 as a commuter Monday through Friday for the past 12 years, it is short sighted to eliminate this bus route. People like myself are on the far east side of capital hill, there is no alternative to downtown. Further to ask us to transfer 2-3 times or walk 25-30 minutes to light link rail station, makes it faster to walk all the way downtown or drive. The 43 bus is full most mornings, and standing room only in the afternoon commute. It connects neighborhoods that the link light rail just does not serve in any way. Please do not eliminate the 43 without serious consideration to the daily commuters that no comparable alternative is being proposed. The 11 is already slow and unreliable to become even more so, and the 12 is proposed as reduced schedules.
Andrew	Wheeler	43	2	Thank you for all the work you guys do! Please do not eliminate the 43. I use it almost daily to go up the hill, and the 8 is entirely too unreliable. Having lines that run parallel to trunk lines (like the Link) are necessary. It's not like a can jump out of the train and burrow up if I need to get somewhere on 23rd. Please reconsider this part of the plan!

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 11 through September 24, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Robert	Kirby	71	2	Metro Route #71 provides a direct trip from the area along NE 65th St to Wedgewood where Food Shopping, Banking and Drug Store are easily accessible. In the other direction, Route 71 provides direct access, without transferring, right through the University District on University Way. This is especially helpful for seniors as well as people with disabilities. I don't think that it would be a problem if the route terminated at the LINK UW Station instead of downtown, especially if it had a stop at the Campus Parkway site, where there are many options for transfers. Also, it would be possible to downsize the bus used for this route. Even if the new route 16 is added from Sand Point to Green Lake, Wallingford, Fremont and finally downtown, this eliminates the access we now have to both the U District and Wedgewood. Please consider the possibility of maintaining Metro Bus Route 71 with the current configuration but ending at the University LINK station instead of the downtown Transit Tunnel.
Trang	Nguyen	25, 43	2	I am writing to express my concern on the proposed elimination of bus routes 25 and 43. Losing both routes would severely limit transport options for Montlake and Portage Bay residents to Capitol Hill, Eastlake and downtown, esp in light of the fact that ridership throughout the city is expanding rather than contracting, and the trend is likely to continue. Also, for people with limited mobility, such as seniors, transfers from 48 to light rail and other routes are not simple nor safe and total commute times will be lengthened due to wait times and delays to other connections.
Steven	Hastings	43	2	Please do not eliminate the 43 route. If it must be eliminated, the 8 and 11 routes must have more frequent and larger articulated buses to accommodate the massive increase in their use that will result.
K'it	Bakke	43	2	As a 30+ year resident of Montlake, I'm struck by the irony of the ads on the buses that tout more options and better service, while you are taking away the much used and incredibly convenient #43 route. I am excited about the light rail additions at Broadway and John, and the one in UW parking lot, BUT they do NOT replace the #43 for us folks who live along the 24th Avenue corridor. Please do not take away our ability to take a bus downtown with no transfers and only a 2 block walk. Especially in rainy and cold weather, waiting for transfers or walking a mile to the light rail is not good transportation service. If the goal is to encourage more people to use public transport, to create a city where everyone uses it (as in New York City or London or Paris, etc.), taking away the #43 is not the right direction to be going. In fact, that plan will likely put more of us back into our cars. Thank you very much for considering this point of view.
Sadie	Wechsler	43	2	I have lived on the 43/48 route my entire life of 30 years. This is the way I quickly and easily am able to go downtown but also to Broadway and connects me to essential services as I do not have a car. A route with transfers would take me more time and it would be harder for the elderly people in my community to access as they rely on the easy nontransfer system to get around. This bus is necessary for our community and others and it used heavily. Please keep the 43 line.
Luan	Nguyen	25	2	My house is located on the Lakeview Boulevard E on Capitol Hill. Every day, I ride the bus 25 to work and home. I rely heavily on it. Please consider maintaining this route. It's very important to my neighborhood.
Patrick	Derks	242	2	The 242 bus route is a very important part of my everyday commute. It is much more convenient for me to get to and from work everyday than any other bus (I work in the lakeridge set of buildings near Microsoft main campus). Without the 242 my daily commute time will increase by approximately 10-15 mins and I would strongly consider just switching to driving alone as a result.
Christopher	Page	43	2	Please do not eliminate the #43 bus line along it's 24th Ave route to and from downtown into the U district! It is a useful and vital connection and the light rail does not take the place of this route. Thank you.
Neala	Kendall	43	2	Please consider keeping route 43 even after the light rail opens. If it's not well used them, you could cancel it, but I bet a lot of people like myself will still ride it. I would rather spend a bit more time getting downtown on one bus than have to walk a ways to catch another bus or have to take two buses. A lot of people live in between light rail stations, like myself. I take the 43 bus to work and to pick up/drop off my son at daycare. Please consider keeping it to see if it's still used--I bet it will be! Thank you for considering this!



Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 11 through September 24, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Bruce	Schoolfield	43	2	Metro 43 serves as a vital link between my neighborhood of Montlake and Capitol Hill, First Hill and Downtown. Its elimination actually degrades Metro service to our neighborhood and makes the light rail line a costly negative development. I would request that the Council find a way to preserve Route 43 even if the frequency of the service needs to be reduced. Thank you for your kind consideration
Linnea	Hirst	25, 43	2	We take the #25 bus downtown (a short block from our house) when it's running. Otherwise, we have to choose to go .4 miles up and over a steep hill to get on the #43 (or half a mile to go a less steep way to get to it), or .6 miles up the long hill to catch the #49. When the light rail station opens, we won't have either the 43 or the 25, and we will have to figure out how to get to light rail-a mile using the Bill Dawson trail, or 1.1 miles using 19th, then Montlake Blvd. We much prefer the trail because we avoid having to cross fast-moving traffic on the entrance ramps to 520. If we get to the #48 to get us to the light rail station, that's .5 miles, then another .3 miles from where it stops to get to the station. That's a long way from the philosophy of 'multi-modal' of the sort there is in so much of Europe. We might as well just walk. There are a lot of other important traffic-related issues that our neighborhood continues to fight for but those are the ones that especially affect my own family.
Awo	Ashiabor	25	2	I am writing to express my concern about the proposal to cancel 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 Portage Bay 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.
Julia	Gold	43	2	Please do not eliminate route 43, which is the direct route to downtown for a large segment of my neighborhood! Walking to the 11 or 8 is not a good option. At the least, postpone changes until the effect of Prop 1 and the new light rail can be evaluated.
Nancy	Beadie	43	2	I am a regular user of the 43 bus between campus and downtown. I am deeply concerned about the proposed major cut in transportation service in this corridor. The 43 is a very heavily used bus precisely because it is accessible. Light rail stops two miles apart are not accessible most places in between. For someone with joint trouble walking these distances is simply not viable. You will leave us no option but giving up public transportation all together. After living in a neighborhood that "worked" for all these years I am deeply depressed that our transit service will dramatically decline rather than improve with the opening of light rail.
Mary	Schoolfield	43	2	Route 43 makes it easy for me to get downtown when I don't have access to a car. It also allowed my sibling who did not yet have a driver's license to get downtown and to Broadway without having me or our parents having to take time out to bring her downtown. I do not think that Route 43 should change because it allows a lot of people in my neighborhood to get around the city, down to the market, and to Broadway without having to access a car.
Cynthia	Ford	43	2	I am not in favor of eliminating Route 43 for the following reasons: 1. Requiring a rider to take two buses to get to a destination two miles away is not a good proposal. Rather I believe it will put more cars on the roadway rather than waiting for two buses in the potential pouring rain. 2. Light rail option. I could ride my bike to the Light Rail at UW but how will I know if one of the four bike racks is available and on which car? Why would Metro eliminate a bus route because of the light rail expansion when the light rail expansion doesn't stop between the UW and Capitol Hill area where the bus route serviced? 3. I feel that the solution is to get cars off the road and increase ridership for all Metro routes rather than eliminate this particular route. If it is savings Metro is looking for then they should look at Route 10 and 11. Those buses come at a frequency of two 10s and two 11s to every one 43. It seems as though you could lessen the frequency of route 10 and 11 and keep route 43. Or move route 10 to 19th rather than 15th at some point so riders can walk down the hill to get to 23rd/24th in a few blocks. It seems unreasonable that the 10 and 12 end at relatively the same general area yet there will be no bus going directly from downtown to 23rd/24th around Aloha or Roy.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 11 through September 24, 2015

Frname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Kathy	Imrie-Eldersveld	43	2	I live one block from 23rd and E. Roy St. (my bus stop)We recently moved to this neighborhood from Montlake -we chose the street paritally because of the proximity to the 43, which goes right downtown (my husband and I both work downtown) We will now need to walk several extra blocks to take of of the other optional routes or drive to the lightrail in Cap Hill, however that is not really an option (no parking and the station is 2 miles away). Please do not delete this very important route. it is always crowded, I have a hard time believing there is lost revenue on this route. Also, the electricity lines are already set on 23rd to downtown (doesn't seem to make sense to me) - WHY GET RID OF IT!!!! Please dont!!!! it is one of the reasons we moved to this very expensive neighborhood - close proximity to reliable transportation.
Karleigh	Koster	31, 32	4	I'm disappointed with the decision to change the routes of the 31 and 32 bus from Stone Way to Wallingford Ave. As I have written in previous public comment, Stone Way is undergoing significant growth (one new condo building finished this year, two more city block sized buildings under construction) that will create more and more bus riders over time. Wallingford Avenue is much more developed and oriented to mostly single-family homes and has no additional room for this kind of growth. Many, many new residents who need bus service will move to Stone Way, not to Wallingford Ave. The decision to change the buses to Wallingford Avenue doesn't seem to take this growth into account, and I feel like it will just mean more cars on the road when people along Stone Way lose the easy bus options they once had.
Samuel	Jaffee	31, 32, 26X, 16 (62)	4	My comments address the proposal for change to routes 31 & 32, as copied below: "Move routes 31 and 32 from Stone Way N to Wallingford Avenue N to replace Route 26. Use N 34th Street and Wallingford Avenue N instead of Stone Way N." This proposed change routes the buses away from high-density apartment housing, which is a significant source of ridership on routes 31 & 32 in the lower Wallingford area. I believe this change would unduly affect residents of the vicinity of Stone Way N and N 40th Street on crosstown trips. I recommend keeping the routing for routes 31 & 32 as-is. This would seem to necessitate modifying the 26X to serve Wallingford Avenue N and N 34th Street (as the 26 currently does). The transfer point between the 26X, 31/32, and the revised 16 (new route 62) would therefore be Stone Way N. and N. 34th Street.
Manuela	Noske	242	4	I ama Microsoft employee and have been riding the 242 on and off for 15 years. The reason why the 242 is the best connection for Microsoft employees is because it goes along 148th Street and then cuts over to the Microsoft campus, providing easy and convenient access to many buildings along the way. The 542 is no match for that. While I understand that there is some overlap in the route, you need to take into consideration how people will get from their bus stop to their buildings. If it leaves them with too long of a walk, they will drive instead. I have not noticed a decline in ridership over the years and believe that the route is well used. Why take something away that works? It only operates during key hours anyway. Please keep the 242 - we fought hard to get it years ago and it's still needed.
Newell	Aldrich	28, 28X	4	I am writing to oppose Metro's proposed changes to Bus 28, and extend the local portion of the 28X. I ride the 28 local and 28 Express for different purposes. I ride the 28X to work in the morning from my condo near NW 70th Street near 8th Avenue NW, and back home. This bus provides quick service to Downtown. Extending the local portion by 15 blocks will result in a slower trip during rush hour. The 28 local provides direct service to Downtown Fremont, a location I frequently visit. This bus allows me to shop for groceries and return home on one bus trip. If this is eliminated, I would need to transfer to the 40, which is often at capacity. Realistically, I would need to drive my car more. When I take the 28 local home from work after 6 p.m., or on weekends, the roads are usually clear enough that trip time is pretty good, so converting to a 28x ride wouldn't seem a significant improvement. In any case, this route is well removed from the Husky Stadium station, so I don't believe the arrival of light rail in the University District should affect these routes. Part of the reason I purchased my condominium was the two bus routes being 1/2 block away, with quick direct access to Downtown, and to Downtown Fremont. Thank you for considering my comments.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 11 through September 24, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Dan	Plaster	242	4	I routinely use the 242 Metro Route and it is dramatically more efficient for me than using the 542 due to is specific route. Using 63 and 542 will cause a significant delay for me and significantly reduce my commute efficiency, to the point that I will have to drive many more days than I currently drive. In fact, I only drive a few days a month due to my child's schedule but with this change, I will be forced to drive on many days outside of that reason due to work time constraints and the significant delays caused by cancelling the 242 route. Consequently I ask you to strongly reconsider cancelling the 242 route.
Sannon	Cary	242	4	I live near Green Lake in NE Seattle, and work at Microsoft in Redmond. I have been taking the 242 to and from work for the last eight years because it offers a safe and convenient trip between where I live, and where I work off of 148th avenue in Redmond. I am blind, so safety is important to me as being able to live in a walkable location where I can easily access shopping, restaurants bus service and recreation options. These are the reasons why I live in Green Lake. Bus route 242 is slated to be eliminated in March 2016 when light rail comes to the U district. I am extremely concerned about this change because with out the 242, there will not be a safe and simple means of traveling from Greenlake to locations in Redmond that are along 14th avenue NE. Without 242 any trip from North Green Lake to Redmond would require two buses, and significant walking in areas with either no traffic signals, or in the case of Redmond where one must cross 520, no accessible traffic signals. Both situations make travel without sight extremely unsafe. The 242 does not conflict with any other routs in locations north of the Green Lake Park and Ride, or along 148th Avenue NE in Redmond, but there are a lot of people who live and work in both locations, and who would like to be able to travel safely between the two. I would also point out that this change won't drive riders to light rail since it simply doesn't go any where we need to go at this point or in March. It seems like the idea is to make bus transportation easy for people who drive while leaving those of us who rely on public transportation, and who made choices regarding where to live based on good service out in the dark, cold and rain, risking our very lives walking to find buses. I strongly believe in light rail, and hope to use the service once it extends to North Gate, and Redmond some day, but I ask that people please remember that key commuter bus routes like the 242 are critical to those who utilize them, and they should not be canceled if there are not safe and convenient alternatives for riders who are also tax payers.
Robert	Sibson	26, 26X	4	The proposal to eliminate the 26 bus route that runs through Wallingford and Fremont to downtown Seattle is, I believe, fundamentally flawed. I have a couple of reasons for this position. 1. The buses I see are very rarely empty when they pass through our neighborhood. Ridership levels are good. 2. There is a significant amount of high density accommodation being built in the neighborhood, whose residents would utilize the 26 route. I would approximate approximately 400 units being built, and if the route is eliminated it would mean many more vehicles on our already congested roads. (if they can find parking in the first place of course!) 3. The claim that the elimination of the 26 route supports the new light rail station at the University of Washington Stadium is utterly ridiculous. The route comes no closer than about 1 1/2 miles to the station, it is irrelevant to that discussion. While there are alternatives for many of the riders of the 26, there are many riders who have no alternative. This is obviously a campaign to remove this route since it was tagged previously during the threat of budget cuts for transit. However, as a supporter of public transit I voted to maintain funding, and was encouraged by the decision to keep this route. However, it has been identified again. Someone apparently has their nose out of joint about being refused on the first attempt to remove it. Given I am a supporter of public transport, and consider it an imperative if you intend to increase the population density in the Seattle area, I am extremely disappointed to see services being removed. I would support scaling back the frequency in low demand periods, but to cut out the route altogether, definitely not. I hope in your discussions you consider the consistent application of policies to improve transportation, not degradation of it.
Noah	Cohen	16	4	I'm currently riding the 16 south to work. We just turned onto Stone way and are so full we can't pick up additional passengers. This happens most mornings. Why are you deleting this route instead of expanding it?

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 11 through September 24, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
				I am disappointed you are terminating route 71 in the View Ridge / Hawthorne Hills neighborhood and making only a limited "peak only" route through part of NE 65th Street. I am also frustrated at how difficult it is to get route information from Metro -- the information is way too complex and overwhelming to read -- and that the Web site is optimized for high speed internet and smart phone. Trying to get bus information from a dialup connection is nearly impossible. My mom, who lives in Hawthorne Hills/Viewridge, uses bus 71 as her no-transfer route to get to the U District and downtown or Northgate. Even with 71, she has to make several transfers to get to the doctor and to appointments. Removing 71 leaves a huge gap for people like her that live south of NE 65th Street and east of 35th Ave NE. If they can't walk the distance needed to get to the next access point (all the way to 35th or all the way down to SandPoint way), you have created an exclusionary hardship for them. My mom is one of those people who would not be able to walk that distance every day. We have noticed that Metro has seemed almost deceptive in advertising which routes they are doing away with -- focusing the messaging only on LINK improvements and not explicitly stating to riders they are doing away with routes like 71. It is deceptive to put up a schedule and say "route changes are in color" and then where a route is to be eliminated, the route is just highlighted in color but there is no word "eliminated". People skip right over this information and don't even realize they are losing something so they won't send you their feedback. My mom asks other riders she encounters whether they have heard about the route cuts and she tells me everyone she has spoken to says no, they hadn't heard anything. I didn't know Metro was doing away with routes until my mom told me. I hope you will reconsider your coverage area and be more inclusive to people living between NE 65th and NE 55th Streets that are now excluded by the new route map, and give people access to the bus at times other than "peak only".
Tess	McMillan	71, 76	6	
<b>Frequency</b>				
				I am writing to support the proposed restructuring of U-Link Bus service. Although it affect several routes in my neighborhood, it is necessary to improve frequency of service to Link and downtown. Please approve these changes to create a well integrated transit system and leverage our considerable investments in Link.
Mark	Foltz	5,26,16,31,32	4	
J	Robertson	11	2	Recommended route lengthens the route and my commute to no advantage. I preferred the recommendation to run the route along Madison. Higher frequency doesn't shorten the trip nor make the times more accurate. This route also has "on time issues".
<b>Network Connections</b>				
				I believe the restructured King County Transit routes for the upcoming opening of light rail at UW Stadium is critically needed to help with the car congestion that sucks the life out of getting basically anywhere at any time of the day (except between 10PM-6AM) in the greater Puget Sound region. Furthermore, it could help with getting a higher percentage of households to eliminate needing a car for a larger percentage of their daily needs. Please vote "Yes" on the changes!
Thomas	DeMaria	75, 74	1	
Eldan	Goldenberg	8, 11, 12, 43, 48	2	I support the proposed bus restructure around the coming Link opening! I am particularly pleased with a few aspects of the proposal: * Encouraging Link transfers where Link is much faster and more reliable than buses can be. * Reducing bus service duplication, in exchange for generally higher frequencies. I am disappointed that the Capitol Hill part of the proposal has been watered down as much as it has since the previous iteration, and particularly concerned that the effort to serve a few blocks of Madison St directly has added a very counter-productive zig-zag to the 8 and 11. Even with this, though, the proposed restructure will be an improvement on the status quo.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 11 through September 24, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Garrett	McCulloch	45/48, 28X, 26X, 16/62	4	I'm writing in enthusiastic support of the proposed Metro bus restructures in North Seattle. This is a huge step toward building a real, functional bus/rail network, and I really appreciate the increase in routes that go places other than downtown. In general, the more we can do to use light rail as the main connection from NE Seattle to downtown along the corridor, the better. Even if this means we lose some one-seat-to-downtown buses, it opens up a lot of possibilities to refocus those resources in a way that gets more people more places. One additional recommendation--I hope Metro will do as much as possible make the bus to light rail transfers easy. A lot of the bus to light rail transfer points are close to UW Station--but not quite as close as they could be. Crossing 5 lanes of car traffic or going out of your way to use a pedestrian overpass makes getting from bus to train a bit more challenging than it needs to be. But overall, these changes are a huge step in the right direction!
Ksenia	Kolcio	43	2	I am very concerned that route 43 is being considered for elimination. This is a crucial line that provides quick access to downtown/U-District for residents of east Capitol Hill such as me, and the areas of Madison Valley, Madison Park, Madrona, and Central District. The 43 route along 23rd ave in particular makes it accessible to these areas and it provides key links to other lines such as #8, #11, #48, #10, and #12. The new light rail line will not provide connectivity these lines forcing residents to go out of their way as well as adding time and distance to their commutes. Please keep the #43 running!
Caryn	Cline	43, 12	2	I take the bus whenever I can, from my home on Capitol Hill. I believe in public transportation, and I'd rather not drive if I can help it. I rely on the # 43 and #12 buses to get to different locations downtown. The # 43 bus also will go right past the light rail stop on Capitol Hill, so it will be the best way for me to get to and from the light rail. What sense does it make to cut the one bus that goes right past the Capitol Hill light rail stop? If these bus routes are eliminated, I will be forced into my car more to get to doctor's appointments on First Hill (where I now take the 12) and to get to places downtown and in the U. District that are currently served by the 43. In my opinion, with the growth now going on in Seattle, we need more bus routes where buses run more frequently. Light rail service is an important enhancement, but it can't replace bus service. They work hand in hand to make it possible to live in Seattle without owning a car. I just returned here from a decade living and working in New York City, which has an extensive public transportation system. Seattle's can and should be just as extensive, reliable and user friendly. Please reconsider your decision to cut these vital bus routes. Thank you.
Smit	Lohia	25	2	The new Link Light rail connection at UW is set to provide a faster and more predictable ride time to downtown Seattle. You have provided good reasons and alternatives to folks in Laurelhurst to get to downtown. However, most riders in Montlake (near the park) are left with the only option being to walk 1/2 a mile to catch a bus on SR520 or frankly just ride a car. I agree with you that there are few riders on 25 all the way from Laurelhurst to downtown. However, providing a new route that just loops between North Broadway, Montlake, and the UW Husky Link station will ensure better connectivity for residents in Montlake and increased ridership on the Link Light Rail. Please consider providing a better connectivity option between UW Link, Boyer Ave, 19th Ave, and Montlake Blvd.
Lisa	Pfeiffer	43	2	43 is an essential link between the 23rd and Boyer area and Capital Hill/ Downtown. I know the link rail will go between UW and Cap Hill, which will be great, but it is a 25 min walk from my house to UW. The 43 will allow me to connect with the light rail stations at UW and Cap Hill. Otherwise, how will I get there? Buses to transport people to the light link stations are as important to people as the light rail itself.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 11 through September 24, 2015

Frname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Daniel	Goodwin	65, 73	1	While these two routes are the ones I personally use most I'm actually going to make a statement on the whole thing...The Good: Most of the Northeast Seattle restructure. The 62 will be a blockbuster after Roosevelt Station opens. The Questionable: The 38 is likely too short and I suspect it will be merged with another route scrap (one to Renton if I had to guess). The Bad: Group Health Hospital at 15th and John will have no direct connection to Off The Hill points. This will be less of an issue as Link is built out though. Maybe if resources become available extend route 10 wire through 15th / Boston to reconnect with 49? The Ugly: Madison to 19th to Thomas. This double-turn will be operated 9 times per hour and the right turn in this combo is going to be dreadful. I understand the "23rd and John" stop is actually nowhere near 23rd so routes 8 and 11 needed to be moved off John to provide a connection to 48 so the 43 could be deleted. But it that section of Thomas St that big a deal? Moving the cut-back to 15th instead of 19th would still serve GH while also serving the Madison Street Trader Joe's and Madison Market.
<b>Off-Peak Service</b>				
Mike	Birmingham	64, 71, 72, 76	1	Please vote YES on the proposed March 2016 bus restructures. As a long-time bus commuter in Seattle, I know they would be a great improvement over our current route structure. I live Wedgwood, and plan on mainly taking the new routes to Husky Stadium and then onwards to my work located in SODO. But thanks to the new routes with increased frequencies and transfer points, I would also use the buses on weekends and evenings to get around town-- which is impractical today in NE Seattle.
<b>Transfer</b>				
Eidon	Leuning	48, 372, 75, 255	6	More frequent service is KEY to creating a truly world class system, allowing workable transfers w/o unacceptable delays. If we are not going to take advantage of the huge investments in light rail, then why did we do it. Bus routes stuck in the 40's is a commitment to dinosaurs. And we all know how that worked out.
Thomas	Park	43	2	Hello, bus 43 is one of the only busses serving my neighbourhood, and the only one that goes from the Arboretum to Capitol Hill without a transfer. The area I live in is extremely hilly, so it can be physically taxing for some people to walk down to the 11 on Madison if they wish to get across town. I hope you will reconsider your decision to eliminate the bus 43 service; it's an important route for people who don't drive habitually.
Jill	Eng	43	2	Please continue with Bus Route 43. For everyone that lives along the the entire route, it will cause hardship. When the light rail begins, we won't be able to get to the stop at UW without 43. We will not be able to get to work downtown without taking at minimum a couple buses and the rail. Please please please keep route 43.

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 11 through September 24, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
JoAnn	McMillan	71	2	<p>I hope that you will consider restoring at least part of Metro route #71, in that it provides a direct trip from the populated area along NE 65th St that will not be served by the new route #78. It's true that another new route #62 will travel along NE 65th but will continue on through to upper Green Lake and then down south, missing the University District by many blocks. Neither of the new routes (78, 62) does what the #71 does, i.e., travels right down through the University District on University Way, without having to transfer. This is especially helpful for people with disabilities. I don't think that it would be a problem if they were to eliminate the part of the route that goes on down to central Seattle; the route could be stopped at the Campus Parkway transit site, where there are many options for transfer to downtown. Also, I think that it would probably be a good thing if they downsized the bus used for the #71 route; one of the drivers suggested this to me when we chatted about the possibilities. He also suggested making the route hourly, instead of every 1/2 hour. I think that there are likely a lot of users and potential future users of this route who are interested in going to locations within the University District, e.g., the U Book Store, the U Post Office, various stores. For example, I am a retired UW physical therapy faculty member with a long history of accessing these locations in the days when mobility was easy for me. Since my 2011 Shingles episode that impacted my balance and hearing, I need to use two canes to get around. And I need to be very careful to avoid additional problems. Another advantage of getting into the U District easily is the ability to access the Health Sciences Express bus at the University Towers stop; this free bus provided by the UW goes down to the Harborview facilities. The latter is a very convenient way to get down to appointments with retinal specialists at the Eye Institute, something that I do on a monthly basis to deal with my neovascular macular degeneration. Thanks for considering my perspective. Please feel free to contact me if there is any way that I can help.</p>
Eric	Hartmann	43	2	<p>although I have not reviewed the proposed changes extensively, I do think that by eliminating the 43 it will produce more cars on the road. If the 43 and the 12 are eliminated or modified, everyone living from 23rd to 19th and Aloha to John will begin to drive in order to fulfill their transportation needs. Taking the 48 and transferring to the 8 in order to get downtown is cumbersome and will take more time. Plus, the 8 is NOTORIOUS for being delayed for prolonged periods of time during evening rush hour (3-7pm) as it is an east-west route that gets blocked by the line up of cars trying to get to I5 at the bottom of Denny hill. Adding more frequent 8's will not resolve that issue.</p>
Martha	Lentz	43	2	<p>I knew that with the completion of the Link Light rail to the University of Washington would not enhance transit opportunities for those of us living in the 24Ave East / East Capital hill area but I did not expect transit to downtown being eliminated. The options of taking a route 48 to the intersection of 23rd Ave E and Madison then transferring to route 11 will essentially double transit time to downtown. Additionally it requires a transfer in an area that neither I nor any women I know will find comfortable to make in spite of the gentrification of the area. Alternatively taking a 48 north to the University station results in the equivalent of a several block walk to the station from the bus stop and a significant increase in transit time although perhaps a safer environment. Essentially the elimination of route 43 has created an island in the 24Ave East / East Capital hill area without transit service to downtown Seattle. I am a long time transit user and find it amazing that the extension of light rail results in it now being far faster for me to drive to Bellevue then to take a bus to downtown Seattle.</p>
Craig	Soper	25, 43	2	<p>I am writing to express my objections to the proposed elimination of both routes 25 and 43 that currently service the Montlake neighborhood with a direct link to downtown. I find it strange that both routes would be eliminated for a neighborhood so close to downtown. What other close-in Seattle neighborhoods do not have a direct connection to downtown? We have been told that the solution is to walk to or take a bus and transfer to the new light rail station. But, this involves either a very long walk or extra time and effort with making a transfer.</p>

Comments received on Council's web site on Metro Service Changes September 11 through September 24, 2015

Fname	Lname	Route	Dist	Comment
Sang-Won	Yu	40, 242	4	I live in northern edge of Greenwood, Seattle and commute to Redmond everyday. I'm relying on the route 242 from Northgate Transit Center. If the route is removed, I'll have to take 3 bus rides. Route 242 is always crowded both in the mornings and the evenings, which proves there are quite a few ridership. The route covers and serves handful of areas and riders. Many commuters to tech companies in Redmond area rely on the route, such as Microsoft and Nintendo. Too many transfers are likely to cause delay for commuting. I strongly would like to ask you not to remove the route, or at least set up an alternative convenient for residents in Northgate/Greenwood area, with less transfers. Thank you for your consideration.
Theresa	Graham	73	4	For us M-F commuters, we will now have to transfer to get to work downtown. The fact that the light rail takes "only 8 minutes" from Husky station to downtown is NOT an improvement when you factor in the extra time to get to that station and to transfer from bus to rail. No time savings, and extra complications and inconvenience in our commute. Also, this route is being discontinued on weekends, and after 9:00 at night. As far as I can tell from your (confusing) website, this leaves the 15th Avenue NE corridor from about NE 143rd to NE 65th without ANY bus service at all on weekends, and after 9:00 p.m. on weekdays.