

Appendix F

Blog posts and comments in chronological order

We want to hear from you

Posted on **November 20, 2013** by **Metro Matters Team**

Public meetings on proposed service reductions are underway

Without a stable funding source for public transit, Metro is preparing to cut more than 600,000 hours of service.

Our proposal to close the budget gap includes deleting 74 bus routes and making changes—mostly service reductions—to 107 more. The effects of these cuts will be felt across the county. Many of our riders will have to walk farther or wait longer to ride buses that are more crowded, and drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians will face increased congestion on highways, city streets, and county roads.

We're reaching out now to help our customers learn about the proposed cuts, and asking them to tell us how the cuts will affect their daily lives. With no new funding, we will have to make the cuts, but public input could help us fine-tune our plans.

Suggestions that help us reduce negative effects on our customers while still making the needed cuts could result in changes to the proposal—but it's no fair asking us to move your cuts to another area instead.



Get informed | get involved

- Thousands of riders have [visited our website](#) to learn about the cuts.
- More than 2,000 people have filled out our survey to tell us about the impacts they will be facing when the cuts are made.
- On social media channels, use #KCMetroCuts to join the conversation.
- Meetings are taking place around the county (see list or check our [schedule online](#)). So far, community members have come together in Federal Way (see a [slideshow on YouTube](#)), West Seattle, and North Seattle to talk with Metro staff members, get their questions answered, and share their perspectives on the situation. This is a great way to get individualized attention from Metro staffers on your situation and learn about alternatives that may be available to

Upcoming meetings

- Bellevue: Wednesday, Dec. 11
- Kent: Monday, Dec. 16
- Kirkland: Thursday, Jan. 16
- Southeast Seattle: Thursday, Jan. 23
- North King County: Monday, Jan. 2

Check our [online calendar](#) for times and locations, plus other

We want to hear from you | Metro Matters

[http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/11/20/we-want-to-hear-from...](http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/11/20/we-want-to-hear-from-...)

you.

- Metro staff members are also visiting bus stops, park-and-rides, and other community gathering places to share information. Check our complete [current schedule](#) or watch for the van in an area near you.

opportunities to learn about the service cuts from Metro staffers.

◦ About these ads

Occasionally, some of your visitors may see an advertisement here.

[Tell me more](#) | [Dismiss this message](#)

SHARE THIS:

 Twitter  Facebook

 Reblog  Like

Be the first to like this.

[A new proposal to keep buses on the road](#)

[Participants discuss proposed service reductions in downtown Seattle](#)

[Kent Community Members Discuss Proposed Service Reductions](#)

This entry was posted in '[Have a say](#)', [Metro Future](#) by [Metro Matters Team](#). Bookmark the [permalink](#) [<http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/11/20/we-want-to-hear-from-you-2/>].

3 THOUGHTS ON "WE WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU"

Mark
on [December 16, 2013 at 10:52 am](#) said:

I do not understand how Metro Transit can continue to provide a 97% subsidy level to Metro Access and then scream that they have a funding shortage? Metro Access only charges a meager \$1.25 for a ride that costs \$44 to provide. This is not fair to other system users who are seeing dramatic cuts in service. The fare for Metro Access needs to be raised immediately to be on par with other users (this was a stated goal of Metro in 1999; 14 years is more than ample time to achieve this). In fact the fare should be raised to the maximum

We want to hear from you | Metro Matters

<http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/11/20/we-want-to-hear-from...>

allowable by law!

Metro Matters Team

on **December 26, 2013 at 10:51 am** said:

Thank you for your comment, Mark. Following is some additional information from an Access supervisor. We hope it will help to clarify the situation with Access:

In 1999, the King County Council adopted an ordinance that stated their intent to achieve parity between complementary paratransit service and Metro's regular fixed route fare. Paratransit fares have not kept pace with regular bus fares, which have increased 80 percent since 2009.

There are many reasons why decision-makers have found it difficult to raise the Access fare, but two likely reasons are that disabled individuals as a group are the least able to pay and often their only means of transportation is highly subsidized paratransit service.

There is a close correlation between having a disability and having a limited income. Disabled individuals are more than twice as likely to live in poverty than those without a disability. In 2011, the United States American Community Survey found that 27.8 percent of non-institutionalized working-age people with a disability live in poverty, while the poverty rate of working-age people without disabilities was 12.4 percent. Most people with disabilities want to work, but find it very difficult to obtain employment for various reasons. Per the 2011 American Community Survey, only 34.4 percent of working age people with disabilities in our country is employed. During that same year, the employment rate of working-age people without a disability in the United States was 75.6 percent.

The cost of the average trip on Access is currently about \$44. Metro's current Access fare is low, \$1.25 per trip. A monthly Access pass is available for \$45. This is one of the lowest paratransit fares in our region. Community Transit, which serves portions of Snohomish County, charges \$2 for a trip on DART, their complementary paratransit service. This is the same fare charged on Community Transit's local bus service. A monthly pass for DART service is \$72. However, Pierce Transit's paratransit fare is 75 cents, and monthly

passes can be purchased for \$27. Kitsap Transit's ADA paratransit fare is the same as their full fare for regular bus service — \$2 per trip — and a monthly pass is \$50. Intercity Transit's paratransit fare is \$1.25. Individuals with a reduced fare permit can by Dial-a-Lift monthly passes for \$15 or an annual pass for \$180. Whatcom County Transit, which serves the Bellingham area, charges a fare of \$1 for paratransit service, which is the same as their regular bus fare. Federal ADA regulations allow transit agencies to charge up to twice the base fixed-route (bus) fare. However, state and local regulations may also come into to play if they allow greater access than federal policy. Washington State Law (WAC 162-26-070) states that it is unfair practice to charge for reasonable accommodation of the special needs of a disabled person. Since Access is an accommodation for persons with disabilities who cannot use the bus, this has been interpreted to mean that fares for ADA paratransit service in Washington State cannot be set higher than the regular adult fare for fixed route service.

If King County Metro's financial situation results in reductions to fixed-route service, the availability of Access service in some areas of the County and at some times of the day may also be affected. Although it not possible to increase fares enough to cover Metro's revenue shortfall, an increase of both fixed-route and Access paratransit service fares may be part of the solution. It is questionable whether Access fares can be increased by enough to be the same as Metro's regular bus base fare. To do so would require a doubling of the current Access fare. Metro's long-range budget includes Access fare increases in 2015, 2017 and 2022. Of course, the King County Council would need to approve these fare increases. Given Metro's current financial condition it would not be surprising to me if the Access fare increases prior to 2015.

The King County Council reviews all of Metro's fares regularly and always provide the public the opportunity to comment during their deliberations. Should a fare increase be proposed, I encourage you to participate in Council's discussions. We value our customers and appreciate that you took time to share your thoughts with us.

If you have further comments or questions, please feel free to share here or correspond directly with David Hull at david.hull@kingcounty.gov.

mj
on **December 26, 2013 at 11:37 am** said:

Thank you for the feedback.

I find it incredulous that Metro continues to identify a funding shortage yet can continue to provide a 97% subsidy to one group of Transit Riders AT THE EXPENSE OF ALL OTHER RIDERS! I have a mother with late stage dementia AND there are private service providers that provide door to door transportation. Thus other Private Service transportation available to serve disabled people. How many of the Paratransit Users simply failed to properly save during their working years?

Once again I see where Metro has failed to increase the Paratransit Fares at the same pace of regular bus riders. If Metro simply eliminated this service (I realize it is not legal to do so) over \$50,000,000 would be freed up to maintain service for other system users.

The 97% subsidy for Paratransit Users is simply too high. It is time that the Paratransit Fare be set on par with regular users as noted in 1999 and to hear that the Paratransit Fares have not even gone up at the same rate as other user fares is unjust to the other system users. These other system have seen drastic cuts in their service!

Mark

Date: Thu, 26 Dec 2013 18:51:53 +0000 To: mjimjj@msn.com

Federal Way community members talk about proposed service reductions... <http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/11/21/federal-way-communit...>

Federal Way community members talk about proposed service reductions

Posted on **November 21, 2013** by **Metro Matters Team**

Commuting, congestion, costs, and options

We met with about 60 people at the Federal Way Community Center on Nov. 20, and hundreds more in southwest King County have filled out our [online survey](#). These people have told us that Metro is an important part of their lives, and the proposal to cut transit service has left them seriously questioning how they will get around—especially to and from work.

“Metro buses are VITAL to our community.”

Most people shared stories about how they depend on Metro to get to work in downtown Seattle via routes [177](#), [178](#), [179](#), and [190](#). If these cuts are made, the

first of these four routes will get added service (17 trips a day instead of 9) to accommodate additional ridership if the remaining three are deleted.



This proposed change is designed to minimize the number of buses going back and forth on I-5 to preserve as many commuter trips as possible between Federal Way and Seattle. But riders are telling us these buses are already overcrowded. Even with additional trips, both pedestrians and cyclists say they expect the consolidated service on [Route 177](#) to be even more crowded. People have told us they will use transit less—or possibly not at all—as a result of that crowding. And they say that this will translate into more congestion on I-5.

People in Federal Way have also said that park-and-rides in the area are already full, and won't be able to accommodate the added drivers who will want to park there after we consolidate service.

*“Seattle will have another car on the road. *Honk* *Honk*!”*

And some riders say they have no cars to fall back on, or they can't afford to drive. For them, transit is a lifeline that makes it possible to stay afloat. “The one and only bus ([Route 280](#)) I found to get me to work by 5 a.m. is going to be eliminated,” one woman told us. “This will change my commuting costs from \$14 a month (employer subsidized) to \$260. As a single mother of two kids, this is an extreme blow to me.”

Here are some ideas we heard at the meeting...

- Have routes [177](#) and [181](#) follow the same routing in both directions around the Federal Way Transit Center, to make connections between them easier.

Federal Way community members talk about proposed service reductions ... <http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/11/21/federal-way-communit...>

- Reduce service on other routes that are very frequent, such as routes 10 and 41, so they come every 30 minutes instead of every 10-15 minutes.
- Instead of cutting routes completely after 9 p.m., reduce the service at earlier times for routes such as 181 and 907.
- Increase bus fares. Several people told us they would be willing to pay more if it means keeping their routes intact. Said one, "I keep hearing that raising the fares is not being considered because it will impact the low-income riders, but not having a bus route will impact them even more."
- Seek funding from businesses, employers, and cities. These benefit from a fully functioning transit system and should help fund it.
- Tax vehicle registration. Some say they would support funding transit through increased taxes or fees on car tab renewals, because transit benefits drivers by reducing congestion on I-5.
- More belt tightening. Some believe there's more room for administrative and other efficiencies to shrink our budget gap.

Question of the Day

Why is Metro promoting use of bus service in Federal Way when we're also proposing cuts?

A: Our recent promotion was intended to help people learn about and use all of their alternatives to driving alone. Those alternatives include buses, trains, vanpools, carpools, bikes, and walking. Our new [Federal Way web page](#) will remain in place so residents can find those options, even if bus service changes. The project was funded by a short-term grant for the county's urban centers.

We want to keep hearing your comments, concerns, and questions about the proposed service reductions. For information on upcoming public meetings, visit the calendar on our [website](#). Can't attend a public meeting? Fill out our [online survey](#).

About these ads

Occasionally, some of your visitors may see an advertisement here.

[Tell me more](#) | [Dismiss this message](#)

SHARE THIS:

 Twitter 2  Facebook 1

 Reblog  Like

Be the first to like this.

RELATED

Federal Way community members talk about proposed service reductions ... <http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/11/21/federal-way-communit...>

[We want to hear from you](#)

[Participants discuss proposed service reductions in downtown Seattle](#)

[West Seattle rider questionnaire: What you told us, what's next](#)

This entry was posted in 'Have a say', Metro Future by Metro Matters Team. Bookmark the [permalink \[http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/11/21/federal-way-community-members-talk-about-proposed-service-reductions/\]](http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/11/21/federal-way-community-members-talk-about-proposed-service-reductions/).

ONE THOUGHT ON "FEDERAL WAY COMMUNITY MEMBERS TALK ABOUT PROPOSED SERVICE REDUCTIONS"

MICHAEL FORD

on [December 23, 2013 at 7:57 pm](#) said:

I live in West Seattle and these cuts that have already been done to West Seattle have hurt me as I'm disabled and have been told by metro customer service that disabled and older people can walk the 2 plus blocks to the QFC and Jefferson SQ Safeway carrying the bags from the store. I live south of the Jct and we no longer have any buses that stop at these stops if you are disabled coming from south of the West Seattle Jct.. I'm a disabled person and with the 22, c line and 128 none of which stop at these stops has made it so I've had to start shopping for more and going to the store alot less often and taking a taxi home from shopping.

Funding alternatives still under discussion to avert Metro bus cuts | Metro... <http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/11/22/funding-alternatives-sti...>

Funding alternatives still under discussion to avert Metro bus cuts

Posted on **November 22, 2013** by **Metro Matters Team**

[Proposed bus cuts](#) still loom large for Metro in 2014 and after as temporary funding expires and stable funding for service has yet to materialize. Officials continue to press for a balanced statewide package as a first choice, but announced a second possible path Thursday.

A



- "A statewide transportation package that is fair and balanced is still our first choice, but in the absence of action by the state, an imperfect local option becomes necessary so that voters can have the chance to save bus service and maintain roads," said Executive Constantine.

tentative agreement with Metro workers also announced could preserve some bus service.

A balanced statewide transportation package, with local options for funding Metro Transit and roads in the cities and unincorporated areas, remains King County's first choice – but in the absence of action by state Legislature, county leaders say they will develop legislation by year's end to give voters the chance to save bus service and maintain roads.

Funding alternatives still under discussion to avert Metro bus cuts | Metro... <http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/11/22/funding-alternatives-sti...>

At the same time, King County Executive Dow Constantine was joined today by the president of the Amalgamated Transit Union Local 587 to announce tentative agreement on a new three-year contract that, if ratified, could preserve some bus service.

Transportation benefit district

As part of a statewide transportation package, King County has requested authority from the state to ask its voters to fund transit service and roads in cities and the unincorporated areas through an increase in the motor vehicle excise tax. Referred to as the "local option", the revenues raised through such a measure would allow Metro to avoid devastating cuts to bus service. It would also provide funding for cities and the unincorporated areas of King County to preserve and maintain their roads and make related transportation improvements.

With the expiration of temporary transit funding, it is critical for King County to obtain this "local option" and to seek voter approval in 2014. If a transportation package does not provide for this outcome, existing state law does allow the Metropolitan King County Council to enact an ordinance creating a transportation benefit district with specific revenue authorities, including sales taxes and a flat annual vehicle fee.

"Time is running out. The people of this region deserve the right to vote on whether or not to accept drastic transit cuts," said Councilmember Phillips, chair of the Council's Transportation, Economy, and Environment Committee. "Putting this decision in front of voters in time to save their transit system, with or without state legislative action, is the right thing to do."

Revenues authorized by voters under a transportation benefit district would be distributed to Metro Transit for bus service, and to funding roads and transportation needs in cities and unincorporated King County.

Tentative labor agreement

Executive Constantine was joined by Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) Local 587 President Paul Bachtel to announce tentative agreement on a new three-year contract with bus operators, mechanics and other Metro workers that could preserve jobs and produce millions of dollars in savings for Metro Transit, subject to member ratification.

"This is a significant agreement that reflects a shared commitment for preserving bus service and the union's desire to be part of the solution," said Executive Constantine. "This agreement was reached following five months of good-faith bargaining, and I appreciate the hard work of negotiators on both sides."

The tentative agreement calls for a one-year wage freeze followed by a 2 percent fixed-rate wage increase in each of the remaining two years of the contract – a wage structure that may serve



Funding alternatives still under discussion to avert Metro bus cuts | Metro... <http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/11/22/funding-alternatives-sti...>

as a model for other County labor contracts.

The tentative wage agreement would save Metro between \$8.4 million and \$12.7 million over the life of the contract, or about 40,000 of the 600,000 hours of bus service that would have to be cut in the absence of stable funding. Wage highlights of the tentative contract include:

— “Local 587 recognizes Metro is in the midst of an unprecedented funding crisis,” said President Paul Bachtel. “This is an agreement we feel we can take to our membership – one that reflects our shared desire to keep our operators on the job and buses on the road for our customers.”

- A wage freeze in 2014 the first year of the contract, which covers Nov. 1, 2013 through Oct. 31, 2014,
- A 2 percent wage increase in the second and third years of the contract,
- An additional 1.67 percent wage increase in the third year of the contract, contingent on Metro’s ability to avoid a deep service loss. Most other county employees will receive the 1.67 percent COLA adjustment in 2014.

The tentative agreement also contains additional elements that will help contain agency costs. Local 587 has approximately 4,200 members who operate and maintain a fleet of 1,400 buses, Sound Transit’s Link Light Rail, and the South Lake Union Streetcar. The union will schedule a membership vote, likely sometime in December.

Stable transit, road funding needed

The cuts that would be required in the absence of funding are unprecedented in Metro’s 40-year history, and would roll back service to 1997 levels, despite the fact the county has grown 22 percent with 360,00 more people. At a time when that population growth would call for increasing service by 15 percent, under Metro’s service guidelines, Metro faces cuts of [up to 17 percent](#).

The Legislature granted King County temporary funding authority for transit two years ago, pending action on a comprehensive statewide transportation package. Those two years will expire in 2014, along with fund reserves, compelling Metro to outline a proposal to cancel 74 bus routes and reduce and revise another 107 routes to reduce costs starting next year.



Metro Transit held off making service cuts for five years by creating more than \$800 million in reforms and efficiencies, along with the temporary Congestion Reduction Charge. Metro needs an estimated \$75 million in annual revenue to keep existing service on the road and purchase replacement buses.

Another 150 daily bus trips between West Seattle and downtown Seattle – buses that ease construction congestion during the Alaskan Way Viaduct project – also are at risk of being canceled in June when state funding ends.

Metro last month carried 412,000 average weekday rides, its second-highest ever. The agency is nearing the annual record of 119 million riders last seen in 2008.

[Three months of public meetings](#) are now underway in advance of County Council consideration next spring of the

Funding alternatives still under discussion to avert Metro bus cuts | Metro... <http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/11/22/funding-alternatives-sti...>

proposed service cuts.

The county Road Services Division has 40 percent fewer workers than in 2009 as a consequence of the lack of stable funding. As a result, the roads system is deteriorating, service levels are reduced, and fewer roads will be able to be plowed and kept open for travel and restoration of utilities this year should a region-wide storm strike.

◦ About these ads

Occasionally, some of your visitors may see an advertisement here.

[Tell me more](#) | [Dismiss this message](#)

SHARE THIS:

 Twitter 2  Facebook 4

 Reblog  Like

Be the first to like this.

[State transportation tour invites public comment](#)

[Kent Community Members Discuss Proposed Service Reductions](#)

[King County Executive and local leaders ask legislature to act on transportation funding](#)

This entry was posted in [Metro Future, News](#) by [Metro Matters Team](#). Bookmark the [permalink](#) [<http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/11/22/funding-alternatives-still-under-discussion-to-avert-metro-bus-cuts/>].

7 THOUGHTS ON "FUNDING ALTERNATIVES STILL UNDER DISCUSSION TO AVERT METRO BUS CUTS"

MICHAEL FORD
on **November 23, 2013 at 8:21 pm** said:

I JUST FIND IT TOTALLY SAD THAT METRO IS THINKING OF CUTTING EVEN MORE OF THE LIMITED SERVICE WE ALREADY HAVE IN WEST SEATTLE. AS IT IS NOW THERE IS NO LONGER BUS SERVICE TO SHOPPING AT THE QFC OR JEFFERSON SQ SHOPPING FOR ANYONE THAT LIVES SOUTH OF THE ALASKIA JCT YET THERE ARE STILL BUSES THAT STOP THERE GOING NORTH OF THE SAME JCT. WE HAVE ALOT OF DISABLED AND

Funding alternatives still under discussion to avert Metro bus cuts | Metro... <http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/11/22/funding-alternatives-sti...>

OLDER PEOPLE THAT ARE NOW FORCED TO WALK 2 OR MORE BLOCKS WITH THE GROCERIES FROM THESE 2 STORES. I'VE BEEN TOLD BY METRO CUSTOMER SERVICE THAT THE DISABLED AND OLDER BUS RIDERS CAN WALK THE 2 BLOCKS WITH A HEAVY LOAD OF SHOPPING BAGS TO THE BUS STOP 2 BLOCKS AWAY. IF THIS WERE YOUR FAMILY MEMMBER THAT WAS DISABLED OR OLD WOULD YOU TALK TO THEM THIS WAY AND FEEL OK ABOUT TELLING THEM LIVE WITH IT AS IT IS WHAT YOU GET TO LIVE WITH. AS SOMEONE WHO WORKS FOR THE STATE AND MY WADGES HAVE BASICLLY BEEN FROOZEN FOR MANY YEARS I FEEL SAD THAT METRO STAFF HAS NOT HAD TO DEAL WITH THESE TYPES OF WADGE CUTS WHILE THE BUS RIDERS HAVE HAD TO. SO IT IS TIME MAYBE METRO LOOKS AT HOW THEY TREAT RIDERS AND STOP PUTTING EMPLOYEES UP ABOVE THE RIDERS AS IF THERE ARE NO RIDERS THEN THE METRO STAFF HAVE NO JOBS!!!! JUST HOW I FEEL ABOUT THE WAY ALOT OF THE DRIVERS HAVE THIS RUDE NASTY DISRESPECTFUL WAY THEY DEAL WITH ALL OF THE RIDERS ON THE BUS. IT DOESN'T TAKE MUCH TO SAY HI OR THANK YOU IF A RIDER SAYS THANK YOU FOR THE DRIVER TO SAY YOU ARE WELCOME. JUST GOOD MANNORS IS ALL THAT IS AS WELL AS GOOD FOR RIDERS AS IT HELPS US FEEL RESPECTED TOO.

[brucedawson](#)
on **December 3, 2013 at 6:08 pm** said:

Cutting transit service is going to push King County over the edge into permanent gridlock. Traffic is already terrible for huge chunks of the day and if a few thousand transit riders switch to driving...

The changes to route 234 will mean I either need to take two buses instead of one, or I will need to walk ten minutes and deal with a halved bus frequency. Either way I suspect that I will decide that busing is no longer worth it. I may become one of those people who drives to work.

Please do the right thing and *increase* service.

Funding alternatives still under discussion to avert Metro bus cuts | Metro... <http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/11/22/funding-alternatives-sti...>

Teri Decker
on [December 4, 2013 at 3:58 pm](#) said:

Raise the fares!

I understand Metro's concern that this will be a burden on people who can't afford the increase, but it will be less of a burden than losing service all together.

Yes, I want better options, but if my two choices are: (1) Scraping together the higher fare by tightening my budget or (2) Not having a bus to get to work or to the grocery store, I'll take the higher fares.

Megan Young
on [December 6, 2013 at 4:29 pm](#) said:

I live in West Seattle also and will be forced to drive downtown to work if the planned cuts go through. It will leave WS riders with no other options. Metro will have to change their tagline from "We'll get you there" to "Sorry, We won't get you there".

Michael ford
on [December 20, 2013 at 7:53 pm](#) said:

Megan, I'm with you there as metro's line of we'll get you there went away with the C line as they stopped serving riders living south of the West Seattle Jct as far as shopping goes. If you live north you still have lots of different buses to get you there til they cut off West Seattle even more for service as well as downtown to go to work!!!! It seems as if metro can't see past the over grown pot belly they have grown into with the c line and act as if we should be grateful for the poor crapy service they have dumped onto us and act as if we all should be happy they gave us what they have so far.

Funding alternatives still under discussion to avert Metro bus cuts | Metro... <http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/11/22/funding-alternatives-sti...>

Michael ford
on [December 20, 2013 at 8:02 pm](#) said:

Teri,
The problem with the plan of raising the price to ride the bus is fares don't cover the cost of running the buses. It is taxes that cover that and with clowns like Tim the tax cutting jerk by cutting taxes for the very rich forget that it is the working class that pay for these cuts in loss of jobs and bus service and roads that start falling apart due to lack of funds to keep them repaired. So by just making it cost more to ride the bus what are you willing to pay to ride the bus to keep our bus services in West Seattle?

Michael ford
on [December 20, 2013 at 8:07 pm](#) said:

I for one can not drive anymore due to medical reasons yet I'm looking at buying a car and driving without a drivers licence and without insurance as I'll have no choice to get to and from work.

West Seattle looks at proposed service reductions | Metro Matters

<http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/04/west-seattle-looks-at-...>

West Seattle looks at proposed service reductions

Posted on **December 4, 2013** by **Metro Matters Team**

Alaskan Way Viaduct, new development, and late night service

We met with some 45 community members at the Youngstown Cultural Arts Center on Dec. 3, and we've heard from 209 people in the West Seattle/Burien area through our [online survey](#).



West Seattle will be affected by the first round of bus service cuts because our Alaskan Way Viaduct funding runs out next summer. The state has been funding added bus service to help relieve congestion on the West Seattle Bridge and Highway 99

as a result of construction work for the new tunnel. When this funding ends in June, we'll need to cut 45,000 hours of bus service in this area.

Here and throughout the county, routes will be consolidated, moved, and run less frequently and during fewer hours of the day or night. These changes are designed to save as many resources as possible and to preserve as much of the transit network as possible, but our riders can expect longer walks to bus stops, longer waits for the bus, longer and less-frequent trips, more crowding, and shorter hours of service.

West Seattle in particular is facing three transit stressors at the same time: congestion will increase due to tunnel construction, bus service will be reduced, and the area is growing—fairly rapidly. New multi-family, higher density buildings are under construction, and more are on the way. More families moving into the area with limited parking in highly walkable neighborhoods will create even more demand for transit. As one resident said, **“There are currently more than three construction projects near the Junction alone. Cutting bus/transit service will cause a huge bottleneck issue on the WS bridge!”**

Spotlight on late night trips

We held a public workshop as part of the Dec. 3 meeting, and participants shared their concerns about the proposed reduction in night service. They said it will be difficult for people who work non-traditional hours, such as hospital employees, to use the bus for commuting. Others won't be able to use the bus for late-night activities such as sports events, shows, and dining in the downtown and SODO areas. **“The late night cuts are the worst,”** one participant told us.

West Seattle looks at proposed service reductions | Metro Matters

<http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/04/west-seattle-looks-at-...>

Here's a quick look at the West Seattle routes that will run at night, listed by the time of day when service will end:

- 9:00 p.m. – Routes [50](#) and [60](#)
- 10:00 p.m. – Routes [128](#) and [132](#)
- 11:00 p.m. – Route [131](#)
- Midnight – Route [120](#)
- [C-Line](#) – all night with fewer trips



We want to keep hearing your comments, concerns, and questions about the proposed service reductions. For information on upcoming public meetings, visit the calendar on our [website](#). Can't attend a public meeting? Fill out our [online survey](#).


◦ About these ads

Occasionally, some of your visitors may see an advertisement here.

[Tell me more](#) | [Dismiss this message](#)

SHARE THIS:

 Twitter 2  Facebook 2

 Reblog  Like

Be the first to like this.

[Keeping Seattle moving during viaduct construction](#)

[State transportation tour invites public comment](#)

[Residents discuss proposed service cuts in North Seattle](#)

This entry was posted in '[Have a say](#)', [Metro Future](#) by [Metro Matters Team](#). Bookmark the [permalink](#) [<http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/04/west-seattle-looks-at-proposed-service-reductions/>].

ONE THOUGHT ON "WEST SEATTLE LOOKS AT PROPOSED SERVICE REDUCTIONS"

Brent
on [December 25, 2013 at 4:25 am](#) said:

Thank you for having these forums.

West Seattle looks at proposed service reductions | Metro Matters

<http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/04/west-seattle-looks-at-...>

I'm concerned that moderately-productive routes in West Seattle and South Park will be cut in June before any low-productivity routes around the rest of the county start to get cut in October, especially since a public vote in April may be too late to avoid these cuts. I'm also concerned that South Park service could take a big hit before the new bridge is opened. As a matter of the county not abandoning South Park, cuts to the 60 and 132 should wait until after the bridge is open.

That said, platform hours could be shaved off the 132, in order to preserve more runs and span of service, by terminating the route on the north end at ID Station, or if necessary, SODO Station. This would also be cheaper than the wierd proposal that has the 132 starting from Westwood after 7 p.m. (and duplicating much of the 60's path). Further hours could be shaved off the 132 by moving its southern terminus to Tukwila International Boulevard Station.

Totally duplicative routes like the 7X, 158, and 159 shouldn't stick around while West Seattle and South Park take such a huge hit.

Residents discuss proposed service cuts in North Seattle | Metro Matters

<http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/06/residents-discuss-prop...>

Residents discuss proposed service cuts in North Seattle

Posted on December 6, 2013 by Metro Matters Team

Transportation, sustainability, and quality of life

On Dec. 5, about 30 people braved an unseasonable cold snap to join us at North Seattle Community College, learn more about proposed bus cuts in their area, and share how the cuts will affect them. We've also heard from 602 people in north Seattle via our online survey. In all of these conversations, we heard that proposed cuts will affect everyone in one way or another—more-crowded buses, longer walks to and from the bus, or longer commutes.



Participants noted that King County has forward-thinking residents and leaders who aim for sustainability, and cutting public transportation seems counterproductive to these goals. Many told us that Metro is about more than just getting from point A to point B: it's about quality of life, and we need more transit service, not less, to preserve and continue to improve that quality of life. As one person said, **“Increasing Metro service is important for so many reasons: climate change, traffic reduction, and equity within our city are just a few.”**

“Public transportation is an important part of moving toward a more sustainable future... We are not investing in our future by making these drastic cuts.”

These cuts come at a time when ridership is high, and many shared the sentiment expressed by one participant, who said: **“All of the routes I take are currently very crowded, so it's hard to understand why they are targeted (for cuts).”**

What do we mean by “productivity?”

We measure the productivity of each route in two ways:

1. The number of passengers who ride the bus per hour the bus is operating.
2. The total miles riders travel on the route compared to the total miles the bus covers from when it leaves the base until it returns.

Residents discuss proposed service cuts in North Seattle | Metro Matters <http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/06/residents-discuss-prop...>

We compare each route using these factors to all other routes in our system that serve similar markets. Routes that fall in the bottom 25 percent on either or both of these measures are performing poorly. Because of the deep cuts we must make if no new funding is identified, we'll have to revise or even delete more than just the lowest performing routes in our system.

Participants at our North Seattle meeting shared many other concerns as well, most of which boiled down to:

Less transit = more cars = more congestion = more pollution = worse city

Question of the day

"What other funding options are being discussed besides sales tax revenue?"

A: Several funding possibilities have been looked at for avoiding these service cuts. The first is a statewide transportation funding package that would need to come from the state Legislature. If the Legislature does not authorize such a package, the King County Executive and Council are exploring a local alternative that would require a vote by county residents, which would probably take place next spring or early next summer.

We want to keep hearing your comments, concerns, and questions about the proposed service reductions. For information on upcoming public meetings, visit the calendar on our [website](#). Can't attend a public meeting? Fill out our [online survey](#).

About these ads

Occasionally, some of your visitors may see an advertisement here.

[Tell me more](#) | [Dismiss this message](#)

SHARE THIS:

 Twitter 2  Facebook 4

 Reblog  Like

Be the first to like this.

[Participants discuss proposed service reductions in downtown Seattle](#)

[We want to hear from you](#)

[West Seattle looks at proposed service reductions](#)

Residents discuss proposed service cuts in North Seattle | Metro Matters <http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/06/residents-discuss-prop...>

This entry was posted in 'Have a say', Metro Future by Metro Matters Team. Bookmark the [permalink \[http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/06/residents-discuss-proposed-service-cuts-in-north-seattle/\]](http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/06/residents-discuss-proposed-service-cuts-in-north-seattle/).

ONE THOUGHT ON "RESIDENTS DISCUSS PROPOSED SERVICE CUTS IN NORTH SEATTLE"

J Jordan
on December 24, 2013 at 2:14 pm said:

Ideas for north/northwest routes in face of pending scarcity revisions:
Place a southbound #28 stop at 100th Street, and eliminate the first of two stops south of 87th.
Connect #40 westbound with #28 southbound on Holman Road with sheltered, usable stop.
Maintain #16 past med. bldgs. & NSCC during times when Northgate Way is NOT jammed up.
Make functional & safe the Holman/13th NW bus stops, and move Rapid Ride to this location.
Move #28 northbound stop on 8th NW from 84th to north of 85th for efficiency, consistency.
Add a #40 northeastbound stop @ 24th NW & 85th, eliminating others as necessary.
Explore a midday bus running on, or routed onto, NW 65th.

Participants discuss proposed service reductions in downtown Seattle | M... <http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/11/participants-discuss-p...>

Participants discuss proposed service reductions in downtown Seattle

Posted on **December 11, 2013** by **Metro Matters Team**

Concerns expressed about routes 2, 27, and more

On December 10, about 65 people joined us at Union Station in downtown Seattle to learn more about the proposed bus cuts and share how the changes would affect them.

Several people came prepared to share their concerns about changes to particular routes. Changes to Route 2 and the deletion of Route 27 were hot topics, particularly because of their likely effects on seniors.



One participant said the loss of Route 27 for residents of the Washington Terrace senior housing apartments would be **“a major problem due to hills and high crime in the area, dimly lit area and the inability to get to the alternative.”** Others said the loss of Route 2 would pose similar difficulties, with one commenter predicting a **“huge impact (on) Horizon House and other mobility-challenged residents.”**

Regarding the proposed cuts in general, one person exclaimed, **“seventeen percent cuts to system—does this mean a loss of 17 percent of riders?”**

We sincerely hope not, but the truth is that the majority of our riders would be affected in one way or another by these service cuts. Some would see their routes changed or deleted, while those on unchanged routes would most likely see more-crowded buses.

Many participants told us they didn't understand why the Seattle streetcar is expanding while bus service is facing steep cuts. **“That really baffles me,”** said one. **“They're extending the streetcar but they're going to cut bus routes.”** In fact, the Seattle Streetcar is a city service that is operated by Metro on a contract basis. It's funded by the city, Metro's funding gap and service cuts will not affect it.

Question of the day

Q: This feedback that we give—is any of it going to change anything, or are the changes a “done deal?”

Participants discuss proposed service reductions in downtown Seattle | M... <http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/11/participants-discuss-p...>

A: The proposed service cuts are based on [Metro's service guidelines](#), and we don't anticipate many changes to the proposal. However, we will consider making minor tweaks based on community feedback. Most importantly, we want to understand how these cuts will affect you. We will present a public engagement report to the King County Council in February 2014, including your comments about the proposed service reductions. The Council will then consider whether to adopt the proposal, so now is a good time to let your voice be heard.

We want to keep hearing your comments, concerns, and questions about the proposed service reductions. For information on upcoming public meetings, visit the calendar on our [website](#). If you can't attend a public meeting, give us your feedback via our [online survey](#).

◦ About these ads

Occasionally, some of your visitors may see an advertisement here.

[Tell me more](#) | [Dismiss this message](#)

SHARE THIS:

 Twitter 2  Facebook 5

 Reblog  Like

Be the first to like this.

[Residents discuss proposed service cuts in North Seattle](#)

[West Seattle looks at proposed service reductions](#)

[September 2012 outreach update: part 2](#)

This entry was posted in 'Have a say', [Metro Future](#) by [Metro Matters Team](#). Bookmark the [permalink](#) [<http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/11/participants-discuss-proposed-service-reductions-in-downtown-seattle/>].

12 THOUGHTS ON "PARTICIPANTS DISCUSS PROPOSED SERVICE REDUCTIONS IN DOWNTOWN SEATTLE"

Shawn Newell
on [December 26, 2013 at 10:07 am](#) said:

If disabled seniors are worried about mobility and safety why aren't you encouraging them to sign up for Access which will solve some of

Participants discuss proposed service reductions in downtown Seattle | M... <http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/11/participants-discuss-p...>

their concerns?

Metro Matters Team

on **December 26, 2013 at 10:59 am** said:

That's a fair question, Shawn. At each of the public workshops, we have an area set up at which people can discuss alternatives to using the bus to get where they need to go. Access is one of the options being discussed. Of those that qualify for Access services, some have found this to be a viable alternative.

Aleks Bromfield

on **December 30, 2013 at 1:58 pm** said:

I've posted this message in a few places. Hoping that one of them will yield a direct response.

In a previous iteration, Metro proposed to route the 5 through Fremont/Dexter. This time, Metro proposes to keep the 5 as it is, and to route the 16 through Fremont/Dexter instead. Can you elaborate on the reasoning behind that change? I think that rerouting the 5 would make a lot more sense for a lot of reasons, but I'm curious if Metro has thought of something that I've missed.

Metro Matters Team

on **January 9, 2014 at 3:26 pm** said:

That's a great question, @Aleks Bromfield. Metro's service reduction proposal suggests making the minimal amount of changes needed to address the budget shortfall, while trying to mitigate impacts to riders. By keeping Route 5 on its current path and revising Route 16, we are able to maintain more overall network connectivity. A revised Route 16 would help maintain connectivity between bordering neighborhoods and Fremont/South Lake Union and would also cover some of the service loss due to the proposed consolidation of Routes 26/26EX and deletion

Participants discuss proposed service reductions in downtown Seattle | M... <http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/11/participants-discuss-p...>

of Route 31.

Aleks Bromfield

on **January 9, 2014 at 3:49 pm** said:

Thanks for the response. I definitely appreciate the desire to promote network connectivity. And for what it's worth, I like the change to the 16; I just think that the 5 should be changed, too.

Let me try to make my case for why I think that sending the 5 through Fremont would promote network connectivity:

- You've pointed out that Wallingford will be losing some of its current connections to Fremont (the 26/31). However, Greenwood/Phinney will be losing their connections, too. Phinney Ridge and Fremont are definitely bordering neighborhoods in my book. The 28 will be rerouted away from Fremont. The 40 is only useful for folks who live very far north. The 358 doesn't stop anywhere near Fremont. In fact, I think you could argue that the current proposal does more to harm the Greenwood-Fremont link than the Wallingford-Fremont link; at least the latter trip is still possible with the 32. Given that Fremont is a major employment center, and that Fremont is "on the way" between Greenwood and downtown, a direct connection between these neighborhoods would be really helpful.

- There is currently no transit service at 36th/Fremont. The closest stops are a hilly walk away, at 34th and 39th. A stop here would add a lot of value.

- The current proposal will provide 20-minute all-day service along Dexter, which is a poor level of service for such a dense and growing transit corridor. If the 5 were routed along Dexter, then combined with the 16, there would be a bus every 10 minutes. In contrast, the local stops on Aurora between Denny and N 46th are effectively unused, and they will already be more than adequately served by RapidRide E; the loss of the 5 along that corridor would go unnoticed.

- As Metro knows very well, simpler routes are better routes. They are faster, and they are easier for people to understand, both of which lead to higher ridership. One of the biggest successes of RapidRide is how it's been able to simplify Metro's network. Right now, there is not

Participants discuss proposed service reductions in downtown Seattle | M... <http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/11/participants-discuss-p...>

a single route that goes straight up and down Fremont Avenue. The 5 could be that route.

It's true that sending the 5 to Fremont will make the route a bit slower, and therefore will inconvenience riders heading downtown. But the new 355 will provide a speedy alternative during peak hours. During the rest of the day, the slowdown will not be as noticeable, and the direct service to Fremont (with stops at 34th and 36th) would be highly appreciated — and, I predict, highly popular.

Aleks Bromfield

on **January 9, 2014 at 3:52 pm** said:

Oh, and one other thing. I'm taking it for granted that we agree that the existing stops at 38th/Aurora and 39th/Fremont do not adequately serve the Fremont business district. After all, if this wasn't true, you wouldn't be proposing to reroute the 16!

Jim Sullivan

on **January 14, 2014 at 5:32 pm** said:

OK Metro, let's say the Executive's proposed ballot measure for funding to make up the budget shortfall passes in the next election. And let's say the measure is able to restore "full funding" to Metro. Will all of the recently proposed service changes and reductions be withdrawn?

JimS

Deb Hemingway

on **January 14, 2014 at 8:19 pm** said:

We will soon be living on a fixed income but rarely, and will rarely, drive or bus. Yet your vehicle tax and sales tax will double what we already pay for having a vehicle (we have only one and it's use eases our health issues). Having very detailed knowledge of the special deal that

Participants discuss proposed service reductions in downtown Seattle | M... <http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/11/participants-discuss-p...>

Seattle businesses receive to provide very inexpensive transport for their employees, I'm quite unconvinced that Metro's budget is hitting in such a regressive way. (I'm sorry but the downtown legal and accounting firms don't need these deep discounts.) Metro needs to increase what businesses pay and the fares should go up fifty cents not just twenty-five cents.

Metro Matters Team

on **January 15, 2014 at 11:32 am** said:

Hi Deb – just wanted you to know we moved your comment to a blog post we just posted that is specific to announcing the new fare proposal. You can [view your comment there](#).

Metro Matters Team

on **January 15, 2014 at 11:33 am** said:

Hi Robert – just wanted you to know we moved your comment to a blog post we just posted that is specific to announcing the new fare proposal. You can [view your comment and a response at there](#).

Metro Matters Team

on **January 23, 2014 at 9:23 am** said:

Thanks @Aleks Bromfield for sharing your input on Route 5. Unfortunately with Metro's funding gap we have to make difficult decisions on service revisions and reductions. Routes 26 and 28 are proposed to be reduced significantly. If both are consolidated into a single pattern it will save resources. Route 16 would be revised to partially mitigate those changes. Fremont and South Lake Union are important and growing transit markets. A revised Route 28 on North 39th Street would allow riders some access to Fremont as well as continue to have fast trips to and from downtown Seattle. It would have common stop transfers with Route 40 that would continue to serve Fremont and South Lake Union. Revising Route 5 to serve

Participants discuss proposed service reductions in downtown Seattle | M... <http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/11/participants-discuss-p...>

Fremont and South Lake Union was considered but had higher operating cost due to its longer running time and would be several minutes slower for all its current riders.

David McBroom

on **February 11, 2014 at 2:31 pm** said:

I want to comment about 249, they cut the most popular route, at 5:00 A.M., we got. Petition to keep the times and still got cut David McBroom

Kent Community Members Discuss Proposed Service Reductions | Metro... <http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/17/kent-community-membe...>

Kent Community Members Discuss Proposed Service Reductions

Posted on **December 17, 2013** by **Metro Matters Team**

Crowded Buses, Extended Commutes, and Potential Impacts of New Revenue

On December 16, 2013, approximately 30 community members attended the Open House at Kent Commons, where they learned more about the proposed bus cuts and shared how these changes would affect them. We have also heard from 143 community members in the Kent area through our [online survey](#). Conversations of the night focused on several specific bus routes as well as concerns with longer commute times.

For the Kent area, both [Route 914](#) and [Route 916](#) serve many seniors and people with disabilities. With proposed changes to the 914 and suggested deletion of the 916, one attendee expressed a fear that many seniors and disabled riders would, "... be shut up in their houses."



Adverse effects were also feared for [Route 157](#), since both the [Route 158](#) and [Route 159](#) are proposed to be deleted. Community members questioned how Metro will, "...assign coaches to make sure there will be enough seats to accommodate riders."

Crowded buses were not the only widespread concern of the night; longer commute times were brought up multiple times during the meeting. One attendee observed that the proposed cuts keep "key coverage at the expense of frequency." Unfortunately, Metro has to make several decisions to cut frequency to be able to maintain some service in some areas. These cuts will likely result in longer commute times due to transferring or lengthy waits at bus stops.

While all these comments were discussed, one community member shared a concern about the long-term effects of the proposed service reductions. "I'm really concerned that once you take something away, it's gone. There's little chance of it coming back." We sincerely hope that additional funding can be found that allows Metro to not have to cut services in the first place – at least not as deeply.

Question of the Day:

Kent Community Members Discuss Proposed Service Reductions | Metro... <http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/17/kent-community-membe...>

“What if more money becomes available? Would cut service come back?”

Answer: Proposed service reductions could still be avoided if alternative funding becomes available for Metro, though it depends on the amount of revenue generated and when such revenue becomes available. Such funding could be contained in the form of a statewide transportation package. The King County Council is also considering a local option that may be put to the voters in spring or summer of 2014. If funding is secured after cuts are scheduled to begin, some services may be restored though not necessarily exactly the same as they are now. The County Council-approved [Service Guidelines](#) would be used to guide Metro in determining where service should be allocated in light of available new revenues.

We want to keep hearing your comments, concerns, and questions about the proposed service reductions. For information on upcoming public meetings, visit our [Calendar](#). Can't attend a public meeting? Fill out our [online survey](#).

About these ads

Occasionally, some of your visitors may see an advertisement here.

[Tell me more](#) | [Dismiss this message](#)

SHARE THIS:

Twitter 2 Facebook 3

Reblog Like

Be the first to like this.

RELATED

[Participants discuss proposed service reductions in downtown Seattle](#)

[September 2012 outreach update: part 2](#)

[Residents discuss proposed service cuts in North Seattle](#)

This entry was posted in '[Have a say](#)', [Metro Future](#) by [Metro Matters Team](#). Bookmark the [permalink](#) [<http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/17/kent-community-members-discuss-proposed-service-reductions/>].

ONE THOUGHT ON "KENT COMMUNITY MEMBERS DISCUSS PROPOSED SERVICE REDUCTIONS"

Kent Community Members Discuss Proposed Service Reductions | Metro... <http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2013/12/17/kent-community-membe...>

Pam Bir
on **January 16, 2014 at 3:24 pm** said:

I'm just concerned that this is a scare tactic that is all about getting people to vote for raising license tabs once again. I think maybe it would be better if the county looked a little more how they spend the budget that is allowed them, look at maybe the 150 routes how often they run and how many they have. And what about the hospitals on First Hill that subsidize the 193 route?

A new proposal to keep buses on the road

Posted on **January 15, 2014** by [Metro Matters Team](#)

With the state legislature's transportation funding effort stalled, County Executive Constantine has [announced a new proposal](#) to keep buses on the road. Today he asked the County Council to take swift action to secure stable funding for Metro and avert service cuts.

He asked the Council to form a countywide transportation benefit district—allowed under state law—and put a funding proposal on the ballot for a public vote. The vote could happen as soon as April.

[The proposal](#) would generate about \$130 million per year from two sources:

- A \$60 annual vehicle fee that would generate about \$80 million per year.
- A sales tax increase of one-tenth of a cent that would generate about \$50 million per year.

Sixty percent of the funds, or a projected \$80 million in 2015, would go to Metro for transit service. This would be enough to maintain our current service level.

The rest of the funds would be divided, based on population, among King County Road Services and cities for road maintenance and projects. ([Learn more](#))

As another part of the solution, the Executive proposed an across-the-board, 25-cent fare increase for all regular service that would take effect in March 2015. The fare for Access Transportation riders would go up by 50 cents. We would also offer a new low-income fare, set at \$1.50, to help make Metro affordable for those who need it the most. Eligible riders would pay the low-income fare only with ORCA—not with cash. ([Read a fact sheet about the fare change proposal](#))

Through Feb. 7, we're continuing with countywide outreach on a set of proposed service cuts that would reduce service up to 17 percent beginning this fall. Without new funding, these cuts will be needed to address a \$75 million shortfall after temporary funding runs out in mid-2014. Metro will send a set of recommended reductions to

A new proposal to keep buses on the road | Metro Matters

<http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2014/01/15/a-new-proposal-to-kee...>

Executive Constantine for council consideration in April or May. ([Visit our website](#) to see what's proposed and tell us what you think; [Read our Metro Future blog category](#) to see what we have been hearing from riders)


As the Council considers these proposals in the coming weeks and months, we'll let you know about opportunities to make your views known to elected officials on each of these critical decisions.

About these ads

Occasionally, some of your visitors may see an advertisement here.

[Tell me more](#) | [Dismiss this message](#)

SHARE THIS:

 Twitter 2  Facebook 5

 Reblog  Like

Be the first to like this.

RELATED

[Funding alternatives still under discussion to avert Metro bus cuts](#)

[King County Executive and local leaders ask legislature to act on transportation funding](#)

[Your investment will help keep our Metro buses rolling](#)

This entry was posted in [Metro Future, News](#) by [Metro Matters Team](#). Bookmark the [permalink](#) [<http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2014/01/15/a-new-proposal-to-keep-buses-on-the-road/>]

21 THOUGHTS ON "A NEW PROPOSAL TO KEEP BUSES ON THE ROAD"

Metro Matters Team
on **January 15, 2014 at 11:28 am** said:

Submitted on 2014/01/14 at 5:32 pm @Jim Sullivan said – "OK Metro, let's say the Executive's proposed ballot measure for funding to make up the budget shortfall passes in the next election. And let's say the measure is able to restore "full funding" to Metro. Will all of the recently proposed service changes and reductions be withdrawn?
JimS"

A new proposal to keep buses on the road | Metro Matters

<http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2014/01/15/a-new-proposal-to-kee...>

Metro Matters Team

on **January 15, 2014 at 11:28 am** said:

Submitted on 2014/01/14 at 8:19 pm @Deb Hemingway said – “We will soon be living on a fixed income but rarely, and will rarely, drive or bus. Yet your vehicle tax and sales tax will double what we already pay for having a vehicle (we have only one and it’s use eases our health issues). Having very detailed knowledge of the special deal that Seattle businesses receive to provide very inexpensive transport for their employees, I’m quite unconvinced that Metro’s budget is hitting in such a regressive way. (I’m sorry but the downtown legal and accounting firms don’t need these deep discounts.) Metro needs to increase what businesses pay and the fares should go up fifty cents not just twenty-five cents.”

Metro Matters Team

on **January 15, 2014 at 11:29 am** said:

Submitted on 2014/01/15 at 1:21 am @Robert Wright said – “From what I have read, the FARE for the Handicapped Bus Passenger would jump \$.75 from \$.75 to now a \$1.50 BUS FARE each time they wanted to use the bus. Is right? ... and this is after they dropped the Bus 28 route for much of the day and then not even offering a round trip opportunity within the same hour, when it does run up to Greenwood and 145th Street. I would like to see the return of the Route 28 that had been servicing the Elderly and the Handicapped that lived in facilities like Seattle Housing Authority’s TRICOURT Apartments.”

Metro Matters Team

on **January 15, 2014 at 11:37 am** said:

Hi @Robert Wright – thank you for sharing your views about bus service to Greenwood and 145th. To clarify, the disabled fare for regular bus service is proposed to be increased \$0.25 – from \$0.75 to \$1.00. The fare for Access paratransit service is proposed to increase \$0.50 – from \$1.25 per trip to \$1.75 per trip.

Aleks Bromfield

on **January 15, 2014 at 12:08 pm** said:

I want to echo Jim's comment, though possibly coming from a different angle. Some of the cuts that Metro has proposed would be devastating, especially the reductions in night and weekend service, and I think it's very important that those cuts be avoided. However, some of the restructures that Metro has proposed would make the system strictly better, and I would love to see these changes happen regardless of the funding environment. For example, I would love to see the creation of the new route 73; the merger of routes 3 and 4; and the consolidation of UQA service on the 13 instead of the 2. Will these positive restructures still be happening in the absence of a revenue crisis?

Henry B.

on **January 15, 2014 at 12:23 pm** said:

Kevin Desmond is the problems. Let METRO go down, and something else rise like a phoenix.

Thomas Smith

on **January 15, 2014 at 12:24 pm** said:

Regarding the fare increases, I would like to see the transfer period

extended from the current 2 hour window to a 2.5 or even 3.0 hour window. Tapping the Orca card as a pre-boarding operation can consume time off of that available for transfer period travel.

Aleks Bromfield

on **January 15, 2014 at 1:52 pm** said:

Henry: I've spoken with Kevin Desmond on a number of occasions. He's an exceptionally qualified administrator, and I have complete confidence in his ability to make the right decisions for Metro. The fact is, he's faced with a very difficult problem: how do you make everyone happy, when you can't afford to maintain the status quo? This would be hard for anyone, and I think he's doing an admirable job.

I'm not sure what you'd accomplish by replacing Metro with a new agency. Sure, it would give you a chance to come up with a more modern route network and fare structure — something that Metro is trying to already. But you'd spend a lot of money liquidating everything, and a lot more money building everything back up again, and you'd be left with an agency that has the same challenges as the ones that we have now.

There's one structural change that I would support, and that would be to reduce the size of the Metro district. Instead of including the whole county, it should include only the Sound Transit district. This would be more fair for everyone; it would lower taxes in the places that receive absolutely no Metro service, and it would also make it easier to pass tax increases in the places that do receive service. But I don't think you need to create a completely new agency to make such a change.

Kirk G.

on **January 16, 2014 at 1:02 am** said:

Constantine's idea would be good providing he ELIMINATES the sales tax part of it... I am strongly against raising the sales tax because that hurts low income people who can barely afford to buy necessities as it is... Surely there are other areas that could be taxed that would target higher income individuals, or frivolous items more, instead of something

A new proposal to keep buses on the road | Metro Matters

<http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2014/01/15/a-new-proposal-to-kee...>

like sales tax that hurts poor people facing already high prices at every turn...

And regarding Desmond, he's GOT to be better than the administration down at Pierce Transit! So by comparison, I'd have to say he's doing pretty good!

dhsea
on [January 17, 2014 at 9:37 am](#) said:

If I thought the money raised was going to actually go to what it was allocated for, that would be fine.

But you yahoo's collect all of these taxes, then shuffle them around to other initiatives, then "poof", we're back in the same situation AGAIN.

By the way, where did all that monorail funding we paid into for years go?

If it didn't get used, I sure haven't seen my refund.

Josh
on [January 17, 2014 at 3:26 pm](#) said:

(apologies if this double posts I experienced an error while commenting)

I am all for Metro staying at full capacity and service levels but money is being mismanaged somewhere.

My wife and I pay \$13 per day to commute to and from work. So that's \$65 per week and \$3,120 per year out of pocket. No corporate Orca Card annual pass deal...hint, hint.

I believe Metro had over 115 million reported boardings in 2012. So I'd love to see the operational costs of the organization and match that to revenue collected with a ride free zone adjustment since the new service rules.

I think proposing a fare increase is a slap in the face to public transit commuters.

Corporations have more privilege than the individual. Why do they get deals buying annual passes for employees, while I pay almost \$1600 annually to use public transit as an individual. I think it's shameful. So you want to tax me more and charge me more and yet give fare discounts to corporate customers.

Aleks Bromfield

on **January 17, 2014 at 3:44 pm** said:

Josh,

If you're referring to the Business Passport program, there are a few reasons why companies get a discount.

One reason is that, by buying a huge amount of passes at once and committing to an annual contract, they provide a stable source of revenue for Metro. I think it would make sense for Metro to sell annual passes at a discount, but currently, Metro has no way of knowing if a monthly pass holder will buy a new pass each month.

Another reason is that Metro and ORCA have lower administrative costs when a company places a bulk order. Distribution and management of cards is handled by the company. Metro simply passes on those savings to employers.

Yet another reason is that, when a company buys a Business Passport, the company must pay for every single employee. In practice, for most large companies, a good fraction of the employees will never use this benefit. The price of the passport is calculated based on estimates of how many employees will actually use it.

I would be very surprised if ending the Business Passport program would save Metro money. More likely, what would happen is that fewer employers would provide transit passes to their employees, and fewer people would use the bus for their commute. In other words, Metro's financial situation would be even worse than it already is.

Regarding Metro's fiscal management in general, note that tax

revenues have been steadily *declining* for the past few years, while Metro's costs have not significantly changed. I don't know why you'd assume this is evidence of mismanagement. If your boss cut your salary by 2% every year, then after five years, you'd probably have to ask for a raise, or else change your spending patterns. That's pretty much exactly what's happened to Metro.

Josh
on [January 17, 2014 at 5:07 pm](#) said:

@Aleks Bromfield

I will commit to buying an annual pass right now for the same fee a business would pay for me, I did not ask for special month-month treatment, will Metro treat me the same way as a business?

I am not asking for the Business Passport program to be cancelled but if they get a break for making up front annual commitments, why can't that be offered to individuals willing to commit to an annual pass?

I did make a bold statement about fiscal mismanagement but then to my credit I did also ask for data of total earnings and boardings alongside annual operational costs.

My basic math for 2012 based on the 115 million boardings reported here <http://metro.kingcounty.gov/am/reports/annual-measures/ridership.html> (assuming a boarding is \$1.50 because I know there are many factors that effect fare rates) totals about \$172 million. Now I know this may be wrong, that's why I am asking for the real data.

I appreciate the example to my employment, really I am not trying to attack Metro. I am trying to understand how much money comes in, and what the operational costs are. I should have made my desire for these facts more clear.

If proposals are being made to dig deeper into commuters budgets to save metro, then I want to understand exactly what the facts are.

[Aleks Bromfield](#)

on January 18, 2014 at 10:13 am said:

Josh,

I can't comment on why Metro doesn't offer annual passes anymore. I also don't know how big of a role this plays in the Business Passport discount. My guess would be that the under-utilization of passes forms the biggest part of the discount.

As far as fare revenue goes, Metro's latest budget indicates that 23% of the total \$639.8 million, or \$147.2 million, comes from fares (<http://metro.kingcounty.gov/am/budget/revenue.html>). 23% is rounded; it could be as low as 22.5%, or as high as 23.4%. If we divide by the figure of 115.4 million annual riders, that yields a figure of between \$1.24 and \$1.30 per trip.

Here's another calculation, using data from Metro's financial summary page (<http://metro.kingcounty.gov/am/reports/annual-measures/financial.html>). Currently, Metro's average farebox recovery rate is 29.4%. The cost per boarding is \$4.25. This places the revenue per boarding at around \$1.23 per trip.

Why are these numbers so low? Here are a few reasons:

- A rider who takes multiple transit vehicles pays the same fare as a rider who takes just one. If we assume that every rider takes at least two buses, and that the average fare is \$2.50, this explains 100% of the difference. In fact, if the rider also transfers to a non-Metro service, this is even worse, since Metro will ultimately collect only a portion of the total fare.
- Monthly passes are priced at 36x the base fare. It's easy to see that a commuter who takes a round-trip every workday will come out ahead in general (44 trips), and even in February (40 trips). If this commuter then takes transit for any other purpose, those trips are effectively free.
- Children, seniors, and the disabled pay discounted fares. The effect of this is small but measurable.
- There is some amount of fare evasion. This is more difficult to measure, and the effect is also very small.

According to the 2013 Service Guidelines Report

(<http://metro.kingcounty.gov/planning/pdf/2011-21/2013/metro-2013-service-guidelines-report.pdf>), the system average is 32.9 rides per platform hour. Meanwhile, the cost of a platform hour in 2012 was \$135.68. Therefore, in the absence of any other revenue, Metro would need to charge passengers an average fare of about \$4.12 per boarding to fully recoup its expenses.

But we've still got the connection problem. You don't want to charge people extra just because they have to change buses. Airlines generally charge a premium for non-stop service, because it's more expensive to operate and it's also a more desirable product. It would be silly for Metro to do the opposite. So if you assume that the average Metro trip involves two buses, then the average fare for a complete trip would need to be around \$8.25. In practice, you could imagine using some form of distance-based pricing, so that short trips are cheaper and long trips are more expensive. If the average length of a "linked trip" is 8 miles (<http://www.publictransit.us/ptlibrary/specialreports/sr6.PortlandvsSeattle.pdf>), then we come up with a figure of approximately \$1 per passenger mile, with no monthly discounts.

That may not sound like a lot, but consider a passenger who commutes from Seattle to Bellevue every day. This 30-mile round trip would cost \$30/day, or about \$660/month. Who would spend that kind of money, when they could drive a comparable distance?

My point is that, however you try to structure it, any kind of dramatic fare increase is bound to lose a lot of riders. So if the goal of Metro is to provide mobility and access to the community, then a dramatic fare increase isn't going to achieve those aims.

Jim Sullivan
on [January 22, 2014 at 10:33 pm](#) said:

I would like to have a response to this question: If Metro regains "full funding" for its operations as a result of the proposed ballot measure or by some other means, will all of the recently proposed service changes and reductions be withdrawn?

A new proposal to keep buses on the road | Metro Matters

<http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2014/01/15/a-new-proposal-to-kee...>

Josh
on **January 23, 2014 at 6:15 am** said:

@Aleks Bromfield

I'd really appreciate some straight forward answers to my questions here...

<http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2014/01/15/a-new-proposal-to-keep-buses-on-the-road/#comment-912>

Metro Matters Team
on **January 23, 2014 at 9:31 am** said:

Good questions @Josh... Metro's budget information online should provide you with the answers you are looking for. Details about Metro's annual sources of revenues and expenses are available here:

<http://metro.kingcounty.gov/am/budget/>

Josh
on **January 23, 2014 at 10:12 am** said:

@Aleks Bromfield

Thank you will read up on Metro's budget.

Please, please consider the following comment

"I will commit to buying an annual pass right now for the same fee a business would pay for me, I did not ask for special month-month treatment, will Metro treat me the same way as a business?"

Metro Matters Team
on **January 24, 2014 at 9:47 am** said:

@Jim Sullivan, thanks for the nudge... If the King County Council forms

A new proposal to keep buses on the road | Metro Matters

<http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2014/01/15/a-new-proposal-to-kee...>

a Transportation Benefit District (TBD), the TBD puts the Executive's proposed ballot measure up for a vote, and the measure is approved by voters, it would generate an estimated \$80 million annually for Metro. That is enough to maintain the current level of bus service and buy buses to replace old ones that should be retired. Keep in mind that Metro regularly assesses how well the transit system is working and adjusts routes to make service more efficient and better at getting people where they want to go. You might see changes some day even though Metro's overall service level stays the same. An additional set of reductions (45,000 hours of service) is being considered by the King County Council right now on routes that serve areas affected by Alaskan Way Viaduct construction. Right now Metro is using funding from the state to provide extra service on these routes, but this funding runs out in June. If the Council adopts the proposed reductions and the state funding isn't extended, these cuts would start in June.

Metro Matters Team

on **January 24, 2014 at 9:51 am** said:

@Aleks Bromfield – to your point about whether some of the restructure concepts embedded in the reduction proposal would go forward in the "absence of a revenue crisis," Metro will continue to use our strategic plan and service guidelines to plan bus service that is productive, gets people to key destinations around the county, and serves communities that heavily depend on transit. See <http://metro.kingcounty.gov/planning/#guidelines> Metro revises bus service three times each year, and we use the guidelines as we develop proposals to reduce, add, or change service. We seek to involve the community in planning service changes, and we always like to hear your ideas!

J M (Jim) Buish

on **February 6, 2014 at 2:23 pm** said:

I have read all of the previous comments and, since I live a Center Park, another Seattle Housing Authority community, I find the proposed cuts in service to be unacceptable, especially for people living in the Rainier Valley. The most objectionable proposals deal with the Route

#4, which is proposed for total elimination, the Route #8, which is proposed to be replaced with Route #106 service from Renton (with service on the Route #8 turning back at 23rd and Yesler) and the Route #9, which is proposed to become a peak-hour only route.

The reason I strongly oppose these revisions is simple: All three routes serve significant parts of Rainier Valley, which has an extremely high number of residents who rely on transit for all of their transportation needs—and making these cuts would be a severe disservice to residents in Southeast Seattle. In fact, the Route #4 is used by a large number of Center Park residents and employees from the Lighthouse for the Blind because it is the ONLY route these people can easily use—all other transit service requires a person to travel at least two blocks and cross a very busy arterial (usually Rainier) between the nearest bus stop and either building. In addition, the Route #4 serves four major destinations—Swedish Cherry Hill (formerly Providence Medical Center), Swedish First Hill, Harborview Medical Center and the DSHS office on Cherry Street. If the Route #4 is eliminated, people will need to either make what I consider a very difficult transfer between the Route #3, and Route #48 at 23rd and James or ride a bus (on the already overcrowded Route #7 or Route #106 or LINK downtown) and connect with the Route #3 to go back up the hill. For these reasons—and the fact METRO made a significant investment for this route (which uses trolley coaches) over 30 years ago, no cuts in service on this route should be made.

As for the proposal for the Route #8 (and its replacement with Route #106 service) this is another route that should be left as it currently is. It currently serves a large part of the Rainier Valley, replacing the Route #42, which was eliminated several years ago, connecting the Valley with Capitol Hill, the Denny Regrade and the Seattle Center area. As such, this route carries a large number of passengers, using articulated coaches. If this route is replaced with Route #106 service, these vital connections would be lost.

As for the Route #9, this route should also not be cut back, since it provides a VITAL connection for many people who live in the Rainier Valley and work in or are patients at the many health-care facilities on First Hill or go to school at Seattle Central Community College or Seattle University. For these people, having a reliable, one-bus trip is essential. Although the Route #60 already provides service on First Hill and Broadway and the First Hill Streetcar is scheduled to begin service fairly soon, neither option may not be an adequate solution for many people, due to the need to cross another busy arterial (South Jackson)

A new proposal to keep buses on the road | Metro Matters

<http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com/2014/01/15/a-new-proposal-to-kee...>

to connect between them and the Route #7.

Facebook comments

During the public comment period from Nov.7th, 2013 to Feb. 7th, 2014, **3** posts were made on the Have a Say Facebook page regarding proposed service reductions.

Comments:

So glad to see this article. I have been concerned. I am sad about the proposal to drop the #4. It had a top over at a handicapped housing place in Rainier Valley and then went by the hospitals.

Boy I am feeling singled out. Almost all of the routes that I use weekly are on the chopping block.

This is a threat from Metro if the car tabs don't go up " we will cut bus service". Well guess what?? If people don't have any mean's of transportation the economy will just get worse. And the people that do park their cars at the FW trans center have to drive the cars into the city's. More traffic delay's global-warning gas's .

Why the city & government and charity's keep draining us for money where do we go for help? Start charging the people that ride their bikes to work just like we have to pay car tabs. Let there be a charge for them also. We have to share the road with them right. It's only fair after while everyone won't be able to pay for anything .