

SCORE CARD COMMENTS

Location: El Dorado	
South Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Light rail needs to extend from Cosumnes River College to its southern center south of Elk Grove Blvd.
EG-RC-ED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - #2 should - Please add pull-out side lanes for traffic going into Teichert and down Douglas - 6 lanes through Sheldon on Grant line - 6 lanes all through Grant Line (including Sheldon)
U.S. 50 Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - #2 – Lt rail to Folsom instead of Sunrise - We need a Sac Ring Road. We’re still pushing traffic down each highway to the one interchange - With light rail from Placerville to Sacramento/Sac Airport - #2 if light rail improvement goes to Folsom - Not addressed on map – Hwy 49 needs to be realigned – out of Placerville (Coloma rd) - Option 2 with the light rail to Folsom - Double track light rail to Folsom - US 50 freeway through Placerville - Route 49 around Placerville - If light rail improvements extend to Folsom and Ray Lawyer Drive extension Hwy 49 bypass - We need a Sac Ring Road. We still have traffic through each Highway to the one interchange - Add light rail, tracks exists already - More transit than is in any of the alternatives. - Reroute Hwy 99 through Missouri Flat and Lotus not through Placerville - Reroute Hwy 49 from Coloma to Lotus Road to Missouri Flat Road or to Ray Lawyer extension. Lt rail from Folsom to Placerville - Extend light rail to El Dorado Hills with connectors further up 50 (Placerville, Cameron Park, etc) - Rail from Placerville to Folsom - Extend light rail through Placerville – as far east as feasible - Rail connector between Missouri Flat Road and Folsom - Extend light rail to El Dorado Hills town center then to Placerville - Extend light rail from Folsom to Missouri Flat (minimum) or further - Like the Green Valley Road expansion and light rail of #1 with carpools of #3 - Shorten commuter lane hours - Doubtful voter 1 vs 3 (do not commute) - Doubtful voter, don’t commute during peak hours - Less light rail (#1)
East Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bus routes on #1 - Connect light rail from Folsom to Roseville/Rocklin - Make Hazel or Sunrise an expressway - Light rail from Folsom to Roseville - A ring road!! How can you get from anywhere East of Folsom to I-80/Auburn/Airport? - #2 More bus routes like option #1 - #2 with bus line improvements - #2 with bus routes from #1 would be perfect - Needs more bus routes - Make Hazel or Sunrise an expressway

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Connect Folsom to Rocklin/Roseville by light rail
East I-80 Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add more direct train (Amtrak) trips to Auburn - Love the commuter rail line connecting to Sac/Yolo/bay area - Connect Folsom to Rocklin/Roseville by light rail
Hwy 65/So. Placer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Too expensive - Important to increase transportation networks along with the development increase - #3 in my dreams. Too expensive - 3 in my dreams – probably too expensive
Sutter/Yuba Co	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -
Yolo Co to Sac	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - #2 with carpool lanes from #3 - #2 but modify with carpool lanes across Yolo county bridge - Modified #2 with added carpool lanes like #3 on I-80 - #2 if carpool lane on 80 causeway - Add carpool lanes to causeway
North Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - #2 Would love to see light rail all the way to the airport - Light rail to airport is of vital importance (Portland is a successful example) - Like light rail to airport - Live light rail to airport
MISC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -

SCORE CARD COMMENTS

Location: Placer	
South Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What about 99? - 10 minute train service to college - Again, rail - Less new freeway - Put light rail out to college - Bring light rail down Franklin to Elk Grove Blvd - Bike Trail to Downtown Sac
EG-RC-ED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - #3 But also expand Grantline Rd to 6 lanes - Don't need 6 lanes - Less new freeway - Don't need 6 lanes - Haze connection is critical. Also would prefer Grantline regular freeway lane - No Rail? Introduce Rail! If you are going to do a Grant Line Project do it right. Introduce a real freeway. Connect Hazel. - Add Hazel Road improvement from I-50 to White Rock - Don't need 6 lanes
U.S. 50 Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Short light rail stops - Connect 50 to 80 – more money for Placer County 65 bypass - Connect 50 to 80 - Add a connector from I-80 to US 50 - Less new freeway - Like Light Rail frequency - 10 minute waits on light rail – Good job - Need carpool on double deck freeway from Hazel to downtown - No road widening - Parking/Service - Hurray for mass transit – take the pressure off of Hwy 50 - Needs more lanes - Need to add lanes to Hwy 50 - Need at least 2 additional new lanes – Hazel to 99 - Need to add lanes to Hwy 50 - Additional lane: Hazel to 99
East Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to resolve the problem of Roseville/Rocklin freeway or expressway to Hwy 50 (shorter way) - Connect 50 to 80 - Less new freeway - Dedicated bus lanes on Sunrise and Hazel - More busses (frequency) - Transit station in Roseville? - We need good connections to light rail. This is my home – the surface street driving takes so much time. We need alternatives - Sunrise @ 50 is access to Elk Grove - #1 in both cases, but with expanded Sunrise for BRT - But need Sunrise improvement also. Also clogged. - Sunrise should be expanded to 6 lanes in some areas as shown on #2 - Expanded roadway improvements on Sunrise (as referenced in #2) - Less widening of roads

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Better connection to East Placer county via public transit - Expand and widen Sunrise in addition - Widen Hazel north to Douglas - Widen Hazel to Placer Countyline - #2 with Hazel (north) improvements - Bus transportation is expandable - Established roads in expansion remains when money gets tight
East I-80 Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Light rail - Extend light rail to Rocklin and Lincoln - Take out diamond lanes - Use new rail lines for light rail - Extend light rail to Lincoln and Rocklin possibly sharing with commuter lanes - Extend light rail - Table of diamond lanes - Minimize/eliminate carpool lanes - Have Nelson or Fiddyment connect to 65 bypass and Placer Parkway (like on #3) - Light rail extension to Citrus Heights - Transit increase ILO streetcar - Light rail to Antelope - Want light rail as far as possible toward Roseville - No streetcars on Watt - Use new rail lines for light rail - Light rail added from Watt/I-80 to Antelope - Light rail to Antelope and remove streetcars from Watt Ave - #2 No beltways. I believe these work best. - #2 Rail! Good job - Less new freeway - “On-Demand” reversible lanes – utilize as needed during peak traffic either direction - Allows multiple ways to travel Roseville/South - Light rail - Light rail is a plus – as Rocklin redevelops is downtown, the light rail will be a plus - Light rail and hard rail expansion a must - We need a 50 to 80 connector - I want light rail to continue east on I-80 to Roseville/Rocklin - Love the rail, would love to see it continue up to Auburn - #2 emphasizes rail transit but also includes other travel modes - We added more options to 1 from choices 2 and 3 - Extend light rail to Lincoln - Add light rail or bike lanes; no connectivity shown on scenarios - Add streetcar and neighborhood shuttle - Move trains and right of way on 3rd tracks over freight train - No carpool lanes - \$\$ for public transportation and bike lanes - Light rail is essential in addition to diamond lane expansion - Like the route of Foothill to Freeway
Hwy 65/So. Placer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prefer 6 lane Placer Parkway but not on north alignment – Like #1 Placer Parkway location and route thru Foothill. - Like concept of street cars. - #3 – Access and environmental smooth - Add new freeway lanes but don’t make them carpool lanes - Take out carpool lanes - Move Placer Parkway South closer to Pleasant Grove. By having this North, people will

- not take this, as Riego Rd is what is overburdened today.
- Bus system, expanded road, freeway, street car looks good as option; however, need more accessibility to go further north and south
- Move Placer Parkway interchange with 99/70 South
- Move Placer Parkway closer to Baseline
- No Diamond lanes needed
- Scenario 3 shows on/off ramps on Placer Parkway. This was never in the mix.
- More public trans
- Minimize Diamond Lanes
- Add bus service to save \$\$, Prefer southern route for Placer Parkway.
- Extend bus line down 65
- Add connectivity to 99 & 80 & 65.
- Lessen interchanges
- No carpool lanes
- Move Placer Parkway to Scenario 1 and closer to Baseline – Don't understand Scenario 3 - multiple interchanges
- Extend ight rail from Watt into Roseville and Rocklin
- Add the connector raod from Lincoln bypass and Placer parkway
- Extend light rail
- Extend light rail from watt Avenue to Rocklin and Lincoln and to Sac Airport
- Add bike/walk trails from Rocklin to Roseville (Douglas/Galleria Mall)
- Connect Lincoln Bypass to the Placer Parkway
- We questioned the need for trollies/cable cars
- Move Placer Parkway North to link w/Blue Oaks.
- Add North/South Improvements @ Dryer and Fiddyment
- Scenario 3 would be good, but 6 lanes seems too much. Perhaps, motivate drivers to commute, carpool, with more carpool or 3 people carpool
- Light rail to Sacto
- #3 but move Placer Parkway closer to Baseline Road
- #3 – Best of all plans presented
- Less Roads – more long distance public transit out of #2 (light rail, second line)
- Smart growth (mixed house/commercial so people can shop w/o cars)
- Placer Parkway should be at location noted in #2/3.
- Placer Parkway @ the Northern location
- Fiddyment Connector to Lincoln bypass
- Fiddyment Road connection should be added
- #3 along with I-80 improvements
- Carpool lanes on Hwy 65 should be added
- Modification and find ways to spend money on Scenario 3 – Look at choices
- Want Fiddyment to Lincoln bypass or like connection. See picture [Table 9 – SC 3]
- I like #1 with Placer Parkway at North Connection. We voted for #3 for better local commutes while congestion is a concern for me.
- I prefer Placer parkway further North (as in 2 & 3)
- Make access to 65 & Parkway
- Less new freeway
- Add BRT
- #3 along with I80 improvements
- Fiddyment Connector between 65 and Parkway
- Light rail or Bart-like transit from employment centers in Rocklin/Lincoln/Roseville to Sacramento/Sac Co.
- Would like a modification of the regular freeway to a carpool lane in #1

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve HWY 65 crossing for bikes (Pleasant Grove/Blue Oaks) - I would also like more rail or light rail access to downtown Sacramento from here in Rocklin and then from Downtown Sac to Sac International Airport - Need light rail to Lincoln w/connection - Amtrak to Auburn - Need auxiliary lane between Pleasant Grove and Galleria on SB 65 - #1 to include an extension of Watt bus to Lincoln to provide additional arterials to Hwy 65 for N/S traffic - The proposed Valley View Parkway seems odd –why the expense of a new road to bring cars through Rocklin’s north end. Those cars will not end up in Rocklin, they will commute through a senior community – POOR planning – Not a regional plus - Need light rail to Sac and Lincoln - Need increased number trains to Sac for commutes - Prefer light rail clear to Lincoln/Rocklin - Like light rail to Auburn - Feedmont connector from #3 on #2 - Add streetcar to Watt Avenue - #1, but with additional mass transit options and fewer road expansions - Reduce Placer Parkway to a 4-lane at grade arterial - Reduce Lincoln bypass to a 4-lane expressway - Better access to Hwy 70/99 - Extend light rail to West Roseville - Better bus service to West Roseville - Add streetcar in Watt Ave corridor to connect to light rail - Plant more trees for sound and pollution barriers - Extend light rail - I must have light rail to Rocklin and then up north as needed. - I don’t like the freeway expansion in South Placer - New highways need access!
Sutter/Yuba Co	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I like the bypass - Extend bus line down 65 - Add bus line on 65 - We need the bypasses in Wheatland and Marysville if we’re going to allow the development - Add bus line on Hwy 65 - Don’t see a need to expand Boyle - Widen 5th and 10th Street bridge - Add bus line on 65 - Less new freeway - #3 but add express bus service from #1 to South Placer - Need to build the Third Bridge from Marysville to Yuba City. However both the existing 5th and 10th Street bridges need to be widened - New bridge over River widen both bridges - Mondavi – easy access - Wheatland bypass - Keep traffic flow away from Hwy 65 going South - Pass around very good idea!
Yolo Co to Sac	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sac to Bay Area Service. Bring Bart here - Less new freeway - Add rail line that is in #3 - Improve I-80/50 interchange - Improve I-80 interchange

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve I-80 @ 50 - Improve I-80 @ 50 interchange and light rail to Davis - Add commuter train and improve I-80/50 interchange
North Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need another light rail or express bus system to Placer county area: Roseville - Light rail to airport - Need connection to airport - Framework for support growth to airport - Frame work for other future projects - To the Airport! We need rail service. - Light rail extensions are the best benefits - Light rail to airport is a must - Add diamond lane from I-80 to airport - Like 6 regular freeway lanes I-5 to Placer Parkway from #1. - Extension of rail to International Airport from 2 - Use new rail for light rail line - Less new freeway - #2 with carpool lanes to downtown Sac from I-80 and carpool freeway interchange - Need carpool on I-5 from I-80 to Downtown - Must have carpool lanes used to downtown Sacto in #2 - #2 with carpool lanes from I-80 to downtown Sac - Multimodal Truxel bridge @ River - Light rail all the way to airport - Public transit to airport - No road widenings - Add multimodal bridge over river at Truxel and Garden Highway - Add Diamond lanes to I-5 all the way to Airport - Light rail to Airport is crucial
MISC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -

SCORE CARD COMMENTS

Location: Central Sacramento-Memorial Auditorium	
South Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extension of light rail service - Favorable light rail service - Greatest congestion reduction would like to see DNA - Add carpool lanes from #3 viability study - Is it liable, can it really decrease congestion with buses on the street? - Add more carpool lanes - Extend peak time past 7pm to 8pm or 9pm - More light rail - Too much growth with not enough hot water and bathrooms at light rail stations - More transit miles - Avoid carpool lanes in favor for more mass transit - BRT should have fixed gridway lanes - Better services, I believe it covers more needs of availability for transit access and destination routes. I believe it serves the purpose of accommodations- balances out. - Extend light rail to Elk Grove, extend light rail hours and security - Will developers pay for streetcars? - In general, would prefer the more shorter trips option because when gas gets really expensive it will be easier to walk or bike a shorter trip - Buses that function all day, not just for commuters from Elk Grove to downtown Sacramento - The least amount of cars- more buses and light rail - Don't widen roads - Add regional rail to Elk Grove, Lodi, Stockton - Complete carpool lanes on I-5 to Elk Grove - BRT-Express buses on I-5 and 99 - Convert extra lane to carpool - Converting one freeway lane to carpool lane rather than adding auxiliary lanes - Convert lanes on I-5 to carpool - Scenario 2 can be changed by adding auxiliary lanes on Hwy 99 and improving transit frequency - Extend light rail to down to Elk Grove - Add carpool lane to I-5 from Cosumnes to Hwy 50 - Add bike lanes on Franklin atleast north of Florin and along Morrison Creek - Add carpool lane on I-5 - Bike lanes on Franklin Blvd from Downtown to Cosumnes River - Light rail to Elk Grove - Reliable bus service/ more frequent service - Extend auxiliary lanes on I-5 up to US 50 - Need better bus service down Freeport, also 67/68 routes are very windy and convoluted - Carpool lanes on I-5 - If #1 is chosen, I don't think light rail needs expansion to Watt/I-80 and the carpool additions to the I-5 may replace those funds - Add carpool lanes to I-5 from Cosumnes Blvd to downtown - Like to see carpools on I-5 south of Hwy 50 - Extend light rail all the way to Elk Grove instead of long distance buses - Clean out light rail...sanitary issues - Extend light rail to Elk Grove, not just buses

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I lived in South Sac over 50 yrs things were improved 1950-2003 - With local shuttle - With more local shuttles - Way more shuttles to light rail - Local shuttles added - No new freeway lanes - I feel any way to connect the Southwest and East - 7.5 minute service on light rail - No auxiliary lanes - Remove auxiliary lanes from scenario 1, I like the greater amount of public transportation in scenario 1 - Future tweaks – auxiliary lanes - No new auto bridges - Widen and improve the 99 to 50 interchange - Highway 99 expanded lanes - Go farther towards transit orientation - Extend light rail from Consumnes to Elk Grove, get a light rail down Power Inn to Elk Grove, and make sure roads are kept up for flood evacuation plans. - More public transit options, get the cars of the road - Add the improved light rail service to 10 minute frequency - I would like 3, but I really prefer 10 minute light rail service during peak periods (do that instead of the auxiliary lanes) - I agree with everything in #3, but think it should include the increase in light rail service as shown in #1 - Select #3 and extend carpool lanes south to Consumnes River Blvd. - On/Off (auxiliary lanes) or parallel service roads are very important - I thought that choice #1 was a better concept, but the outcomes for congestion was better for #3 - Have carpool lanes extend further to Consumnes River Blvd - Emphasis on service streets, improving roads other than highways, more bus service - Accelerated build out of mass transit - Lots of bike paths - Do not support expansion of I-5 and 99, definitely support BRT and light rail - I like 99 south of Florin auxiliary lanes - Add increase south line frequency to 10 minutes - Add BRT from south Sacramento to Rancho - Need to help 99 – extend carpool - More shuttles - Bus line from Harbor Point/Elk Grove Blvd direct to light rail. A bridge north of Pocket area across Sacramento river into West Sacramento - New bridge or crossing from north of Pocket to West Sacramento - Expand general purpose freeway lanes instead of carpool lanes - Don't want auxiliary lanes – spend the money on a shuttle/streetcar for Elk Grove commercial center
EG-RC-ED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Light Rail with feeder lines - Downtown trolley - Prefer more a more infill route that connects to Cosumnes River Parkway - More buses - All restrooms needed at light rail stations - More transit miles

- Avoid carpool lanes in favor for more mass transit
- Choice of alt2 with caveat that open space and agriculture take precedence over housing development
- Don't like 6 lane streets. Make sure 'complete streets' concept followed on expanded roads
- Electrify certain bus routes- Watt/Howe/Fulton/Sunrise
- Too much emphasis on new/expanded roads
- Alt #1 but seriously question streetcar in Rancho Cordova town center
- Buses that function all day, not just for commuters from Elk Grove to downtown Sacramento
- BRT or Express bus from Rancho Cordova, Folsom to Roseville
- No development south-east of Grant Line
- Scenario 2 is preferred
- Open Space policy for East and South of Beltway
- Preserve farm land SE of Grant Line
- Keep vision to never develop or limit development east of Grant Line Rd
- Make light rail go to Elk Grove
- No increase in HOV
- I worked in this area for 20 yrs 1981-1997- things were severely challenged during those years
- Housing/jobs balance
- Less roads
- Better shuttle, local transit
- Encourage job/housing balance- more housing in Rancho
- Stop housing without jobs in Elk Grove
- Bike/Ped crossing at freeways
- Housing in Rancho
- Bike/Ped crossing at freeways
- Shuttles
- Less roads period!!!
- Housing/Jobs balance
- Roads restricted to 4 lanes unless used for BRT
- I don't like any of them, what about a serious light rail set-up
- Again, minimize widening
- Confine Grant Line to 4 lanes, reduce widenings, increase public transportation
- Do not want connector
- Long distance bus and more extended light rail
- Public transportation
- Don't like any alternatives, Grant Line shouldn't be wider – it is all rural and not a lot of development, it will create higher speed limit. More bus system.
- #1 – please incorporate bike lanes into expanded east
- Do not want to expand Grant Line, this will encourage development in southern and eastern parts of the county
- 6 lane roads are too wide, people movement should focus on robust public transit, bike lanes, ped facilities and roads no wider than 4 lanes
- Do not like any of the alternatives. Need to build a heavier transit option (light rail, high frequency buses) along the Grant Line/ White Rock Rd connecting Elk Grove to Bradshaw
- Need to focus on serving development in the undeveloped area. Address goods movement around the region. Better transit, no 50.
- Too much emphasis on auto expressways and not enough on public transportation
- Like the Grantline Road
- I voted for 3 because I don't want to give developers a big new road to build housing on

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concern at large outside expanded roads putting pressure on to develop south of Grant Line – want to - Need to have shuttle from Mather Field light rail into Mather Park especially at peak times - No bypass of Sheldon - #2 w/o bypass at Sheldon - Why bypass Sheldon? Take out the bypass - Make the Consumnes River Parkway part of a regional freeway beltway - I don't like any. Expand the bus service more, lessen road expansion. - Two would be a good plan if and only if the Natomas region will be guaranteed from development, and if adequate flood protection was made for the homes in the area under federal standards. - Don't enlarge freeway interchanges at Sunrise or Hazel, they're already very unpleasant by bike - We were not unanimous on this one. Split between #2 and #1 with #1 having more votes - More of a grid of 4-lane roads to make future growth there a success
U.S. 50 Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Light rail-good - Don't spend \$ on more freeway lanes. You can't build out of congestion by adding lanes - Delete HOV lanes - Cost reduction - All restrooms needed at light rail stations - More transit miles - Avoid carpool lanes in favor for more mass transit - Need the connector from Hwy 99 to Hwy 50 to get some traffic off 50 then discard the carpool lanes on 50 - Don't like 6 lane streets. Make sure 'complete streets' concept followed on expanded roads - Consider electric buses instead of streetcars - 'If you build it, they will come.' Put the money into mass transit. - Take out Rancho streetcar and put in neighborhood circulator shuttle - I don't see the need for a streetcar...it wouldn't be very useful. Take it out - Increase rapid transit for all areas - Complete carpool lane network - Consider HOT lanes- can be used be buses from El Dorado - Take out Rancho Cordova streetcar - Eliminate streetcar in Rancho Cordova - Add carpool lanes from #2 and add Express bus from #3 - Eliminate streetcar - No streetcar - Like the Rancho Cordova streetcar and improved 2 track LRT to Folsom - Dislike streetcar - #2, make light rail to Folsom every 10 minutes, more people would take it - With double track light rail to Folsom - Easy access to freeway - Without streetcars - Bike/Ped crossing across freeways - More North/South shuttles - Double track - Double track to Folsom, but no new freeway lanes added - Need double track/bridge for express light rail - Light rail express from Folsom-Sacramento - Express light rail - Also need rebuilt 99 interchange @ 50

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mix 6 lanes - Love the light rail, nix the new freeway auxiliary lanes and new/expanded roads - Concern about auxiliary lanes from some participant, some people want to nix the 6 lane extension - Nix 2 – 6 lane expanses - Don't widen to 6 lanes, no new auto bridges, now new freeway expansions, add carpool lanes to existing freeways, Don't widen to 6 lanes to El Dorado Hills - Other options emphasize automobile travel excessively, 1 means people have to decide if they really want to commute by car. - Double tracking RT light rail is a good idea - Drop auxiliary lanes - Double track, yes, no on auxiliary lanes - Eliminate the big road across the vernal pools unless you have a lot of culverts and limit access - More light rail and Amtrak services, get people off the road – reduce congestion - Accelerated build out of mass transit - Lots of bike trails - No expansion of freeway, improvement of light rail very important to alleviate congestion on Hwy 50 - I like the auxiliary lanes - Scenario 1 provides the most in ?? and the least new freeway. It avoids the HOV lanes, which are simply a disguised freeway expansion. If you want HOV, convert existing lanes. - Put wi-fi access on light rail to increase ridership – I could stomach and I hour + commute on it if I could work at the same time. - Change new auxiliary lanes into carpool lanes with express buses - Would prefer light rail option to scenario 3. Preferred #3 but didn't like no train options. Do not like auxiliary lanes – worried about community impact. - Liked #2 because of improved light rail service - Streetcar should connect to LRT - I don't think carpool lanes will help at all - #1 has more choices, perfect mix - I don't really like the auxiliary roads and think more should be done across the river and down Sunrise Blvd. - Express light rail trains - Expand general purpose freeway lanes on 50 - Add widening and extend White Rock Rd, delete Folsom expansion - #3 but add expanded White Rock Rd, not Folsom Blvd or “Eastern Valley Parkway” - #3, add light rail - Facilitator did not include everyone in discussion. Discussion hi-jacked by load people. Rushed. - Better “back road” access to El Dorado county from Rancho Cordova and area - Don't widen Madison or Greenback or Hazel. These areas need more density and mixed use, don't improve roads. Don't widen bridges
East Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do not expand Madison - More bus routes –East/ West - Widen Howe Bridge - Expand Howe Bridge - Delete HOV lanes - Watt Ave needs widening - Add central Roseville streetcar to Alt 2 - All restrooms needed at light rail stations

- More transit miles
- Avoid carpool lanes in favor for more mass transit
- Widen Howe Avenue Bridge
- Do not widen Madison to 6 lanes unless 2 lanes dedicated to BRT
- Widen Howe Avenue Bridge
- Not so much widening, widen one, then go back to drawing board
- Don't like 6 lanes roads
- Don't widen with 6 regular lanes
- Don't like widening Hazel to 6 lanes
- Need expansion of Howe Ave bridge
- Express bus or streetcar service on Fair Oaks Blvd-J Street downtown
- More frequent train service from downtown Sac to Auburn
- Widen Howe Ave Bridge
- Remove all widenings beyond 4 lanes
- Expand circulator shuttles as much as possible
- We need buses, light rail and trolleys
- BRT or Express bus Rancho Cordova to Roseville-Placer County
- Cut out streetcar
- Widen Madison and Greenback East to West
- Increase widen Sunrise from Rancho to I-80
- New mixed-use bridge- the Sandy Smoley Memorial Bridge
- More transit, but no road widenings for more cars
- Keep the many rapid transit buses, reduce those road widening
- Moratorium adding lanes
- More buses
- Delete expansion of Hazel Bridge except for transit
- Mix widening to 6 lanes
- I like the improvement in public transportation, nix increasing Hazel to 6 lanes to the Placer county line unless used for BRT
- Want beautiful bike lanes on Hazel bridge, Hazel should have BRT dedicated lanes at peak or all times
- Add bike lane to Hazel bridge. Use 2 of 6 Hazel lanes for BRT during peak hours
- No wider than 6 lanes, don't expand bridge to 6 lanes, add bike lanes
- #1 has the most variety
- Widen Howe Ave. bridge to 6 lanes
- Don't like any of the alternatives, widening roads does not slice any problems – need more different modes of transportation
- More bike paths
- Increase of BRT in corridors like Watt, Hazel and Sunrise will be answer, not widening of roads
- Please fix central Watt b/t Fair Oaks Blvd and Arden Way to be 6 lanes – consistent with the rest of the road.
- Keep Folsom Road Bridge and make it a pedestrian/bike bridge. None of these really help me at all except for Sunrise Blvd bus expansion. Need bus access onto Mather Air Field, not just the street.
- I would like to see light rail that goes from east to west, not just north to south
- Dedicated bike lane or trail on Roseville Rd.
- Expand general purpose freeway lanes on 50
- Bus rapid transit/neighborhood buses in Carmichael to American River College, Sunrise/Greenback road widening will make problems for adjoining homes. Add Howe to #1 and expand Howe bridge to 6 lanes, delete widening at Madison

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add Howe Ave expansion to #1, bus route on Howe to #1, light rail extension from Watt to Sunrise on #1, delete Madison expansion and rapid transit on Watt Ave. - #1, add Howe expansion - Monorail between 65th street transit hub and Sac State. Improve signage at all bus stops - Light rail security for passengers - Bike lanes and light rail
East I-80 Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No HOV lanes - Light rail to connect to Sacramento - Major lanes for good coming into California - Would prefer with light rail to Roseville - Want to add lighting - Delete HOV lanes - Add rail - Delete Roseville Rd widening - Add rail - We want rail lines - What about bike lanes? - HOV lanes don't work, remove them and add light rail along Roseville Rd - All restrooms needed at light rail stations - More transit miles - Avoid carpool lanes in favor for more mass transit - No carpool lanes - Like streetcars from option #1 - Like streetcar - Like streetcars from #1, 'complete streets' on road expansions - Regional rail full service/ hours - Express bus Auburn to downtown Sacramento - Should extend light rail from Watt Ave to Roseville - Amtrak doesn't stop often enough - Remove HOV lanes and all road widening beyond 4 lanes - Regional rail to Placer County from Sacramento - Complete carpool and or HOT lanes to I-5 - Commuter Rail - Eliminate the additions of streetcars on North Watt and I-80 and Hwy 65 as they add to congestion with minimal benefits - No streetcar - Widen Madison and Greenback - No streetcars - Take streetcar out, it is too expensive and fixed - Eliminate most of the options but keep the light rail in #2 to help lower costs - Eliminate other road and keep the light rail - Keep expanded rail, but make other parts of #2 on to decrease costs - No carpool lanes - Fix I-80/Douglas bottleneck - No carpool lanes - No carpool lanes - #2 Exclude all carpool lanes and Roseville Rd expansion - Really loved the local aspect of #1. However we selected #2 because of the visionary and progressive idea of broad connections for Placer, Yolo, Sacramento to Bay Area - Streetcars added to #2. I like the Amtrak- I think this is important for the long term - Delete HOV lanes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mix 6 lanes, widen Hazel bridge - Add #2 rail line, cancel carpool lanes - Don't do widening, divert \$ to regional rail and more light rail and streetcars. Take out carpool lanes unless used for dedicated bus. - Cancel carpool lanes, add regional rail, no widenings - Reduce widening to 6 lanes, don't widen freeways use more to add regional rail - This corridor is closest of any of these 9 corridors to where I live (Midtown), but the options in all 3 scenarios are irrelevant to my personal transportation preference, which would be to live in Sacramento w/o a car and yet suffer little inconvenience, even when getting around w/ granddaughter in tow. - Light rail critical to alternative transportation - Add more express buses and commuter park and rides - Scenario 2 is the only alternative with public transportation - Even split on table b/t 3 and 1 - Train to downtown - Stop train in downtown Sacramento / West Sacramento - Rail system – have people commute with rail, reduce congestion at I-80 - Accelerated build out of mass transit - Please consider including additional light rail - Would like to see light rail expansion along with corridor - Love the Watt Ave streetcar - No new freeway lanes, no carpool lanes, need more crossings of 80 for bikes and peds, and keep cars away from interchanges - I like the light rail extensions - I work in Rancho Cordova and I believe all the bridges and lanes should be widened - The rail plans from #1 and #2 need to be combined the bus system needs to accommodate the people living in Watt. - #1 is best performer - Add rail from #2 to #1 - #1 but add rail to #1 with deleting the streetcar - Don't widen Roseville Rd to 6 lanes, don't add carpool lanes on I-80 - Light rail service extension up to Roseville. Would heavy rail add more trackage to separate from freight disruptions? Carpool lanes not desirable. - Where is the light rail option? We chose the lesser of all evils as #3 - No light rail into Roseville
Hwy 65/So. Placer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Like light rail - All restrooms needed at light rail stations - More transit miles - Light rail connecting to Sacramento - Avoid carpool lanes in favor for more mass transit - Change regular freeway lanes carpool - Change regular freeway lanes to carpool lanes - Change regular freeway lanes to carpool lanes - Change regular freeway lanes to carpool lanes - Regional rail from Sacramento to Marysville and Lincoln - To expensive - With expanded buses - Add rail stops - Add additional rail stops and extension to Roseville - Add rail going to Roseville - Streetcars are essential

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Take out widening, add regional rail - Keep those streetcars coming - No new 4 lane expressways, no new freeway - No freeway expansion or roads, add safe bike lanes - Yeah – increase bus service, more frequency, and extended hours. Express bus to light rail - Love the Watt Ave streetcar - Like the 99/70 expansion - I would like to see light rail go out there, too many people drive their cars out there - Expand Highway 65/I-80 transition - Build Placer Parkway in #1 as indicated in #2 and #3
Sutter/Yuba Co	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - None of them, money should be sent where it is needed more - Need a bridge to West Sac - All restrooms needed at light rail stations - More transit miles - Avoid carpool lanes in favor for more mass transit - Hwy 70/99 freeway to Marysville/ Yuba City - These are all bad, we must limit sprawl - None are acceptable - I don't like any option, but whatever don't add expansions or expressways - Add bus line on Hwy 65 - Add bus line to Hwy 65 - Include the 10th Street expansion - Include 10th Street bridge expansion - Include 10th Street bridge. We really hated #3, it is obvious that it is for developers - Include 10th Street bridge - #1 has more transit destinations - Expand 99 and 70 to 4 lanes all the way - Focus on N/S rather than SE access
Yolo Co to Sac	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expand Bus Service - More Rapid Bus and other bus service - Remove Broadway Bridge - More Light Rail in West Sacramento - Table had a hard time arriving at a consensus - #1 good, but use bus not rail - Expand 80 causeway (especially causeway westbound @Bus 80/I-80 merge) - Bus/ streetcar throughtout West Sacramento to RT - I Street Bridge- New Rail Line - New freeway carpool lanes - Light rail or streetcar from W. Sac to Downtown - Yes- streetcars, rail, I-Street bridge, I-80 carpool lanes. Bike/Ped Bridge - No- General I-80 Freeway lanes, R Street 4 lane bridge, Broadway-West Sacramento Bridge - I Street Bridge rebuild- very very good - Look for ways to reduce costs - Add dedicated bus lines to replace Broadway bridge - Must fix 34 pass congestion - Add another bridge across causeway and lane for commercial traffic - Although I like the idea of having the rail in #2, #3 addresses the Yolo Causeway congestion - Light rail - Add train service and increase lanes on 80

- Rail lines, bike lanes
- All restrooms needed at light rail stations
- More transit miles
- Avoid carpool lanes in favor for more mass transit
- Like to streetcar loop in option #1
- Add streetcars from West Sac to Sac
- Streetcar lines seem unnecessary off freeway back road to downtown
- Davis shuttle service to airport
- Do not like increased rail service
- Convert HOV existing lanes on I-80 to BRT
- Light rail or streetcar connecting West Sacramento to downtown Sacramento
- Encourage more rail transport between Placer and Bay Area
- Regional rail to Fairfield from Sacramento
- Improved Sacramento/Davis/Woodland Bikeways Class I
- Change regular lanes to carpool lanes
- 2 lane bridge from Broadway to West Sacramento
- West Sacramento to Downtown streetcar added
- Add regional rail to Scenario 3
- Add streetcar line from Scenario 3
- Add streetcar from #3 and #1
- Fix bike lanes from #3
- Add more Amtrak service during peak periods
- Please improve Yolo Causeway bike lanes from West Sacramento to Davis and in West Sacramento
- Add auxiliary lanes across causeway
- Add streetcar system for West Sacramento and Sacramento
- Streetcar thru West Capitol Ave
- Add West Capitol streetcar that runs through downtown Sacramento. Great opportunity to redevelop West Capitol Ave
- With streetcars
- Add streetcars (Sac-West Sac loop)
- Add streetcar from #1
- Especially like commuter rail, dispute about rebuilding a highway interchange
- Add West Sacramento – Sacramento streetcar
- No new freeway interchange in Woodland, no new freeway expansion
- I would want the new streetcars and rail line as in #1
- Need access to “Zip Cars” for inter-city transit – not realistic to depend on bus or rail b/t Sacramento – Woodland – Davis – Winters.
- Add some freeway capacity, but keep rail capacity. Can we decrease congestion w/o so much road building?
- Add trolley lanes
- Add trolley
- Add trolley from #1
- Want streetcars West Sacramento to downtown
- Commuter rail to Davis
- Add streetcar as shown in #1
- #3 with street car pattern from #1
- Would like 80 freeway to have HOV lanes
- Carpool lane instead of regular freeway lane
- Better rail system, similar to Capitol Corridor with more a better services. Expanding I-80 will create problems. Cheap tickets for train.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Incorporate bike trails on all street improvements and additions - I really like the streetcar circulation of #1, but discourage the additional freeway lane and support carpool lane of #3 - Like the Davis commuter rail, run it along the existing Amtrak/freight rails and make sure it is strong enough for all trains - Add other and change that has greatest impact on congested miles variable - Expanded public transit (hours and frequency), bike lanes, ped facilities - Change freeway lanes to carpool lanes - Add inter-modal terminal. Change new freeway lanes to bus/carpool lane or eliminate new lane. Additional bike crossing (R Street concept was workable) between Sac and W. Sac. - Exclude the extra lanes - Harbor Blvd between the Port and I-80 - Want rail and LRT - I want trolley cars in any future scenario and Amtrak station in West Sacramento - Improve the rail line as included in #2 - Improve rail line. I like the streetcar element - #1 plus commuter rail service b/t Sacramento, Yolo and Placer - Don't like any option, like the expanded streetcar part - #1 with rail line in #2 - #1 but add the heavy rail line from #2 as long as it uses existing rail - I would like to see a streetcar system included downtown in any plan. - Add trolley in downtown Sacramento - Go Streetcars! - No on #2, on one will take this train – it is not cost effective to the rider. Cheaper to drive to Davis. No one takes the train now, why would they if frequency isn't the deciding factor for potential riders? - I chose 1 over 3 due to ineffectiveness of carpools - Add streetcars in Midtown Sacramento - Add streetcar loop to West Sacramento - Separation of scenarios desired to integrate W. Sac-Sac. Street car service with either light rail or heavy rail - Tries to address too many issues and areas. None of these scenarios work. - Too many issues with too many items to consider - Another bridge link is crucial - Add streetcar
North Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Remove carpool from 80/50 to airport and the 99/70 from I-5 to Placer - New bridge for bike/peds and transit only - Add long distance bus along North 16 Street - Use bus service - Light rail improvement - Must extend light rail to Sac Airport ASAP before costs increase further - Light rail to airport - Extend light rail all the way to the airport - You get a longer bus trial to the airport so it is easier to travel - Add light rail to airport - Extending light rail is imperative, even though it is cost a lot, I feel it is helpful - All restrooms needed at light rail stations - More bike lanes - More transit miles - Avoid carpool lanes in favor for more mass transit - No carpool lanes

- No carpool lanes
- Need light rail to airport
- Change freeway lanes to carpool
- Change regular freeway lanes to carpool lanes
- Change regular freeway lanes to carpool lanes
- Change regular freeway lanes to carpool lanes
- Expensive but will give us an international city
- Take out light rail to Richards and in BRT
- Increase bus service from downtown to the airport in addition to bus service from North Natomas to Airport
- LRT phase I to Natomas town center
- Carpool lanes I-5 to 70/99 and I-80 across top
- Add carpool lanes instead of regular freeway lane
- No new bridge over river
- Frequency of any service to Airport should be frequent and 24/7
- Good reliable transportation from Airport to downtown/midtown
- Assure that bus service to Airport is available 24/7 at a minimum frequency of every 15 min
- BRT to Airport does the same as LRT
- No HOV lanes, too expensive and not efficient
- Make buses come more frequent 10 minutes?
- I don't think the airport traffic is among the biggest problem (priority in the Sacramento area)
- Light rail to at least Natomas, but the Airport is ideal
- Light rail to Airport
- Delete HOV lanes
- Take out road widening
- Light rail to the airport is a big deal, dump the road increases
- Concerned about road widening
- No freeway widening, no new roads or bridges, new light rail and new bus lines
- Add trolley for downtown/Richards Blvd.
- I love #3, please take light rail to the airport. Important at the LEAST to take light rail to Natomas, especially if there will be a sports/entertainment facility @ the Railyards.
- Light rail is wonderful alternative, to too expensive to construct.
- Add more shuttle buses to Natomas
- Table chose #2, but strong support for #1
- Group consensus on #2 with strong support of #1
- Ditch the carpool lanes
- Rail to airport – PERFECT, IMPORTANT doesn't matter \$\$
- Incorporate bike trails to all street improvements and additions
- Light rail to airport through Natomas is a must
- #2 makes the most sense especially since it is the only option for light rail to the airport
- More bus service is needed
- I don't like taking RT to the airport, just for the sake of taking the train service to the airport. If there are job centers employing huge #'s of people close to the airport, then provide the train line to serve the commuter, but this doesn't exist now.
- My experience in Paris, Melbourne, Portland, and trips to SFO via rail – rail to the airport is not needed. I used to support, but I think it sucks too much \$\$ for the benefit and induces sprawl.
- Inter-modal terminal is prerequisite but not included in cost. Bus service in Natomas is higher priority. Ped access b/t downtown and Natomas is key

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Young long-distance commuters strong-armed the vote here - We were not happy with any of the choices - No expansion, no light rail - This is for the developers only, let them pay for it. Start with Angilides. - No good choices, not smart growth. Concern about expanding light rail to airport because of sensitive species (Swainson's hawk, garter snake) push for development in protected area/floodplain - More bus routes as in #1 - #3 forces us to choose b/t a combo of public transportation and building more roads and freeways. I am opposed to expanding roads and freeways. I support increasing public transportation only. - Even though #1 is choice, I would like to combine "bus" #1 with "light rail" #2 - Additional buses to airport, bridge at Truxel American River - Bring streetcars/light rail to guard highway commercial areas - Lt rail beyond Natomas should be lower priority as that other unmet needs can be funded - Add light rail to airport, delete bus to airport, delete street expansions - Expand #2 to include a highway bridge on Truxel over the American River - #2, add new highway bridge - #1, delete BRT from downtown to airport, add light rail to airport - We should try downtown-to-airport bus service with 15 minute headways before dumping \$1 billion into light rail. - More and frequent bus service to and from the Rio Linda/Elverta area - There needs to be a ped/bike crossing across American River coupled with light rail crossing – leave ROW for ultimate light rail extension to airport - De-couple airport parking revenue light rail to airport will raise airline rates because of loss of parking revenue, but it's best for the community. - Don't add carpool lanes on I-80, don't add 6 lane road on East Commerce Parkway, don't change the I-80/I-5 interchange.
MISC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With all systems must extend later bus schedules - No toll freeways - Instead of car/bus/rail, instead of any new roads, let's have more community gardens and urban agriculture - It's about access not mobility - How about a streetcar down 'J' Steet to the CSUS - I want to spend all the \$ on public transportation and bike ways and pedestrian walk ways - I'm looking for the best long term solution to congestion, environmental degradation and livability. The mix of auto centric and public transportation doesn't seem to have a long enough horizon. If we were just building for the commuters convenience over the next 5-10 years the options may be relevant. We should be looking at the next 20-50 years. - We can't build our way out of congestion with more and more roads, we need alternatives for an aging population. My major consideration is to reduce expenditures on new roads, freeway expansions and increase transit options - Why don't any scenarios talk about bike lanes? What is the 6-lane road focus for? - No Meter System - Where did all of these auxiliary lanes come from? How is this reflective of our previous work if our table hadn't seen them before?

SCORE CARD COMMENTS

Location: East Sac	
South Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More bike/ped improvements - No improvements for bicycle routes was considered - Consider more bicycle/ped accommodations - What about bicycle traffic? - More bike lanes - #2 – Very important! Do it!!! To it!!! - My biggest interest is speeding up Hwy 5 - No option that connected Hood-Franklin to Grant Line - Wrap around freeway - Reduce rail increase flexibility - Need rail - Need bus transit - Bus rapid transit - Extend carpool lane to Cosumnes River College - Extend I-5 carpool lane from #2 to #3 - Street cars - #3 cheaper -
EG-RC-ED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More grade separations/interchanges - No Sheldon bypass - Really ensure that Scenario 2 doesn't lead to more development in SE Sac County - Build Beltway all way around lake to 80 & 50 – 80 - No improvements for bicycle routes was considered - Consider more bicycle/ped accommodations - What about bicycle traffic? - Land use to encourage people to NOT commute. Eliminate expanded route toward El Dorado Hills - Bike lanes - Add streetcars to facilitate transfer from express buses to variety of destinations - Would like to see #1 and #3 combined because future growth will demand it - Sheldon bypass is weak! - Keep the two tracks to Folsom and street cars. I like that grant is being built. - #2 Use of developer fees for Hazel extension south of 50 as in #1 & 3 - #2 Developer fees to improve Hazel south as in 1 & 3 - #2 Developer fees should be used for Hazel South of US 50 - Extend Hazel to International - Extend Hazel South of Hwy 50 to International - Expressway/toll road paralleling existing grant line corridor. Review toll option - We also need a new express/toll road to parallel Grant Line Road to connect Hwy 50 to Hwy 99 and over to Hwy 5 - Shelton should be 6 lanes complete. Start to finish...6 lanes - Sheldon should be 6 lanes start to finish. Review toll road. - Go Latrobe Road to Hwy 50 - #3 Interior expansion in #1 is also appealing - Like 6 lane road going from El Dorado Hills to Elk Grove. Will relieve traffic on Hwy 50 - Beltway - Good to take traffice from 50 (6 lanes)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Connect the express way around Sheldon - No Grant Line Road - (Grew up here) Bradshaw – from 2 to at least 4-6 lanes from 50 to Elk Grove - I talked to my neighbors and most of them said “we need Neighborhood Shuttle, since they are smaller than regular buses, and our streets are very narrow”. - Need new freeway from Folsom to South of Elk Grove - Do not like any scenario. Grant Line should NOT be 6 lanes. White Rock should NOT be 6 lanes - No 6 lane roads - #3 cheaper but 2 has better access - Expressway cutting across – 99 to 50 - Light rail and/or street car options in and around newly developing areas of Rancho Cordova and Rancho Cordova Employment centers
U.S. 50 Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Light rail from downtown Sac to Folsom still not addressed in Option 3. Needs to be done as well. - With additional river crossing near Sunrise - Please scrap the auxiliary lanes out of Scenario 1 and add more carpool lanes to that. - Improvements to light rail and carpool to downtown (before streetcar investment) - Add HOV lanes to downtown – More minor arterials (4-lane max) and no 6 or 8 lane arterials - Complete streets – fewer cul-de-sacs - More bike/ped improvements - Better trolley loop - Beltway - No improvements for bicycle routes was considered - Consider more bicycle/ped accommodations - What about bicycle traffic? - Add streetcars to facilitate transfer from express buses to variety of destinations - No widening of Motherlode and Durock - #3 but there was agreement that double tracking to Folsom is very important - Double track and extended hours to Folsom must have - Add double track to Folsom - I like the transit connection to the airport for #2 that is not a part of #3 - BRT south to EDH Business Park - Include widen White Rock Rd from Sunrise Blvd to El Dorado Hills and extension of Hazel from 50 to White Rock Rd - Increase light rail! Double tracks and 10 min time between departures - Add the bridge at Howe - BRT service to neighborhoods for connecting to light rail - Prefer HOV from Sunrise to Downtown and Double-track light rail from Folsom to Downtown w/15 minute frequency - Widen Sunrise and Watt at 50 and expand Howe and Hazel Bridges to 6 lanes Combining #1 & #2 was favorable discussed. - Don't want car pool lanes between Sunrise and downtown - I like one carpool lane in the #2 otherwise I like #1 - #3 Though I'm concerned about the lack of double track into Folsom. 15 minutes on Folsom segment is crucial - #3 Assumes that future light rail goes from 30 minutes to 15 minutes regardless of these choices. Otherwise #2 - Good mix! New carpool lanes, improved light rail, new roads #2 - Promote carpool lanes

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I carpool from El Dorado Hills to Stockton Blvd on Hwy 50. Would be faster with a carpool lane. - Need to ease mobility for all of these areas is dire. - Widen US 50 - Create a loop around Sac connecting 5/80/99 (8 lanes) and 50 - Auxiliary lanes! Would relieve so much congestion and carpool lane from Sunrise to Howe! - Add HOV lanes Sunrise to downtown - Shuttle buses in Folsom - Means for connecting Sunrise – Folsom – Roseville - Add streetcar in EDA down EDH Blvd - Add bus service from within various areas in Folsom to light rail - Like double track to Folsom - Light rail double track to Folsom - Additional bridge(s) over the American River between Watt Ave and Sunrise - Bridge over river or a ferry boat to get us across the river - #3 cheaper/better - #3 best results for El Dorado Co - #2 less expensive - Eliminate road construction – Invest in transit, bicycle and pedestrian option instead - Include express trains from Folsom to downtown, trains every 15 min - Up-per and lower tier lanes both ways - Subway from El Dorado to downtown - Double Decker highway - Close carpool lane and make it all access. Add one more lane. - Better ingress/egress at Latrobe & El Dorado Hills Blvd - Another “way out” by El Dorado Mercedes Benz – Frontage Road possible - Help us McKeever!
East Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would like to see bike lane/pedestrian instead of priority on street car. Allow people to access rapid bus and light rail by walking/biking easily from east/west streets (such as Winding Way and Fair Oaks Blvd. - No expansions of surface streets beyond 4-lanes - Hazel – 6 lane complete street - Prefer no road widening - Do maintenance - Connect sidewalks - Grade separations/interchanges - Need to expand Sunrise bridge to 8 lanes - More bike/ped improvements - No improvements for bicycle routes was considered - What about bicycle traffic? - Consider more bicycle/ped accommodations - Bike lanes - Add streetcars to facilitate transfer from express buses to variety of destinations - Need light rail to Citrus Heights - Keep the light rail to the airport - BRT into Gold river - We need Watt & Howe & Sunrise to go to 6 lanes and widen the bridge lanes also - Don’t expand Watt to River – it would be a bottleneck - Would like Hazel widened all the way like #1 (combine 1 & 2 together) - New combination 1 & 2 - #2 Greenback expansion in #3 is also appealing

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Like the widening of Greenback, Madison, Hazel, Folsom-Auburn Blvd. - Beltway - Need to ease mobility for all of these areas is dire - Widen Howe Avenue Bridge - Need alternatives for El Dorado County, need statistics for regional commuting on US 50 or on Connector if the Livermore traffic jam is eliminated - Passenger rail - Widen Hazel – 50 to 80 - Add another bridge. Like the additional buses, but also like the Watt & Sunrise widening - Widen Sunrise Blvd from 50 to 80 - Strong concern about taking private homes – should show this impact as a factor. Add Greenback. - Add Greenback Road Widening from #2 to #2 - #2 with bus service as described in #1 - Need another crossing of American River between Rancho Cordova & Carmichael to #1. - Light rail to airport and Davis - #1 won because of local connectivity but many also liked greater rail development of #2 - Light rail to airport - #3 better – more for the buck - #1 better results - #3 most cost effective - Eliminate road widenings – Put funds into transit bicycle and pedestrian improvements including transit operations - Put light rail or street car down Hazel, Sunrise and Watt instead of Rapid Bus - More emphasis on transit expansion – especially bus frequency, less emphasis on adding traffic lanes - Light rail from Folsom all the way to the airport - Continue the widening of Sunrise to Douglas Avenue to complete the connection to I-80
East I-80 Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add streetcars from #1 or choose 1 without extra mixed flow lanes and add commuter rail - Complete streets - Fill pedestrian gaps (there are many) – this will remove cars from the road - No improvements for bicycle routes was considered - Consider more bicycle/ped accommodations - What about bicycle traffic? - Need light rail to Penryn – No good choices – Synchronize signals on Greenback, Madison, Sunrise, Auburn Blvd. - Need more light rail – especially the line to the airport - #3 but expand Roseville Road - Like the expansion of Greenback and Madison - #1 picked this because of less congested miles of travel per household - Beltway - Need to ease mobility for all of these areas is dire. - Create a loop around Sac connecting 5/80/99 (8 lanes) and 50 - Passenger rail – exclusive lane - Are streetcars necessary? - Add expanded roads at Madison & Greenback @ I-80 - Add Greenback & Madison expansion from #3 to #1 - Provisions to have service (rail) expanded to serve Yuba and Butte Counties - Emphasize transit with pedestrian facilities – Reduce road expansion - Add class 1 bike lanes along rail corridor and/or creeks - Upper and lower tier lanes both ways. Expressway (Hwy 5 to Rancho Cordova) to Hwy 80/Roseville

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Double decker highway - Match the lanes of I-80 from Antelope road to Hwy 65 so as to reduce the traffic backup due to lane reductions - Simply more mass transit – higher density land use considered in mass transit
Hwy 65/So. Placer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No improvements for bicycle routes was considered - Consider more bicycle/ped accommodations - What about bicycle traffic? - What is wrong with I-5 – I-80 interchange - Keep focus on Rapid Transit and Street cars - Increase the road from 99 to 70 - Beltway - Increase BRT consistent with Option 1 - Increase bus routes to Sierra College - Add bus options from #1 to #2 - Concerned about conflicts with peds, traffic and streetcars - Scenario #1 – Don’t get how street car can improve and/or be efficient. Why not use shuttle/smaller bus? - Least amount of money - Have a commuter train stop in Lincoln with service north to Marysville and Chico
Sutter/Yuba Co	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No improvements for bicycle routes was considered - Consider more bicycle/ped accommodations - What about bicycle traffic? - With new expanded road east of Marysville - Beltway - #1 with bypass around Wheatland - I like Scenario 1 but feel Wheatland should be bypassed – so like #3 - Commuter rail to serve Yuba City and Marysville w/northbound service to Chico
Yolo Co to Sac	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add commuter rail to #3 - New bike/ped bridge on causeway is key feature. - Complete streets - Commuter rail lines - Major bike facilities - No improvements for bicycle routes was considered - Consider more bicycle/ped accommodations - What about bicycle traffic? - Street car implementation attractive - Street cars in downtown Sac - Beltway - #1 without light rail - Question inclusion of street car – use local dollars as it appears to be a tourist amenity - I like Scenario 1 since a lot of UC Davis University students are trying to get there and this part is always crowded will be a great idea to expand freeway. - Add street cars
North Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Complete streets - Eventual light rail to airport - Expand freeway from Sac to I-80 - Don’t encourage growth in floodplain - No improvements for bicycle routes was considered - Consider more bicycle/ped accommodations - What about bicycle traffic?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bikes on RT/Bus - Need LTR access to airport - #1 Better use of money but would still like light rail extension at least to Natomas - The bridge would be good addition to Plan #2 - I like Scenario #3 with adding light rail to the airport - Need light rail to airport asap. Good equity. - We need light rail to our airport ASAP and we need more international flights out of Sac so we don't have to drive to San Francisco. We are going to have more seniors. - Light rail to airport as soon as possible. - Light Rail to the airport now. - #3 except don't do the light rail. - Prefer BRT to light rail - I liked the expanded carpool lane to the airport - #3 although, I'd prefer to see airport transit directly from downtown (as in #1) - To the airport - Beltway - Grantline East to Folsom - Extend Light rail to airport - Add bus lane to airport - #1 without light rail - Build light rail to the airport! It works so wonderfully in Portland, Oregon - If we cannot justify light rail to airport, we need frequent bus from light rail to airport - Like light rail to airport - DNA Very important to Folsom residents - Important to have light rail to and from airport
MISC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What about smarter funding schemes? (See attachment) - Build efficiently the first time to avoid REDO - Just new freeway lanes --- Not HOV lanes - The agreement with every scenario is to get people out of the automobile as much as possible - Instruction for using voting device was unclear. Some devices did not clear to allow for voting on some items - Too many scenarios to consider for the amount of time allowed. - Electronic aspect was not worth the value - Overall – connectivity between bus and light rail and doubletrack light rail in Folsom - No new freeway lanes – more bike & ped across complete streets – no freeway interchanges unless there is a separate bike/ped overcrossing or it is incorporated in Sac County's proposed Hwy 50/Watt Avenue interchange - More expressways and lanes – Synchronize all street stop lights

SCORE CARD COMMENTS

Location: North Sac	
South Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I think it's a good plan but needs a carpool lane, well it might later - #1 – 2 widening of major artery Hwy 80! Weekend user - More treatment needed on I-5 - Liked own lanes on 99 - More bus lines - #2 – Maybe more could be spent in this area - Like #1 – More bang for buck - Increase local transit frequency - Increase light rail frequency - East to West 5. 99 to Hwy 5 - Grantline bypass to Hwy 50 - More public transit for quick easy going little trips from here to there. Light rail transit - Congestion on 99
EG-RC-ED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Let builders pay for roads so development can occur – no subsidy for development where there is not development now. - #1 Most benefit and low cost - Don't support 6 lanes on Grantline 99 to Bradshaw - I don't want to pay for new roads for these ideas - I don't want to subsidize these scenarios. None of the scenarios is a good one. - #2 with Placerville/Bradshaw/Fruitridge widening - Critical long term needed - All of these scenarios increase vehicle miles crowded and number of cars on the road. More work and planning needs to occur in this area to balance jobs/housing - Don't widen any roads – Increase job creation - Move road west of Keifer - Widen Bradshaw Fruitridge from Choice 1 - Improve road maintenance and safety. More and bigger and a lot more lanes. - All lanes on Bradshaw/Fruitridge from #1 plan
U.S. 50 Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - #1 for streetcar survey locals – ensure it goes to useful places - Reverse commute crowded, slow, not addressed or reported on. - Morning – I-5 southbound to 50 Eastbound---Evening 50 W to I-5 N a parking lot - Needs a major overhaul on Interchange @ 50/99 - All agreed How Interchange important - More light rail to Folsom and beyond. Express bus runs - More light rail - #2 lower cost similar benefit to #1 - Could include additional light rail improvement specified in Scenario 1 - Carpool lanes are inevitable - More busing vs. light rail or street cars. Not feasible for \$\$ - or aestically. - No streetcar for Rancho – not an “old time” type of town - Wants carpool lanes and express busses as well - #1 – Add rapid bus transit - Increase light rail - Add a dedicated BRT lane from Folsom to downtown Sac - Increase light rail frequency - Increased bus rapid service from Folsom - Need more roads parallel to 50 and wider roads in nearby areas

East Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need those bridges - #1 seemed to have the most benefit - Mass transit = less road widening - Sunrise expansion negative factor - Expansion does not solve the problem - Make Watt have a bus only lane - Seriously need a Roseville to Folsom/50 Route - Take out road widenings, spend \$ saved on more neighborhood shuttles, BRT, bike and ped infrastructure. No 8 lane roads - #1 minus road widening - Eliminate road expansion/widening - #1 Minus Road widening
East I-80 Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good change for Scenario 2 - I like the idea of train service with #2. If BART came to Sac that would be good. Upgrading AMTRAK would be nice but expensive and then traveling to BART is needed to Richmond - Too mush roads in #3. Put in light rail along Roseville Road - Light rail alternate please - Light rail to Roseville - Expansion of existing rail lines was deciding factor - I really liked the idea of connecting Hwy 160 to Cirby being I live in Roseville - #2 Might be most cost, but its best for connect to Cap City to I-80 Corridor - Need light/heavy rail to Roseville beyond - #2 need subsidy for rail riders – Amtrak perceived as \$\$ for daily commuters - Need more BRT or Express along HOV lane to El Dorado County from Rocklin to Downtown - Widen bottleneck @ Roseville Douglas Blvd/ I-80 - More BRT from North Sac to Roseville - Long term good of travel for longer distance - Take out carpool lanes, revamp Roseville Road to accommodate cyclists; bus only lanes on I-80 and/or Roseville Road - Eliminate carpool lane - Bike racks/accommodations at rail stations - Limit truck traffic during commute hours - #1 to get a faster way to Arden Mall - I like more rail choices in Antelope/Roseville. - A hoop around Sac for commercial traffic/trucks.
Hwy 65/So. Placer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No connection to Watt Ave. Is Watt the only North/South connection? No! - Some type of expressway from Fiddymet’s baseline should be put in that connects to I-80 - I would like to limit growth in areas along Placer Parkway with habitat valued farmland. Habitat should not be fragmented if possible. - Long term good/Need - No street car - Save money on streetcars and use for very frequent (5-10 minute) bus service. Complete the streets along N. Watt and S. Placer neighborhoods - Switch the street car for buses - Replace street car with bus service - No street car - Smoothing out congestion in the 65/80 area and shopping around the Galleria
Sutter/Yuba Co	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bus Rapid Transit – Yes ---- Light Rail – Yes - #2 to have most benefit for the cost. Marysville Bypass may have substantial impacts and

	<p>the commute is not north of Marysville. Environmentally may be worst. I quest the efficiency of the model for busses.</p>
<p>Yolo Co to Sac</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Carpool lanes a plus but not on off-peak hours or weekend commuters - Carpool lane seems most efficient - More intersections and I-80 Causeway – fleet pricing - More trolley service as in Scenario 1 - More bus/light rail/street cars - I believe in 80 being widened anywhere and place it could be since its already so congested - Include rebuild of I Street Bridge and carpool lane across Yolo causeway - Rebuild I Street Bridge - Add I Street Bridge – Rebuilt also - Include I Street Bridge within #2 - Rebuild I Street bridge - #3 Only with expanded street car from Scenario 1 - #2 with streetcar from #1 - Add streetcar from Scenario #1 - Like the carpool to Davis and not as costly. More bus routes in West Sac would be good - If expand freeway include carpool lanes - #3 prefer work done on freeway - Train won't make as much difference for the \$ spent as a HOV lane across the bypass – like the street car in W. Sac - Connectivity tight - Concerned about widening on I-80 - Tie together City of Sacramento and West Sacramento - Widening Yolo Bypass Interchange area around the Port - More coverage in West Sac. West Capital Avenue/Harbor and to Reed/I-80 (Shopping IKEA). Also to/from Downtown Sac
<p>North Sac County</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scenario 1 – best choice - Include increased connectivity to light rail - Light rail to SMF would be very convenient to have - More bus/light rail/street cars - All against light rail taking up lanes on Truxel - Keep light rail off Truxel – it is already too busy and light rail would congest it more rather than alleviate congestions. Light rail on Truxel would also bring down people's equity in their homes in the Natomas area. - More bus and light rail - Alternative modes besides mass transit aren't indicated i.e. which form of bridge across Discovery to Truxel. - No new car bridges to Truxel from downtown – mass transit and bike/ped only. - We need an on-off ramp on Southbound I-5 at West El Camino with light rail to airport - #3 with light rail to airport not Natomas Center - Extend LRT from Natomas Town center to Airport - Add vehicular traffic to DNA - American River Crossing - More bus lines on #2 - No new rail line – no car pool lane - I like the carpools available with option #3 but it does not take light rail all the way to the airport which is the big incentive bringing it north to me. We need to develop denser areas if we take light rail north. If you spend the money and have the environmental impact then build a combo light rail/street extension over American River - More feeder connections – run later

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BRT should have stops within various Natomas Shopping centers - More neighborhood shuttles and feeder buses - Light rail to airport instead of BRT (or more transit carriers to airport- not just #1 only with additions of light rail to town center - North Natomas – evening and weekend – bus & shuttle service – bike/ped/transit safety. N. Natomas shuttle to Arden Mall on Saturday. I-5 trucks at night, truck lanes – widen I-5 south to I-50 E/W - Light rail from Downtown to Natomas Town Center; and Safe Bike/Ped Bridge across American River - Add bus stops from Natomas neighborhoods to light rail - Light rail to airport - No auto bridge over American River - Use #2 Light Rail Ped/Bike Bridge - Financing permitting – light rail to airport and Roseville - Expand the express bus farther down to the West - #2 With light rail coming out of downtown to serve Natomas, but BRT to airport. Use \$ for neighborhood improvements/more local transit, bike/ped facilities - Increase light rail frequency - No light rail - East-West Movement between Hwy 80 to N 99 – Elkhorn Blvd. access through McClellan. - Light Rail to Sac International - Rocklin Hwy 65 to 99 Bypass - 80 – Bus 80 split - Straightening Marconi Curve - Congestion in Arden/Cal Expo Area -
MISC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very poor lighting and on video

SCORE CARD COMMENTS

Location: South Sac	
South Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amtrak service through Elk Grove (San Joaquin Line) - Add carpool lanes to 5 if possible - Carpool network on I-5 is desirable - \$\$ - Extend carpool lanes on I5 to Franklin Hood Road - Bike/walk trails - Extend I-5 carpool to Elk Grove - Increase security at light rail stations - Neighborhood shuttles to light rail stations - Diamond lane should be extended to Elk Grove Blvd on I5 - Bike trails – hiking/walking paths - Bike and horse trails - Extend carpool to Hood-Franklin on I-5 - Add carpool lane to Laguna Blvd/I-5 - #3 with add carpool lane to Laguna Blvd - I-5 HOV, SR 99 auxiliary lanes - Light Rail to College, Less BRT - Want carpool on I-5 - No BRT on ANY - No need to improve light rail to “10 minutes” (maybe 15-20 minutes)
EG-RC-ED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - #3 if we need to save money! - #1 No 4 lanes (2 lanes) from Bradshaw to Grantline Rd (only 2 - giant oak trees) - #1 Only 3 lanes from EG-Florin Rd to Bradshaw - Too many expanded roads in settled area E to W - Excelsior through Mather endangers sensitive vernal pool habitats - #2 Definitely protects the community of Sheldon - Improve Scott Road - \$\$\$ - Bike/walk trails - Extend the six lanes of White Rock Road all the way to Hwy 50 - Not sold on Connector project – does not seem justified for what it costs - From White Rock Road to Hwy 50 six lanes all the way - #2 diamond lane on I-5 needs to go farther south to Hood-Franklin - #1 okay but need more on Grantline all the way like in 3 - Bike and horse trails - I would like to see all of Grantline expanded as in #3 but I need expanded roads on Sheldon, Calvine and Bond as in #1 - Connection to 50 is good - #1 but no widening on certain roads (Sheldon). - Do not go through vernal pools at Mather
U.S. 50 Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - \$\$\$ - Need auxiliary lanes from Sunrise to Scott - Good balance of carpool (drive thru) and light rail (yeah) - I believe the city would benefit from the carpool lane being extended all the way to 99/80 - Add more of the light rail improvements from #1 to #2 - #3 Especially like 50/99 interchange - Constrain growth South of 50 near Bidwell Easterly.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve White Rock - Restrict growth south of Hwy 50 - Eliminate expansion on Green Valley Road - Expand Easton Valley Parkway to Sunrise
East Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - \$\$\$ - Include expanding Sunrise - Add widening How Avenue bridge to six lanes - Expand Sunrise also - Like expansion of Sunrise and Hazel to connect to I80 - Eliminate expansion on Foothills - Drop Howe Bridge expansion - Expand Sunrise - Add Howe Bridge expansion to #1
East I-80 Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No #2 - Considered #2 but believe good land use – job center will reduce need for hard rail. - Want light rail where the rail line is in #2 - \$\$\$ - Want more light rail
Hwy 65/So. Placer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Until Placer County is a self-help county (measure A), supporting high \$ projects will be difficult - Add new longer distance buses between North Watt & Foothill Blvd - Add bus service on a loop along Pleasant Grove, Industrial, Blue Oaks - Add buses between Foothill Blvd and North Watt
Sutter/Yuba Co	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - \$ - Add Bogue and new bridge as in #3 - Widen Bogue (housing to be moderated consistent with jobs)
Yolo Co to Sac	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - \$\$\$ - No new freeway west of Mace - Delete Bike replacement on 80 Causeway - Add Rebuilt I Street Bridge - I would like new street car added to #2 - #1 Make sure your levees are reinforced - Don't widen I-80 to Davis
North Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - \$\$\$\$ - Add pedestrian access to light rail bridge into Natomas - Take light rail over American River - #3 – recommend light rail bridge include pedestrian and bicycle accommodations - #2 without car pool lanes - #1 but do away with carpool
MISC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For all areas: more light rail – no carpool lanes. More parking at Public transit stations

SCORE CARD COMMENTS

Location: Yolo	
South Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Like diamond lane on I-5 & light rail to CR College - Ample bike amenities. Wide bike shoulders - Don't know the area well enough. - Again congestion due to I-5 traffic not addressed- ADD carpool lanes for traffic driving through region. - More freeway carpool - Statistics were best for one. - Add carpool lanes to I-5 - Concern about reality of getting Elk Grove folks out of their cars so favor a combined HOV and express transit access. - #3 Extend HOV & Cosumnes Blvd (or in #2) - Extending HOV to Cosumnes Blvd. - Extend HOV on 5 to consumens River - More roads are cooler, let's fix the busted road's man! This way buses can ride the roads that are good equality. - Option 1 - 2+ fly ramps off to Q on from P - Lower socioeconomic levels make public transportation options really attractive. Expand light rail to Elk Grove Blvd. - Add the I-5 carpool. - I do think I-5 needs carpool lanes. - Like the improved light rail - 3 is best choice. Would be nice to get new freeway carpool lane I-5 between US50& Cosumnes River Blvd. - B
EG-RC-ED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase Grant Line Rd. minimize internal roads (not yet developed) - But minimize new roads in unincorporated areas - Wide safe bike lanes - Fewer road expansions is good. - #1 kept high traffic parallel to US50 while #3 opened up whole areas to high speed routes. - #2 Restrict development to none open space results of new x line x. Buy farmland protection to x. - Limit the development along Grant Line corridor through conservation easements. - Conservation easement along Grant Line freeway to prevent development to east. - Restrict access; easement - Looks like more access for 3 is x equality of roads & train's a groovy thing man. Hook me up w/ free passes yo! - Add bike paths. - Option 3. Add bike paths. - Opion w/ tie into American River Bike trail. - Bike paths - 2 BRT Auburn-Folsom - Better transit to Med Center - Good ring road! - Except 6 lane on Sheldon the whole way - Like the grid

U.S. 50 Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I would want to expand diamond lane between Sacramento to El Dorado Hills - Please add wide bike lanes - #1 but streetcars should be deleted and money diverted to light rail - Delete aux lanes on US-50 - #2 but eliminate auxiliary lanes around Green Valley - Need to address I-5 congestion re: traffic driving through region like carpool & auxiliary lanes. - Use of auxiliary lanes to move freeway bound traffic off Howe, Watt & Sunrise - Improve interchange @ Sunrise & Hwy 50. Suttles from light rail to office complexes - Buses or light rail for Sunrise Blvd. - Resurfacing would be helpful. - Better address service street & river crossing. An example would be Watt Ave. - Real problem is: need for more bridges across the American River that is what congests US 50 corridor and the streets going north and south. - Need to address N-S surface street <i>issier</i> and congestion at major intersections - Serves Hill Country best - Improved light rail service and less money - Programs to encourage carpool implementation/use/<i>poulaasigation ex</i> + light rail options? - No streetcar - Concern that 99/50 interchange be improved. - I like light rail- expand it yo. I hate freeway expansion—too much CO2 in the air. Let’s see, free passes on rail trains- man commuters need to leave their SUV’s at home and walk to work or ride trains yo. I mean obesity is increasing . get the heck out of the cars guys, geeze! - Xx bike paths- that connect to transit stops. - Bike path. - Arterary bike paths tie into American river bike trail and transit - 3 serves most people best. - Better transit to Med Center - 1 is best choice - Carpool lanes are good but will mainly benefit skiers... - I but need HOV lanes, not aux lanes on US50. (Aux lanes east of EDH Blvd. doesn’t make sense anyway.) - But I like the light rail aspects of #2 can’t we increase service even a little? - Add improvement to the I-80/99 corridor on 50- carpool
East Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expand light rail; additional bridge needed - Wide safe bike lanes - #3 doesn’t address transit access & access to main routes that area required. - Light rail connection to American River College - Need another (ie new) bridge over river - Add new bridge between Watt & Sunrise across river. - I like 2. Why expand this street when you can light rail east to Greenback? 3 is the way to go my friends. It’s probably cheaper as well. - Bike paths - Bike paths - 2 would be best for mobility. Bike accesses to American River Parkway. - Better transit to Med Center
East I-80 Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I like the expansion of Greenback & Madison Rds. & I-5 - Wide safe bike lanes - I can’t speak to the value of new long distance busses but I am all for the rail expansion. - Delete Roseville Rd.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CHOICE- ABSTAINED- only had 2 minutes to decide. - This is already very congested! So, you need to spend the \$ to fix it! - The feasibility of the rail seems difficult; can it sustain itself? - Bus Rapid Transit is good. - More transit - Not too much need for expanded roads. - Expansion of Amtrak service along U-Pac. Trax in lieu of new trax. - II I but take out the streetcars - Train across the Valley (Rocklin-Davis, eg.) is an attractive option. - Take out streetcar - 3 is cool. 3 is my favorite number, seriously those maps look the same. - Parking & bike lockers at transit stations. - #2 additional bike parking - Parking & bike lockers at stations. - Better bus service to Med Centers, educational, entertainment & shopping; more rail for Yolo. - 2 is best choice to get railroad ridership. - Congestion decreases most w/ option 1. - I don't really like any of these options. - Think light rail or some rail is still a good idea along that corridor.
Hwy 65/So. Placer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wide safe bike lanes - CHOICE- ABSTAINED- only had 2 minutes to decide. - #3- too expensive and does the least to reduce congestion - <i>Redu ferry</i> - 3 is a good choice because it fixes roads & increases access to busses & rail facilities. As I scratch my head I think that 1 & 2 are horrible choices. - Include casino bus. - #1 w/ casino buses - Casino bus - 3 minus Whitney widening - Better transit to Med Centers. - Change streetcar to light rail - Why not extend Watt North rather than build disconnected Lincoln bypass freeway?
Sutter/Yuba Co	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wide safe bike lanes - Ran out of time - Add a bus on bogle bus on #1 - Chose this (#1) because it was this most logical - An area rapid transit should be considered for the future. Pleasanton did not grown until BART was added there. - Needs light rail or cable car. - Add streetcar between Yuba City & Marysville. - Bridge a necessity for Marysville & YC - Flood maps??!! - Concerned about growth-inducing effects of transportation investments - 3- Bogue bridge important - Add streetcar or light rail between Yuba City and Marysville. - 2's cool! Bridges are built, roads are connected, and there is some really cool access for low income who don't drive. We need to invest money into 3 my friends! 3, 3, 3! - Wheatland bypass and no road expansion through Wheatland. - #1 w/ Wheatland bypass - Wheatland bypass; no expansion in Wheatland.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2- no expansion within Wheatland; with Wheatland bypass. - Expanded bus service to Placer. - Add bus service to Placer. - Also expand bus service to South Placer Co. - Include Placer in expanded bus service. - Better transit to Med Centers. - None. - All of these scenarios worsened air quality ☹ More funds to this corridor. - Put all proposed bypasses into one big road that bypasses Wheatland, Lincoln, Yuba City, etc. - Build a single bypass from 99 xx Yuba City and Marysville linking to 70s of Marysville, then diagonally SE to Hwy 65 south of Lincoln.
Yolo Co to Sac	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I would prefer #1 with diamond lanes because it has more light rail/streetcar work in West Sac. - Streetcar Davis to Downtown Sac or Lt. Rail Davis to Downtown. - I'd choose #3. I would like expansion of light rail West Sac to Sac, not new trolley. I like the idea though of adding a diamond lane to I-80 & I like new interchange CR102 & Covell. I-5 & 113 not as important to me. - I would like to see a separate light rail/ rial line in regular (15-20 min) arrival departure times between Davis & Sac linked to scenario #1's streetcar system in addition to an expanded bypass freeway w/ carpool lanes. Also- light rail to Sac Airport & Arden Fair Mall area. - Add changes to Richards L/rail undercrossing. Add lanes to CR102 from I-5 to Covell. - As much funding for bicycle infrastructure or bus as possible. Light rail or bus connections to main rail line. - Remove streetcars & increase regional rail. - I would like to see a rail line from Davis to West Sacramento much like plan #2. - 2 + carpool lanes on causeway - Add carpool lanes between Davis & Sacramento to reduce the traffic between Bay Area & Tahoe on weekends. - Eliminate fixed bridges (unless pedestrian or alternative) and include streetcars (Sacto – W. Sac) - Some improvements to causeway (carpool, etc.) - Integrate carpool lane in to this scenario #2 - New rail line great for regional commute. But would like carpool lane for traffic going through region i.e. SF to Tahoe. - LRT system can be added on #3 with several stations between Davis & Sac. It's cheaper than rail but more efficiently. - Would prefer a hybrid of #2 & #3 Where is paratransit? - Specifically, our group wanted a hybrid between scenarios 2 & 3 because the rail in @ did not seem feasible but with modifications it would be great. - Keep streetcars, but increase Capitol Corridor and do not widen I-80. - Expand bus service to Winters. - More bus service in West Sac and buses from Davis to Winters. More streetcars in Sacramento. - I really dislike having three bundled choices, but would much prefer having an a la carte menu to choose from! - More light rail. - Add "trucks-only" lanes to I-80 Corridor - Separate bicycle & pedestrian (across the bypass) from the freeway. - Against new bridges across West Sac for vehicles.

- We need to make sure out lying cities like Vacaville, Fairfield, Dixon also become connected to the rail lines to avoid congestion on I-80. Connect it also to Yolo short line making a loop from Sacramento to Davis to Woodland to Sacramento.
- Additional bike paths between Yolo & Sacramento.
- I'd like to see a bike path along the rail line. I'd like to see a connection between the Yolo short line rail and rail to Davis. This has the potential to connect the whole county eventually by train.
- Need to add rail out to Solano County (Dixon, Vacaville). Add more bike lanes in Woodland, West Sac.
- Complete 113/I-5 interchange
- I do not think increased rail service will attract ridership. A new train system (technology) should be developed so that there is a time/speed increase (50 min will not attract ridership. Maybe 20-30 at most).
- Wise to assure that use of new rail line is supported with coordinated access from more satellite parking structures and shuttles to trains. Eg walk shuttles @ end destinations to employment areas- get people w/in ¼ to ½ mile of start & stop points.
- Information, cost and complexity of using rail line needs to be clear
- Be sure the 113/I-5 interchange is done; scenarios in *both* confusing; do not match *mar*
- Additions to rail service, temporal or physical. Increased bicyclist safety measures.
- Need bicycle route Davis to Sac away from causeway noise.
- We all favor interchange 113 & I-5 South. WE like increasing frequency commuter rail.
- Must have I-5/113 interchange. No streetcars- change with bus system.
- No widening of any roads except for highway carpool; more bike lane.
- Be careful regarding widening Richards Blvd. underpass on scenario #1
- I/we would've liked #1 if it added carpool lanes to I-80 & if it DID NOT widen Richards Blvd (the people voted it down in a BIG way—it's a NO GO).
- Table choice might have been #1 but not given option of eliminating bad individual features (ie widening Richards Blvd.)
- 2 need more information. (But still best option...)
- Really we would like to see significant increases in train service as well.
- Need #3's HOV expansion on I-80 causeway, with added trains on the Capitol Corridor during peak times.
- 3- More street car & public transit
- 3- scenario 1 widens Richards to 1st w/o proposing where cars go once they get to 1st. Bad idea! #2 did not explain how U.P. bottleneck (train) overcome.
- Leave out streetcar in West Sac
- Connect Davis with Dixon and rest of Solano County and then to the Bay area!
- Bike path along new rail line! Add non-stop bike lanes along all new rail lines/freeway lines.
- Bike path along rail line; cooperate w/ neighboring counties to connect the rail line.
- Concern of carpool lane in lieu of non-registered lanes.
- Free bus/train passes for students, low income & disabled to encourage ridership on trains and a new rail allows a tired employee or student to have a drink (Budweiser for instance on the train)
- Increase bicycle and motor vehicle parking at Davis & Sacramento tram stations.
- #2 bike parking & lockers at stations and streetcars in West Sac.
- #2 parking & bike lockers at stations.
- Parking and bike lockers at stations. West Sac streetcar.
- 3- Best use of \$\$. Group modified #2; streetcar in W. Sac.
- Add no new lane, but take one lane each way on I-80 and dedicate them to carpool.
- Take away a lane on I-80 and make a carpool lane.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Take one existing lane in each direction for carpools. More frequent and reliable than train service. - #2 press ahead w/ light rail to SMF. More incentives from transportation to work sector; take a lane to make a carpool each direction. - Access to bike paths b/t train track & freeway from central & east Davis- railroad undercrossing? - I don't necessarily see need for carpool lane. - Need more trains-more often-more affordable, expand more buses more accessibility - Change streetcar to light rail. - Balance the \$ going into \$2 (i.e. add \$ to level of at least #3) and use the extra \$\$ to #2 to develop more feeder buses going to train stations and to lower price of rail usages. - Move pedestrian access under I-5 - Best choice of 3 add life improvements to E. Chiles Road Mace to Causeway to Sac - 3 ok if add more trains on Sacto-Dixon corridor. Add station @ UCD! Lite rail service to Sacto & Bay area= > frequent and on weekend. Need connections from West Davis to streetcar lines – weekends as well as weekdays. Widen causeway as well for road travel. - #2 with new streetcar service to West Sacramento. A line and loop connecting W. Sac. And downtown Sac. - #3 w/ a possibility of adding rail service from Sac to Airport - 3+ But add rail to airport from the Del Paso end shown. - I like rail, more bus, streetcar in W. Sac- more focusing on I-80 - 1 (streetcar) + 2 (rail) +3 (carpool) = 5 - Transit from #1 Don't expand 80! - Vote #3. Like more streetcars in West Sac, tho & regional rail at the expense of a few road-widening projects. - I like more streetcar systems. - Increase in transit from Davis to Downtown Sac. - I would still like to see increased rail frequency – and I'm very concerned about the lack of bus service information. - Add the Davis-Sac rail line to scenario 3 & I would pick that. Or, add the I-80 carpool lane to scenario 2. - Yolo County I-5/113 interchange is crucial to Yolo County. - #2 more pedestrian improvements in Woodland where low income people live. - Connect outlying communities. <u>Davis.</u> - #2 I want better train service (direct) to Santa Ana/ Los Angeles.
North Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expand diamond lane I-5N to airport or like light rail between Del Paso & Downtown Sac. Don't need diamond lane between Woodland & Airport. - Consider taking light rail away from airport and directing it toward dense development. - Carpool lanes on 99, not regular ones! - Scenario #2- and add carpool lane from scenario 2 up Hwy 99 North. - Light rail to airport - Carpool lane on SR-99 please - Again congestion due to I-5 through region traffic not addressed- ADD carpools. - Addition of bridge to Downtown-Natomas - Consider adding bridge for cars from Downtown to Natomas right by the train bridge. - We think rail will get more people off the road. - Add bike access over American River at I-5 when Discover Park <i>under xx.</i> - The rapid bus system without transfer to Sacramento should increase ridership. - Favor direct access to airport to downtown. - #1 cost less and achieve similar results with #3 - <u>No</u> expansion of reg. Freeway lanes, no new bridge. Replace w/ carpool lane conversions.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Better bike route from airport to Natomas to Downtown Sac. - No widening of any roads except for highway carpool; more bike lane. - #1 helps the greatest # of people and shares the wealth to x x 5! The tables said #2, but I feel #1 is the choice that helps Rio Linda and provides the most relief to I-5 congestion. - I like the added bridge between I-5 & 16. - HOV all the way to airport. - Bike lane along rail line. - Doesn't address I-5 concerns, though. - 1 is the way to go because it just is! - Add bike lanes to light-rail bridge across American River. - Bike paths & over the bridge. - Add bike lanes w/ light rail route. - Bike lane on bridges w/ new rail. - Bikes on LRT/BRT bridge. - Create carpool lanes by taking existing lanes. - Provide bike access across American River when Discovery Park is flooded. - Need for more carpool lanes. - Better transit to Med Centers. - None. - Best choice of 2. add new/ expanded bridge downtown to Natomas as shown in #1 - Prob: need to make public transit convenient or people won't use it. In W. Davis, you can't get to pub. Transit on weekend anyway, so it's a moot point. - #3 Airport to Sac rail service - Light rail good. No one will transfer to BRT to airport. But LRT will serve Natomas. - More light rail & TOD all around.
MISC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Despite real cost shown, there should be heightened concern about the long-term hidden costs to society from unhampered, unrestricted reliance on the automobile. Therefore the large \$\$ scenarios may be small \$\$ in the long run (35 years). - I think people are more likely to use rail than buses. Good long term investment to serve population. Carpool lanes increase congestion in all other lanes except those in carpool lane. Bus service would be better than carpool lanes.

SCORE CARD COMMENTS

Location: Yuba & Sutter Counties	
South Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would like to see more car pool and road widening throughout - Do something about the I-5 interchange to 50 and 80
EG-RC-ED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to connect Grantline at Sunrise - Go through Sheldon not around - No Hov
U.S. 50 Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - None are acceptable - None are acceptable - No Hov
East Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HWY 80/50 Connector - Make the Government open Folsom Dam
East I-80 Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We like the rail - Direct Interchange at Foothills/Cirby/I-80 - Rail is good - We like the rail. Rail is good. - Extend light rail east - Keep it cheap and effective
Hwy 65/So. Placer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good (#1) - #2 Less money plus it works for the goals - No Hov - Need to add lanes to 99 – up to 4 to 5. It's only 2 now. - Widening of Hwy 99 below Placer Parkway will be needed to accommodate increased traffic - Potential usage of light rail - Add regional rail - Regional rail - Add rail - The third plan will have to be done eventually anyway - Placer Parkway crucial to Measure M in Sutter Co - Consider adding interchanges to Lincoln bypass instead of at-grade intersections that are currently proposed - Glad all scenarios have Lincoln Bypass – is much needed - Put money to 3rd Bridge! Even if it is placed South of Bogue. A must! -
Sutter/Yuba Co	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add 3rd Bridge at Bogue - 113 interchange at 99 - Add bus down Hwy 65 - Bike lane over Bogue & Bridge St Bridge - Bike lanes and trees on all improved roads - No Hov – Put in Bypass - Hwy 99 – 4 lanes - 3rd Bridge may have to go South of Bogue Rd to Barry Rd - Use Bond money for bridges - Add Bogue Road Bridge - Add Bypass 65 to 20 (Not 20 to 70 North) - Delete Marysville Bypass - Hwy 65/Hwy 20 Connector linking Nevada Co to Roseville and Third Bridge - Bypass in Wheatland to 4 lanes

- 4 lane bypass around Marysville
- 2-4 lane connection from Hwy 20 to Hwy 65 between FarWest lake and Beale
- We need a third bridge
- Put in bridge between bogue & Eule Road and have the bypass through to Lomo crossing
- Marysville ByPass added to #1
- #3 is just right
- I would like to see Proposition spent for structures – 3rd ridge in Yuba/Sutter county
- Instead of widening 120th & 5th Street bridges, add 3rd Bridge at Bogue (also slow traffic in Marysville-Arboga corridor)
- I like Bogue Bridge Expand
- Add Wheatland Bypass
- 3rd Bridge
- Wheatland bypass 4 lanes
- Connect Lincoln bypass to Wheatland bypass
- Add Buses
- Build Bridges
- Add 3rd Bridge to #1
- Add Bus Transit to #3
- Personal choice #3 with transit service on Hwy 65
- #3 with added bus service on SR 65 to Lincoln/Roseville
- Add Third Bridge #3
- Use Prop monies for 14th and change third bridge (#2)
- Like to see improvements and widening on Hwy 65
- Please pay attention to the great City of Live Oak
- Pay attention to Live Oak. Need to fund bridges
- Wheatland bypass is critical. No 4 lanes through the City.
- We need regional rail
- Rail – regional
- Don't favor 3rd bridge unless its included in a Highway 20 bypass to north. Spend bond funds on major structures and elements
- Add the township road bypass of Yuba City
- #3 will eventually have to be done – cheaper now
- Include township road bypass of Yuba City
- Redce the longer distance DIs roads
- Township Road Bypass for Yuba & Sutter County
- Township Road Bypass for Sutter Co –Yuba City Area
- Interchange north of Wheatland Bypass
- Build Bridges to cross the river and roads will come
- Use proposition money to build bridges
- Possible to build the new bridges over the river in the floodplain to reduce costs. Could still be used majority of time.
- Use proposition money to build the big ticket items, ie bridges and bypasses!
- Wheatland Bypass should not be restricted to only to the east side; that would require two overpasses over the railroad.
- New Yuba River and Feather River should consider crossing only the season river and not the entire floodplain to keep economically viable but usable 99% of time.
- Marysville Bypass Very desirable and Wheatland Bypass
- I'd add interchanges through Yuba City on Hwy 99 to alleviate stop and go traffic on a major highway.
- Third Bridge necessary.
- 99 Lincoln to Pease 6 lanes with interchanges

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Where 113 comes into 99 we need interchange - Pease Rd/99 Interchange - Use Proposition Money on new bridge and Hwy 113 interchange - #3 has the best design for future growth concerns. Must have bypass and Third Bridge - We want bridges and bypasses - Would also like to see interconnected streets, bike and pedestrian trails and tree lined medians and street scaping - On a regional basis, add a 3rd bridge to the plan. Public safety in the event of a flood for evacuation - The third bridge is the critical need in Yuba-Sutter. It will greatly decrease the bottleneck in both counties – especially Marysville - Concerned with cost of crossing railroad twice in the East Bypass of Wheatland - Proposition Bond money should be used for bridges and interchanges as a priority. The third river bridge crossing is vital - “Scenic” bypass east of Beale from Hwy 20 to 65 - Four lane bypass east of Marysville - Hwy 99 from Lincoln Road to Pease Road with Interchanges to 6 lanes. Need interchange at 99/113 - Freeway through Marysvielle – then Beckworth Park. - Freeway to Hwy 70 north of Marysville - 3 Do it now!! - Hwy 99 Lincoln to Pease - Interchange 113 & Hway 99 – 6 lanes - 3rd Bridge - Wheatland bypass – 4 lanes - No one rides the bus - 20/99 interchange - Option 2 – Eliminate Marysville Bypass, add Wheatland bypass - Add 3rd Bridge to all options - Add 3rd Bridge from Yuba Co to Sutter county - Add 3rd Bridge South of Marysville/Yuba City - New expanded roads Wheatland/Hwy 65 bypass 4 lanes - MSV 1/Hwy 65 - Windfall money from propositions go to big ticket items – bridge & interchanges – not piecemeal projects.
Yolo Co to Sac	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - East Nicholas needs help - Add more express bus routes - I like carpool lanes from #3 and Regional Rail expansion from #2 - Add Rail to #1 - New interchange needed between 113/I-5 to avoid surface streets - Regional Rail excellent idea - We like the rail - Eliminate new/expanded bridges - Incorporate Streetcars as in #1 - Combine 2 and 3 - I would like to see 1 and 2 combined - I like Scenario 1 but would like to add the rail line
North Sac County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add Freeway Improvements on I-5 from I-80 to Airport - No Car Pool Lanes - No Hov - Save Money, Dump light rail - Don’t want to see carpool lanes. According to our CHP member, they are not eeffective.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Light rail to airport wouldn't be effective. Put money elsewhere - Eliminate the carpool lanes - Light rail potential. Where is the money to build? - Rail included to airport from downtown - #1 but no carpool lane South of I-80 & 5 cross - Extend rail to airport - Take light rail to airport - Light rail should extend to airport - Carpool on Hwy 5 could be difficult - Light rail should extend in all features - Light Rail should be all the way to the airport – any scenario - Light rail too expensive - We must complete the carpool lane system - Bridge over American River and Truxel - Elverta interchange will be inept.
MISC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use the Prop money for 3rd Bridge, interchanges (the major expenses) - Use Proposition money 1E to pay for major interchanges and bridges - Use bonds to improve bridge infrastructure - Use bond/proposition money for high ticket construction in Yuba/Sutter – 3rd Bridge (Yuba City) Nicolas Bridge – 113 interchange at 99 - Sutter & Yuba Counties: Use bond money recently voted for High Ticket items (eg bridge) in our area - Use money from the recently approved state transportation bond for high ticket items like a third feather river bridge, highway 99/113 interchange, East Nicolaus Bridge for Highway 20 and Nicolaus Bridge for 99. - Use Bond money from recently voted for High ticket items such as more bridges in our area to bypass the towns - Bond proposition money for the Bridges (all three) and 113 and 99 Interchange in Yuba and Sutter area - In the past 25 years, traffic volumes have increased greatly in the SACOG region. Most cities have received some infrastructure improvements (i.e. new Lake Natomas bridge for Folsom Hwy 65 Bypass of Roseville, planned Hwy 65 bypass of Lincoln). There have been <u>no</u> improvements in Marysville, while truck traffic (hauling aggregate to develop other communities in the SACOG area) has grown significantly. It's time (actually, long past) for effective improvements in Marysville! - Use the windfall money we have for large ticket items such as 3rd Bridge and 113/99 Interchange – the road upkeep can be done in smaller sections. - Windfall money – use for “big ticket” items (3rd bridge and 113 interchange) - Convert railcrossing at 5th Street to Bicycle Crossing - Use Prop money from ballot which is a windfall. Use it for high dollar items 3rd bridge, Nicholas Bridge and 113/99 interchange.