

### **Attachment 3**

#### **Downtown/Natomas/Airport Study Public Workshop Comments Wednesday, November 13, 2002**

The Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT) held a public workshop for the Downtown/Natomas/Airport (DNA) Study on Wednesday, November 13, 2002 at Natomas High School from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Over 200 members of the public attended as RT/Consultant/City/County staff walked the public through twelve informational stations. David Melko, RT DNA Project Manager, Councilmember Tretheway and Supervisor Dickinson each made brief presentations thanking the public for attending the workshop and encouraging public involvement.

The summary includes a list of workshop attendees and verbatim comments submitted by workshop attendees on comment cards and on easels pads of papers positioned at the North Natomas, South Natomas and American River Parkway workshop informational stations.

DNA Public Workshop verbatim comments submitted by attendees:

### **Comment Cards supporting the Truxel Road Alignment**

- I want to thank you for holding this meeting. I feel much more informed about the proposed light rail system. I came to the meeting fully against the proposal going up Truxel. I am now swaying from that decision. I think that if this is done properly (by involving the community in the planning process) it may be a good thing for the Natomas community.
- I have lived in the Natomas area for 16 years, 15 years in South Natomas and 1 year in North Natomas. I grew up riding buses/LRV's in San Francisco. I strongly feel you need to bring mass transit to where people live and to places they go (stores, movies, libraries, and jobs). People live around Truxel and places on Truxel are destinations. I would use light rail on Truxel, but I would have no use for light rail on I-5. If I'm on I-5, I'm already in my car and I'm not going to get out for light rail. Anyway, people like me have a choice about how to get around. What about our teenagers, seniors and others who don't have the option of driving? We'd do them a great disservice by not using the Truxel route. Let's not sell them short.
- I support an alignment on Truxel. I feel strongly that a light rail alignment should be convenient for the residents of South Natomas to be an effective means of transportation.
- Truxel Road route will serve South Natomas best but I'm concerned about an increase in noise on Truxel especially from buses.
- We've waited 10 years for transit. Bring it down Truxel so I can use it to go downtown.
- I am very supportive of public transit. Light rail is a preferred option, but must be accompanied by a complete system of feeder public transit. There should be neighborhood shuttles for short trips and feeder buses for longer feeder routes. Parking for private auto's should be minimized to encourage use. Bus Rapid Transit should be considered for longer routes. Light Rail Stations and bus stops should be made more "user friendly" with good shade, landscaping, and adequate seating. Transit Oriented Design should be implemented at all light rail stations. Transit facilities should emphasize connectivity and multi-modal services. The best alignment for the DNA line is the Truxel Road route. It will result in the greatest ridership. The LRT crossing of the American River Parkway should be designed to minimize visual/aesthetic impact. A station should be considered for the Parkway. Use longer spans and "natural" appearing architectural treatment. Insert the existing Historic Depot should be a true "user friendly" multi-modal transportation center.

- The LRT alignment along Truxel Road would provide the people of North and South Natomas with an excellent alternative mode of transportation. Providing energy efficient transportation is the right, responsible thing to do. Please hold firm to the planning that has been done and retain the Truxel Road alignment. I live off Truxel Road and I want my property values to INCREASE with LRT on Truxel Road - it will!
- I like Truxel route/alignment. Please, in design review add enough shade tree and on benches for the comfort of the riders. If you are going to utilize land around Arco, then build around as a sports complex and provide feeder buses to the Arena.
- We strongly support the Truxel route proposal. It makes no sense to by pass heavy residential, commercial and businesses. To establish the DNA route in either of the other two proposals would severely limit ridership.
- Light rail along the Truxel right of way out to the Airport is long over due. Our only concern is that construction from San Juan and Truxel to the Airport will not begin this year! We support light rail to the airport and a rapid rail link from the Sacramento Airport to the San Francisco Airport to make Sacramento Airport a viable landing option - more rail is better.
- The Truxel Route is consistent with the community plans and city general plan. That route will also have the highest ridership. Property owners have also made significant investments based on that alignment. The I-5 alternative is not needed.
- I support the Truxel alignment because I believe that it will provide better transit service to the Natomas area. Routing LRT along I-5 would be a waste compared to the benefits of the Truxel alignment. LRT vs. BRT: I'd like to learn more about the trade-offs associated with each. At this point, LRT seems to be a more attractive option especially if Sacramento is looking to be an 'international' city. LRT seems to carry a more urban feel or nostalgia (for me). Thanks for sharing!
- The light rail alignment down Truxel still appears to me to be the superior choice. It would maximize ridership, minimize cost, and align with the community plan. It has been studied for many years, and continues to be the best alternative. The other choices all seem to have major drawbacks and issues that the Truxel alignment does not.
- I live in Natomas Park Development and I fully support the Truxel alignment of LRT. One of the reasons we purchased our home was that there would be a LRT Line near our home. We were told that light rail was in the Master Plan and that it would be coming to the area via Truxel. Keep up the good work.
- My wife and I were the first residents at Natomas Park and one of the major selling points in choosing that neighborhood was the proposed light rail line stop

at the Town Center. We strongly support the Truxel alignment and look forward to taking light rail to work downtown. Thank you for your hard work developing this project.

- I support light rail on Truxel - but not the widening to 40', share route/lane with autos. Truxel to the airport through new Town Center is a must.
- Natomas desperately needs frequent transit service as an auto alternative. Truxel alignment is the only one that is viable, consider BRT as an interim service becoming a feeder service once rail is built. Neighborhood concerns include public awareness of:
  - a) the DNA line itself
  - b) what real opportunities there are for public input.
- Please frame the public process around what we can actually influence about this project--get something besides the alignment out for discussion. For example, how we can make the stations nicer than the Alkali Flat and Globe Stations--these are big concerns.

#### **Comment Cards Opposing the Truxel Road Alignment:**

- I've lived in South Natomas for 18+ years. There was no RT plan ever mentioned when I chose to live here. Saginaw Circle exit on Truxel is a nightmare NOW! Light rail will make it impossible for 70+ households in Saginaw to navigate traffic on Truxel. If light rail is imposed on top of this horrible traffic situation, I dread to think of the results! It would add more crime, disturbances (I'm familiar with the Arden - Del Paso mess!) as well as noise and an impossible traffic situation. People going to Natomas Marketplace and other stores will still DRIVE! They can't carry bags of purchased items onto a train. And property values will go way down - are you trying to create another Northgate?
- I would like to make an appointment about the concerns I have about light rail and the possibilities of Truxel and I-5 routes. When I went to the Natomas meetings concerning the issues and walked around to discuss my concerns, it appeared as if the representatives were there to defend their possible discussion and were ready to have quick "come backs" to oppose the community member's concern. I thought we were going to be heard and our comments and concerns would be addressed to taken into consideration. Please contact me.
- I live on Rocky Bend Drive approximately 1/2 block from Truxel. I currently ride RT to work on a daily basis using the globe station on Del Paso Boulevard. I prefer the I-5 option for RT to Airport. Truxel is already too congested and I'm concerned about real estate values if the Truxel Road options is chosen (I'm in the RE profession for Caltrans). As you can see from my own current use of RT

(and others I know in the Natomas area) we still take RT even if it is not within walking distance. Please choose the I-5 option. Thank you.

- I think it would be great to have light rail from downtown to the airport but through I-5 not Truxel. I-5 does not disrupt any residential communities or the American River/Discovery Park. I-5 is more accessible for residents southwest of I-5 and is a more direct feasible route. I live near Truxel and will sell my house if this goes by here. I will not wait for the noise, vagrants, traffic, low property values, etc. I did not know a train was going by here when I bought my house. Truxel is already far too congested. Garden Highway would more than meet the need for access and would not congest an already disruptive traffic.
  - Why disrupt a reasonably quiet and settled neighborhood with light rail down the middle of Truxel? Why light rail to the airport? Who (how many) would actually benefit? If the City feels light rail needs to be in the Natomas area, they run it along I-5 following to I-80 and then on out toward Roseville. Use buses to the airport for the workers. Purely no one believes a TRAVELER with luggage would use light rail! NOT down Truxel, period.
  - I have big concerns about the LRT going down Truxel Road on South Natomas. Truxel Road is already heavily used. Also, I strongly feel that it would be detrimental to the appearance of the neighborhood. Why wreck a residential neighborhood, when another route can be designed that detours residential streets. I can't imagine seeing stations so close to home. I cringe to think it might be anywhere near the appearance of Arden/Del Paso. Why not run it up I-5, or the hybrid alternative?
  - We do not agree with the light rail going down Truxel. We feel the light rail would take away from our neighborhood environment. We also have a concern the light rail stations would bring vagrants into the area. Another concern is the light rail stations will be too accessible for the students who attend the high school. Our ultimate vote is not to have the light rail lines or station down Truxel Road.
  - I don't live on Truxel Road, however, if I did I would certainly be outraged by this proposal. Not only is traffic on Truxel already congested, I would not want to look out my window and see the train go by. I believe that most of the people that live on the west side of Natomas already own transportation and would not be willing to give up this freedom. I would think the Northgate proposal would be more fiscally feasible as it would cost less to tie directly into the Del Paso line. As for the airport, I understand the need, however myself I would not utilize this. If this line were to run in front of Mayor Fargo's home would her home not be de-valued by this?
1. Would prefer the alternative alignments rather than the Truxel alignment. Simply ask yourself, would you like a line down your street where you live?

2. Has a traffic study been completed for Truxel with the RT line. Truxel has a large number of staggered intersections and a lot of school kids between Garden Highway and I-80. Are you seriously going to put crossing arms lights and warning bells all this way along Truxel in the middle of a residential area.

3. Natomas High School presents a major safety concern. Take a drive through here during a.m. peak hour. How will safety be addressed?

4. The existing intersection of Truxel and the Marketplace is already acceptable. The RT line will have to be elevated over this intersection to make it work. (I would like to see your traffic numbers for this intersection).

- I agree to connect city and airport but why do you have to go through residential area? Just connect city and airport. No light rail on Truxel Road. My family don't want light rail there. We don't have any use for it.
- I am opposed to an RT line going up Truxel through South Natomas. I favor the I-5 alternative or a hybrid route (I-5/I-80 Truxel in North Natomas).
- My main concern is congestion with Truxel Road. In the past 5 years, the traffic has been increased tremendously. We do not need to add LRT to the mix. We need to improve the existing service from the Downtown. Not lay more tracks. "No" to LRT to Airport. I-5/I-80 is a better alternative to the Airport.
- I do not think that Truxel Road is where light rail should come down. I think I-5 to I-80 to Truxel Road north is a better choice. You have over 40 homes on Truxel Road and parking will be a real problem.
- As a very concerned homeowner in South Natomas near Truxel, I wish to express my displeasure with the Truxel Road route (LIGHT RAIL) proposal. My cul-de-sac and my property values will go down the drain, as well as my family's safety. I am sure you have heard all of the arguments. Please! "No" on Truxel light rail. P.S. Have RT attempt to improve its bus schedules and see if that doesn't help?
- I strongly oppose RT alignment on Truxel Road. It is already extremely congested, and I feel that light rail would only add to the confusion. I also believe that property values would adversely be affected. Truxel Road between West El Camino and San Juan Road is mostly residential, and most of us residents want to keep it peaceful. Another concern is crime if a different element of commuters come into our area. PLEASE align with the freeway.
- My name is Paul Herguth. I am a husband and father of three who only two months ago, purchased my first home 1600 Vallarta Circle at the corner of Truxel. I had no knowledge of a plan to build light rail on Truxel Road. I am very concerned about my property value decreasing if this plan is enacted. What are the other possible routes? Do I have any means by which I can work to

change this plan? I-5 alignment?

- I disagree with light rail through Truxel Road on South Natomas because traffic congestion will increase and will be unsafe for students coming and going to schools. We're a small community, everything is close by and we don't need a massive rail system.
- I came tonight to protest the route of taking RT down Truxel Road South and North Natomas. There is no room, the traffic is very bad now. It would hurt our apartment complex that is on Truxel (Natomas Village Apartments). We already have to pick-up trash for the bus stop now. I am not happy with the trash on the curbs, because it is not good for future renters. We were told the High School would be no trouble. Before it was built. What a JOKE! We always have trouble with kids on a daily basis. Please ask the residents of the route down Truxel before it's a done deal.
- I say "Hell No." Leave Truxel alone, we have enough traffic now. How many homes will be lost in the area as a result of "light rail" plowing through our neighborhood, slicing it in half. Where light rail has gone in the past has been through business areas, not tearing into stable communities. Again, I say "Hell No."
- I, Kristina Martinez, don't agree to put a light rail on Truxel Avenue. First of all, I live in Natomas Village Apartments and my apartment is on the street of Truxel, I would not appreciate a light rail 10 feet away from my bedroom. Second of all, I also work at Natomas Village, putting a light rail here will bring not so clean people around and more trouble to our complex. Once again, I don't agree with this.
- I believe the best route put forth is the I-5 corridor path. I live 3 blocks off of Truxel Road. The addition of light rail along Truxel will diminish the quality of life for the residents of this area. Truxel Road corridor has already become noisier, more polluted and dangerous, with regard to traffic. Light rail will also make our neighborhood visually more unattractive. I also feel the added presence will possibly default from the value of my home and immediate neighborhood. I also don't want the added presence of transient traffic passing through my neighborhood. The I-5 route is also less expensive to build. I'm also worried about added crime as a result of having light rail travel through our neighborhood. I will fight any and all attempts to run the transit through our neighborhood. (Truxel)
- After reviewing your alternatives, I am in favor of the I-5 option only. I live near Truxel (within 1/4 mile) and am strongly against the changes that would occur in my neighborhood if the transit goes down the Truxel corridor. We have already endured the increase in noise level and traffic that has dramatically reduced the appeal of this neighborhood being a quality area for families and children, as

well as an increase in safety concerns for children, pedestrians, bicyclists, joggers, etc. It was a nice family neighborhood, and we are desperately trying to hold on to that appeal. The addition of transit down Truxel would only make the situation worse.

- Thank you for the workshop last evening regarding the DNA transit alternative study. Here are my opinions:
  1. I do support rapid transit and attend all scoping meetings of which I am made known.
  2. I am opposed to light rail down Truxel, for the following reasons:
    - Safety
    - Noise
    - Aesthetics
    - Crime
    - Traffic
  3. I would support light rail along I-5 with feeder buses, shuttles, etc. and think the link to and from the airport is paramount.
  4. I am interested in your outcome studies comparing bus rapid transit, as that is another option I would support.
- I support the I-5/I-80/Truxel Road Light Rail Alignment. This alternative will minimize the noise impacts within the South Natomas community, while providing valued transit services to the North Natomas community and shopping (I.e. Market Place, North Natomas Town Center, etc.). More importantly, with a multitude of apartments on Truxel between I-80 and Del Paso Boulevard, the North Natomas community had light rail in mind during its planning process. I do not support the Truxel or I-5 alignment. In regards to the light rail alignment on Truxel, right-of-way may be limited between El Camino and Truxel. Moreover, the social and noise impacts to the houses along the corridor may be significant. The I-5 alignment will not benefit the South or North Natomas community. With this alignment, the majority of people will still have to depend on their cars, because light rail will not be in close proximity to homes or apartments within the corridor. Besides, is there right-of-way available for park and ride lots and/or light rail stations along the I-5 corridor? To my knowledge, these projects are not in any of Caltrans short or long range plans. The I-5 light rail alignment is a perfect example of reactive planning. The individuals that proposed this alignment are concerned with the value of their homes, instead of the welfare of the community. In short, in my opinion, light rail via I-5/I-80/Truxel from Downtown to the Airport will benefit the North and South Natomas. It may not benefit a few individuals. However, it will provide a COMMUNITY BENEFIT. Besides, adding light rail lines within the Natomas community will lessen the dependency of cars and improve the air quality in the Sacramento region.

- **Members of the Regional Transit Board of Directors, Mayor Heather Fargo, Councilmember Ray Tretheway, County Supervisor Roger Dickinson: I strongly object to the construction of a light rail line along the Truxel Road route bridging Discovery Park. I agree that there is need for a route from downtown Sacramento to the Sacramento Airport. I support working with the state and federal authorities to obtain a right of way up I-5 to I-80 and Truxel or an alternative that would route light rail down Northgate Boulevard and across the existing bridge to link with already existing rails to Richards Boulevard. However, the division of an existing neighborhood by a light rail line when these other, more appropriate routes are available is inexcusable and demonstrates a direct disregard for the well being of an established neighborhood. The introduction of this route would subject the South Natomas area to further deterioration of the neighborhood as a lovely place to live and enjoy proximity to Downtown amenities. Light rail will:**
  - a) **increase congestion along Truxel Road and increase safety hazards to an unacceptable level for those walking or biking to neighborhood amenities such as the Library, Community Center and Natomas High School.**
  - b) **Change the character of Truxel Road from a thoroughfare allowing access to residential neighborhoods and neighborhood amenities to a through-route from one region of the city to another.**
  - c) **Create by implication a further extension of the mentality that says “right side of the tracks and freeway” when considering desirability and neighborhoods. While intangible, this attitude is already rampant as North Natomas and its needs overshadow the existing neighborhoods of South Natomas. This route will open the door to South Natomas for the blight already being experienced along Northgate Boulevard.**
  - d) **Introduce an acceptable visual element into the heart of South Natomas. No matter how many public art projects and trees are planted, light rail is not a beautification project.**
  - e) **Bring strangers and transients along with an increased opportunity for a rise in crime and burglary in the heart of what is an exceptionally safe area.**
  - f) **Decrease the desirability and visually blight Discovery Park, the jewel of the South Natomas neighborhood.**
  - g) **Destroy the peace and quiet of our neighborhood as trains clatter along the tracks every 7 minutes (15-minute schedule in each direction).**
  - h) **Materially damages property along the route and within earshot of trains.**

**I wish to notify the board and elected officials that not once, ever, in 11 years of**

residence have I been contacted the by South Natomas Neighborhood Association which suppose to speak for me and my neighbors. Furthermore, when I attempted to contact them I was ignored. This organization does not speak for me or the more than \$1,500.00 in taxes I pay each year.

I am offended that I was told by all three elected officials many months ago that the Truxel Road route was "it." They suggested that I look at existing light rail routes and see how lovely they appear. I have looked and I am appalled. I do not wish to live near such a "lovely amenity." I reject them out of hand as having no place along the only route into and out of my small neighborhood.

The RT Board of Directors as well as my elected officials must stand up for my neighborhood and quality of life. I strongly urge you to choose a route that does not impact anyone's peace and quiet but utilizes existing routes to accomplish light rail from Downtown to North Natomas to the Airport.

- I oppose having light rail on Truxel. We are very congested now. The extra bus traffic to support light rail will bring more noise and traffic. This is a nice residential area light rail will bring in undesirable element and drop property values. Truxel is not wide enough to support light rail, cars, buses and light rail stations. The I-5/I-80 route is more desirable.
- I strongly oppose to having light rail come down Truxel. It is far too congested now. We also have many children who walk along Truxel making it dangerous for them. This is a residential neighborhood - we don't need the undesirable element this will bring! Crime and burglary will increase, property values will go down!! I can see a mass exodus of the area if this is approved. The I-5/I-80, Truxel route is much more desirable.
- Why in the world would you want to put a regional transit system on street (Truxel) that has increasing traffic each year? This proposal would only cause Natomas Village Apartments to lose business and residents as well. Increasing the traffic and also bringing in more trespassers that would loiter and vandalize our property. This would cause a loss of tenants and we would also experience job layoffs and/or pay cuts. Perhaps the best solution is an alternative route somewhere else, like I-5 or something from downtown that goes from I-5 to Airport.
- If hybrid route is used, provide adequate parking at key rail stations so that South Natomas residents can use it for commute Downtown if to airport.
- If you decide to choose light rail, go I-5 to Truxel by North Natomas. I am a long time bus rider, women feel safer on buses than on rail and most transit riders are women. I would prefer bus rapid transit (BRT). BRT costs about 1/3 of light rail and could be done fast with more flexibility and could add to the current bus system.
- Have LRT go down Highway 50 then I-80 then Truxel.

### **Comment Cards Regarding the American River Parkway Crossing:**

- Protect American River Parkway by using I-5 crossing or eastern most crossing (by cement plant).
- If there is going to be a new bridge across the American River, it should be next to the existing I-5 bridge. If a particular alignment cannot work with this, the alignment should be rejected.
- 1. I-5 route over American River - less of an eyesore or link with 7th Street to ease Downtown construction.
  2. Up Truxel to Natomas Park Town Center.
  3. Over Meister Road.
  4. To Airport.Great job - thanks for the opportunity to learn!

### **General Comments:**

- If you want everyone's comments, you should send these forms out to the communities that are directly affected by the alternatives, particularly North and South Natomas.
- Kindly include me in the EIR Distribution. I am very interested in police presence and increases in it when light rail comes in.
- Nice information stations. Friendly speakers!
- Why all the fuss? Since there is no money available now for light rail or fancy bus service out to the airport-nor will there be for quite some time. Why not just run an hourly bus from the AMTRAK station now-plain regular service until there is money available. At least then Sacramento International Airport will have some kind of service into town. Run a bus out Truxel. No muss or fuss! Surely there are a few buses available now. Why not try it?

### **North Natomas Area Station Comments:**

Focus meeting on North and South Natomas impacts. Residents concerns and issues.

- Have LRT go down Highway 50 to I-80 then Truxel (alternative).
- Use of existing transportation corridors is the best option.
- San Juan --> north on Truxel then up I-5 to Airport. Use the corridor, as proposed.

- Connect LRT along Del Paso Road and I-5 instead of Truxel Road.
- Please have LRT running along Truxel Road.
- What lanes will be used if LRT are going to be used on Truxel Road?
- Increased crime rates? Would like to see LRT running on Truxel Road.
- All plans need shuttle service from residential areas to the station.
- As a user, I feel more comfortable walking through a residential area to use LRT.
- Concern that LRT is not going to Truxel, would like LRT to go to Truxel!
- LRT on Truxel would be convenient and easy for me to access from my home in South Natomas.
- LRT through Natomas should reduce more vehicle traffic.
- Taking LRT to work from Truxel would save parking costs from Downtown.
- Favor the hybrid from I-5 to I-80, to Truxel and Airport.
- Does not like to see LRT go through South Natomas.
- Like the freeway idea.
- LRT would exacerbate traffic problems on Truxel.
- I live on Truxel and my home has been vandalized twice, I do not wish LRT to be on Truxel.
- Have LRT stay on I-5.
- Need better ways to get in and out of North Natomas.
- Will there be LRT coming from Yolo to Downtown?
- What about the aesthetics? (RT going up to Truxel is going along businesses except for the last 3 blocks before Del Paso, where apartments are being built) People in this community does not like the look of LRT.
- Not opposed to LRT, would support LRT along I-5, and is better for West Natomas.
- Need LRT on Truxel to connect North and South and offer real alternative to SOV - I-5 route would kill the project.

- Support LRT on Truxel and the way to Airport. It would be great for our neighborhood. I live three blocks from Truxel.
- 3 North Natomas residences bought their house because they were told LRT were coming. Therefore, if South Natomas does not want LRT, then put that section on I-5. Since most residents go to jobs along I-5 and Downtown.
- The majority of North Natomas residents had no idea LRT would be coming down Truxel.
- The LRT for Truxel is the heart of the North Natomas plan, has been that way for 10 years. Since RT first planned it.
- All land in North Natomas has already been mapped with row dedication for original alignment if RT has to buy new alignment, it would be too expensive to build. Won't get federal funding to buy the alignment.
- Prefer Truxel to ensure adequate ridership.
- How would the final routes be decided on?
- Does not feel safe to have LRT so close to residential areas.
- The obvious solution for the DNA line is buses. If the routes do not work, it can be changed.
- Oppose to the line going through the park. Will have a lot of resistance.
- Many people want to support rapid transit. The most agreement would be I-5 behind the Marketplace along Arco Arena and north to the Airport.
- Truxel is currently very crowded, LRT would make it worst.
- Truxel offer a sense of connection with the whole Sacramento Metropolitan Area. It would connect to the freeway and the rest of Sacramento area.
- I think we should look at rapid transit instead of LRT. If we are going to have LRT, it should go up by I-5 from Downtown up to the Airport and not through the community.
- We should look at an elevated line going above Truxel Road.
- I like the idea of rapid transit/LRT throughout Natomas to connect people with shopping and entertainment without congested streets.

- The alternative Truxel route that goes by Arco Arena would seem to offer more ridership alternative including office and proposed hotels while still serving the education center and town center. The benefit is that it will thus not adversely impact the North Natomas entrance, traffic on Del Paso Road and the education center.
- We strongly support as residents of North Natomas the alternative Truxel plan.
- I'm concerned about the negative impact on our Regional Park by sticking with the out dated 1994 plan.
- As a resident of South Natomas, I strongly oppose the Truxel plan.
- As a resident of North Natomas, I am concerned about increased crime, traffic, noise from people and train, trash, vibration, and lighting pollution. We would like to see a survey given to North and South Natomas residents about actual ridership of LRT in general and based on different routes.
- Also would like to see increased police officers in North and South Natomas.
- We are against the Truxel and hybrid, but is supportive of I-5.
- "Our historical experience with local politicians is that our concerns and opinions become totally overridden by the power and money structures behind the scenes." "Their job is to make us feel good not to listen to us."
- Truxel residents have gotten feedbacks from police officer friends that they have problem with homeless riding LRT. Also not residents riding LRT to the neighborhood and loitering.
- I strongly support having the LRT going through park near Town Center.

**South Natomas Area Station Comments:**

- If Truxel option is chosen, we may move!
- Please move West El Camino stop (along Truxel alignment) south to Bel Air shopping center. The current location is right in front of our complex, worried that the station will bring crime, vandalism, etc. Or consider the vacant lot next to the fire station. Need to coordinate with schools for student pick-up and bus service.
- I am concerned with Truxel turning into another Del Paso. We know how the light rail stations are on Del Paso with vagrants and such. Currently, my children walk to school and I am concerned with their safety if light rail comes. I-5 makes much more sense, more room. I am worried about what will happen to my community if light rail runs down Truxel.

- The light rail alignment belongs on I-5.
- Ditto.
- Concerned with increased traffic congestion and the safety and school children walking to/from school. I feel that this will not benefit our community--we are small and do not need mass transit to get around.
- Afraid of Truxel turning into another Del Paso!
- How about having bus along Truxel instead. NO LIGHT RAIL ON TRUXEL!
- Have you considered Northgate? Why make a South Natomas run-down (since Northgate is already run-down)?
- Light rail on Truxel will lower our property values and will bring in unwanted elements (crime, vandalism, etc.).
- Since the City does not know what to do to clean up Northgate, put light rail there!
- Truxel has too much activity already. We not want to look out the window and see trains. Do not want children to have such easy access to Downtown and Airport.
- If Mayor Fargo would not put in front of her house--do not put in front of ours!
- Do not want elements that light rail brings like Del Paso. In support of I-5 alignment.
- Should follow community plan. People who purchased home without looking at the plan should have known that this change was coming. I personally purchased my home knowing light rail would be built on Truxel. As far as the "element" that light rail brings--this is a racist/classist assumption. Lots of professionals and young professionals living in Natomas would like to take light rail into downtown to work.
- Concerned with added buses that will also be on Truxel feeding the light rail (sitting buses) system like Del Paso. We have short streets and having four buses could block the streets.
- LRT riders using impromptu parking lots (local malls, supermarkets)--this is a concern. Concerned with LRT blocking access to driveways.
- Concerned with amount of digging and construction if on Truxel. Loss of property if not shared right of way. Will add congestion on Truxel-not relieve it.

- Support it on Truxel. LRT (not bus).
- Avoid taking east side property at Natomas Village Apartments. (Truxel and San Juan).
- People living in Natomas already have short commutes (via car). Bringing light rail will not change their habits significantly.
- I disagree with above. I prefer the Truxel alignment.
- Would recommend a more westerly alignment between Truxel and I-5 north of I-80.
- When homes were sold on Truxel--the light rail project was not disclosed. This is a legal issue--especially if you take away homes.
- I support the “pure” I-5 alignment. Concerned with increased traffic light rail will bring (along Truxel).
- What is the advantage of light rail versus buses? What is the cost? (Difference). Have you considered Azevedo as an alignment option? There is already median through the whole street.
- From an air quality stand point--Truxel route likely to make worse (slow traffic, idling) versus hybrid which will not impede traffic patterns and worsen air quality.
- Ridiculous to build LRT when buses are much less expensive. Buses are more flexible and timely.
- Lot less resistance from community by using the Arco Alternative route.
- Why do people need to lost their homes (Truxel alignment) when the alternatives will lose none?
- Congestion on Truxel is bad today.
- Safe pedestrian routes and crossings within 1/2 mile of all stations. I prefer Truxel.
- In favor of Truxel alignment. Because it will save on my commute time and save on downtown parking costs (\$1400 per year).
- Truxel alignment would provide a centrally located line that could be accessed easily by a lot of residents in South Natomas.

- Because of the opportunity of having light rail along Truxel, I plan on keeping my house as its property values will most likely grow.
- Light rail serving South Natomas will improve air quality by taking polluting cars off the road, and will improve mobility for me and my neighbors.
- As a real estate broker, I find that a lot of my clients are receptive to the idea of light rail and consider it an advantage to purchasing a home in this area.
- Easy access to Arco Arena events from my South Natomas home on Truxel, light rail would be fabulous!
- Consider replacement parking at the Bel Air shopping center.
- Concerned about safety issues for pedestrians from West El Camino and San Juan. Opposed to stop at Pebblestone--light rail needs to flow without stops from West El Camino to San Juan.
- Truxel is already so busy. I think it should go along I-5.
- Light rail on Truxel would improve the quality of my daily life in South Natomas.
- A Truxel alignment would be really easy to get to on my bike.
- If the ridership of BRT and LRT are equal--why choose LRT when BRT is less expensive?
- If there is a station built at the community center where will people park? There is no room to build a lot - forcing people into the neighborhoods. Same problem with San Juan - people will park in the shopping center! It makes more sense to go I-5 to I-80 to Truxel, north to Airport (hybrid).
- I would use a Truxel light rail for commuting to downtown and for recreational destinations and activities, in the evenings and weekends.
- No to the Truxel alignment--because I am concerned with safety of already congested roads, loss of turn lanes, pedestrian interaction from high school from multiple modes, concerned with parking by people riding LR from out of the area.
- Use I-5 alignment in order to accommodate the 5-10 million square feet of offices being built along the freeway. Build this for your ridership.
- Prefer I-5 for commuters coming from Woodland and other parts of Yolo.
- No light rail on Truxel--congestion, ugly, safety, but yes on BRT.

- Even though there appears to be a significant majority opposed to the Truxel alignment, I am chagrined that our deep concerns will be glibly over-ridden by the political money and power structures behind this project.
- Ditto with above.
- Build large park and ride lot at I-5 and 99.
- American River Parkway Station Comments:
- Timberwood Court resident - good idea Truxel alignment.
- Why is it taking so long?
- Prefer tunneling option instead of roadside.
- Grade separation/aerial structure as much as possible.
- Horrible idea to go down Truxel.
- Issues:
  - reduced property values
  - safety/crime
  - traffic conflicts
  - noise
- If RT could convince me that these 4 items are resolved, then LRT is okay.
- Business/residence access blocked Natomas Village Apartments (host a meeting with apartment residents).
- May help decrease homeless population.
- Property values enhanced by LRT. Chose to purchase property due to convenience.
- LRT makes neighborhoods look run down. Feels it will connect clean nicer neighborhood to dirty lower income neighborhoods.
- Sad to see a station placed in front of community center.
- Why do rail crossing bars begin a new cycle on the light traffic signals. Why so long before the trains comes?
- Alternate pressure on freeway (LRT) easier access.

- Easier commuting to farther distances such as Folsom; Natomas.
- Brings in more business due to mobility.
- Truxel good but another easier alignment might be out by El Centro.
- Shade trees at all bus stops and benches and ADA areas, LRT stations.
- No station within park. Place just outside instead.
- Brings transit to where the people are.
- Do not need LRT in Natomas that brings parking lots.
- Community center-riders will use facility lot for LRT. If lot is full then parking moves to the streets which block parking for residents. Parking near community center is already an issue.
- 17 years resident of Natomas area. Traffic increase with children more cars. Safety issues. Cutting through a community will divide it instead of bringing it together.
- Lives 3 house off Truxel. Right next to where it will be and "I WANT IT!" Downtown parking is up through the roof and expensive and hard to find. Wants a way to get to the Airport. Will improve property value.
- Live off Pebblestone. Since community center - have traffic problems, more theft, more people walking through community that do not belong.
- Loves American River Parkway. Also loves LRT. However, getting LRT access with minimum impact is great. Yes down Truxel!
- Caltrans - make sure there is room for their expansions.
- I-5 Truxel hybrid: Making it go up to I-80 and then hitting Truxel versus Garden Highway to Truxel.
- Need good pedestrian crossings at station areas.
- Need good frequent shuttles from neighborhoods at North Natomas to stations.

- A safe pedestrian crossing is needed on the I-80 Watt line at Arden and Del Paso. Also at San Juan and Truxel (High School students).
- Safe pedestrian routes and crossings to all stations.
- Use Jibboom Street bridge for river crossing.
- Use an elevated structure that's attached to I-5 instead of new bridge (on top of I-5).
- Eastside I-5 to Truxel (good).
- In favor of LRT going down Truxel. No stats that show evidence that the LRT system will bring crime and bad element into neighborhood. System is well maintained and managed and will be a benefit to Natomas Community if placed on Truxel.
- A way to get service to this community, no other way to get to Airport unless you have someone drive you.
- Has to be located in populated area so people can utilize service.
- Preference is I-5 corridor and would like to be sure that we are looking at BRT for flexibility and cost.
- Prefer to use I-5 alignment rather than going through Discovery Park to save the environment and Native American artifacts.
- Prefer I-5 alignment with existing bridge because I'm concerned that litigation/environment impact of building new bridge for alternative routes would delay or cancel alternative options.
- Prefer I-5 alignment because alternative negative impact has congested residential areas already.
- RT needs to show other successful residential aligns to compare.
- Truxel is preferred because it has been identified over 10 years with land use and development.
- The higher projected ridership on Truxel alignment would really improve air quality.
- Yes on BRT
- No on Truxel:

- Safety schools
  - Noise
  - Aesthetics
  - Traffic
- 
- Consider the hybrid which is I-5 only.
  - Disappointed in format of event. Thought would be appropriate to have workshop 1 hour followed by sit down front of podium questions and answer period, so that everyone could participate in questions and answers.
  - An EDU pieces that go out to community that discusses property value +/- local and national basis.
  - Accidents - stats on accident reports.
  - What is the turn time with trains?
  - How will RT get broken trains to RT facility for repair. Where will it be located noise associated with turns.
  - Would like The Hoyt Company to send out a survey to local communities. Usage and preferred alignment.

**Downtown/Natomas/Airport Study  
List of Public Workshop Attendees  
Wednesday, November 13, 2002**

Rhonda Abell  
Kerri Aiello  
Ron Anderson  
Bree Arnett  
Ana Avila  
Luis Avila  
David Bailey  
Maria Balakshin  
Steve Barlow  
Tarnin Barlow  
John Barters  
Andrew Bayne  
Chuck Beaven  
Nancy Beaven  
Sharon Belings  
Linda Bennett  
Eric Berry  
Rick Bettis  
James A. Birt  
Dean Blank  
Paul Blumberg  
Carley Borelli  
Luis Bosch  
Sally Bourne  
Ann Brand  
Daisy Braxton  
Barbara G. Brown  
Ly Michael Brown  
Alfred R. Bult  
Brenda Burmell  
Scott Butterfield  
Jose Luis Caceres  
Catherine Camacho  
Rose Chapman  
Jon Chase  
Joul Chase  
Teresa Clane  
Nancy Cochran  
Judy Cook  
Ed Cox  
Wil Craig  
Tim Dailey

Helen Davis  
Suzanne Day  
Bryan Debonk  
DeLaCruz  
Danielle del'Etoile  
Charlotte Delgado  
Praful Deshmane  
Bruce deTerra  
Mike Devereaux  
Azadeh Doherty  
Cathy Doughty  
Phong Duong  
Mark Eggers  
Annette Emery  
Charles Ervin  
Jessica Ervin  
Casey Estep  
Shawna Fadden  
John Febbo  
Kevin Ferns,  
Krista Ferns  
Marlon Flournoy  
Bridget Flores  
Adam Foster  
Daniel Frankfield  
Karen Fulkerson  
Maria Garcia  
Joe Gee  
Angela Geiselman  
Rebecca Gonzeles  
Ernest Green  
Rick Grelle  
Bruce Hammer  
Yoichi Hara  
Jim Hartley  
G. Hasbrouck  
Alexia Heckers  
Rob Henderson  
Barbara Hill  
Susan Hoffman  
Chris Holm  
Linn Hom  
Taiwo Jaiyeoba  
Carol Javarro  
Cassandra Johnson  
Larry Johnson  
Debra Jones

Patricia Jones  
Steve Kawamura  
Vicki Kawamura  
Maria Ketcham  
Steve Ketcham  
Barbara Krieger  
Kay Krupprath  
Gary Kukkola  
Peter Kuttner  
Kate Leary  
Nancy Lee  
Marni Leger  
Todd Leon  
Toni Little  
Sara Lybstra  
Maldonado  
Adam Marcus  
Corrdia Marshall  
Linda Martin  
Liz Martin  
Debbie Maus  
Keith McAdams  
Rachel McAdams  
Scott McDonald  
Stephen McMurchie  
Steve McMurchie  
Roxanne Miller  
Connie Miottel  
Laura Miramontes  
Saul Moreno  
James Morgan  
L Gaz Moss  
Dave Mowery  
Karl Moya  
Mike Murphy  
Victor G. Navarrete  
Julie Nichols  
Cheryl Noble  
John O'Connor  
Rob Olmstead  
Rose O'Meara  
Dean Park  
Larry Pasion  
Rebeka Pasion  
Kelly Patterson  
Katie Petersen  
Arielia Pautopa

Mario Perez  
Joseph Perry  
Janice Porter  
Bernie Quinn  
Cathy Quinn  
Julie Quinn  
Terry Reardon  
Jeannie Reats  
Ronald E. Reats  
Eva Reyes  
Mona Reynolds  
Robert Reynolds  
Silvia Reynoso  
Frank Ricca  
Alan Richardson  
Jan Rider  
Bruce Roberts,  
John Roe  
Lisa Rojas  
Lois Ross  
Mike Ross  
Jon Ruggieri  
Mary Rutishauser  
Terry Sajobek  
Pedro Sanchez  
Teresa Sandberg  
Mark E. Scheal  
Nathan Schmidt  
Kim Scott  
Laura Shayer  
Mary Shumaker  
H. Alan Sims  
RC Slovensky  
Kellie Smith  
Steve Soderberg  
Jesus M. Soinchez  
Barbara Stanton  
Lynn Stanzel  
Ken Stevenson  
Debbie Stockton  
Ted Stockton  
Dennis Stuart  
Jill Stuart  
Sonja Sun  
Lorrinda Sweeney  
Randee Tavarez  
Ted Tedesco

J.V. Thompson  
Joan Toomire  
Amadon Traone  
Gordon Treadway  
Briza Trujillo Cardenas  
Elizabeth Turnbull  
David Turnbull  
Pedro Villegas  
Kim Weisenburg  
Noel Weshman  
Farrell Wheeler  
Elizabeth Williams  
LM Williams  
Lorrie Jo Williams  
Karen Wilz  
Lillian Wong  
Brian Wright  
Chava J. Yniguez  
Karen Ziebron  
Arnold Z.L.C.