

Comments_Negative_C
Neg_ScenC
premature deaths prevented
??
1st option
2nd best plan
Acres of farmland consumed.
Air quality
air quality still low
all
Already enough programs for rural areas
also a lot of crime rate
Because it uses land
Because walk to where they want to go.
Better buses
Better farmland
better to fix our communities than build new ones.
Big cities and communitis would suffer
Big cities don't see a lot of benefits.
Bus Line
Buses
buying more land
communicate in community
Community will continue to saty a poor community
congestion
Consumes a lot of farmland
consumes farmland
Consumes too much farmland
Consumes too much farmland. Need to prevent urban sprawl.
Cost
Cost too much
Disadvantage communities
disadvantage to city
disadvantaged areas will not maintain the money invested in them
discriminate to small populations
Do not like the evaporation of usable farmland
Doesn't address the majority of population
Doesn't affect me
Doesn't improve active transporttaion & too much farmland

Comments_Negative_C
Neg_ScenC
Don't need more growing
Don't think new people would commute to these areas or from
Everything will be too tight
existing gets worse
Expensive
Farming??
Farmland
fixing our roads would be a waste of money because we need a reliable transportation system
Focus in just rural is not city roads
Fresno County is the agricultural capital of the world - less land no good.
Getting smaller communities on board can be challenging. They want growth and improve sidewalks, bike paths, etc. but don't want population to grow.
Good idea
Greedy
Growing population! Most people don't like to live far from stuff.
Growth in small towns would eliminate the non city ??
growth in smaller cities
Grwoth should be closer to town
Hard to implement/doesn't help all neighborhoods, only a selected few
harmful to our farming economy
Has a lot of acres allocated to new growth
Have more jobs
Help people in need
high amount of farmland consumption
highest consumption of farmland
How many houses and roads there are
I also like C.
I don't live there
I don't notice much investmenst in bike transportation
I like it
I like this one but we also need to focus on All rural not just the disadvantaged
I like this option too. Preserves old instead of wating it.
I think keeping farmland is important
If the areas are sturdy I think it would be to tight
Ignores significant portion of population on borderline
Ignoring other areas
Ignoring other areas that need assistance

Comments_Negative_C
Neg_ScenC
ignoring others while focusing on one, why choose?
in our community we do not receive funds
increases travel in cars overall-but could promote more exchange culture?
Investment in vulnerable areas to grow as a rural community
Is more for the buildings
It could take money from city projects
It does not affect me
It has negative impact on populations
It is not fair to distribute money
It removes farmland
It sounds unrealistic, to expect that investing in small rural communities will make residents less likely to drive to urban areas. This may just increase urban
it takes up more land
it would be different for everyone in this
It's a good choice
It's only beneficial to the rural area
Job is further
Just disadvantaged
Just on small city
lack of fund for current needs
Land Use
Land use on C is a lot of land consumed
less farmland from a community who depends on farming
Less focus on urban core.
less jobs lost of farmland
less land and more traffic
less land for anything we need
Less pollution
less possibilities
Limited
limits it to a smaller portion of population
Living expenses in these communities may increase
Loss of farmland
Loss of money in community
Lots of construction
lots of deaths
Low reduction of greenhouse gases. Fewer pre-mature deaths prevented

Comments_Negative_C
Neg_ScenC
Major losing of ag land
May cause too much growth in Clovis and Fresno area in order to allow walking/biking to be plausible
Maybe the smaller towns are more focused on the main cities.
might increase further growth outside of city center -> less density
Mixed use could be too expensive
mixed use development will be as high cost to LMI community
More cost to city
More greenhouse gases and pollution
More home construction within reach of budget
more housing
More land development. More cost.
More money in disadvantaged communities
more premature deaths
More rural than cities
more traffic
More transits
Most communities might not like the growing population
My community is pretty well funded, and it would be overflow when there are other options needing more attention. Resources low
my community is too small for more thing to be add
N/A
Need agriculture. #1 agricultural county
Need more farmland
need to get a lot of funds and will maybe cost a lot of money.
Need to live in smaller spaces
No
no benefit for me
No disadvantage beside used of farm land
no help tourban areas
No negativity
No one else benefits but the rural area
no public transportation
No road maintenance to my area
none
Not a lot going to the community with the most population
Not a lot of support to develop in these areas
Not accustomed

Comments_Negative_C
Neg_ScenC
Not enough for the people
Not enough growth.
not enough population to justify expenditure. Needs more money for existing urban concerns
Not fair for city
not fixing within Fresno
Not good for bigger community
not helping Fresno in any way and that is where the majority of population lives
not helping Fresno in any way and that is where the majority of population lives
Not in the Fresno town
not including the city
Not many public transportation available
not preventing premature loss of life as much
not that agricultural land is richer in agriculture, it would be less air quality
Not that rural isn't important but most residents live in urban/suburban areas
on high acreage
one area receiving more funds/focus
one area receiving mere funds/focus
Only address rural
only help this town
Only rural areas are affected
Only targets small cities
people in small communities will still need to travel by car to bigger cities for work and shopping
people in small communities will still need to travel by car to bigger cities for work and shopping
Population
Premature deaths
Prepares cities
Presenter didn't seem for it...
Quality of life
Reality of neighborhood improvement, proper enforcement.
removes farmland
Repair
Repair existing roads
roads
Roads are cracking and more ??
Rural access- commerce
Rural farm communities would lose population
Rural should not be priority like metro

Comments_Negative_C
Neg_ScenC
Rural would not affect as many people
safety
Same as A
Silo
Small areas do not need more transportation
small cities should stay small and keep their charm (grew up in Kingsburg)
Still need to travel miles to metro area from small.
Takes focus off more populated areas
Takes too much farmland.
Takes too much valuable farmland
Takes up a lot of land 38.2 acres
Takes up land to build
Taking up too much farmland
taxes/sprawl/unaffordable housing
that no more are going to communicate in the small cities
that no more are going to communicate in that community
that the people don't get forgotten
the acres will be less
The amount of farmland consumed
The bus stops don't have shade or security
The cities would be more populated
the consumption of farmland due to new growth
the distribution would be inhospitable
The large use of farmland which is very important to Fresno County
the money should be distributed evenly
The older and nothing gets fixed
The rural communities won't be rural anymore
Their will be more pollution
There are more middle-class wqho need the assistance, which means more cars
there could be much more traffic jams on busy ???
There will be nothing to really help the City of Fresno (where moe of the population lives)
These areas are small cities - ???
they have to buy more land of roads
Thi s is not mutually exclusive frame B. Do both
think they all help but for certain areas
This has merits but population growth is key
This scenario consumes a lot of farmland which is very important to our economy

Comments_Negative_C
Neg_ScenC
Too mcuh farmland relatively
Too much contamination
Too much driving
Too much farmland to do this
too much farmland used
Too much longer commuting and more air pollution
Too much use of farmland will reduce our agriculture.
Too much would not be good for smaller towns
too muvh money
Transportation improvements will have little effect on improving their community
travel a lot
Urban sprawl
Use of farmland
Use of farmland for development
Use up more farmland
Vehicle miles
Very low Greenhouse Gas Reduction. Least premature deaths prevented
Way too much land used
We would end up spending more resources for less benefit
we would have more things with scenario a
West Fresno community more parks needed
Why is it that it will only be in small cities
Would be my second choice. Still OK.
would only help those in ??? Towns
would use the land for agriculture
Wouldn't incorporate outside towns
You can drive car
You can get hurt on the road