

CITY LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP

Key Challenge No. 3: Traffic and Congestion

Rating: S=Support / NS=not support Y=Yes/N=No

A. Central Business District		B. Sub-Regional Centers		C. Employment Centers		Question 1: Do you agree that it is acceptable to allow development of housing and job generating destination in existing key areas, if doing so enables people to live closer to their jobs, retail etc.?	Question 2: Would you support a downtown with very limited parking if public transportation was convenient, frequent, and safe?	Additional thoughts?
#	S/NS	Comment:	S/NS	Comment:	S/NS	Comment:	Y/N	Comment:
1	S	This is great, but there is a lot that is not said. What is missing is the variety of mix and type of mix.	S	This is great, but there is a lot that is not said. What is missing is the variety of mix and type of mix	S	This is great, but there is a lot that is not said. What is missing is the variety of mix and type of mix	Y	
2	S	Housing will help downtown become a 24 hour destination & make downtown more vibrant.	S	Focus of City needs to be in attracting jobs.	S	Attracting jobs to the City is important	Y	
3	S	Better/more complete use of already developed land	S		S		Y	Maybe - housing density
4	S	Add shuttle buses that serve main commercial corridors and improve bike lanes.	S		S		Y	Increase security on light rail
5	S	The addition of high-density housing and supportive retail would help the CBD transform into a true neighborhood.	S	Offers the same amenities as the CBD, but on a smaller scale would help diffuse activity and circulation.	S	It is vital to offer areas where business synergies can develop and grow.	Y	
6	S	Attention needs to be made to cultural opportunities in this area to add quality of life to central business dist.	S	Struggle with this one, as it conflicts with downtown revitalization	S	Absolutely, need the employers with mixed use to create vibrance/activity	Y	
7	S	More parking is vital	S		S		Y	
8	S	Extension of RR & Arts dist.	S	Individual personalities	S	If they fit in property	Y	
9	S	It is already there, as is government	NS		S		Y	Limited = Yes Very Limited = No If it was convenient, frequent & safe
10	S	Absolutely vital for getting to the City Council's vision	NS	I don't agree with the conclusions & implications	S	Smart growth opportunities		"Case by case" basis
11	S		S	Develop transportation to downtown where they could afford to live	S	Develop transportation to downtown where they would live	Y	
12	S		S	Arco w/transit? Please -yes	S	I would support augmenting transit to serve these areas. Need rapid transit to these destination	Y	
13	S		S	Arco Arena/Florin/65th Street. Aging/Youth also. 80% non-commute trips live near activity centers	S		Y	
14	S	I support the preliminary conclusions and the implications	S	Because they should be designed to be compatible with existing adjacent residential neighborhoods	S	Because to support the conclusions on new direction and the implications	Y	
15	S	A strong vibrant center is key to the functioning of the City.	S	Creating "energetic" sub-regional centers helps foster balanced activities throughout the City, especially if these centers are along transit corridors.	S	Increases ridership for transit and brings people into new area.	Y	
16	S		S	There is concern that there is too much competition from existing office centers and new sub-regional centers - Florin will be able to develop	S		Y	
17	S		S		S		Y	
18	NS	Too much commute traffic, too many bedrooms ringing the center	S	Shorter commutes, better looking communities	S	Possibly, good to remove vehicles from the road?	Y	
19	S	Affordable & Accessible housing & offices needs to be included in this area.	S	Get people out of their cars but RT needs to be efficient, safe and public needs education on benefits.	S	Will help to keep people out of their cars	Y	
20	S		S		S		Y	
21	S	Yes, let's create real distinct (yet diverse) populated, small sub-regions/towns	S	Pocket parks, small entertainment & arts venues please	S	More area for seniors & children to play, read, picnic, sports	Y	
22	S	Any increase in housing within the City will reduce traffic & create a "come to" environment.	S	Reduce traffic as we do not have adequate corridors to handle what we have & no potential for expansion. Must provide attractive incentives in transportation	S	Reduce daily movement into & out of City core	Y	
23	S	CBD is key to a vital City - offers range of choices found nowhere else in one place - to survive it needs a good housing base	S	But will only work with good circulation (ped, bike, walk) to adjoining areas - scale an issue	S	But call them mixed-use centers with strong emphasis on housing component	Y	
24	S	Must have more housing & neighborhood oriented service. Don't focus all effort on downtown.	S	More of a "sense of place" for various areas. Need to annex Stockton/Florin area and develop a large center there. Better proximity to services.	S		Y	
25	S	This is best opportunity that currently exists for residential development in Sacramento.	S	These are acceptable near light rail, but I would oppose otherwise.	S	Need more residential and retail in these areas otherwise they become vacant/dead areas on weekends	Y	
26	S	Measure traffic congestion, including all modes, walkers, bicyclists, transit riders, motorists - not just motorists. Begin to measure LOS on sidewalks, bike lanes, bus and LR services	S	Florin - opportunity for joint City/County replanning of the area. South area needs a "center" heart. Let's do it.	S	The description in the workbook of EC is a poor representation of what EC is envisioned to be - EC was designed to include (and to limited degree has provided) mixed use - horizontal is ok/vertical is preferred	Y	
27	S	As a destination this area would be a revenue generator and create a vibrant urban core	S	Would take the pressure off any one location	S	Close proximity between work and residence	Y	
28	S	...but only with adoption of urban design study for the central city	NS	I strongly support sub-regional centers but not this approach which is basically a zoning approach. Better would be to create reinvestment incentives in those areas and let them evolve organically	NS	This kind of zoning based development has contributed mightily to approve & lack of adequate transit. Employment centers should be integrated with sub-regional centers. These should also include police & fire substations.	N	I think the so-called jobs/housing balance not only does not exist but gets in the way of place making as an urban form and complete neighborhoods.
29	S	Allow opportunities to solve traffic impacts	S		S		Y	Need increased transit and other solutions for traffic congestions
30	S		S		S		Y	
31	S	Downtown Sacramento is cultural/entertainment/employment core of region. State is largest regional employer. Enhance and focus infrastructure S.	NS	Limits on downtown type amenities. Focus limited resources on downtown.	S	Mixed use	Y	
32	S	Yes, Yes, Yes. More parks and open space, roof gardens	S	Less than 15 stores, No hi-rise centers like LA	S	Must include a mix of uses. Photos do not show pedestrian friendly	Y	
33	S		S	but can they support themselves? What is the proportion of housing and employment? Does this compete with the downtown?	S		Y	
34	S	Supports 24/7 core downtown area concept	S	Concerned about impact to downtown development. Timing issue	S	Same concept/comments a "B"	Y	
35	S	I support increased height in the dense Urban Core for both housing and office towers. Helps maximize transit opportunities, better air quality	S	I think this helps transit use, air quality and strengthens neighborhood economic health. Population growth will sustain central City and req. centers.	S	Denser development and mixed use is great for employees and residents of the EC's.	Y	!!!!
36	S	This is the best area to increase density, esp. housing. This option needs more connectivity bikes and open space, more traffic ok as long as there are mass transit options.	S	Residential areas should have a grid pattern with no fences or barriers to block ped/bike connectivity	S	These centers need direct transit access with supporting retail, esp. food but no drive thru's	Y	
37	S	Services to support: open space; parking	S	Lot of subsidy needed for Franklin/Florin site; most in the County; no freeway visibility	S		Y	
38	S		S		S		Y	
39	S		S		S		Y	
40	S		S		S		Y	
41	S		S		S		Y	
42	S		S		S		Y	
43	S		S		S		Y	
44	S		S		S		Y	Convenient, frequent and safe
45	S		S		S		Y	Parking demand will never be met/offset by the rate of investment possible in mass transit. Use/concentration densities at other end of transit line won't justify investment
46	S		S		S		Y	Have the option of developers pay significant mitigation costs in lieu of providing parking.
47	S		S		S		Y	Provided safety/police services also benefit or get support as crime will rise with increased densities.
48	S		S		S		Y	
49	S		S		S		Y	This is a very long shot on public transit. So...
50	S	The downtown/central district needs to be attractive to residents to be "live & work" as well as move around downtown.	S	This will increase the usage of public transportation & will allow people to work closer to home.	S	More employment in the outer areas would decrease traffic and increase public transportation	Y	
51	S	Trees is a good thing and density should follow	S	Trees are healthy and feed a healthy overall City and downtown	S	Connection to housing/transit/work is critical	Y	

	A. Central Business District		B. Sub-Regional Centers		C. Employment Centers		Question 1: Do you agree that it is acceptable to allow development of housing and job generating destination in existing key areas, if doing so enables people to live closer to their jobs, retail etc.?	Question 2: Would you support a downtown with very limited parking if public transportation was convenient, frequent, and safe?	Additional thoughts?	
#	S/NS	Comment:	S/NS	Comment:	S/NS	Comment:	Y/N	Comment:		
52	S	But, increased traffic on surface streets will reduce response times. Increased infrastructure and new types of operations (i.e. Bike medics, ems rooms at high-rise condos)	S	But, increased traffic on surface streets will reduce response times. Spreading out jobs and putting people closer to jobs may ease congestion	S	(same as sub-regional, #B)	Y	Street design must be compatible with emergency service response needs	N	Lack of parking creates illegal parking. When cars illegally park, response is impaired.
53	S	It makes sense!	Both	Have we enough pop. so we can do this without sucking the life out of the CBD?	S	Ambivalent? Coord better and sub-regional centers	Y		N	Makes it too hard for those who can't walk well or far, ie. Elderly, children
54	S	Urban core, can support high density, empty nester moving close to downtown.	S	Support high end job close to housing, mix of retail/housing	S	Support transit supported employment centers	Y		Y	
55	S		S	But realistic locations	S	same sore EC zoning areas				
56	S	Must maintain historic neighborhoods	S		S		Y		N	Both must be considered (short/long term)
57	S		S	Better quality of life, less auto dependence for work force	S	(same as sub-regional, #B)	Y		N	
58	S	It has a good chance of vitalizing the CBD so that people use it outside the usual work day. The increased density should support amenities such as theater, restaurants, etc. The reduction in automobile dependence is desirable environmentally. (Note: the survey shows citizens luke warm to high rises) "Avoid high rise enchantment-let the market function"	S	Helps to avoid clogging CBD and freeways. Will add interest and vitality to life away from CBD.	S	Putting more employment opportunities closer to where many citizens live supports quality of life and the environment. Would stimulate growth in sub-regional centers and new growth areas.	Y		Y	
59	S	Reinforces the Central City as an employment center, enjoys increase density for residential high density, government and commercial office uses.	S	"Can't be at the expense of downtown" Encourages distribution of jobs throughout the City and resident would live closer to employment. Individual personalities - not same. Ok.	S	Establishes an intensity of development that optimizes and reinforces work force within the community and support transit use.	Y	Maximize the opportunity for new housing to meet the housing needs of the City and be in close proximity to their place of work.	Y	- limited = yes very limited = no. Increase frequency of transit schedule, coordinated with bus, light rail system. Accessibility to transit system to outlying neighborhoods.
60	S		S		S		Y	"allow" should be emphasized, not merely allowed.	Y	
61	S		S		S		Y		N	don't believe public transportation will develop to satisfy the consumer.
62	S	However, limited development sites limits capacity and potential	S	We need great centers (districts) throughout a large city such as Sacramento	S	We need to increase the intensity of use and mix of uses in employment centers.	Y			In between, eventually but it needs to be a transition over time.
63	S	Downtown needs housing. To be vibrant you need people living not just working downtown.	S	Spread work center & retail to reduce number of vehicle trips and miles. Create more pedestrian center!	S	(same as sub-regional, #B)	Y		Y	
64	S		S		S		Y		Y	
65	S	Arts & culture - for entire region. Housing	S	Not at expense to downtown. Individual & unique to the area.	S	If they don't compete with each other, need economic viability	Y		N	Need parking, need public transportation
66	S		S		NS		Y		Y	
67	S	The region also must see this as their downtown for arts and culture	S	What are the natural drivers that will cause these to happen where you've located them? These are equivalent to Roseville, Folsom, Rancho downtowns.	S	What does the Economic Development strategy say about these? Are they needed for the new jobs? Are these mixed use flexible zones that mix in non-traditional integrated elements?	Y		Y	But only in a carefully orchestrated transition.
68	S	Make district as large as possible with lots of height		Have mini-sub-centers in areas that have started to be problem			Y			
69	S		S	Transportation in place	S		Y		N	
70	S	Need to address & respect historic properties. Look at context.	S	Transportation important, otherwise could be a failure.	S		Y	but transit must happen first	Y	But depends on how transportation is managed
71	S		S		S		Y		Y	
72	S	More housing and retail	S	Enables you to go downtown without actually having to go "downtown"	NS	seems pointless	Y		N	
73	S	This will take a long time without providing services. It's a chicken and egg issue.	S		S		Y		Y	Housing, neighborhood services near station.
74	S	Ok	S	Transportation in place	S	Good idea	Y		Y	
75	S	Increase densities in core where many modes of transportation exist.	S	Residents would live, work and play close to home. Better for environment.	S	Would reduce overall traffic and be good for the environment	Y		Y	As long as it doesn't impact retail, businesses.
76	S	Support higher densities in CBD creation of true destination	S	Reduce trip within region	S	Again, meeting diverse needs within employment center.	Y		N	Very limited is a strong term.
77	S	With few development sites, don't limit heights to the extent we can't accommodate growth	S		S		Y		N	Would support some limited parking but very limited parking
78	S	More housing and arts/entertainment destinations are needed to revitalize downtown.	S	We need job centers in addition to downtown - to attract employers and to locate near housing	S	(same as sub-regional, #B)	Y		N	You still have to provide sufficient parking so as not to dissuade people and businesses downtown.
79	S	Duh! Study height, wind, shade	NS	Not well thought out, wrong locations	S	(what's the difference between this one and B.?)	Y		N	Great concept, but dreaming
80	S		S	Regional centers must have easy transit connections to downtown and to each other. Probably not at Arco and more distant locations, but in...(closer areas)	S		Y			Is this realistic? Maybe a limited number of new parking garages. Eliminate surface lots.
81	S	Caution should be used to avoid the development of high-rise concrete jungles.	S	Good concept except buildings with 15 stories should be exceptions not the rule!	S	An integrated mix as suggested should work well in these proposed areas.	Y		Y	
82	S	For the reasons it was created.	S	Need parks as a compliment to these plans.			Y		N	
83	S		NS	It sounds too much like "big box" syndrome; locations (suggested) are not sensible.	NS		Y		Y	
84	S	For a big/convenient city center. Concerned about height/concrete jungles	NS	What is this? Locations = bad places for this.	S	The new centers are welcoming and good for smart growth. Helps the environment. Will lessen congestion	Y		Y	
85	S	Add more housing	NS	Need better definition of sub-regional center? What is this? How were the locations picked?	S		Y		Y	But need to address reality
86	S		S	Concern about 15 stories high, why separate sub-regional centers and employment center?	S	Concern about how high also why separate sub-regional center from employment center	Y		N	
87	S		S	Don't like LOS D or E. 2-15 stories- oh, hell no!	S	Sub-regional and employment centers should be co-located.	Y			
88	S	It is going this way now	S	Like Portland	S	I do not see it in pic.	Y		Y	
89	S	It will make our City's economy more vibrant, as well as improve arts & culture	S	I would like to live closer to amenities	S		Y		Y	But you need to follow through with this. The bus is already too expensive!
90	S	Public Safety response is being impacted by excessive traffic congestion	S		S		Y		Y	How can it be convenient, frequent and safe?
91	S		S	But be careful @ 65th Street. There should not be building higher than 5 stories. F-65 and East Side Lofts are prototypes.	S		Y		Y	
92	S	Development of a vibrant downtown is the key to creating a world class city	S	Intermodal travel; employment centers	S		Y		Y	
93	?	I am concerned that existing downtown neighborhoods will be "developed out."	S		S		Y		Y	But I fear that the end result will be gridlock
94	S	CBD is vibrant and should be encouraged to continue mixed use and high density.	S	Balance job centers which in turn promotes smart growth	S	Absolutely, this should be the highest priority of smart growth	Y		Y	
95	S	If Sacramento is to be a 24 hour city, we need housing downtown								
96	S	I believe that the new GP direction as a great way to probably display what downtown Sacramento should represent	S	I support the new plan as it would provide more housing and work opportunities to allow residents to live/work nearby	S	When there is new transit opportunities to provide nearby one's job, more people will begin using public transit and traffic will decrease as people will rely on public transit	Y	But depends	N	How would we know if the public transportation will be convenient, frequent? Who will ensure this?
97	S	City's got to grow up	S	Helps minimize commute issues	S	I like mixed use change	Y		N	
98	S		S		S	Great but must be transit accessible	Y		Y	
99	S	To promote the arts, culture and entertainment. It should always be vibrant, 24 hours	S	Prevents one single gathering area, creates a more diverse city with larger options for progression and entertainment	S	"Campus feel" is dull and requires too much commuting. Not very exciting or creative. No public transportation, causing a divide and isolation.	Y	Only if transit is convenient and effectively implemented	N	Parking is always needed.
100	S	Need vibrant civic center, include arts, cultural, dining.	S		S	Transit issues must be included in planning	Y		N	
101	S		S	Not sure about Florin Road Sub-Regional Center - too close to Delta Shores?	S		Y		Y	
102	S		S	Public transit in Sacramento must be more user friendly and efficient. Safety is key. People will use it if it feels safe.	S		Y			Must have regional cooperation
103	S	The walking for exercise is healthy, which will hopefully prolong life to enjoy the "smart growth"	S	(same as A)	S	(same as A)	Y		Y	
104	S	A vibrant downtown is essential, it also will be compatible with the rail yards and Richards Blvd developments	S	Possibility of increased employment opportunities, closer to neighborhoods, less need for vehicles	S		Y		Y	
105	S	Building height should be unlimited in the CBD. Transitional zone between downtown and surrounding areas should have reasonable height requirement	S	Good idea	S		Y			Maybe - depends on what "very limited" parking means. I agree that getting people onto public transportation, but no city has managed it yet.
106	S	Not enough art, cultural aspects must be inclusive	S	Must have their own identity!	S	With some flexibility to change if demand is there (housing/workforce)	Y		N	What does "very limited" parking?

	A. Central Business District		B. Sub-Regional Centers		C. Employment Centers		Question 1: Do you agree that it is acceptable to allow development of housing and job generating destination in existing key areas, if doing so enables people to live closer to their jobs, retail etc.?	Question 2: Would you support a downtown with very limited parking if public transportation was convenient, frequent, and safe?	Additional thoughts?	
#	S/NS	Comment:	S/NS	Comment:	S/NS	Comment:	Y/N	Comment:	Y/N	Comment:
107	S		S	Must develop their own unique attractions	S	Have to figure out how to make these employment centers work. Does this work with zone based codes?	Y		Y	But remove "very"
108	S		S		S		Y		Y	
109	S	We need to focus on making a 24 hours vibrant heart	S	This is an efficient and critical approach to addressing the jobs/housing balance	S		Y	Public Transit	Y	Convenient
110	S	Obvious, need to start thinking about inclusionary housing in central city and other infill areas where values might occur.	S	Obvious with mix-transit	S	Obvious with mix	Y		Y	
111	S		S		S		Y		Y	
112	S		S		S		Y		N	Limited but not very limited
113	S		S		S		Y		Y	
114	S	Interaction & impacts to Regional Centers	S	Interaction with regional issues	S	Same - relationship to transit and airport	Y		Y	
115	S	Core of current work force base...best transportation uses and alternative at this time	NS	Can not do everything at once. Reinvest portion of economic spin off from other areas to develop this.	S	Creates and provides jobs. Focused transportation and livability	Y		N	
116	S		NS	Real trade-off to focus on this as long as its not a further drain from downtown	S	Like Delta Shores, focus on integration of uses	Y		Y	
117	S	Critical mass/population will increase viability of public transit - promote pedestrian/bicycle use	S	Offer an excellent denser opportunity for those who chose not to be in the urban cores but do not want typical sub-urban type of living experience.	S	Better mix of uses, potential decreasing trips	Y		Y	
118	S	Critical to the growth of any City	NS	Difficult to implement without conflicting with CBD goals, CBD focus is hard enough without easier to build sub-regional centers	NS	Corporate/business campuses are very insular and create geographically divided communities			Y	Parking structures rather than street parking
119	S		NS		S	It's a good area to make things closer together. What about schools?	Y		Y	
120	S	This is high priority for development of employment and housing to create 24 hour feel. Densities should be unlimited.	S	I like concept where linked to transit, otherwise traffic and parking will be unmanageable.	NS	The proposed centers are completely disconnected from transit, we should focus development around transit. I also don't understand why this function cannot be served in the sub-regional centers	Y		Y	
121	NS	We need completely different approach, we have to look at the central city vs. the CBD, we're investing to much energy and resources to CBD	?		?					
122	S	downtown needs the energy of people	NS	too many, delete Point West/65th St	S	jobs/housing balance decrease traffic	Y		N	
123	S	This is the center of the city - more density here makes sense including much more residential density. Housing should be for all income levels and include families as well as singles/empty nesters. New park space is critical to making this work (Sutter Landing, Railyards, pocket parks). Historic neighborhoods must be protected, transition between CBD and these neighborhoods is critical	S	It makes sense to spread out employment so more people can live close to where they work. This will also help create character and a sense of place in what are now pretty much characterless places. I like what is already starting to happen near 65th St light rail	S	Again, this spreads out jobs and job accessibility and encourages mixed use	Y	But, I also think that we must have a huge shift in focus from cars to transit, there simply isn't enough space to either park or drive all these cars.	Y	Conditional Yes. I think we should really be able to reduce the number of commuters significantly, but we have to deal with after hours entertainment venues. People looking for evening parking are overwhelming neighborhood and taking the "very" limited spaces in which residents can park.
124	S		S	Except fewer sub-regional centers are needed	S		Y		Y	
125	S	Mixed uses; 24/7 destination; broader tax base; appeal to both residents and visitors; get rid of the cars!; change parking policy of low-cost meters (encourages cruising); make parking minimums into maximums.	S	Use car-centric; combine employment with nearby housing; should include community gathering place	S	Use car-centric = healthier, encourage employees to provide workforce housing (see example of REACH and other in Illinois-Chicago area); incorporate retail services as well. Make sure that current employment centers start to change as well.	Y		Y	Definitely!!!
126	S	housing is critical to a vibrant downtown	S	reduction in freeway traffic, 1st phase should be CBD; followed by sub-regional centers, mid-rise. Arco, Florin, Swanston, 65th	S	reduction in freeway traffic. Mainly office throughout city	Y		Y	
127	S		S	More realistic than urban transit being used by Californians	S	Often disconnected for present transit	Y		N	
128	S	This is great community that already appreciates the walkability and community of the CBD and see densification as an asset. Concern for parking when making it vibrant destination	S	I like the idea of central S/R Centers so people don't have to commute as far and will help create community identities.	S	Concer: how will we attract businesses and will they align with regional transit opportunities	Y		Y	
129	S	There is a potential to have decreased traffic/air pollution	S	This would take traffic away from the downtown area	S	It supports transit use and fosters pedestrian activity	Y		N	
130	S	Support contingent on adequate funding and ordinances assisting emergency services with impacts	S	(same as A)	S	(same as A)	Y		N	The bulk of area residents live outside city limits. If you want them to come downtown to spend money, you have to provide convenient parking.
131	S		S		S	if tied to economic development strategy	Y		Y	
132	S		S	Schools? Hospitals? Religious Celebration Sites?	S	Need to resolve relationship between sub-regional centers, CBD, Natomas, Delta Shores, Railyards, Richards Blvd. Etc. Are all of these employment centers?	Y	Level of Service (LOS) = E/F	Y	Resolve parking compatibility issues with State Garages
133	S		?	I support this concept, but think the City needs to recognize the competition faced by surrounding communities for businesses/employers- eg. Roseville, Rancho Cordova, West Sac.	?	(see B) What analysis has been done to validate the numbers so we understand the impact of growth of employment centers in outlying areas?	Y		Y	But is this realistic by 2030?
134	S		S	I like the idea of putting all major necessities in one area, thus promoting less dependence on personal vehicles	?		Y		Y	
135	NS	Need to expand boundaries and CBD - for study	S	Good start - but seem all the same	S	Too general - competing forces not defined.	Y		Y	
136	S		S		S		Y		Y	
137	S		S	But downtown development should be priority one	S	But be aware corporate campuses can be very isolating - need for integration	Y		N	Downtown needs parking - just price it accordingly
138	S	Less use of cars and air quality will improve	S	More convenient, better quality of life	S		Y		Y	
139	S	Focus on diversity	S	Focus on housing affordability	S	(same as B) but do not scatter these regions. What is strategy to attract business development	Y		Y	Quality of architecture/design of buildings and public space is key.

Rating Totals	A. Central Business District		B. Sub-Regional Centers		C. Employment Centers		Question 1		Question 2	
S	133	S	118	S	121	Y	133	Y	87	
NS	3	NS	13	NS	6	N	1	N	39	
Total Votes	136		131		127		134		126	