

## Reverse Triangle Transportation Area Plan (RTTAP) Meeting #2 – Project Team Meeting **Agenda**

**Date:** Wednesday, September 4, 2019  
**Place:** Fresno COG Ash Room  
 Call-in Information: For those unable to attend:  
 (888) 398-2342 Code: 740166  
**Time:** 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM

**Note:** Copy of the agenda items are posted on the Fresno Council of Government’s website (<https://www.fresnocog.org/>). Additionally, there will be a two week period provided for team members to provide comments from the date of this meeting.

### Item Description

**1. Introductions – Please sign in**

**a. Fresno COG & Partners**

Kristine Cai, FCOG	Janelle Del Campo, FCRTA
Braden Duran, FCOG	Moses Stites, FCRTA
Jill Gormley, City of Fresno	Brian Spaunhurst, Fresno County
Mariah Thompson, CRLA, Inc.	Lucio Avila, LCJA
David Padilla, Caltrans District 6	Jim Anderson, MCWD
Shelby MacNab, City of Fresno	Jeff Long, FAX
<b>Michelle Zumwalt, City of Fresno</b>	

CRLA, Inc. – California Rural Legal Assistance  
 FAX – Fresno Area Express  
 FCOG – Fresno Council of Governments  
 FCRTA – Fresno County Rural Transit Agency

LCJA – Leadership Council for Justice and Accountability  
 MCWD – Malaga County Water District  
 TPA – Townsend Public Affairs

**b. GHD Team: GHD, Regional Government Services (RGS), New Economics & Advisory, Townsend Public Affairs (TPA)**

Gary Mills, GHD	Isabel Domeyko, NEA
Jim Damkowitch, GHD (phone)	Megan Duran, NEA
Joe Ramirez, GHD	Richard Harmon, TPA
Katherine Lee, GHD	Kendall Flint Kim Anderson, RGS (phone)

RGS – Regional Government Services

NEA – New Economics Advisory

- City of Clovis
- City of Coalinga
- City of Firebaugh
- City of Fowler
- City of Fresno
- City of Huron
- City of Kerman
- City of Kingsburg
- City of Mendota
- City of Orange Cove
- City of Parlier
- City of Reedley
- City of San Joaquin
- City of Sanger
- City of Selma
- County of Fresno

**2. Logo/Social Pin Point (Please access prior to meeting)**



<https://fresnocogreversetriangleplan.mysocialpinpoint.com/home>

Gary M. opened up the discussion regarding the finalized project logo. With collaborative effort, six concepts were consolidated into two. Finalized logo (as shown above) will be shown on every correspondence and website.

Gary M. opened up the Social Pin Point link to demonstrate how comments are entered into the application. The Social Pin Point application shows an interactive map or study area that allows all citizens and all interested in the project to leave their comments about the project. Social Pin Point will be assessable to all language speakers/readers via Google translate. All comments will be anonymous will available on the site for all to get access to.

Action Item:

- ✓ Send Social Pin Point link to committee, public, and stakeholders.
- ✓ Provide closing date to Social Pin Point before proposed recommendations.

**3. Discussion: Working Papers**

**a. Goals & Policies**

Gary M. summarized the highlights of common goals and policies that are relevant to the RTTAP study area. Goals and policies were referenced from the City and County of Fresno General Plan, the ATP, the RTP, and FAX. Goals and policies are applicable to bikes, pedestrians and other issues in regards to transportation relevant to RTTAP study area such as safety, connectivity, environmental (i.e. air quality, AMT), and traffic operations and improvements.

Currently in discussion:

- City of Fresno will be in contact with Sophia P. about the specifics of policies and goals relevant to South Industrial Priority Area (SIPA) project.
- In response of specific goals and policies for SIPA, RRTAP project may have to establish and incorporate SIPA goals and policies.

Action Item:

- ✓ Contact and coordinate with consultants working on SIPA, such as Ascent, in regards of establishing plan specific goals and policies.
- ✓ Establish goals and policies specific to the project plan.
- ✓ Stakeholders to provide feedback in regards of the goals and policies. All incoming feedback response will be directed to Gary M. and Kristine C.

#### b. Collision Data

Gary M. discussed the next working paper of study collisions. This section identifies collisions that have occurred within or near the RTTAP study area. It shows the quantitative data which would be beneficial when applying for future grants. Gary M. reiterated that this section includes qualitative and quantitative collision data. Quantitative and qualitative data would be used when including benefit costs for future grants. GHD primarily uses (Transportation Injury Mapping System) TIMS to summarize the 5-year (2012-2017) collision data results.

Gary M. then mentioned the fatal collisions that has been recorded during the 5-year span. According to the collision severity map, most of the fatalities occurred near the RTTAP study area. Out of the five fatalities, only one fatal collision happened within the project area—just south of Orange Elementary School.

Braden D. (Fresno COG) commented if the data recorded delineates semi-trucks and cars. In response, Gary M. concluded that there are attributes to narrow down to the specifics, but GHD typically narrows it down to bicycles and pedestrians. However, including semi-trucks and cars will be considered.

Action Item:

- ✓ Shelby M. suggested DUIs to be excluded from collision-by-severity type data.

#### c. Bikeway Facility Types

Gary M. informed team members that all bike facilities information is based upon existing plans from the City, County and ATP. He went over each classifications of bike facilities that are currently located within or around the study area. Gary M. states a potential link, if possible, of the existing network within the study area to the outside, so the project is not “self-contained”. There are potential conflicts to the linkage, one would be the bicycle stress level. Gary M. initiated a discussion about the Level of Traffic Stress (LTS), Jim D. and Joe R. (GHD) summarized their findings of the LTS results.

Joe R. started off the discussion listing the factors of the RTTAP LTS results: speed, road right-of-way, existing bike lanes and infrastructure, and traffic lanes. He concluded that speed is the leading factor that causes high level of stress along the corridors within the study area. Jim D. continued on with the discussion that the analysis is compelling because of the points of interest, the desire line, where people would want to go. He suggested that it is important to look at the failing points of interest within the study area and see if they can be traveled to via low stress network without having to detour. LTS study will continue to be under review to provide improvements on low stress connectivity to all major points of interest within the Triangle.

Kristine C. brought up the discussion of the similarities of factors related roadway stress and segment stress. Jim D. responded that there are different criterions and factors associated with a segment versus an intersection approach.

Moses S. (FCRTA) initiated the discussion about how stress level would be effected by radar speed. This comment was brought up in consideration of rural roadways, where majority of the posted speed limits are exceeded by the drivers. Jim D. responded that posted speed limits are used for ease of analysis and the addition of analyzing free-flow speed will be

under consideration.

Action Items:

- ✓ Include raw LTS data for intersection approach and segments in the Appendix.
- ✓ All quantitative data to be included as a table for better understanding of the methodologies used for LTS analysis.

d. Transit

Gary M. introduced this section by giving an overview. The section covers the history of transit, transit routes, cost by user type (i.e. children, elderly, etc.), times of services, and headways for Fresno Area Express (FAX) and Fresno County Rural Transit Area (FCRTA). Since there is not a lot of housing and schools within the study area, there is not a lot of demand for transit route that extends southward to the RTTAP study area. However, it is important to incorporate transit into the Triangle, which also includes improving roadways and adding shelters and transit stops.

There was a discussion about FAX planning a potential extension down to the project area. Specific bus routes not confirmed. Kristine C. questioned if there are any existing routes near the big distribution centers such as Amazon and Ulta. Jeff L. (FAX) responded that there are currently no transit route/stations near the distribution center. There has been discussions with the directors of Amazon and Ulta, there were no big interest or demand to go forward with the need of public transit routes near the area. Shelby M. added that there has been a TCC grant project to extend service, however, an extension year not yet confirmed.

Going further into discussion, Kristine C. mentioned that there may be interest in public transit routes reaching to the big distribution areas because of their high total number of workers. If workers feel like there is a need for transit, then there may be a potential survey asking usual routes workers take to go to and from work. Jeff L. responded that the discussion were more towards getting potential shuttle system out of downtown where large transit agencies come together to run shuttles back and forth during shift change hours of the 24-hour distribution centers (i.e. Amazon). There was a mention of the complications of implementing transit stations because of the road structures, such as blocks, gutters, utilities—they do not support a lot of bus stop systems

Gary M. brought the discussion forward about the trend of transit ridership. As shown in the line graph (Exhibit 3.1), there is a downward trend in ridership between 2007 and 2016. It was mentioned that FAX is currently experiencing the upward trend and data in the graph will be updated to reflect ridership up to the most recent year that data is available. Many factors play a role in the fluctuating trend, such as population growth, funding, price of parking, price of fuel, highway congestion, etc.—all included in the report.

Action item:

- ✓ Follow up with FAX for current ridership numbers
- ✓ GHD will take in consideration of potential bus route extension and incorporate it in the Bus Routes and Bus Stops figure.

e. Freight and Goods Movements

Joe R. elaborated of the identification of STAA truck routes that run within and outside the

RTTAP project area and discussed road classifications based upon the City's road classification and shapefiles. Within the Triangle, SR-99 and SR-41 are considered STAA and terminal routes. Gary M. added that additional truck route recommendations will be based off of the land use within the city. Brian S. (Fresno County) commented that there are many speed limits that are posted by the County and that there are different classifications between the City and County speed limit classification—collected definitions would vary as well.

Action Items:

- ✓ Follow up with Brian S. with the discrepancies between the City and County posted speed limits.

f. Plan Line

Gary M. defined the plan line as a blueprint of the area around a certain roadway that needs to be preserved. The CAD maps of the Cedar Plan Line illustrates the standard cross section of an arterial roadway along Cedar Avenue. Katherine L. (GHD) explained that within the segment sections, utility lines and parcels were illustrated. The utility lines and parcels are referenced from the County website, Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E), and *Fresno Works* provided by FCOG. Gary M. reiterated that these drawings are for discussion purposes only, and are subject to change.

Gary M. continued the discussion about the standard 110' divided arterial street from the City of Fresno's standard drawing. The Cedar Plan Line maps currently illustrates the 110' arterial street, which raises concern of the right-of-way boundaries cutting through parts of the parcels along south of the Cedar Avenue corridor. It is a plan to look at the future forecasted traffic volume along the corridor to scale down the street width of the corridor.

A comment was made about looking at the map in the Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) to see the planned number of lanes that will be running along Cedar Avenue. Cedar Avenue is planned to have two lanes even though it is classified as an arterial.

The group had questions regarding agricultural preservation (i.e. prime farmland) requirements that run along the Cedar Avenue corridor that should be considered. Kristine C. mentioned that preservation requirements should be looked into when widening right-of-way that may potentially impact prime farmland or other agricultural preservation.

Action Item:

- ✓ Scale down arterial street cross section on southern portion of Cedar Avenue.
- ✓ Include maps to show aerial view of the corridor.
- ✓ Follow up about agricultural preservation requirements for the corridor.

g. Funding Opportunities

Richard H. (TPA) discussed that the current funding opportunity is high level and mostly narrative driven and is waiting for the start draft of the whole plan before diving into the specifics of funding programs. Richard H. plans to take the narrative to drill down the specifics of the programs that are offered. Currently listed in this section of the working papers are funding programs with no timeline. First results will be used to help determine

priorities of funding programs. Some priority factors would include crosswalks, over-crossings, housing, items listed in this year's budget

Action Items:

- ✓ Prepare a funding matrix.
- ✓ Include reduction in VMT.
- ✓ Include impact fees in City of Fresno.

**h. TTR and Congestion Threshold**

Jim D. described the congestion threshold as a way of improvement. Roadways that are designated to be part of the National Highway system have pre-speed data available to them. Included in this section includes figures that depict the results from 12-month data or the true annual data, AM and PM peak hour, and off-peak hour. It is clear in various updates and the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) that people on the road is driving faster in denser conditions due to better-made vehicles and autonomous vehicles (that will be a factor affecting the future). Jim D. continued that the prevailing peak hour speeds currently do not fall under 60% of the free flow. When they do fall below 60%, which is primarily based upon speed, the roadways are congested. Jim D. concluded that the congestion is more of an issue for heavy trucks than passenger vehicles.

A comment was made about doing an analysis on the jurisdictions around Cherry Avenue roadway. There are auctions held on Tuesdays and Saturdays which results in traffic backing up onto Caltrans facilities. Gary M. commented that week-long traffic report was generated. As a result from that, traffic average on Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday are about half of the traffic count of Tuesday. A team member added that traffic control should also be included in the analysis because during the days of auction, drivers are to take an alternative route, which also alter bikeway conditions through traffic.

A team member commented that in addition to the Cherry Avenue Auction, Sikh religious temples and Buddhist temples have big gatherings on Saturdays that should also be taken in consideration.

**i. Intersection Operations Analysis (Existing Conditions)**

Gary M. discussed the analysis of intersections determined by collaborative effort between the Caltrans, City, and the County. Caltrans and City provided signal timing plan sheets for the analysis. In general, between gathered and new, there are 61 intersections, including the ramps that surround the project area and critical intersections within the study area. Analysis for all intersections and road segments are run on *Synchro 10*.

There are three intersections that failed either during the AM or PM peak hour period under existing conditions. The three failing intersections are primarily on southbound ramps of SR-99.

Kristine C. announced that the COG, Caltrans, and City are looking for possible funding to improve the intersections of North Avenue and SR-99 and Central Avenue and SR-99. Gary M. initiated the discussion about the future model that will be utilized to forecast the future conditions. Kristine C. continued the discussion that COG has two versions of the model. There is the traditional 4-step model, where the base year is 2014 but the City of Fresno has

brought their base to match current conditions (2018). The COG has an activity-based model (ABM), where the base model is also 2014, but through calibration, it can be updated to 2019—which will take a couple months. Currently, the COG is collecting information from the major developments of the 16 jurisdictions within Fresno County. The model used by the City of Fresno is focused more on the area located within City boundaries, but ABM is more valid overall and the mini calibration is more accountable. Kristine C. concluded that the base year for the future models will be 2018 or 2019.

#### **4. Economic Conditions**

##### **a. General Economic Conditions of the Study Area**

Isabel D. (NEA) summarized the section of economic condition as an overview of what they have done so far. The ultimate purpose of their work is to provide an understanding of the economic base of the area and how certain types of transportation improvements will help stimulate economic development or help the City of County achieve their economic development goals. NEA look at the real estate market, interviewed different stakeholders, businesses, school districts, and utility providers to get a better understanding of the usage of roads.

Isabel D. mentioned doing interviews with Ulta, school districts, local brokers, and land owners to better understand how the development is going and to figure out what kind of transportation improvement would best benefit them. In recap of the findings, there about 300 businesses within the study area, many of them are manufacturing, construction wholesale, and transportation warehousing. Most of the jobs are in the manufacturing industry and retail (e.g., Amazon and Ulta).

Continuing with the findings, there are about 10 million square feet of industrial space, which is 15-16% of the City's inventory. Many people choose to establish industrial businesses in the area because of its good accessibility. However, there would be some conflicts near south of the Triangle. Potential conflicts would include smaller parcels, utilities not reaching far enough south of the Triangle, and more residents. Transportation would then be a potential conflict due to truck traffic congestion.

##### **b. Summary of Interviews with Key Stakeholders**

Included in this section are interviews that were conducted. Isabel D. continued that they are hoping to conduct a couple more interviews with a medium-sized company and a small-sized company, preferably not distribution related and more manufacturing and construction related. She also included some conflicts in transportation node that people have pointed out as potential problems. A potential point of conflict would be around the school, in this case Orange Elementary School which has 350 students. The concern mentioned from the school's superintendent would be over-canal transportation bike route that student would take to get to school because of the distance and condition.

##### **Action Items:**

- ✓ Follow up with manufacturers on truck sizes (5-axial trucks).
- ✓ Isabel D. to follow up with Shelby M. about potential forecasting for grant application.
- ✓ Michelle Z. to provide information on new projects happening within the City.

## 5. **Community Engagement/Workshops**

### a. Community Engagement Plan

Kendall F. (RGS) started the discussion about the community engagement plan with asking the group feedback on when the best target date would be for the first workshop. This will help Kendall F. go forward with locking in a facility site that is needed with a head count of how many people will be there to facilitate the workshop. Kendall F. continued with another question to the group of what the vision of the workshop is so they can prepare a combination of exercises to get data that is needed. Multilingual staff will be present to help facilitate the workshop.

### b. Discussion on Venue Times and Dates – 1<sup>st</sup> Workshop (prior to holidays)

Kendall F. discussed with the group of holding the first workshop prior to November. October or early November would be ideal and successful. Shelby M. mentioned that the most effective way for engagement would be a pop-up during parent coffee hour or a sporting event, if aiming to hold a workshop at a school. Kristine C. commented that there are community groups that may be willing to help us get connected with location and event.

### c. Discuss Future Meetings/Workshops (3) prior to June 2020

Shelby M. made a comment if each workshop targets a specific audience. Kendall C. responded that she would like to get this feedback from the group of where the best allocation would go. An ideal plan for pop-up dates and workshops is to have them planned out in November 2019, February and April 2020.

#### Action Items:

- ✓ Provide engagement plan feedback to Gary M. and Kristine C. by next Friday, September 13<sup>th</sup>. They will forward the feedback to Kendall F.
- ✓ Kendall F. to provide a calendar of potential dates of workshops and pop-ups.

## 6. **Tentative Schedule**

### a. Admin Draft Scheduled for May/June 2020 (for use in applications)

### b. Draft/Final Draft Scheduled for July/August 2020

### c. Final Due to State September 2020

Gary M. mentioned that Kendall F. would want a draft done before June 2020 in order to meet the schedule. In order to meet the final due date in September 2020, there will be a tentative schedule done for meetings. Gary M. made a comment referring to the engagement plan of some facilities that are available, it would be helpful if everyone review them and provide feedback.

## 7. **Next Steps (discussion)**

Braden D. mentioned that the agenda, meeting minutes, all working papers, and engagement plan for the RTTAP study will be found under Special Studies on the FCOG website.



Action Items:

- ✓ Provide feedback on working papers by the next 2 weeks after the engagement plan feedback (Wednesday, September 25, 2019).
- ✓ Gary M. to send out engagement plan to all stakeholders.
- ✓ Send out reminders of feedback due date to all stakeholders.
- ✓ FCOG to put a link on website for engagement plan.

**8. Adjourn**