Fresno Public Transportation Infrastructure Study

Task 1: Review of Current Plans and Studies

May 27, 2005

Prepared for:
Council of Fresno County Governments

WC05-2162

FEHR & PEERS
TRANSPORTATION CONSULTANTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

1. OVERVIEW OF TASK 1 REPORT

The consultant team undertook a review of both prior studies on the feasibility of high-capacity transit in Fresno County and existing transportation and land use planning policies.

The first section provides a historical context to regional transit planning in the San Joaquin Valley through summaries of previous transit studies in Fresno County. Sections 2 – 4 provide a summary overview of existing transportation and land use policies as represented in key planning documents, i.e.:

- The 2004 Fresno Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
- General Plans (16 in all, covering Fresno County and each of the 15 incorporated cities)
- Transit Plans for Transit Operators in Fresno County

Appendix A provides tables from the RTP detailing funded transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects and those prioritized projects deemed worthy of funding should additional finances become available.

In addition to these policy documents, the team reviewed the Capital Improvement Programs (CIPs) of several agencies in the Fresno region as these related to pedestrian and bicycle facilities and other transit-supportive infrastructures. This review revealed few transit supportive projects in the CIPs beyond those included in the RTP.

The final section makes focused recommendations for policies aimed at overcoming barriers to implementation of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit infrastructure as well as transit-supportive development patterns. This organizes the review by topic area and references existing policies and practices by jurisdiction, and identifies potential additional policies and changes in practice to better support the long-term viability of transit in the Fresno region. These recommendations form the starting point for the key corridor recommendations that will be developed in Task 3: Land Use and Infrastructure Assessment.

2. PREVIOUS STUDIES OF REGIONAL TRANSIT

This section summarizes the key findings of six previous studies: four studies (spanning from 1988 to 2001) focused on regional transit and rail projects in Fresno County; a 2001 study of the transportation implications of welfare-to work-reforms in the Fresno region; and a 2003 study of farmworker transportation needs.

STUDY #1: UPDATED PRELIMINARY LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS

Prepared by the Council of Fresno County Governments
April 1988

Purpose

This report's purpose was to update a 1980 preliminary light rail transit feasibility study conducted by the Council of Fresno County Governments (COFCG). The 1980 study determined that higher densities would be needed to justify LRT service in Fresno, but that "light rail transit should not be ruled out as a future transit alternative."

Some changes and developments took place in Fresno from 1980 - 1988, warranting a further look at LRT:

- Updated Fresno General Plan projecting higher density in residential uses
- Development of a transportation model
- Possible abandonment of an intra-city rail line
- Efforts towards completion of the metropolitan freeway system
- Renewed local interest in refining the analysis of the potential of light rail for Fresno

Ridership Projections

MINUTP (the traffic simulation model used by COFCG in 1988) was used to forecast traffic on the street and highway network.

Projected transit ridership figures were generated for three freeways and four rail corridors:

- Freeway 41
- Proposed Freeways 168 and 180
- Santa Fe main line
- Southern Pacific branch lines running along McKinley and Clovis Avenues
- Biola branch line (abandoned)

Ridership projections were made considering full development to General Plan densities. They are not considered realistic, since real development seldom equals full planned capacity, but were used for purposes of analysis representing the most extreme scenario.

Results

The projected daily trips were far below the recommended federal Urban Mass Transit Administration's (UMTA) feasibility threshold standard of 15,000 daily trips per corridor. The total projected ridership for the entire network was 9,539 daily trips. These are shown below.

TABLE 1 PROJECTED LRT DAILY RIDERSHIP	
Location	**Daily Ridership**
Freeway 41	956
Freeway 168/Portion of SP McKinley Avenue	1,395
Freeway 180	1,401
SF main line	1,411
SP branch line (McKinley Avenue)	1,052
SP branch line (Clovis Avenue)	2,400
SP branch line (Biola)	924
TOTAL	9,539
Source: CoFCG, 1988.	

Cost Effectiveness

To obtain UMTA funding at the time required proof of a reasonable possibility that the LRT alternative would be cost effective compared to alternative transportation modes. The report estimated the capital and operating cost per mile for establishing a LRT line compared to two alternatives, an exclusive busway and an expanded fixed-route bus service.

The study found that the estimated capital cost per mile was substantially lower for the expanded fixed-route alternative, followed by the exclusive busway and LRT alternatives. However, in estimated operating cost per mile, LRT service was lower than the other two alternatives. Costs are detailed below.

TABLE 2 COMPARATIVE ESTIMATED CAPITAL/OPERATING COSTS		
	Cost Per Mile ($)	
	Capital	**Operating**
Light Rail Transit		
Rail Corridor	8,050,000	3.30
Freeway Corridor	9,440,000	3.30
Motor Bus Service	48,000	3.40
Exclusive Busway		
Rail Corridor	799,000	3.40
Freeway Corridor	661,000	3.40
Source: CoFCG, 1988		

Funding Sources

Local, state and federal revenue sources that were considered as potentially available to implement a LRT service were reviewed, including:

- Local sales tax
- Local innovative sources, such as:

Lease/sale

Special benefit assessment

Tax increment financing

- Article XIX
- State Transit Assistance
- State Transit Capital Improvement Funds
- UMTA Section 3 and Section 9

Conclusions

The report concluded that:

- Operation of light rail within the three freeway and four rail corridors is not cost effective given the lack of projected ridership demand
- Light rail should not be completely ruled out as a future mass transit option in Fresno, however.
- A more concentrated employment center might be required for light rail to become a cost effective alternative.

  LRT feasibility rule-of-thumb: minimum of 60,000-70,000 employees in an employment center

  Downtown Sacramento (ca. 1988): 55,000-60,000 employees with 12 million square feet of non-residential floor area and light rail system with 8,000-11,000 daily passengers

  Downtown Fresno (ca. 1988): 8,000 employees with 2 million square feet of non-residential floor area
- Future recommended land use direction would be the provision of much higher employment centers

STUDY #2: FRESNO COUNTY RAIL CONCEPT PLAN

Prepared by Marc P. Scalzo, Planning Coordinator
County of Fresno County Governments
Adoption: June 27, 1991

Purpose

COFCG conducted this study to update and expand the Rail Element of the 1992 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Completion of this rail plan was viewed as critical for Fresno to compete for available local, state and federal rail funding. This Concept Plan included basic conceptual information for both intercity rail service and long-term light rail or local commuter rail for the region.

More specifically, the rail-specific projects addressed in the document included:

- Present intercity (Amtrak) service
- Consolidation of Southern Pacific and Santa Fe trackage onto one corridor through the Fresno region
- Establishment of a sound planning basis for future mass transit options
- The potential for intercity commuter service

- Preservation of rail and freeway right-of-way for future mass transit options
- High speed intercity services

Fresno Rail Planning

The report notes that Rail planning in Fresno was focused on the following eight issues:

1. Consolidation of all Santa Fe mainline rail traffic onto the Southern Pacific corridor from Calwa to the San Joaquin River
2. Additional intercity train service for the San Joaquin route
3. Switching the Amtrak San Joaquin service from the Santa Fe to the Southern Pacific line between Stockton and Fresno
4. Construction of a new, multimodal station in Fresno to provide facilities on the Southern Pacific line
5. Obtaining abandoned trackage through Fresno County of Fresno for future local transportation purposes
6. Long range planning and corridor preservation for future commuter and light rail, or other mass transit applications in Fresno County
7. Development of train service rather than dedicated bus service to Sacramento (north of Stockton) as a logical expansion of valley train service.
8. The potential of commuter light rail in Fresno County

Rail Priorities

The following list details the priorities for the rail transportation mode as listed in the RTP:

- Seek ways to move all mainline Santa Fe and Southern Pacific passenger and freight rail traffic to the Southern Pacific alignment through the City of Fresno
- Consider development of a central multimodal transportation terminal facility in or in close proximity to Fresno's CBD
- Continue to give high priority to grade separation construction projects
- Close grade crossings of main lines with minor streets and alleys wherever possible
- Protect grade crossings on main lines with automatic gates
- Seek legislative changes to rail abandonment procedures to require that all lines proposed for abandonment be brought under public ownership as a precondition to abandonment
- Consider advantages and disadvantages of projects, including economic, environmental and social factors
- Endorse the following priorities for passenger rail service:

  Use of the Southern Pacific mainline tracks between Fresno and Stockton

  Additional train service for the San Joaquin route
- Support the following passenger rail service improvements:

  Provision of direct train service to Sacramento

  Operation of train service to the East Bay over the Altamont Pass

Provision of direct train service to Los Angeles

STUDY # 3: FRESNO COUNTY RAIL CORRIDOR PRESERVATION/ACQUISITION AND TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES STUDY FOR COUNCIL OF FRESNO COUNTY GOVERNMENTS

Author: Korve Engineering, Inc.
Final Draft – January 30, 1997

Summary

The purpose of the study was to analyze the future of rail corridors, specifically to:

- Determine likely future of rail service
- Identify potential funding to maintain and keep rail lines
- Identify future rail use
- Relate findings and needs

This study provides a summary of the current (1997) status and inventory of rail networks in Fresno County, and identifies existing land use policies for all rail corridors. It also describes potential funding sources to preserve corridors.

Of the remaining corridors, the Clovis and Exeter Branches are clearly important to preserve. Other corridors that are suggested to preserve are:

- East portion of Western Branch
- Visalia subdivision (marginal)
- Coalinga branch in Fresno County (questionable)

Brief History

Owners of rail at the time (1997) included:

- Union Pacific (UP)
- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF)
- Tulare Valley Railroad (TVP)
- Port Railroad (PR)

The Surface Transportation Board (formerly the Interstate Commerce Commission) determines what can be abandoned. Senate Bill 562 allows RTP agencies to submit information regarding potentially available ROW suitable for commuter and inner city rail and to identify ROW currently not for sale.

Rail Conditions

Overall rail conditions were mostly fair to poor, necessitating slow operating speeds. Significant upgrades were deemed necessary to permit passenger rail speeds.

Land Use and Planning Policies by Community

This report discussed several communities and the policies that have been set in place regarding rail. Most do not have special land use designations; few have defined specific goals and policy standards. Many

would like to maintain rail for the purpose of freight services, whereas some have already abandoned rail service and sold the ROW. Several noted that at the time the report was completed, no railroad zoning was included in their General Plans but it was intended for inclusion in future plan revisions. Policies current in 1997 are summarized in Appendix B. Following is a summary of policies by community.

Clovis

- 1993 General Plan – transportation corridor along UP ROW; light rail, bike, pedestrian, public transit
- Clovis Railroad Plan prepared for abandonment of SPRR Branchline Corridor – similar plans as described for UPRR
- GP Circulation element promotes all modes of transport and as it becomes available, acquire railroad ROW

Coalinga

- Already abandoned and sold ROW, so no longer has continuous corridor
- No existing policies exist but a Passenger Rail feasibility study examined a rail corridor up to edge of Coalinga on Coalinga and Exeter Branches of UPRR

Firebaugh

- SPRR (now PR) Westside mainlines runs E to W and services agriculture uses
- No land use associated with railroad
- No specific goals or policies in General Plan
- Wants to maintain freight service and keep railroad corridor for freight purposes

Fowler

- UPRR mainline runs NW to SE
- No land use associated with railroad
- No specific goals or policies in General Plan
- Wants to maintain freight service and keep railroad corridor for that purpose, but would like to deal with issues of at-grade crossing

Fresno

- No land use associated with railroad; railroad shares adjacent land use
- No specific goals or policies in General Plan
- 1990 Trails Manual examines using railroad ROW for recreational trails
- Wants to purchase Pinedale Spurline ROW

Huron

- No land use associated with railroad, railroad shares adjacent land use

- No specific goals or policies in General Plan
- Want to maintain freight service and keep railroad corridor for that purpose
- User of mainline is not satisfied with maintenance of rail, so is moving to use other rail, owner of rail filed to abandon ROW

Kerman

- No land use associated with railroad, railroad shares adjacent land use
- No specific goals or policies in General Plan
- Wants to maintain freight service and keep railroad corridor for that purpose

Kingsburg

- No land use associated with railroad, railroad shares adjacent land use
- No specific goals or policies in General Plan
- Wants to maintain freight service and keep railroad corridor for that purpose

Mendota

- No land use associated with railroad, railroad shares adjacent land use
- No specific goals or policies in General Plan
- Wants to maintain freight service and keep railroad corridor for that purpose

Orange Cove

- No land use associated with railroad, railroad shares adjacent land use
- No specific goals or policies in General Plan
- Wants to maintain freight service and keep railroad corridor for that purpose
- City now negotiating with railroad to acquire ROW for trucking
- Part of railroad line has been abandoned and no plans to preserve ROW exist, but County wants to preserve so they are re-evaluating

Parlier

- No land use associated with railroad, railroad shares adjacent land use
- No specific goals or policies in General Plan –railroad will be addressed in planned General Plan update
- Aware and concerned with abandonment but doesn't know what they want to do with ROW

Reedley

- No land use associated with railroad, railroad shares adjacent land use
- No specific goals or policies in General Plan – in General Plan update railroad will be addressed

- TVP Branchline – no service, but ROW intact
- Was going to be abandoned but American Trails Association agreed to use for trails /recreation
- They are aware and concerned with abandonment and this will be addressed in General Plan update

Sanger

- Railroad owns ROW and leases it to industrial uses, included in General Plan
- No specific goals or policies in General Plan
- Rail currently used for commercial and industrial uses and wants to keep it for that purpose; knows it should maintain ROW in case Pax rail becomes a possibility

San Joaquin

- No land use associated with railroad, railroad shares adjacent land use
- No specific goals or policies in General Plan, but wants to include a goods movement section in General Plan update
- Wants to maintain freight service and keep railroad corridor for that purpose
- Concerns of safety at at-grade crossing

Selma

- No land use associated with railroad, railroad shares adjacent land use
- No specific goals or policies in General Plan
- Wants to maintain freight service and keep railroad corridor for that purpose
- General Plan update will include discussion of noise, at grade crossing and beautification

County of Fresno

- No land use associated with railroad, railroad shares adjacent land use. Proposed zone for railroad intended to preserve all railroad corridors for transport modes
- Preservation is a major concern – sees corridors as irreplaceable transportation assets and trail uses are not acceptable alternatives

Funding Overview

Several funding sources available at the time of the report (1997) were discussed. Table 2 provides a list of all the possible funding sources available, and ranks each one according to nine sorting criteria. The results indicate that the funding sources fall into three categories:

Group 1: More Promising Sources (Score of 8 or above)

Federal Funds:

- "Q" Funds – ROW Revolving Funds – used to acquire ROW for future facilities on any federal-aid system corridor; highly competitive procurement process

- Section 9 Formula Grant – Grant program that makes funds available on the basis of a statutory formula to all urbanized areas in the country for transit operations and capital needs. Eligible projects include ROW acquisition; Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs, e.g. COFCG) approve the projects
- Regional Surface Transportation Program – flexible funding provided by the COFCG; requires a 12% match; has been used to acquire the Clovis Branchline/Pinedale Spurline railroad corridor
- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality – Allocated through state MPOs based on the population weighted by the severity of the region's air quality and project must be linked to improving air quality; 12% match is required

State Funds:

- Petroleum Violation Escrow Account – legislatively allocated for special projects on a statewide competitive basis for projects that reduce gasoline consumption/emissions

Local Funds:

- Utility Investment – Funding participation by users that share railroad ROW such as utilities, energy pipelines, and fiber optics
- Short Line Partnership – involves working with the freight railroads to fund rail capital improvements by using freight revenues as a source of repayment or local match

The "Moderately" and "Less Promising" sources are described in more detail on pages 22-34 of the original report.

Preservation Strategies

Eight preservation methods are summarized in Table 3 below.

Organizational and Institutional Arrangements

The report identifies the organizational and institutional arrangements utilized within California to preserve and acquire railroad corridors, and how they can be applied to Fresno County. They can be summarized into three broad categories:

<u>Group 1: Existing Agencies</u>

- The City
- The County
- COG
- Transportation Authority

<u>Group 2: Special Purpose Agencies</u>

- Joint Power Agencies – Multiple political agencies that sign an agreement to create a JPA that can have all the powers of creating jurisdictions, purchasing, condemnation, etc. All groups included must have prior agreements on the common goals and proposals of the Agency
- Regional Transportation Authority
- Public/Private Corporation

Group 3: Informal Agencies

- Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) – A less formal agreement than the JPA, but still an agreement between multiple agencies on a common goal – in this case to acquire railroad ROW. The purpose of the MOU is to address the conditions of approval prior to the COG considering a proposal
- Cooperative Agreement
- Contract with Private Carrier

Given the lack of confidence using existing agencies to preserve rail corridors, MOUs appears to be the most appropriate mechanism to acquire ROW.

Preservation Strategies

Some of the preservation recommendations provided in this study include:

- Preserve the Clovis Branch and Pinedale Spur through acquisition of ROW by public agencies
- Preserve the Exeter Branch between Fresno, Sanger, and Reedley by assuring the private railroad operator that they can maintain active freight service
- Preserve the Westside Line between Fresno and Kerman by assuring the private operator that they can maintain active freight service
- COFCG should establish an ad hoc task force to work with SJV to keep freight ops financially viable on the Exeter and Westside line. If this is not possible, COFCG should try to obtain funding from Mobil Source Emission Funds and Congestion Air Quality Program funds
- COFCG should work with the SJV railroad to develop a private/public partnership to utilize future freight revenues as the local match for funding sources
- COGCG should continue dialog with corridor land owners to understand and monitor their objectives regarding the long term use of their property and should try to coordinate efforts to develop shared uses with utilities
- Fresno County and the cities of Fresno, Kerman, Sanger, and Reedley should adopt land use policies that would assist the development of shared utility uses on the corridors, and should prepare a contingency preservation strategy if and when freight service on the Exeter and or Westside lines are no longer financially viable
- Fresno County and the cities of Fresno, Clovis, Kerman, Reedley and Sanger should adopt land use policies that support Rail corridor preservation in their General Plan and Zoning ordinances

STUDY #4: FRESNO RAIL CONSOLIDATION REPORT FOR THE COUNCIL OF FRESNO COUNTY GOVERNMENTS

Final Draft – December 2001
Author: HDR Engineering, Inc.

Summary

Problem Framing

As the Fresno metropolitan region continues to grow, the presence of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad line through the City of Fresno will cause increased problems for traffic and safety,

dispersed land development to accommodate residential and commercial demand, and a less efficient use of the transportation corridors than other alternatives.

Proposal

The Fresno Council of Governments (COG) and partner jurisdictions are evaluating a proposal to relocate a portion of the BNSF railroad trackage from its present location to the Union Pacific (UP) railroad line right-of-way. Specifically, the proposal would either:

- Require the railroads to operate under a joint operating agreement and single-dispatch protocol, or
- Would create two separately operated railroads within the same corridor

This report documents the opportunities, benefits, and costs associated with these two alternatives for accomplishing the consolidation.

The Fresno COG, Madera County, Amtrak, and the California High-Speed Rail Authority have each prepared long-range plans that outline infrastructure development priorities, programs, and policies to guide the organizations in meeting their future transportation challenges. Each of the plans acknowledges the rail corridor and the proposal to consolidate the two railroads.

Objectives

The objectives of the consolidation proposal are to:

- Improve motorist safety and eliminate noise and vibration along the existing BNSF alignment.
- Eliminate vehicular traffic delays by grade-separating all locations where roadways cross the UP railroad corridor (i.e., where the consolidation would occur).
- Improve rail operations and make efficient use of resources by concentrating all track and signal improvements in one corridor.
- Enhance the quality of life and economic development opportunities in the City of Fresno, particularly along the BNSF corridor.

Location

The proposal examines relocation of an approximate 15-mile portion of the BNSF railroad trackage from its present location (between the North Avenue/Highway 99 intersection and a location approximately ½ mile north of Avenue 7 in Madera County) to the Union Pacific (UP) railroad line right-of-way that runs parallel to and west of the BNSF.

The BNSF operates on UP track south of Bakersfield and north of Stockton, and its tracks cross the UP's mail line at Calwa Yard and run north directly adjacent to the UP on its own alignment adjacent to Calwa Yard as it enters Fresno. On the UP system in the Fresno metropolitan area, the BNSF would be consolidated within the UP right-of-way between UP mileposts 196 and 209.

The UP line runs west of the BNSF line and runs adjacent and parallel to the Highway 99 corridor.

In 1998 the BNSF deeded to the City of Fresno all of its ownership interests in its current rail route between Calwa Yard and the San Joaquin River. However, this is contingent upon the construction of (and deeded to BNSF) a dedicated, fully grade-separated double track corridor for BNSF within the current UP right-of-way.

Alignment

BNSF Alignment

The BNSF alignment also accommodates Amtrak's San Joaquin Corridor service and connects to the San Joaquin Valley Railroad. Specifically, there are:

- 27 public and 3 private at-grade rail/roadway crossings along this portion carrying approximately (per day)

  39 trains

  428,000 vehicles

UP Alignment

The UP alignment carries:

- 14 public road crossings with approximately (per day)

  20 freight trains

  178,000 vehicles

Alternatives Considered

Most of the study alternatives include four main line tracks (two for each railroad). The two railroads would each dispatch their own trains and maintain their own tracks.

One alternative involves a joint-use track alternative. This alternative involves construction of three tracks for joint-use by both railroads and would reserve right-of-way for future construction of a fourth main track.

STUDY #5: THE TRAVEL BEHAVIOR AND NEEDS OF THE POOR: A STUDY OF WELFARE RECIPIENTS IN FRESNO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Authors: Evelyn Blumenberg with Peter Hass
Mineta Transportation Institute Report 01-23
December 2001

As a result of welfare reform, millions of welfare recipients are now required to enter the paid labor market. A growing number of studies suggest that reliable transportation—either automobiles or public transit—is essential to linking welfare recipients to employment opportunities. Nearly all of this previous research focuses on large urban areas. In contrast, smaller urban areas, small cities, and rural areas have received comparatively little attention. Yet, rural, non-metropolitan areas alone are home to almost one-quarter of all welfare recipients in the U.S.

To address this gap in the literature on the travel behavior and needs of welfare recipients living outside of large metropolitan areas, this study examined data from six focus groups and a random survey of 502 welfare recipients in Fresno County. The objectives of the study were to (1) examine the travel behavior of welfare recipients, (2) assess the relationship between access to transportation and the employment outcomes of welfare recipients, and (3) develop a set of policy and planning recommendations to improve the transportation options of welfare recipients and other low-wage workers living in smaller metropolitan and rural areas.

This study confirms that the transportation barriers facing welfare recipients are not experienced exclusively by welfare recipients living in large metropolitan areas such as Los Angeles, Chicago and New York. Many of the barriers are widespread. Similar to welfare recipients in large urban areas, welfare recipients in Fresno County who report the greatest travel difficulties are those who are transit dependent and those who

are traveling to many unfamiliar destinations while searching for employment. Most welfare recipients find that their travel to childcare is relatively easy. However, welfare recipients who use childcare centers and homes report greater travel difficulties compared to those who rely for care on relatives, friends, or neighbors. In addition, relative to other commuters, welfare participants more frequently travel during off-peak hours when transit service may be limited.

Moreover, welfare recipients with unlimited access to automobiles have higher employment rates and report fewer transportation problems. These findings are quite robust across a number of recent studies. Access to automobiles, however, is highly variable across racial and ethnic groups. African-Americans are more likely to use public transit and less likely to use cars compared to other racial/ethnic groups. Access to automobiles may also vary by the reliability of the automobiles themselves since many welfare recipients own older vehicles that require frequent maintenance and repairs.

Some of the transportation issues facing welfare recipients in smaller urban and rural areas are quite unique. Compared to welfare recipients in other urban areas, those in Fresno County are more likely to travel by car and less likely to rely on public transit. The survey shows that 86 percent of all Fresno welfare recipients commute by car compared to only 60 percent of welfare recipients living in Los Angeles County. Overall, Fresno welfare recipients have less difficulty traveling to and from work compared to welfare recipients in Los Angeles.

Fresno welfare recipients are more likely to live in rural areas distant from the urban core of the county. Approximately 23 percent of Fresno County welfare participants live outside of the Fresno-Clovis urban center. Transit usage among rural welfare recipients is significantly lower than transit use among urban welfare recipients. Rural transit service is much more limited and travel times into the Fresno-Clovis metropolitan area can be long. Relative to recipients living in some of the rural areas, those living in Fresno-Clovis have higher levels of transit service, shorter travel times, and live in closer proximity to bus stops. Rural welfare recipients are also less likely to use any form of childcare and have lower employment rates than their urban counterparts.

In contrast to other studies showing greater isolation and transportation difficulties among the rural poor, a rural residential location in Fresno County does not appear to influence welfare recipients' ease of travel. This finding may be due to the lower employment rates among rural welfare recipients. Those with the greatest transportation difficulties may be the least likely to find employment and, therefore, travel. It may also be due to rural welfare participants' greater reliance on automobiles. Finally, the ease of travel among rural welfare participants may also be affected by the location of their employment. ***Only three percent of respondents live in rural areas and commute into the Fresno-Clovis area; in contrast, 15 percent live and work in rural areas. Interestingly, close to 30 percent of all respondents who live in Fresno-Clovis commute to work destinations outside of the urban area.***

To respond to the transportation needs of welfare recipients, Fresno County provides transportation assistance that includes free bus passes and tokens as well as mileage reimbursement for participants who travel by car. Approximately 22 percent of all survey respondents who engaged in work-related travel received some sort of subsidy from the county. In two separate questions, survey respondents were asked about their automobile and transit-related policy preferences. The top car-related policy preference among all respondents, including respondents who currently drive automobiles, is assistance in purchasing automobiles. In terms of public transit, survey respondents overwhelmingly prefer a shuttle service that would take them to and from work.

Overall, the findings from this study suggest the following types of policy solutions:

- Automobile assistance programs to facilitate ease of travel particularly among welfare recipients who are looking for jobs, welfare recipients who commute from Fresno-Clovis to rural areas, and welfare recipients who own unreliable vehicles;
- A special emphasis on programs to aid welfare participants while they search for employment;

- Targeted investments in urban public transit which may include extending service hours and, perhaps, experimenting with non-fixed route service to large employment sites outside of the metropolitan area;
- Increasing the supply of childcare services, particularly in rural areas of the county; and
- Administrative efforts to ensure that those who qualify for transportation subsidies receive them.

STUDY #6: AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRIES TRANSPORTATION SERVICES STATEWIDE NEEDS ASSESSMENT; AGRICULTURAL WORKER TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT, FINAL REPORT

Authors: Robert Castaneda and Steven Castaneda
California Department of Transportation
May 2003

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) funded the Agricultural Industries Transportation Services Statewide Needs Assessment Study to determine the existence and extent of the unmet transportation needs among the state's agricultural worker population. Additionally, Caltrans wanted a review of a pilot agricultural worker transportation program in four (4) Central Valley counties. The objective of the study was to build upon the limited information compiled on this community, and to recommend strategies to address the outstanding issues surrounding transportation. In order to achieve the stated goals, the consultant team engaged in several data collection activities which included focus groups and community forums with farmworkers and their families conducted throughout the state's major growing regions, telephone and personal interviews with major stakeholder representatives, and mail surveys to the state's licensed farm labor contractors.

To illustrate the location of farmworker housing, transit routes, and major agricultural regions in relation to each other, Geographic Information System (GIS) maps were developed.

Results of the study indicate that there are several transportation and related improvements needed to create sufficient opportunities for farmworkers to avail themselves of safe, affordable, and dependable transportation. Further, fundamental changes in access to vehicle insurance, the introduction of vanpools, modification of federal rules, and greater enforcement of vehicle safety laws will improve the existing situation for the target group of this study.

The report includes 17 recommendations for Caltrans to consider for further review, and implementation. The report also recommends further review of both the AITS Pilot Program, and the Farmworker Driver Safety Program, which were being implemented at the publishing of this report. Both programs represent significant efforts to address access to transportation and vehicle safety issues, and a comprehensive evaluation is warranted.

Applicable Study Recommendations:

Expand Public Transportation Services to Early Morning and Weekend Hours

Even for public transit to provide partial service to this community, it is necessary to expand bus service to early and weekend hours. Agricultural workers by the nature of their industry are required to report for work as early as 4:00 am. Most of the transit services reviewed for this study do not provide early morning service. Such limited service makes it difficult to use public transportation to get to work.

Introduce Shuttle Van and Bus Service to Growing Areas

Surveys indicate that the Kings County AITS Pilot Program model is the most sound as it relates to providing transportation to this hard to serve labor group. Although there have been difficulties in launching

the program, the design has been endorsed by a majority of all stakeholders interviewed for this study. This type of approach should be expanded in cooperation with community-based organizations that can recruit, and train drivers. Farmworker public purpose program providers could disseminate language sensitive information and conduct targeted outreach.

Housing providers could establish park and ride locations, and employers that can coordinate onsite transportation with shuttle services should be provided incentives.

3. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN – POLICY SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

2004 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN POLICY LISTING

Policy Summary and Effectiveness Criteria

This section contains the excerpts from the Regional Transportation Plan's Goals, Objectives and Policies that are related to Public Transportation.

3.1 San Joaquin Valley Policy Element

Note: this element is jointly developed and adopted by all eight counties in the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

Goal: Design, develop and maintain a multimodal transportation system that efficiently and safely moves people and goods, and also serves the social, economic, and physical needs of Valley residents while enhancing their quality of life.

Objective:

1. A multimodal circulation network that is convenient, safe, and efficient.
2. A multimodal circulation network that is both cost effective and environmentally sound.
3. A transportation system that meets the travel demand of both citizens and businesses.

Policies:

- Facilitate a cooperative effort between the public and private sectors to integrate transportation modes through a coordinated transportation planning process, carried out by the eight regional transportation planning agencies.
- Work with public transit and social service agencies to assist in implementing "welfare-to-work" programs.
- Involve citizens and businesses in planning transportation facilities and services. Special efforts will be made to include those individuals and groups who may not have been included in the past. These groups may include the elderly, infirm, and racial/ethnic minorities, including Native Americans. Working with these and other groups, strategies that address transportation issues of importance to under-served groups will be developed. Direct involvement by under-represented groups will be promoted in transportation planning, project selection, and other transportation issues that affect them.
- Cooperatively work toward a transportation system that will widen the mode choice available to travelers and shippers.
- Support the implementation of the Transportation System Management, Transportation Demand Management, and Transportation Control Measures that reduce emissions from the circulation system. This support shall include consultation with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District.
- Support transportation systems that have the lowest feasible levels of energy consumption while meting reasonable mobility needs.
- Support alternative land use patterns that will allow walking, biking, and transit to become more viable transportation options.

Goal: Develop and finance multimodal transportation facilities and services that are consistent with regional and local growth policies and are consistent with state and federal air quality plans.

Objective:

1. Prepare RTIP that lists multimodal transportation facility improvements/ operations that are run in a financially constrained manner and in conformance with adopted California State Implementation Plans for air quality purposes.
2. Work to attain and maintain National Air Quality Standards in the San Joaquin Valley.

Policies:

- Improve air quality through a cooperative effort of stationary, mobile, and transportation source controls.
- Improve air quality by supporting jurisdictions that take steps to reduce VMT through compact, mixed-use land use patterns.

Goal: Encourage land use design which is more efficient and more conducive to the use of transit, non-motorized transportation, and rail alternatives.

Objective: Support land uses that are in the interest of the general community by encouraging population densities and patterns that are conducive to transit and non-motorized transportation options.

Policies:

- Advise decision-makers on land use issues to favor compact development.
- Discourage non-contiguous development that is widely separated from existing urban services.
- Promote the concept of jobs-housing balance in new and existing development.
- Encourage infill development to raise population density in existing settings.
- Support walkable subdivision design that is based on an interconnected grid of neighborhood streets and small blocks.
- Support the development of high density, mixed-use neighborhood centers and transit stops.

3.2 General Transportation Goals, Objectives, and Policies

Goal: Provide for an integrated multimodal transportation system which serves the needs of a growing and diverse population for transportation access to jobs, housing, recreation, commercial, and community service.

Objective: Develop an integrated multimodal transportation network.

Policies:

- Develop a regional streets and highways system that has a balanced mix of high-speed and local corridors that are functional and flexible for intermodal use.
- Integrate transportation modes through a coordinated transportation systems management process.
- Provide for efficient, multi-destination trips through the coordination of urban and rural public transportation.
- Decisions on improvements to the transportation system shall take into account the effective use of all modes and facilities.
- Encourage and support the development of methods to expand and enhance transit services and to increase the use of such services.
- Public transit, ridesharing, carpooling, bicycle and pedestrian access, park-and-ride

facilities, and other transportation demand strategies shall be pursued as preferred alternatives where feasible.

- Support the coordination or consolidation (where appropriate) of transit and paratransit services to provide more effective, efficient and accessible transportation services.
- Encourage local jurisdictions to provide incentives to encourage transit, ridesharing and bicycling.

Goal: Maintain and improve the safety and efficiency of existing facilities as the basic system which will meet existing and future travel demands.

Objective: Complete and maintain a transportation network which provides operational efficiency in conjunction with meeting the functional requirements of existing and future travel demands.

Policies:

- Develop a convenient, safe and efficient interface between transportation modes.
- Manage the transportation system in a manner designed to increase operational efficiency, conserve energy and space, reduce air pollution and noise, and provide for effective goods movement, safety, personal mobility and accessibility.
- Continue support for the preservation of existing transportation facilities and, where practical, ways to meet transportation needs by using existing transportation facilities more efficiently.
- Maintain stringent safety requirements for all transportation modes.
- Identify those transportation problems where transportation systems management can be effective.

Goal: Provide support to the maintenance and expansion of transportation modes for the movement of people and goods within and through the region.

Objective: Develop a multimodal transportation network which facilitates and enhances the movement of people and goods in a manner which is economically beneficial to the region.

Policies:

- Strive to ensure that public and private transportation providers and other interested parties have a “reasonable opportunity” for input into the transportation planning process.

Goal: Manage the financial resources which are available from government, the private sector, and users of the transportation system in a cost-effective manner to meet regional needs.

Objective: Procure and leverage federal, state and local transportation funding to the maximum degree possible, in order to develop a regional transportation network which serves the residents of the region in the most economical, effective and efficient manner possible.

Policies:

- Pursue additional funding sources for development of major transportation programs and projects. Work with all interest groups to reach consensus and initiate an active public information program regarding transportation funds needed.
- Submit applications for any supplemental revenue sources that may become available.

Goal: Work with local, state, and federal agencies to promote environmental sensitivity and energy efficiency in the development and management of our transportation system.

Objective: Development of a regional transportation network which is environmentally sensitive and maximizes energy efficiency wherever possible.

Policies:

- Evaluate the transportation system for air quality, energy and efficiency impacts.
- Strive to avoid or fully mitigate all significant impacts of new transportation facilities on environmentally sensitive areas and natural resources.
- Mitigate motor vehicle, railroad and airport-related noise in populated areas.
- Encourage energy conservation through alternatives to single-occupancy vehicles, increased auto efficiency and facility design.
- Project-level decisions should give priority to safety, air pollution, noise and energy considerations.
- Support the implementation of Transportation System Management, Transportation Demand Management, and Transportation Control Measures that reduce emissions on the circulation system.
- Endeavor to ensure the consistency of regional transportation planning efforts with applicable Federal, State, and local energy conservation programs, goals, and objectives.

Goal: Support cooperative efforts between local, state, federal agencies and the public to plan, develop and manage our transportation system.

Objective: Establish intergovernmental organizational relationships and lines of communication which foster an understanding and awareness of the overall impacts of transportation/land use/air quality decision making.

Policies:

- Coordinate with other public agencies to ensure that the overall social, economic, energy and environmental effects of transportation decisions are understood by the general public.
- Work closely with local land use agencies to ensure that land use planning is coordinated with transportation planning to fully mitigate the traffic impacts of new development to the greatest degree possible.
- Existing and future land use plans of the communities within the region shall be recognized in the formulation of transportation decisions.
- Encourage and support mixed land use developments that encourage a jobs/housing balance and that make alternative modes more effective.
- Provide safe, efficient travel while supporting growth management policies to discourage premature urban fringe development.
- Work together with the appropriate public agencies to preserve rights-of-way for construction of future transportation projects, including identification of unused rights-of-way which may be needed for future transportation corridors and identification of those corridors for which action is most needed to prevent destruction or loss.
- Communicate with local land use agencies on the likely impacts of transportation policy decisions on land use and development; and strive for consistency (where appropriate) between transportation plans and programs and applicable land use and development plans.

3.3 Highways, Streets and Roads

Goal: Establish an integrated highways, streets and roads network that provides for the efficient

movement of both people and goods within Fresno County.

Objective: Develop and implement an integrated highways, streets and roads network that provides mobility for both urban and rural residents including the movement of goods.

Policies:

- Monitor levels of service on the streets and highways network within Fresno County to ensure safe and efficient movement of people and goods.
- Develop a convenient, safe and efficient interface between transportation modes.

3.4 Mass Transportation

Goal: Provide public transportation mobility opportunities to the maximum number of people in the region.

Objective: Continue to pursue expanded federal, state and local funding for both public and social service transportation.

Policies:

- Provide a transit system that meets the public transportation needs of the service area.
- Provide transit services that serve elderly and disabled communities.
- Support the coordination and consolidation of social service transportation.

Goal: Provide quality, convenient and reliable public transportation service.

Objective: Encourage safety, appropriate frequency of bus service, reasonable fares and the provision of adequate service to satisfy the transit needs which are reasonable to meet.

Policies:

- Provide reliable and convenient public transit service.
- Provide clean, attractive and comfortable vehicles and facilities.
- Provide a safe system.

Goal: Provide an efficient and effective public transportation system.

Objective: Consider advantages and disadvantages of projects, including economic, environmental and social factors.

Policies:

- Maximize public transportation patronage.
- Minimize operating and capital expenses.
- Encourage the private sector to provide service when economically feasible.

Goal: Promote public transit's service and image in community.

Objective: Provide complete and accurate information that makes public transportation "user friendly".

Policy:

- Create and produce publications that promote the use of public transportation.

Goal: Provide for an integrated multimodal transportation system which facilitates the movement of people and goods.

Objective: Develop a multimodal transportation network.

Policies:

- Coordinate service to facilitate multimodal and inter-system transfers.
- Coordinate fare and transfer policies along with service information programs.

Goal: Coordinate public transportation policies with land use and air quality policies.

Objective: Support transportation investments that work toward accomplishing air quality goals, optimize utilization of land and encourage a stable economic base.

Policies:

- Provide incentives to reduce dependency on automobile travel without compromising travel mobility.
- Evaluate the transportation system for air quality, energy and efficiency impacts.

3.6 Non-Motorized Transportation Goals

Goal: Recognition and integration of the bicycle as a valid transportation mode in transportation planning activities.

Policies**:**

- Include bicycle transportation planning as an integral part of the Fresno COG's transportation planning program.
- Encourage and assist member agencies to develop new or updated existing bicycle transportation plans which are integrated with the regional bikeways system and which provide for bicycle use as an alternative to the automobile for shorter trips.
- Encourage member agencies to provide for bicycle-friendly development, including bicycle travel in new development or redevelopment plans and projects.
- Encourage member agencies to include bicycle parking requirements in all land-use/site development requirements that address automobile parking.

Goal: Safe, convenient, and continuous routes for bicyclists of all types which interface with and complement a multimodal transportation system.

Policies:

- Support the development of a countywide system of designated bikeways that links communities, activity centers, and regional recreational destinations and provides for all types of bicyclists.
- Encourage member agencies to adopt policies or design standards to include accommodations for bicycle travel on all new construction, reconstruction or capacity increasing projects on major roadways where reasonably feasible. Such accommodations may be made by a separate bike path, by bicycle lanes, or by a shared roadway. A shared roadway would include a wide outside lane or a paved shoulder.
- Encourage member agencies and Caltrans to develop, strip, and site bikeways consistent with state design standard in order to develop a visually consistent, clear, simple and recognizable bikeways system with clearly defined travel areas and boundaries.
- Encourage member agencies and Caltrans to install traffic signals that will detect bicyclists in a designated bicycle lane or in the traffic lane of a road or street without bike lanes.
- Encourage member agencies to provide bicycle parking facilities, including secured storage facilities where appropriate, at public and commercial areas, centers of employment, schools, recreational areas, air and bus terminals, major transit stops, and other places that attract large groups of people.
- Encourage local agencies and Fresno County Rural Transit Agency to establish bicycle-to-transit connections throughout the County, including bicycle park-and-ride facilities at transit centers to serve regional route use and the accommodation of bicycles on public transit.

Goal: Increased acceptance of bicycling both as a legitimate transportation mode on public roads and highways and as a transportation mode that is a viable alternative to the automobile.

Policies:

- Encourage, through educational and promotional efforts, bicycling as a transportation mode which promotes cleaner air, eases traffic congestion, conserves nonrenewable sources of energy, and promotes health.
- Encourage member agencies to work with major employers to provide incentive programs for bicycling including shower facilities guaranteed ride home programs and mileage reimbursement for work-related bicycling miles.

3.7 Rail Goals

Goal: Develop a safe, efficient and convenient rail system which serves the passenger and freight needs of the region and which is integrated with and complementary to the total transportation system.

Objective: Promote the growth of rail passenger and freight usage.

Policies:

- Consider development of a multimodal transportation terminal facility in, or in close proximity to, the Central Business District.
- Endorse the following passenger rail service improvements:
- Additional train service for the San Joaquin route
- Improved station facilities servicing the San Joaquin area.
- Additional direct train service to Sacramento and the East Bay Area
- Provision of direct train service to Los Angeles
- Incorporate design awareness of multimodal transportation facilities in development of highway systems.
- Support planning for rail services at a similar level of detail as is currently done for roads.

3.8 Air Quality Goals

Goal: Attain and maintain national and state air quality standards as set by the Environmental Protection Agency and the California Air Resources Board.

Objective: Implement all appropriate Transportation System Management, Transportation Demand Management, and Transportation Control Measure strategies as necessary to meet mandated state and federal clean air legislation.

Policies:

- All strategies recommended in the 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan and the State Implementation Plan shall be implemented as feasible.
- The goals, objectives, policies, and implementation measures of the Regional Transportation Plan, the Transportation Improvement Program, the State Implementation Plan, and the 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan, shall be consistent.

Objective: Integrate land use planning, transportation planning, and air quality planning to make the most efficient use of public resources and to create a more healthy and livable environment.

Policy:

- Consider air quality when planning transportation systems to accommodate expected growth in the community.

Goal: Support regional planning efforts in addressing air quality issues.

Objective: Participate and support a coordinated transportation planning effort between the eight Regional Transportation Planning Agencies, Caltrans, the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, the California Air Resources Board, and local agencies charged with land use planning.

Policies:

- Coordinate air quality planning at the technical and policy level.
- Participate in the transportation/air quality modeling program for the State Implementation Plan with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District.

Objective: Coordinate local air quality programs with regional programs and those of neighboring jurisdictions.

Policy:

- Work with neighboring jurisdictions and affected agencies to address cross-jurisdictional and regional transportation and air quality issues.

Goal: Provide for improved air quality through local planning and enforcement efforts.

Objective: Adopt and implement appropriate land use, transportation, and air quality plans and strategies.

Policies:

- Support the efforts of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District to integrate appropriate policies and implementation measures identified in the Air Quality Guidelines for General Plans into local General Plans

Objective: Create a transportation system that will encourage people to walk, bicycle, or use public transit for a significant number of their daily transportation trips.

Policies:

- Consider air quality and mobility when reviewing any proposed change to the transportation system in the community.
- Encourage projects proposing pedestrian or transit oriented designs at suitable locations.

Goal: Improve transportation mobility and operations by improving and utilizing transportation system management strategies which coordinate travel modes through operating, regulating, and service policies to achieve maximum efficiency and productivity for the whole circulation system.

Objective: Plan for a multimodal transportation system that meets the mobility needs of the community and improves air quality.

Policies:

- Pursue and use state and federal funds earmarked for bicycle and transit improvements.
- Ensure that upgrades to existing roads (widening, curb, and gutter, etc.) include bicycle and pedestrian improvements in their plans and implementation where appropriate.
- Encourage preservation of abandoned railroad ROW with no potential for use as light rail lines for use as bikeways and pedestrian paths.
- Work with cities to identify potential light rail corridors and ensure protection of the right-of-way from incompatible development.
- Support the use of suitable freeway and expressway right-of-way for light rail.

Goal: Improve transportation mobility and operations by improving and utilizing transportation demand management strategies which consist of managing human behavior regarding how, when, and where people travel.

Objective: Encourage use of alternate transportation modes, flex hours, and mixed land uses

resulting in a jobs/housing balance.

Policies:

- Support rideshare outreach and public information programs.
- Encourage employers to utilize flex hours, van pools, and telecommuting measures.
- Support mixed land use developments which encourage a jobs/housing balance.
- Plan for appropriately located transportation nodes to support public transit facilities.
- Encourage the development of bicycle and pedestrian circulation systems.

Goal: Improve transportation mobility and operations by improving and utilizing transportation control measure strategies which consist of reducing vehicle trips, vehicle miles traveled, vehicle idling, traffic congestion, and increasing average vehicle ridership, to reduce motor vehicle emissions.

Objective: Encourage the reduction of vehicular trips traveled resulting in reduced emissions, impacts, and fuel consumption.

Policies:

- Support the development of transportation management associations to coordinate small and large business rideshare programs.
- Support greater use of public transit systems through the provision of efficient and effective services.
- Increase inter-city rail ridership through the addition of Amtrak services on the San Joaquin Route.
- Support carpool and vanpool programs that reduce the use of single-occupancy vehicles.
- Support Caltrans and local agency development of park-and-ride lots and referrals to public transit.

Goal: Reduce the consumption of and critical dependence upon non-renewable energy resources used in transportation.

Objective: Conserve fuel for mass transportation purposes by influencing personal travel behavior and by encouraging the development of alternative fuel sources.

Policies:

- Support transportation programs which have the lowest feasible levels of energy consumption while meeting reasonable mobility needs.
- Encourage automobile manufacturers to improve auto technology to increase the fuel efficiency of new cars, buses, and trucks.

4. GENERAL PLAN POLICY SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

GENERAL PLAN REVIEW FOR TRANSIT SUPPORTIVE POLICIES AND POLICY EFFECTIVENESS

Each of the 16 General Plans in the region (The County of Fresno and its 15 jurisdictions) was reviewed. (Appendix C provides the year of the latest update for each element in each of the General Plans that were reviewed). Each General Plan policy that promoted transit, walking or bicycling, or that was aimed at reducing automobile dependence was identified. It was given an "effectiveness" rating by the consultant team based on the following criteria. Each criterion is assigned a value of 1 point; the policies are rated on a scale of 1-5, with the most effective policies receiving a score of 5.

Effectiveness Criteria:

1. Effective policy should be explicit and directive; ideally mandatory ("shall" not "should"). The implementing agency should be designated.
2. Effective policy should entail incentives that make it likely to be implemented.
3. Effective policy should be clearly expressed, understandable and accessible to those who must implement it or are affected by it.
4. Effective policy should be based on and make explicit reference to a substantial factual basis (e.g. a technical study, data base or model).
5. Effective policy should be explicitly linked to performance standards or indicators enabling the policy's results to be monitored.

Excerpts from Fresno County General Plan and Unincorporated Community Plans Related to Public Transportation

FRESNO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

The County shall encourage mixed-use development that locates residences near compatible jobs and services**.** (LU-F.1) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

The County shall encourage the combination of residential, commercial, and office uses in mixed use configurations on the same site. (LU-F.2) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

The County shall promote development of higher-density housing in areas located along major transportation corridors and transit routes and served by the full range of urban services, including neighborhood commercial uses, community centers, and public services. (LU-F.3) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

The County shall work with the Cities of Fresno and Clovis and other agencies to achieve land use patterns and densities that support transit services, preserve adequate rights-of-way, and enhance transit services in the designated transit corridors shown in Figure TR-3. (TR-B.3) **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

The County shall work with transit providers to provide transit services within the County that are responsive to existing and future transit demand and that can demonstrate cost-effectiveness by meeting minimum farebox recovery levels required by State and Federal funding programs. (TR-B.1) **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

The County shall promote transit services in designated corridors where population and employment densities are sufficient or could be increased to support those transit services, particularly within the spheres of influence of the cities and along existing transit corridors in the rural area of the County. (TR-B.2) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

The County shall work with the COG and transit service providers to pursue all available sources of funding for transit services when consistent with General Plan policies and long-term funding capabilities. (TR-B.4) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

The County shall consider the transit needs of seniors, disabled, low-income, and transit dependent persons in making recommendations regarding transit services. (TR-B.5) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

II. Policies that Promote and Enhance other Alternative Transportation Modes

The County shall adopt transit and pedestrian-oriented design guidelines and incorporate them into community plans and specific plans. The County shall review development proposals for compliance with its adopted transit and pedestrian-oriented design guidelines to identify design changes that can improve transit, bicycle, and pedestrian access. (LU-F.8) **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

The County shall plan adequate pedestrian-oriented neighborhood commercial shopping areas to serve residential development. (LU-F.9) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

The County shall encourage school districts to site new schools in locations that allow students to safely walk or bicycle from their homes, and to incorporate school sites into larger neighborhood activity centers that serve multiple purposes. (LU-F.10) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

The County shall require residential subdivisions to be designed to provide interconnected internal and external street and pedestrian systems. (LU-F.20) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

The County, where appropriate, shall coordinate the multi-modal use of streets and highways to ensure their maximum efficiency and shall consider the need for transit, bikeway, and recreational trial facilities when establishing eh ultimate right-of-way plan and precise plans of streets and highways. (TR-A.12) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

The County shall develop and maintain a program to construct bikeways and recreation trails in conjunction with roadway projects in accordance wit the adopted Regional Bikeways Plan, the adopted Recreation Trails Plan, available dedicated funding for construction and maintenance, and a needs priority system. (TR-A.13) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

The County shall encourage the development of facilities for convenient transfers between difference transportation systems. (TR-B.6) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

The County shall implement a system of recreational, commuter, and inter-community bicycle routes in accordance with the Regional Bikeway plan. (TR-D.1) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

The County shall give priority to bikeways that will serve the most cyclists and destinations of greatest demand and to bikeways that close gaps in the existing system. (TR-D.2) **Effectiveness Rating:**

The County shall develop bikeways in conjunction with street improvement projects occurring along streets and roads designated on the Regional Bikeways Plan map. (TR-D.4) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

The County shall support development of facilities that help link bicycling with other modes of transportation. (TR-D.5) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

III. Policies Intended to Reduce Use of and Dependence on Conventional Automobiles

The County shall work with the Cities of Fresno and Clovis to encourage new urban development within the FCMA to provide appropriate on-site facilities that encourage employees to use alternative transportation modes as air quality and transportation mitigation measures. The type of facilities may include bike parking, shower and locker facilities, and convenient access to transit, depending on the development size and location. (TR-C.3) **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

The County shall support acquisition by local agencies of railroad rights-of-way that are: 1) in designated transit corridors shown on Figure TR-3; and 2) required for public health, safety, and welfare. (TR-E.3) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

The County shall support multi-modal stations at appropriate locations to integrate rail transportation with other transportation modes. (TR-E.5) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

The County shall support the development of a statewide high-speed rail service through the Central Valley that serves downtown Fresno and that parallels the Burlington Northern/Santa Fe corridor south of Fresno, the Union Pacific corridor through the City of Fresno, and is capable of accommodating the rapid movement of freight during nighttime, non-passenger usage hours. (TR-E.6) **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

FRESNO COUNTY SUBAREA AND COMMUNITY PLANS

SIERRA NORTH REGIONAL PLAN

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

Promote the concentration of urban and other intensive land use around existing urban centers. **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Plan and develop a street and highway system that can accommodate alternative modes of travel (1.02.e) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

The use of public transportation should be encouraged between foothill and mountain communities and between other communities and the valley floor. Land use proposal should include analysis of future potential transit and include necessary infrastructure when feasible. (4.01.a) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

II. Policies that Promote and Enhance other Alternative Transportation Modes

Experimental transit projects should be encouraged to determine which combinations of types best serve the area. Alternatives include car pools, van pools, fixed route buses, or chartered buses for larger groups. (4.01.b.) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Highway 168 and the Friant-Kern Canal are designated bikeway corridors. Other bikeways should be considered at the specific plan level so that developers can provide them and interconnections between adjacent communities. (5.00) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

COALINGA REGIONAL PLAN

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

The City operates a bus service within the City and also provides two routes to Fresno. The first route is direct to Fresno while the second route links Coalinga with Huron, Lemoore, Lemoore Navel Air Station, Riverdale, Caruthers, Easton and Fresno. **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

WESTSIDE FREEWAY SUB-REGIONAL PLAN

No applicable policies.

KINGS RIVER REGIONAL PLAN

No applicable policies.

SIERRA SOUTH REGIONAL PLAN

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

The use of public transportation should be encouraged between foothill and mountain communities and between other communities and the valley floor. Land use proposal and major road construction projects should include analysis of future potential transit and include necessary infrastructure when feasible. (4.01.a) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

II. Policies that Promote and Enhance other Alternative Transportation Modes

Transit efforts, such as car pools and van pools, should be encouraged. Public support in the form of park and ride should be provided when and where appropriate. (4.01.b) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Three regional bikeway routes exist in the planning area: The Sierra Parks Trail (extending on Highway 180 from Minkler to Kings Canyon National Park – low priority); the Friant-Kern Canal Trail; and the Kings River Recreational Trail. Other bikeways should be considered at the Specific Plan level so that they may be provided by developers and interconnections between adjacent communities can be reviewed. (5.00) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

BIOLA COMMUNITY PLAN

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

The County supports transit planning and implementation efforts of the Council of Fresno County Governments (COG). The County will continue to support transit services in a manner consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan as adopted by COG. (4.00) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

CARUTHERS COMMUNITY PLAN

No applicable policies

DEL REY COMMUNITY PLAN

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

The County supports transit planning and implementation efforts of the Council of Fresno County Governments (COG). The County will continue to support transit services in a manner consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan as adopted by COG. (4.00) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

EASTON COMMUNITY PLAN

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

The County supports transit planning and implementation efforts of the Council of Fresno County Governments (COG). The County will continue to support transit services in a manner consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan as adopted by COG. (4.00) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

FRIANT COMMUNITY PLAN

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

The County supports transit planning and implementation efforts of the Council of Fresno County Governments (COG). The County will continue to support transit services in a manner consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan as adopted by COG. (4.00) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

II. Policies that Promote and Enhance other Alternative Transportation Modes

A multipurpose trail is designated along Friant Road by the Fresno County Recreation Trails Element from the Fresno-Clovis Metropolitan Area to the Friant-Kern Canal. The southerly portion of the trail south of Lost Lake has been completed as a bikeway. (5.00) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

LATON COMMUNITY PLAN

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

The County supports transit planning and implementation efforts of the COG, the Fresno County Rural Transit Agency, and King Area Regional Transit. The County will continue to support transit services in a manner consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan as adopted by COG.(4.00) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

RIVERDALE COMMUNITY PLAN

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

The County supports transit planning and implementation efforts of the COG and the Fresno County Rural Transit Agency. The County will continue to support transit services in a manner consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan as adopted by COG. (4.00) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

SHAVER LAKE COMMUNITY PLAN

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

The County supports transit planning and implementation efforts of the COG and the Fresno County Rural Transit Agency. The County will continue to support transit services in a manner consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan as adopted by COG. (5.00) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

II. Policies that Promote and Enhance other Alternative Transportation Modes

A non-motorized transportation system is needed to meet the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, and to conserve energy. (2.00) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Develop a community-wide transportation system that will accommodate non-motorized modes of travel and facilitate the use of non-motorized modes as a viable transportation alternative. (2.02) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Develop a system of bike and pedestrian ways that will connect residential and commercial areas. (2.02.d) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

The County will coordinate the multi-modal use of streets to ensure maximum efficiency by: developing a program to construct bikeways; and providing for bikeways and pedestrian facilities when establishing the ultimate right-of-way plan and precise plan of streets and highways. (2.03.a) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

TRANQUILITY COMMUNITY PLAN

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

The County supports transit planning and implementation efforts of the COG and the Fresno County Rural Transit Agency. The County will continue to support transit services in a manner consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan as adopted by COG. (4.00) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

LENARE COMMUNITY PLAN

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

The County supports transit planning and implementation efforts of the COG and the Fresno County Rural Transit Agency. The County will continue to support transit services in a manner consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan as adopted by COG. (4.00) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

SHAVER LAKE FOREST SPECIFIC PLAN

No applicable policies.

MILLERTON SPECIFIC PLAN

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

Priority shall be given to transit measures that provide an alternative to the private automobile, including park and ride/express bus services and the inclusion of a local bus service. (SP1-P55) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Provide for alternative modes of motorized transportation. (C.4a) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

A sufficiently large concentration and mix of shops and services shall be established within the core in order to provide for, on a sustained basis, the needs of nearby residents. This will reduce the number and length of vehicular trips for daily services, thereby saving energy and adding to community cohesiveness. (SP1-P4) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Development of the circulation system, which emphasizes the private automobile, includes provisions for alternative travel modes. The most efficient travel modes in the foreseeable future appear to be buses or van pools. Facilities for the operation of a bus line, as well as for cars and van pooling, shall be required in the commercial area. These facilities shall consist of bus turnouts, bus shelters, and park-and-ride areas. In addition, bike storage facilities shall be provided in the core area, higher density housing areas, and at recreation facilities. (SP1-P25) **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

II. Policies that Promote and Enhance other Alternative Transportation Modes

While most transportation will continue to be by private automobile, alternative modes of transportation, including pedestrian trails and recreation trails, are provided for in the Plan. **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Park-and-ride locations and loading areas shall be provided at community activity areas. (SP1-P14) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Bicycle and hiking trails shall be provided throughout the Plan area. (SP1-P15) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Within a 60-foot right-of-way, all other collectors shall be developed as two-lane roadways. Sidewalks shall be required unless an alternative walkway or path is located in close proximity to the street. (SP1-P27) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Figure SP1-9 shows the trail system, which includes: (a) local hiking trails and paths, (b) equestrian trails, only if part of an approved equestrian recreational project, and (c) community bicycle lanes which parallel major roads and provide the most direct route into and out of the community. The recreation trails are generally located in open space or landscaped areas and serve to provide the local pedestrian and bicycle circulation network. The path systems provide an alternative to automobile travel, link the community with commercial, cultural, and recreation facilities, and contribute to community identity. (SP1-P22) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Pedestrian and bicycle pathways, not associated with roadways, are located to take advantage of natural drainage areas or areas of scenic quality. Hiking trails and pedestrian pathways should be a minimum of four feet in width and constructed of compacted natural material. (SP1-P24) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

White Fox Creek shall be maintained as a component of the recreation corridor system. Pedestrian and bicycle trails shall be placed along its alignment and public access provided at frequent intervals. **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

Local corridors with in each project should follow drainways within open space easements when feasible. These shall be dedicated to the County or CSA and should incorporate a hiking trail. (SP1-P41) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

A program for the development of the bikeways system shall be instituted in an effort to encourage bicycle use as an alternative transportation mode. (SP1-P56) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

QUAIL LAKES ESTATES SPECIFIC PLAN

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

The Plan's development standards include the construction of a transit bench prior to completion of the final phase to accommodate future bus service and development of a portion of the neighborhood commercial parking lot as a park and ride facility. (5.00) **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

II. Policies that Promote and Enhance other Alternative Transportation Modes

The community contains a pedestrian/recreation trail of approximately two miles. (7.00)
Effectiveness Rating: 4

DEL RIO SPECIFIC PLAN

No applicable policies.

Excerpts from Incorporated Community Plans Related to Public Transportation

CITY OF COALINGA

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

Require developers to design project sites to increase the convenience, safety, and comfort of transit users, pedestrians, and bicyclists. (2-19) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Require dedication of land for bus turnouts and shelters at sites deemed appropriate and necessary by the City and the transit providers.(2-24) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Design arterial and collector streets to allow the efficient operation of public transit. (2-25) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Support projects that propose pedestrian or transit oriented designs at suitable locations. (2-2)
Plan areas within 1/4 mile of transit hubs and commercial centers for higher density development. (2-3) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Consider redesignating vacant lands suitable for higher densities or for transit/pedestrian oriented developments during General Plan updates and periodic reviews. (2-15) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

II. Policies that Promote and Enhance other Alternative Transportation Modes

This map illustrates the City's ultimate bikeway and trail system and is followed by a series of trail standards. The system shown on this map will be implemented as development occurs and as funding becomes available. (Map 5) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Promote downtown Coalinga as the primary pedestrian-oriented, commercial, and financial center in the City. (2-6) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Work closely with the Coalinga-Huron Unified School District to help the District choose school sites that allow students to safely walk or bicycle from their homes. (2-9) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Require park and ride lots at appropriate locations to serve long distance and local commuters. (2-10). **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Ensure that a comprehensive system of bikeways and pedestrian paths is planned and constructed in accordance with the General Plan. (2-26). **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Require developers to fund the extension of regional and commuter bikeways to serve their developments. In those areas where bikeways are not feasible, developers shall contribute to a City bikeways fund. (2-27) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Require developers to provide bike racks, or enclosed and locked bicycle storage, at major activity centers, offices, and commercial establishments to serve patrons and employees. (2-29) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Work with employers and developers to provide employees and residents with attractive, affordable transportation alternatives. (3-4) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

III. Policies Intended to Reduce Use of and Dependence on Conventional Automobiles

Require new homes and businesses to be wired with fiber-optic cables, and encourage the development of video-teleconferencing facilities. (3-5) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

CITY OF FOWLER

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

Encourage transit alternatives to meet the basic transportation needs of the young, the elderly, the disabled, and people without access to an automobile. (5-10.1) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Maintain opportunities for a transit center within the City where alternative transit modes would connect. (5-10.1.a) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Support transit operators' programs to increase transit usage. (5-10.5) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Support programs developed by transit agencies/operators to provide paratransit service. (5-10.7) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Incorporate the potential for public transit service in the design of major trip attractors (i.e. community centers and employment centers). (5-10.8) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Support the use of alternate fuel vehicles and fueling stations for City and County vehicles and public transit vehicles. (5-10.4) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

II. Policies that Promote and Enhance other Alternative Transportation Modes

"Open ended cul-de-sacs" to major streets are encouraged for pedestrian access. (5-2.8) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Subdivision layouts should include safe and pleasant designs which promote pedestrian access to arterials and collectors and consider the location of community services, such as schools, parks and neighborhood shopping activity centers in the accessibility of their design for all persons. (5-4.1.a) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Require the installation of sidewalks as an integral part of all street construction where appropriate. (5-4.1.b) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Maximize visibility and access for pedestrians and encourage the removal of barriers (walls, easements, and fences) for safe and convenient movement of pedestrians. Special emphasis should be placed on the needs of disabled persons considering ADA regulations. (5-4.2) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Plan for pedestrian access consistent with road design standards while designing street and road projects. Provisions for pedestrian paths or sidewalks and timing of traffic signals to allow safe pedestrian street crossing shall be included. (5-4.3) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Collaborate with the Fowler Unified School District to ensure that school children have adequate transportation routes available, such as a local pedestrian or bike paths, or local bus service. (5-4.4) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Coordinate with transit operators to ensure that pedestrian facilities are provided along and/or near transit routes, whenever feasible. New land developments may be required to provide pedestrian facilities due to existing or future planned transit routes even if demand for a pedestrian facility is not otherwise warranted. (5-4.6) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Encourage and provide for ride sharing, park and ride, and other similar energy saving and air emission reduction programs. (5-10.1.b) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Support continued improvements to AMTRAK rail passenger service within Fresno County and throughout the San Joaquin Valley. (5-10.9) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Give priority to bikeways that will serve the highest concentration of cyclists and destination areas of highest demand. (5-12.2) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Provide bikeways in proximity to major traffic generators such as commercial centers, schools, recreational areas, and major public facilities. (5-12.3) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Support installation of bike parking at public and private places of assembly such as parks, schools, office buildings, churches, and retail commercial developments. (5-12.5) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Amend the zoning ordinance to include provisions for bicycle parking facilities in off-street parking requirements. (5-12.6) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Develop a comprehensive bikeway system as an incentive for increased bicycle use. Give priority to bike routes that link local routes with planned regional facilities. (5-12.7) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Develop a multi-purpose recreational bikeway network and support facilities. (5-12.9) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Coordinate with Caltrans, Fresno COG, transit agencies and other responsible agencies to identify the need for additional park-n-ride facilities along major commuter travel corridors. (5-14.2) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

II. Policies Intended to Reduce Use of and Dependence on Conventional Automobiles

New development shall consider Transportation System Management and Transportation Demand Management as strategies for the mitigation of traffic and parking congestion. Public transit, traffic management, ride sharing and parking management are to be used to the greatest extent practical to implement transportation management strategies. (5-14.1) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

CITY OF FIREBAUGH

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

The City shall cooperate in and encourage the development of inter-city and intra-city transit systems, with special emphasis toward serving the needs of senior citizens, the physically handicapped, and low-income residents. (3a.) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

CITY OF HURON

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

Incorporate the Regional Transportation Plan and the Fresno County Short- and Long-Range Transit Plans into the Circulation Element, and encourage the active participation of Caltrans in the design of highway capital improvement projects. (8.1) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Support transit operators' programs to foster transit usage. (10.1) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Incorporate the potential for public transit service in the design of developments that are identified as major trip attractions (i.e. community centers and employment centers). (10.4) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

II. Policies that Promote and Enhance other Alternative Transportation Modes

Provide facilities for the safe movement of pedestrians within developments in accordance with City Development Standards. (4.1) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Maximize visibility and access for pedestrians and encourage the removal of barriers (walls, easements, and fences) for safe and convenient movement of pedestrians. Special emphasis should be placed on the needs of disabled persons considering ADA regulations. (4.2) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Plan for pedestrian access that is consistent with road design standards while designing street and road projects. Provisions for pedestrian paths or sidewalks and timing of traffic signals to allow safe pedestrian street crossing shall be included. (4.3) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Collaborate with local communities to ensure that school children have adequate transportation routes available, such as a local pedestrian or bike path, or local bus service. (4.4) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Encourage, where feasible, the construction of overpasses or undercrossings where pedestrian facilities intersect SR 269. (4.6) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Coordinate with all transit operators to ensure that pedestrian facilities are provided along and/or near all transit routes, whenever feasible. (4.7) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Promote development of park-n-ride lots throughout Fresno County. (10.5) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Develop a multi-purpose recreational bikeway network and support facilities. (12.3) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Coordinate with Caltrans, Fresno COG, transit agencies and other responsible agencies to identify the need for additional park-n-ride facilities along major commuter travel corridors. (15.1) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

CITY OF KERMAN

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

The City shall promote all modes of transportation including mass transit (buses, etc.), bicycling, and walking. (F.1.) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

II. Policies that Promote and Enhance other Alternative Transportation Modes

The City shall prepare a bike path design plan that lays out a community-wide bicycle land network; subdivision developers shall provide for the network. (F.2) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

The Engineering and Planning Departments will prepare a bike path design plan. Funds will come from tax increment financing and transportation funds. Bike paths will be required to be built in new subdivisions where required by the bike path design plan. (F.2 action). **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

CITY OF KINGSBURG

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

Regional transit capability exists by utilizing the Southern Pacific Railroad line that connects with the metro areas and major cities of the San Joaquin Valley, the San Francisco Bay Area, and Southern California. A station is proposed close to Draper Street to underscore the importance of regional transit as a means to mitigate the adverse impacts of traffic on the freeway system and regional air quality, and because of the short-term benefits of a transit service that would connect Kingsburg with all cities along the Freeway 99 corridor between Madera and Tulare. **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Planning for a bus system is to be considered a fundamental policy of the General Plan. If proven feasible, the implementation of a bus system to connect residential areas with major activity centers is an objective to be considered during the next 10 years. **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

II. Policies that Promote and Enhance other Alternative Transportation Modes

The relatively compact character of the community encourages the use of bicycles as an alternative mode of transportation. The Circulation Element therefore proposes that separate bike lanes be provided along these connecting links and streets which connect with bike lanes along County roads as follows: along Sierra between 6th and 10th Avenues; along Draper, between 10th Avenue and California Street; and along Golden State Blvd.- Simpson Street between Sierra and Kamm Avenue. **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

CITY OF MENDOTA

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

Assure the efficient use of public transit in the community of Mendota and connections to other areas of the County. (1.5) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

A well-coordinated transit system should continue to serve the needs of Mendota residents and which will also provide access to Fresno and other County areas. (2.14) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Continue to improve the scope and frequency of transit service throughout the Mendota community. (3.7) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Seek methods of meeting the needs for inter-city trips by promoting the transit system as a viable alternative to the automobile. (3.9) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

II. Policies that Promote and Enhance other Alternative Transportation Modes

Provide a traffic circulation system for motor vehicles and pedestrians, ensuring safe and efficient access to employment, education, commerce, and recreation without interference to adjacent land uses. (1.1) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Incorporate bicycling and bikeway development as an integral, active function of a multi-modal transportation system. (1.8) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Recognize the bicycle as an alternative form of transportation as well as a form of recreation. (1.9) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Sidewalks in the community should be provided in commercial and residential areas to facilitate pedestrian traffic especially along routes with high pedestrian traffic circulation such as in the vicinity of schools, parks, and the downtown area. (2.10) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Encourage the development of bicycle lanes when bicycle usage is heavy and existing pavement widths are adequate. Marked routes should not be placed on roadways which have identified low levels of service. (2.12) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Encourage the development of the Regional Bikeways System by implementing a bikeway along Oller Street as indicated on the Transportation Plan. (2.19) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

CITY OF ORANGE COVE

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

Promote alternative modes of transportation including bicycles, buses, trains, and walking. (10.I.) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Reduce automobile use by improving transit service and encouraging transit use (10.II.) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

New developments adjacent to arterial or collector streets shall include bus loading zones at appropriate locations. (10.II.a.) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Improve transit line coverage and frequency throughout Orange Cove and to adjacent cities, with particular emphasis on service to the downtown, employment centers, and social services. (10.II.c.) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

II. Policies that Promote and Enhance other Alternative Transportation Modes

Encourage residential developments and adjacent land uses to be pedestrian oriented. (III.2.) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

All residential developments with walls should provide openings for pedestrian and bike traffic. (III. 2.a.) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Land uses adjacent to residential developments should provide for pedestrian access between the two types of developments. (III. 2.b.) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Develop a bike path system for Orange Cove. (8.III.1) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Design the plan so that some of the bike path segments are not along surface streets but along the railroad right-of-way, parks, and ditch easements. (8.III.1.a.) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Ensure that subdivisions are designed so that persons riding bikes can access adjacent properties from the neighborhood. (8.III.1.c.) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Work with the County of Fresno to ensure that Orange Cove's Plan in linked to the County's regional bikeway network. (8.III.1.d.) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Provide safe and convenient pedestrian access to all areas of the City, including between neighborhoods. (8.III.2) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Establish a walking and biking trail within the railroad right-of-way. (8.III.3.) **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

Ensure that children have safe walking and bicycling routes to school. (9.I.) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

III. Policies Intended to Reduce Use of and Dependence on Conventional Automobiles

The Smart Development District shall incorporate planning principles that promote moderate increases in residential densities, narrower streets, better connectivity in and between neighborhoods and site and architectural design that emphasizes a humanized environment, as opposed to an auto-oriented environment. (III.1.a.) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

CITY OF PARLIER

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

Encourage transit opportunities to meet the basic transportation needs of the young, the elderly, the handicapped, and people without access to an automobile. (5.4.A) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Planning and development of arterial and collector streets shall include design features which can be used as future public transit stops. (5.4.5) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Support the expansion and improvement of transit systems and ride sharing programs to reduce the production of automobile emissions. (5.4.8) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

II. Policies that Promote and Enhance other Alternative Transportation Modes

Promote the use of alternative modes of transportation to reduce dependence on the private automobile and reduce air emissions. (5.4) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Encourage and provide for ride sharing, park and ride, and other similar commuter energy savings programs. (5.4.A.b.) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Subdivision layouts should include safe and pleasant designs which promote pedestrian access to arterials and collectors and consider the location of community services, such as schools, parks and neighborhood shopping activity centers in the accessibility of their design for all persons. (5.4.A.2.a.) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Require the installation of sidewalks as an integral part of all street construction. (5.4.A.2.b.) **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

Give priority to bikeways that will serve the highest concentration of cyclists and destination areas of highest demand. (5.5.2) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Provide bikeways in proximity to major traffic generators such as commercial centers, schools, recreational areas, and major public facilities. (5.5.3.) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Support the installation of bike parking racks at public and private places of assembly such as parks, schools, office buildings, churches, and retail commercial developments. (5.5.7) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

III. Policies Intended to Reduce Use of and Dependence on Conventional Automobiles

New development shall consider Transportation System Management and Transportation Demand Management as strategies for the mitigation of traffic and parking congestion. Public transit, traffic management, ride sharing and parking management are to be used to the greatest extent practical to implement transportation management strategies. (5.4.4) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

CITY OF REEDLEY

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

Consider the need for transit and bikeway facilities when establishing the ultimate rights-of-way of streets and highways. The City should prepare typical roadway cross sections that define standards for transit and bikeway facility improvements. (302-03.9.2) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Provide additional rights-of-way and improvements off of the travel way of arterial and collector streets where deemed necessary for public transportation. (302-03.9.3) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

II. Policies that Promote and Enhance other Alternative Transportation Modes

Develop bikeways in accordance with the City Bikeways Plan (302-03.9.1) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Provide areas for pedestrian travel that enhance the safety and efficiency of the street system. (302-03.9.4) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Develop a continuous and easily accessible bikeways system that facilitates the use of the bicycle as a viable alternative transportation mode. (303-02.1) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Encourage the use of the bicycle within the local transportation network. (303-02.4) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Bikeways should be designated near major traffic generators such as commercial and employment centers, schools, recreational areas, and major public facilities. (303-03.1.2) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Bike parking and storage facilities should be provided at major bike traffic generators. (303-03.1.3) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

The bikeway system should be monitored and evaluated in order to determine the effectiveness of established bikeway facilities in terms of use, safety, and efficiency. (303-03.2.5) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

CITY OF SANGER

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

Support transit service through the Fresno County Rural Transit Agency (FCRTA) that adequately serves low-income residents, students, the elderly and physically disabled. (5-1) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

The City, through FCRTA and development of the Fresno County Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP), should help identify short and long-range transit needs and maximize revenue sources utilizing all funding mechanisms including federal grants, State enabling legislation, and farebox revenue. (5-2) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Encourage safety, reasonable fares and the provision of adequate service to meet reasonable transit needs. (5-3) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

II. Policies that Promote and Enhance other Alternative Transportation Modes

Prepare a Community Pedestrian and Bike Trails Plan that:

- Identifies walking and bicycle routes that are appropriate for recreational and commuter use;
- Prepares and coordinates information systems for bicyclists and carpools;
- Reviews and addresses the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists within the city; and
- Encourages and supports maintenance of existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities. (6-1) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Designate regional bicycle routes that are designed for safe use by bicyclists and reduce conflicts with motor vehicles. Support development of designated bicycle paths adjacent to or separated from commute corridors. (6-2) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

Support implementation of bicycle support facilities such as bike racks, showers, locker rooms and other facilities during the project review process. Encourage employers to offer incentives (showers, locker rooms, and money) for bicyclists to reduce congestion and increase parking availability. (6-3) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Encourage the use of abandoned railroad right-of-ways and canals for bicycle paths. (6-5) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Encourage removal of barriers (walls, easements and fences) for safe and convenient movement of pedestrians. Special emphasis should be placed on the needs of disabled persons. (6-6) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

III. Policies Intended to Reduce Use of and Dependence on Conventional Automobiles

The City, in coordination with the Fresno COG, shall encourage Transportation Systems Management (TSM) strategies in urban areas to reduce vehicular trips during peak periods. Such strategies may include development of park and ride facilities to accommodate carpools and vanpools; and a transit service that meets public transportation needs of local residents. (3-2) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

CITY OF SAN JOAQUIN

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

The City will review its current transit system in conjunction with the Fresno County Rural Transit Agency. (Transit 1) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

The City will continue to maintain services for the elderly; market service to low income and young family residents; continue to maintain existing services, and modify services as needed. (Transit 1. 1-4) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

II. Policies that Promote and Enhance other Alternative Transportation Modes

The City will review is current bicycle route system in 1997-98. (Bicycle Transit 1) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

The City will apply for funding for future bicycle facilities; encourage bicycle use as a transportation alternative to help reduce pollution; and will also review development projects with an eye on the compatibility with the needs of both young and old bicyclists. (Bicycle Transit 1. 1-3) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

The City will review its current pedestrian facilities in 1997-1998. (Pedestrian Facilities 1) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

The city will review pedestrian enhancements in the CBD; encourage walking as an alternative to the vehicle for short trips to the help reduce pollution; and will also review development projects with an eye on compatibility with the needs for pedestrian improvements. (Pedestrian Facilities 1. 1-3) **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

III. Policies Intended to Reduce Use of and Dependence on Conventional Automobiles

The City shall promote TCMs that provide alternatives to the use of the automobile. The following programs will be promoted by the City of San Joaquin: ride-share, park-and-ride lots, bicycling, mass transit, trip reduction programs, fleet operators alternative fuel program, traffic flow improvements, telecommunications, alternative work schedules. (TCM 1) **Effectiveness Rating:** 3

CITY OF SELMA

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

Provide demand-responsive taxi service in conjunction with the Council of Fresno County Governments (COFCG) and Fresno County. [Policy 3.1] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Provide convenient and efficient taxi service to the elderly, handicapped, and low-income population of the City and its environs. [Policy 3.2] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Coordinate transit services through the City Manager and in conjunction with surrounding cities, and the County of Fresno, and Council of Fresno County Governments; [Policy 3.3] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Cooperate with the COFCG in providing transit service and planning to meet the social and economic needs of all segments of the community; [Policy 3.4] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Provide benches, telephones and shaded areas at major transit destinations so people can utilize the transit system safely and comfortably. The City shall determine such need based on site plan review procedure and other planning implementation methods; [Policy 3.5] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

Major arterials, arterials, and collectors will be designed to allow transit vehicles to pull out of traffic. This policy may be implemented with either a continuous parking lane with bus stops, or with special bus pull-out lanes. [Policy 3.6,a]

Transit centers/stops shall be established to encourage the interface between commercial centers, high density residential uses and the transit system. [Policy 3.7,a] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

Where security walls or fences are proposed for residential developments along major arterials, arterials, or collector streets, pedestrian access should be considered between the major arterial, arterial, or collector, and the development to allow access to transit vehicles operating on the street. [Policy 3.48,a] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Large development shall be encouraged to incorporate transit passenger facilities, bicycle racks or lockers, shower facilities, as well as on site services (eating, mail, banking, etc.) as ways to encourage alternative modes for commute trips. [Policy 3.63] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

II. Policies that Promote and Enhance other Alternative Transportation Modes

Among the designated bicycle routes in the community, each should be designated according to standard development class. Bicycle routes intended for signage only should be designated as class III; bikeways which are to be striped and signed designated as class II bikeways; and bikeways intended to have pathways separate from other transportation facilities should be designated as class I bikeways; Improvement standards should be developed for each class and included in the Standard Drawings and Specifications Manual. [Policy 1.31] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

Medium and high density residential developments shall be concentrated near the central commercial area, parks, and other community services, so that higher intensity traffic can be efficiently accommodated. [Policy 3.12] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Local collectors shall serve residential neighborhood but shall not be used to carry through traffic or high traffic volumes. Actual design and improvement to ultimate standards shall be achieved through inclusion of facilities as part of the City-wide Capital Improvements Program, or by new developers as areas adjoining the designated circulation system are developed, with allowance for bicycle lanes, where planned. [Policy 3.14] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

As the community grows and as need warrants, a bicycle lane plan and standard specifications for bicycle routes will be considered. As part of the planning effort, designated regional and county bikeways will be considered. If the City decides to incorporate off-street bike paths, an Ordinance or Resolution must be adopted. [Policy 3.44,a] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Sidewalks, paths, and appropriate crosswalks should be located to facilitate access to all schools and other areas with significant pedestrian traffic. Whenever feasible, pedestrian paths should be developed to allow for unobstructed pedestrian flow from within a neighborhood. [Policy 3.45,a] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

The City shall require curb, gutter, and sidewalks in all areas of the community to accommodate pedestrian traffic, especially along routes with high pedestrian traffic such as schools, parks, and the Downtown area. Installation of these improvements shall be encouraged to the extent feasible in existing neighborhoods where they do not currently exist. [Policy 3.46,a] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

The City shall promote safe, convenient and accessible pedestrian ways within the community. [Policy 3.47,a] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

The City shall encourage the use of energy efficient and non-polluting modes of transportation. [Policy 3.58] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

III. Policies Intended to Reduce Use of and Dependence on Conventional Automobiles

To the extent practicable, residential areas of the community shall be located so as to provide convenient access to public facilities, services, major streets, places of work and neighborhood shopping centers. [Policy 3.15] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Concentrate medium and high density housing near the central commercial area, near parks and other community services, so that higher intensity traffic can be more efficiently accommodated and so that persons not able to afford second automobiles can get to shopping facilities and other needed services without over-extending the City's transit system. [Policy 3.18] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Encourage the central location of community—wide commercial land uses to provide maximum convenience, access and joint shopping trips. [Policy 3.27]**Effectiveness Rating:** 2

The general location of future school sites shall be designated. Such sites shall be selected based on access convenience for the schools' service area population. [Policy 3.38] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Parks and open space shall be located so as to be within walking distance (one-quarter mile) for users for which the facility was designated. [Policy 3.40] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

Parking standards shall be evaluated to assess the potential for offering reduced parking requirements to development that incorporate measures proven to reduce Commute or customer trips. [Policy 3.51.a] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

The City of Selma shall work with CALTRANS and transit service providers to establish a park and ride lot or lots within the community to serve the needs of regional and local commuters. [Policy 3.52.a] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Transportation System Management and Transportation Demand Management are the applicable strategies for the mitigation of traffic and parking congestion Public transit, traffic management, ridesharing and parking management are to be used to the greatest extent practical to implement transportation management strategies. [Policy 3.59] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

Promote the long term shifting of peak hour commute trips from the single occupant automobile to ridesharing, buses, pedestrian, and bicycles. [Policy 3.60] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

The City of Selma in conjunction with other public agencies and Private companies will actively pursue the development of a telecommuting center in Selma. [Policy 3.61] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

The use of alternative fueled vehicles will be encouraged. [Policy 3.62] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

FRESNO CITY AND CLOVIS GENERAL PLAN POLICY ANALYSIS

Relevant Excerpts from the 2025 City of Fresno's General Plan related to Public Transportation

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

- Establish an integrated land use and transportation implementation program that utilizes the intensity corridors and activity centers as conceptually shown on the Urban Form Components Map that will be linked by a public transportation system (including pursuit of fixed guideway systems such as a monorail or people mover) with the highest frequency and level of service economically and technologically feasible within the 20-plus year planning horizon of this plan (see Exhibits 6 and 8). [Policy A-1-h.] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4
- Pursue a coordinated Regional Land Use and Transportation Planning Program with the City of Clovis, Fresno and Madera Counties, and other cities which:

- Identifies areas suitable for development.
- Directs urban development to incorporated cities.
- Proposes programs to meet federal, state and local air quality requirements.
- Identifies future regional facilities and services, including transportation corridors, water, and sewerage.
- Applies public service impact fees equitably and uniformly throughout the metropolitan region.
- Conserves agricultural land and prevents its premature conversion including requirements for an economic assessment, phasing plan, and criteria to prevent leapfrog development.
- Opposes the creation of new rural residential lots within the identified sphere of influence of the city. [Policy B-I-a.] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

- Place emphasis on pedestrian activities and linkages and provide for priority transit routes and facilities to serve activity centers. [Policy C-4-c.] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4
- Pedestrian circulation, site access, and transit access shall be considered as important criteria for site and community development. [Policy E-8-c.] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2
- Continue to implement broad scale general plan strategies to decrease the generation of air pollution through the reduction of vehicle miles traveled , excessive vehicle traffic congestion and excessive engine idling by implementation of public transportation and other alternatives to private automobile travel. [Policy G-1-d.] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

II. Policies that Promote and Enhance other Alternative Transportation Modes

- Support the Growth Alternatives Alliance "Landscape of Choice-Principles and Strategies" as based upon the Ahwahnee Group Principles. [Goal 5] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2
- Coordinate land uses and circulation systems to promote a viable and integrated multi-modal transportation network. [Goal 6] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2
- Provide activity centers and intensity corridors within plan areas to create a mix of land uses and amenities to foster community identity and reduce travel. [Goal 9] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2
- Reinforce the Roosevelt Community Plan (update adopted 1992) strategies as amended by the 2025 General Plan objectives and policies to sustain its many desirable community features and use its substantial growth potential (land area, transportation, sewer collection, water, and natural resource capacities) to accommodate projected population growth and economic development within a pleasing and desirable environment. **Effectiveness Rating:** 4
- Apply development standards and design strategies to accommodate expanded and appropriately intensified residential development within the eastern quadrant of the community that ensure existing neighborhoods are respected and enhanced.
- Aggressively promote economic growth through (1) redevelopment of existing poorly designed and maintained commercial/industrial areas that do not presently provide adequate land use buffers, (2) development of new commercial and industrial uses in the southern and eastern sectors of the community, and (3) assure that regional transportation funds are utilized to complete regionally important facilities such as State Route 180 (east) freeway/expressway. **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

- Utilize innovative strategies to establish appropriately located mixed use developments such as the area east of the Clovis Avenue and north of Kings Canyon Avenue that might include retail commercial/entertainment, business/industrial, residential and public facility activities within an aesthetically pleasing and healthful environment. [Policy C-2-e.] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4
- Pursue the 2025 General Plan goals, objectives and policies as they amend the McLane Community Plan (first adopted 1978) to strengthen existing neighborhoods, encourage development of underutilized and bypassed properties, and facilitate appropriately intensified residential and industrial development within its eastern quadrant. **Effectiveness Rating:** 4
- Fully utilize the community's location and resource attributes of transportation (major commercial airport, freeways, major thoroughfare, railroad spur track), groundwater quantity and availability of raw land to accommodate efficient and attractive industrial and residential growth. **Effectiveness Rating:** 4
- Allow a broader range and intensity of development, including expansion of industrial and residential uses, within the plan's easternmost sector. [Policy C-2-f.] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2
- Facilitate and promote a range of land uses and intensities, including innovative transportation oriented mixed use development, within the area of the Bullard Community Plan (update adopted 1988) consistent with the amending objectives and policies of the 2025 General Plan, while sustaining the area's highly regarded characteristics of neighborhood integrity, aesthetic appeal and economic stability. **Effectiveness Rating:** 4
- Ensure that the highly diverse components of this community (ranging from very expensive residential estates to moderately priced residences or from exclusive specialty retail to high volume discount merchandisers) are effectively integrated with appropriate design, and adequately served by the full range of public facilities and services. **Effectiveness Rating:** 4
- Pursue inter-agency strategies to provide transportation and circulation improvements such as Herndon Avenue capacity enhancements, railroad consolidation and major street crossing grade separations. [Policy C-2-i.] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4
- Intensify efforts to preserve or enhance established neighborhoods and fully utilize land and resources readily available for new development within the area of the Fresno High/Roeding Community Plan (first adopted 1975) consistent with the amending goals and policies of the 2025 General Plan. **Effectiveness Rating:** 4
- Implement policies and standards to accommodate the full range of urban uses consistent with the areas unique advantages and characteristics (proximity to downtown, walk able neighborhoods, strong historical and architectural features, educational institutions). **Effectiveness Rating:** 4
- Pursue all available strategies to establish critical public facilities such as the Shields Avenue overpass of Freeway 99 and the Union Pacific railroad and to address circulation and mobility issues with a multi-model transportation approach that takes advantage of walkable neighborhoods. **Effectiveness Rating:** 4
- Continue to identify and implement focused strategies, such as the Tower District Specific Plan, that address the particular needs or issues of unique neighborhoods. [Policy C-2-j.] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2
- Conduct a comprehensive update of the zoning ordinance to facilitate the implementation of intensity corridors. [Policy C-3-b.] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2
- High Speed Rail. High speed rail offers a promising travel alternative to connect Fresno with

other major population centers with increased speed and improved safety. The objective of current high speed rail proposals is to complete a 20-year high speed rail plan which will include feasibility studies addressing corridor evaluation and environmental constraints, ridership demand/market analysis, economic impacts analysis with mode cost comparison, and institutional analysis and financing options. The City of Fresno, together with other governmental agencies and transportation interest groups, has continued efforts to promote and participate in high speed rail planning and development efforts particularly in advocating a downtown Fresno station location. [E. Public Facilities Element Narrative] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

- Light Rail/Mono Rail/People Mover. Rail lines throughout the metropolitan area offer an opportunity to consider light/commuter rail as a possible future transportation mode. Larger cities have utilized light rail transportation successfully for years. Analyzing the characteristics of transit systems helps to determine a personalized system which can best meet the needs of riders within a service area. The important characteristics to be highlighted include the following: frequency, speed, system capacity, inter-modal interface, safety, and land use density (minimum of nine dwelling units per acre). **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

- The speed and frequency of light rail service, like any other transit mode, depends on service demand and the number of stops. Nevertheless, light rail is able to provide faster service due to having a separate route with minimum traffic interference. This is especially true if traffic control devices which prioritize light rail transit movement are used. The interface between light rail transit and access points for other modes of transportation such as bus service, conventional and high speed rail systems, and automobile parking facilities is common. **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

- During the past several decades public transportation systems in the Fresno region have primarily been used by transit dependent patrons (non-drivers, low income, elderly and disabled persons). However, the environmental and resource constraints confronting the Fresno area in the twenty-first century now necessitate a dramatic refocusing of attention upon expanding the attractiveness of public transportation alternatives for those who have typically chosen to travel by private automobile. Public transportation must once again be a major factor in meeting the city's growing transportation needs generated by population increases and economic development while addressing quality of life factors such as reduced traffic congestion and improved air quality. This will include thorough consideration and aggressive pursuit of alternative transportation modes, including fixed guideway systems such as monorail and people mover systems. [E. Public Facilities Element Narrative] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

- Give the highest priority to street and highway improvements that will not jeopardize or negatively impact neighborhoods and other sensitive land uses (such as residences, hospitals, schools, natural habitats and open space areas). Additional considerations are as follows:
    - Added safety
    - Air quality
    - Maintenance of capacity and pavement integrity
    - Facilitation of multi-modal transportation system
    - Increased efficiency [Policy E-I-c.] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

- Provide areas for pedestrian and other non-motorized travel that enhance the safety, utilization, and efficiency of the street system. Pedestrian travel should be encouraged as a viable mode of movement throughout the metropolitan area by providing safe and convenient pedestrian facilities in new and existing urban areas and particularly within the Central Area

and urban core community centers. [Policy E-l-j.] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

- The location of park and recreation sites should be central and accessible to the population served, while preserving the integrity of the surrounding neighborhood. [Policy F-3-a.] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4
- Public open space should be linked to major activity centers through a series of landscaped linear walkways and bikeways that enhance and encourage pedestrian use. [Policy F-3-b.] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

III. Policies Intended to Reduce Use of and Dependence on Conventional Automobiles

- Provide for safe, clean, and aesthetically pleasing neighborhoods free from excessive traffic and noise. [Policy C-7-a.] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2
- Utilize the model ordinances contained in the "Livable Neighborhood development" implementation guideline of October 2001 (prepared by the Growth Alternatives Alliance for "Landscape of Choice") for guidance and preparation of zoning regulations proposing mixing of residential with nonresidential land uses. [Policy C-8-b.] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4
- Encourage the integration of multi-story residential projects into other parts of the community in order to increase the efficiency of transportation. [Policy C-11-b.] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2
- Support and encourage regional, state and federal programs and actions for the improvement of air quality. [Policy G-1-a.] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

CLOVIS

Relevant Excerpts from the City of Clovis General Plan related to Public Transportation

I. Policies that Promote and Enhance Public Transit

The intent of the plan is to provide a network of sustainable quality neighborhoods which are integrated into a balanced community that provides housing, employment, agricultural, industrial, educational, health care and recreational opportunities. The ultimate objective is a series of three communities, termed Urban Centers, designed as clusters of villages consisting of neighborhoods that are interconnected vial multipurpose corridors. Agricultural land and rural residential subdivisions are maintained as buffers between the pockets of more concentrated development and to sustain opportunities for the pastoral lifestyle many residents desire.

An Urban Village is basically comprised of a network of Urban Villages and their supporting Village centers, as well as employment and commercial centers; transit centers; schools and super school campus facilities; open space, parks and recreation areas; and residential neighborhoods of varying densities. Each Urban Center is typified by a super school complex that integrates elementary, middle, and senior high school facilities with playfields and recreation facilities and serves as a focal point within the Urban Center.

Neighborhoods within each Urban Village are planned and developed with a combination of land uses for a self-sustaining community. The Village Centers, around which the neighborhoods are clustered, are envisioned as approximately 10 acre areas which provide quasi-public support services such as day care centers, community centers, religious institutions, recreational facilities, and other pedestrian-oriented uses to the surrounding neighborhood and create a community focal point.

The Old Town and downtown Clovis will remain the distinct Destination oriented focal point of the community. Arterials will provide links between outlying major activity centers and community core. Activities within and between Urban Centers and the community core will be linked via bicycle or alternative modes of transportation in conjunction with transit corridors. [Character of Community narrative - Land Use Element] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

Establish a network of Urban Villages within each Urban Center, based on the concept of neighborhood building blocks, comprised of approximate 160 acre neighborhoods situated around a Village center mixed use activity core, which provides public activities and services within 1/4 to 2 mile distance to high density residential. [Goal 1: Action] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

Concentrate employment centers primarily at Transit Centers, at circulation interchanges on transit corridors, at interchanges along the inner and outer beltway, and along Clovis Avenue, Herndon Avenue, and Shaw Avenue business corridors in order to protect residential neighborhoods from disruption due to vehicular through traffic. [Policy 5.4] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

Locate expanded, well designed, aesthetically pleasing and environmentally sensitive industrial development in multiple centers throughout the Project Area with emphasis on proximity to transit corridor or business corridor access. [Policy 5.6] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

As it becomes available, acquire railroad right-of-way for use as pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and/or parkway corridors and as multi-modal terminal locations, including bus or rail transit stations. [Goal 3: Action] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

The Urban Center should be developed according to a Specific Plan. The concept of the Southeast Urban Center envisions seven Urban Villages, each concentrated around a Mixed Use Village Center. Residential uses are comprised primarily of rural residential, very low and low density designations, with lower densities along the southern perimeter and adjacent to agricultural designated land. Medium and higher density residential areas are concentrated around the Mixed Use designation of the Village Centers, the Employment Center and associated transit station at the junction of the inner beltway and Shaw Avenue, and the 160 education campus which serves as the focal point of the urban center. [Southeast Urban Center narrative] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

II. Policies that Promote and Enhance other Alternative Transportation Modes

Require adequate park and open space connections with community wide and regional trail systems, and recreational facilities within each urban neighborhood. [Goal 1: Action] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Incorporate safe and direct pedestrian linkages in the design and development of residential areas to school sites, parks, and community activity centers. [Goal 1: Action] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Achieve a balanced multi-modal transportation system, including multi-modal corridors and transit centers. [Circulation Element Policy 3.1] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Emphasize human scale and pedestrian shopping activity. [Circulation Element Policy 4.2] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

Utilize canal easements to provide bicycle and pedestrian trails. [Circulation Element Goal 3: Action] **Effectiveness Rating:** 4

Sidewalks, paths, and appropriate crosswalks should be located to facilitate access to all schools and other areas with significant pedestrian traffic. [Circulation Element Policy 3.2]] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

III Policies Intended to Reduce Use of and Dependence on Conventional Automobiles

Promote the long-term shifting of peak hour commute trips from the single occupant automobile to ridesharing, buses, pedestrian, bicycles, and other strategies that may emerge. [Policy 3.3] **Effectiveness Rating:** 2

5. FRESNO REGION TRANSIT PLANS AND ONGOING STUDIES

The consultant team, led by Nelson\Nygaard reviewed the following five transit service documents:

1. FAX Short Range Transit Plan
2. FAX Long Range Transit Master Plan
3. Clovis Short Range Transit Plan
4. Rural Fresno County Short Range Transit Plan
5. Fresno Alternative Mass Transportation PRE-MIS Corridor Study

FRESNO AREA EXPRESS SHORT RANGE TRANSIT PLAN 2005– 10

System Overview

The FAX service area (http://www.fresno.gov/fax/pdf_schedule/SYS_MAP.pdf) covers most of the developed portions of the City of Fresno and part of the adjacent areas of Fresno County. This area is consistent with the area planned for urban growth during the 20-year planning period, including the Cities of Fresno (2000 census population of 427,652) and Clovis (2000 census population of 68,468). The 2000 census population for the entire Fresno Clovis Metropolitan Area (FCMA), an area slightly larger than the PUA, is 570,169. The FCMA contains 299 square miles. The overall average population density is 3 persons/acre, though in the urbanized areas the average density ranges from four to fifteen persons per acre.

The FAX fixed route network follows a modified grid pattern with intersecting north south and east west bus lines. In 2003/04 the system carried 4.8 million passengers and accumulated 10.8 million passenger-miles.

Most routes run on 30 minutes headways. Table 3 describes each of the routes.

TABLE 3
FAX ROUTES

Route	Route Name	Frequency	Service Hours
4	Downtown Circulator Trolley	10 minutes, Wkdy only	6:30AM – 6:30PM, Wkdy only
9	Shaw Ave. Crosstown	30 minutes, Wkdy 30 minutes, Wkend	5:30AM – 10:30PM, Wkdy 6:30AM – 7:30PM, Wkend
12	Southeast Circulator	30 minutes, Wkdy only	8:00AM – 6:30PM, Wkdy only
18E	Fresno ROP Express	Express service	7:30AM–12:30PM Outbnd 12:30PM–4:00PM Inbnd
20	N. Hughes / N. Marks / E. Olive	30 minutes, Wkdy 50 minutes, Wkend	5:30AM – 10:30PM, Wkdy 6:30AM – 7:30PM, Wkend
22	North West Ave. / East Tulare Ave.	30 minutes, Wkdy 50 minutes, Wkend	5:30AM – 10:30PM, Wkdy 6:00AM – 7:30PM, Wkend
26	North Palm / Peach Avenue	30 minutes, Wkdy 60 minutes, Wkend	5:55AM – 10:30PM, Wkdy 7:00AM – 7:30PM, Wkend
28	CSUF / Manchester Center / W. Fresno	30 minutes, Wkdy 30 minutes, Wkend	5:30AM – 10:30PM, Wkdy 6:00AM – 7:30PM, Wkend

30	Pinedale / N. Blackstone / West Fresno	30 minutes, Wkdy 30 minutes, Wkend	5:30AM – 10:30PM, Wkdy 6:30AM – 7:30PM, Wkend
32	N. Fresno / Manchester Center / W. Fresno	30 minutes, Wkdy 30 minutes, Wkend	5:45AM – 10:30PM, Wkdy 6:30AM – 7:00PM, Wkend
33	Olive / Belmont Crosstown	30 minutes, Wkdy 40 minutes, Wkend	6:00AM – 10:30PM, Wkdy 7:30AM – 7:00PM, Wkend
34	NE Fresno / North First / West Fresno	30 minutes, Wkdy 30 minutes, Wkend	5:45AM – 10:30PM, Wkdy 6:45AM – 7:30PM, Wkend
38	North Cedar / Jensen / Hinton Center	30 minutes, Wkdy 30 minutes, Wkend	5:45AM – 11:00PM, Wkdy 6:45AM – 7:30PM, Wkend
39	Clinton Avenue Crosstown	30 minutes, Wkdy 60 minutes, Wkend	5:15AM – 11:00PM, Wkdy 7:30AM – 7:30PM, Wkend
41	N. Marks Ave. / Shields Ave. / VMC	30 minutes, Wkdy 50 minutes, Wkend	5:30AM – 10:30PM, Wkdy 7:30AM – 7:30PM, Wkend
45	Ashlan Crosstown	60 minutes, Wkdy 60 minutes, Wkend	6:00AM – 9:00PM, Wkdy 9:30AM – 6:30PM, Wkend
58	NE Regular Service	60 minutes, Wkdy 60 minutes, Wkend	6:45AM – 6:45PM, Wkdy 11:00AM – 6:30PM, Wkend
58E	Valley Children's Hospital Express	60 minutes, Wkdy 60 minutes, Wkend	6:15AM – 6:15PM, Wkdy 11:30AM – 6:00PM, Wkend

Source: Nelson\Nygaard, 2005.

The Handy Ride system provides demand responsive, curb-to-curb service seven days a week during the same hours and throughout the same service area as FAX. In 2002/04 the system carried 133,000 passengers and accumulated 1 million passenger-miles. Requests for service are accepted on a "previous day" basis for ADA Certified City of Fresno residents and visitors, and on the "same day", if space is available, for other ADA and/or general public passengers.

FAX currently has an active fleet of 114 vehicles, of which 97 are diesel-powered, 40' coaches. Twelve buses in the fleet are "low-floor." In March 2001, FAX received two Hybrid-Electric drive buses. These buses produce emissions that are comparable to buses operating engines fueled by Compressed Natural Gas.

The fares for FAX and Handy Ride are displayed in Table 4.

TABLE 4 FAX AND HANDY RIDE FARES		
Fare Category	**Adult Fare FAX**	**Adult Fare Handy Ride**
Single Ride/Express Single Ride	$1.00	N/A
Token/10 Tokens	$ .85/$8.50	N/A
Metro Pass	$40.00	N/A
Monthly Pass	$35.00	N/A
*Half month Pass	$17.50	N/A
	FAX Senior/Disabled Fare	Handy Ride Senior/Disabled Fare
Single Ride	$ 0.35	$0.75
Monthly Pass	$10.00	$25.00
Source: Nelson\Nygaard, 2005.		

Transit Supportive Policies

Program for New Transit Service - FAX is pursuing an aggressive program for new and increased transit service as part of an overall effort to increase mobility. Furthermore, FAX has made a commitment to reducing crowding issues created by increases in passenger loads, wheel chair boardings, and by traffic congestion. Transit improvements will be targeted to high growth areas while maintaining our commitment to seniors and the transit dependent community.

Future Bus Service Improvements/Expansion Plans - Working with land use and transportation policy makers, FAX hopes to ensure transit friendly development along the principal transit corridors identified in the City of Fresno General Plan. This will allow FAX to concentrate transit resources and provide high frequency service along these designated routes.

Maintain Service Reliability - FAX has been experiencing major increases in ridership during peak period service. These capacity issues occur most frequently near schools, and are present for only short periods of time, often less than one hour. On Route 26, additional trippers have been provided to help offset the high ridership. Also problems continue to occur on Route 28, which provides service to the major university. FAX, with financial support from local CMAQ funds, will be providing 15 minute service on Route 28 and Route 30 beginning in FY06. These routes have been experiencing increases in demand for service and have been congested and delayed for a long period of time. It is anticipated that the increase in frequencies will provide a more reliable service to passengers.

Increase Service Area Coverage - As the urbanized area continues to spread, more and more development is occurring where public transportation does not currently exist. These newly developed areas, as a rule, do not have the density to justify fixed-route service on 30 minute headways. Additionally, adjusting trunk line service is a difficult and often very costly solution. For these reasons, this SRTP contains an evaluation of circulator service as an option for providing service in currently unserved and newly developing areas. The introduction of the "FANS" service is an attempt to assess new areas for ridership without the cost of a system wide adjustment.1

1 South East Fresno has been selected for a FANS service based on the existence of several generators, which have the potential to show significant transit ridership. Among these generators are: the new Sunnyside High School, which is located at Peach and Kings Canyon Avenues, a new middle school to be located at Willow and Church Avenues, Pacific College, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Senior Citizens Village. In addition, in FY06 FAX will be constructing a new transit facility in the Southeast corridor which will provide more transportation access to passengers in the area. The center will act as a transit multimodal center which will

FAX LONG RANGE TRANSIT MASTER PLAN

Transit Supportive Policies

Protect Transit Speed and Reliability

- Space stops between 600 and 1320 feet apart to decrease the number of stops along the route.
- Build bus bulbs at bus stops to eliminate the need to merge out of the stop.
- Implement minor signal pre-emption to extend the signal to allow the bus to get through.
- Integrate queue bypasses at major signals.
- Implement bus-only and HOV lanes.

Improve the Connection Between Land Use and Transit

- Encourage increased density and transit friendly-development along the route network.
- Major route corridors should have building orientation and pedestrian accessibility requirements for all new developments.
- Transit-dependent land uses, such as social service offices, should be located along major route corridors.

Expand Transit Service

- Provide 15-minute headways on existing routes
- Provide high frequency service along corridors that have transit supportive development.

CLOVIS SHORT RANGE TRANSIT PLAN

System Overview

The Clovis Transit service area (http://www.ci.clovis.ca.us/UMAP/UserPageObjects/Transit-Master-map.pdf) is consistent with the Planned Urbanized Area (PUA) of the City of Clovis General Plan and represents the area planned for urban growth during the 20-year planning period.

Clovis Roundup, the city's demand-responsive system, transports elderly (55 years and older) and disabled residents within the city and adjacent unincorporated areas, primarily along Shepard Avenue to the north, Dakota Avenue to the south, Locan Avenue to the east and Winery Avenue to the west. Zonal service is provided within the City of Fresno as far north as Nees Avenue, south to Kings Canyon, west to West Avenue and south to Downtown Fresno.

Clovis Stageline operates four fixed routes, each running on a 30 minute headway. The four buses have timed transfers at the Sierra Vista Mall and the Clovis Civic Center. A fifth bus operates as a limited hour express service.

The Stageline routes are timed to facilitate transfers to/from FAX routes 9, 29 and 32 at a variety of locations.

Stageline carried 97,000 passengers in FY 2003/04. Table 5 describes the routes. Most routes run on 30 minutes headways.

---

include access to transit, bikeways, walking and some nearby multi family housing. This facility will be the first multimodal transportation center in Fresno and should be in place by early 2006.

TABLE 5
STAGELINE ROUTES

Route	Route Name	Frequency	Service Hours
10	Fresno State University/ Northwest Clovis	30 minutes, Wkdy only	6:00AM – 6:30PM, Wkdy only
50	Northeast/Southwest Clovis	30 minutes, Wkdy only	6:30AM – 7:00PM, Wkdy only
60	Clovis Community Hospital/Sierra Vista Mall	30 minutes, Wkdy only	6:50AM – 7:00PM, Wkdy only
65	Southeast Clovis Circulator	30 minutes, Wkdy only	6:30AM – 6:30PM, Wkdy only
70	Reagan Education Center Express	Express Service	7:00AM Outbound 2:55PM Inbound

Source: Nelson\Nygaard, 2005.

The Clovis Roundup carried 37,000 passengers in FY 2003/04. Buses operate on weekdays from 6:15 a.m. to 6:15 p.m., and upon demand on Saturdays 9:00 a.m. until 2:30 p.m. Fresno is served Monday to Friday from 9:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. Service is provided on both an advance reservation and a real time space available basis. Passengers may make reservations up to 14 days in advance or the required 24 hours in advance and could displace non ADA riders. Roundup policy requires passengers to be ready at least one hour before a schedule Fresno ride and a half hour for a Clovis ride with pick-up within five minutes of the designated pick-up time and no longer then 15 minutes after the designated pick-up time.

The city has a fleet of seven diesel and gasoline buses which are used for transit service. All of them are lift equipped 18 passenger buses.

Fares for Roundup and Stageline are shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6
ROUNDUP AND STAGELINE FARES

Fare Category	Adult Fare Stageline/Round Up
Single Rider	$0.50
Express Single Ride	N/A
Day Pass	N/A
10 Tokens	N/A
Monthly Pass	$18 for 20 rides
	Senior/Disabled Fare Clovis Transit
Senior and Disabled	$.50
Single Ride	$1.00
Monthly Pass	$13.50 for 20 rides

Source: Nelson\Nygaard, 2005.

Transit Supportive Policies

The City of Clovis supports:

1. Providing safe, efficient, adequate roadway access - Maximize traffic safety for automobile, transit, bicycles and pedestrians. Provide separate bicycle and pedestrian paths on the beltway system and other high speed, heavy traffic facilities.
2. Promoting all modes of transportation - Achieve a balanced multi-modal transportation system, including multi-modal corridors and transit centers. Sidewalks, paths and appropriate crosswalks should be located to facilitate access to all schools and other areas with significant pedestrian access.

The General Plan also promotes the long term shifting of peak hour commute trips from the single occupant automobile to ridesharing, bus, pedestrian, bicycle, and other strategies by:

- Implementing a community bikeway plan
- Requiring bike parking and amenities at commercial developments
- Requiring commercial development to participate in TDM programs
- Requiring developers to provide bus shelters and turnouts as part of the development approval process where bus service is provided.
- Designing arterials and collectors to include either a continuous parking lane with bus stops, or special bus pull-out lanes, where appropriate

RURAL FRESNO COUNTY AREA SHORT RANGE TRANSIT PLAN 2004 – 2009

System Overview

The Fresno County Rural Transit Agency (http://www.ruraltransit.org) is the overall administrator of rural transit systems in the county. This includes serving the general public transportation needs of county residents living beyond the Fresno-Clovis Metropolitan Area.

The day-to-day operational authority is vested with local agencies or service contractors. The Consolidated Transportation Service Agencies (CTSA) provides transportation services to immediate clients of social service agencies.

The following listing shows the sub-systems and services operating within each of the rural incorporated cities, as well as between cities and rural communities:

Intra-city operations

Coalinga Transit

Del Rey Transit

Firebaugh Transit

Fowler Transit

Huron Transit

Kerman Transit

Kingsburg Transit

Mendota Transit

Orange Cove Transit

Reedley Transit

Sanger Transit

San Joaquin Transit

Selma Transit

Inter-city operations

Auberry Transit

Coalinga Transit

Huron Transit

Laton Transit

Orange Cove Transit

Southeast Transit

Westside Transit Services

Inter-community operations

Auberry Transit

South Sierra Transit

Private intercity carriers

In addition to the public services, there are a number of private transportation services including:

Greyhound - limited service between Mendota, Fresno, Selma and Kingsburg.

Orange Belt Stages - serves Fresno, Selma and selected cities in Tulare, Kern, Kings and San Luis Obispo Counties.

Transportes Intercalifornias - service between Fresno, Los Angeles, Santa Ana, San Ysidro and Tijuana.

Tables 7 and 8 summarize FY 2002/03 ridership, mileage, hours and performance data for all of the FCRTA services. Table 9 also offers comparative statistics for FAX and Clovis.

TABLE 7
2002-2003 FCRTA SYSTEM OPERATING DATA

Transit System	Total Seniors	Total Disabled	Total General Public	Total Passengers	Total Mileage	Total Hours
FCRTA	94,420	4,970	352,210	451,600	848,770	58,245
Auberry	2,590	275	1,000	3,870	29,000	1,730
Coalinga	6,250	1,150	42,930	50,330	199,390	8,985
Eastside	0	0	0	0	0	0
Firebaugh	7,220	490	23,080	30,780	28,730	2,330
Fowler	2,960	5	28,080	31,040	17,600	2,370
Friant	0	0	0	0	0	0
Huron	4,230	0	63,260	67,490	15,390	2,870

Kerman	4,550	20	5,090	9,655	16,100	1,875
Kingsburg	8,260	16	17,990	26,260	40,640	4,040
Laton	320	0	1,290	1,610	11,340	260
Mendota	4,120	13	9,070	13,200	37,630	2,350
Orange Cove	8,200	720	25,170	34,090	66,070	4,750
Parlier	4,390	6	9,410	13,810	23,350	1,960
Reedly	9,210	320	55,460	65,000	89,800	6,000
Sanger	12,470	550	9,470	22,500	55,330	4,660
San Joaquin	1,300	0	1,800	3,100	32,910	1,875
Selma	14,430	710	47,280	62,420	97,610	7,470
Southeast	2,300	660	5,750	8,720	40,350	2,360
Westside	1,600	30	6,080	7,720	47,530	2,360

TABLE 8
2002-2003 SUMMARY OF FCRTA PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Transit System	Pass/ Hour	Pass/ Mile	Cost/ Hour	Cost/Mile	Cost/ Pass	Farebox Percentage
FCRTA	7.75	0.50	$54.00	$3.70	$7.00	12.60%
Auberry	1.20	0.10	$57.00	$3.40	$25.00	9.20%
Coalinga	5.60	0.25	$68.00	$3.10	$12.00	15.40%
Eastside	0.00	0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00%
Firebaugh	13.20	1.10	$4500.	$3.60	$3.40	11.50%
Fowler	13.10	1.80	$44.00	$6.00	$3.40	14.40%
Friant	0.00	0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	0.00%
Huron	23.50	4.40	$38.00	$7.10	$1.60	18.30%
Kerman	5.15	0.60	$44.00	$5.15	$8.60	9.25%
Kingsburg	6.50	0.65	$56.00	$5.60	$8.70	7.60%
Laton	6.10	0.10	$47.00	$1.10	$7.70	13.80%
Mendota	5.60	0.35	$45.00	$2.80	$8.00	10.30%
Orange Cove	7.20	0.50	$49.00	$3.50	$6.80	25.70%
Parlier	7.00	0.30	$51.00	$4.20	$7.00	10.15%
Reedly	10.80	0.70	$51.00	$3.40	$4.70	11.50%
Sanger	4.80	0.40	$61.00	$5.10	$12.50	6.90%
San Joaquin	1.70	0.10	$45.00	$2.60	$27.00	6.90%
Selma	8.35	0.60	$55.00	$4.20	$6.50	8.60%
Southeast	3.70	0.20	$56.00	$3.25	$15.00	15.30%
Westside	3.30	0.20	$61.00	$3.00	$18.50	16.00%

TABLE 9
2001-2002 SUMMARY OF FAX, CLOVIS AND FCRTA PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Transit System	Pass/ Hour	Pass/ Mile	Cost/ Hour	Cost/ Mile	Cost/ Pass	Farebox Percentage
FAX[1]	**38.40**	**2.90**	**$33.80**	**N/A**	**$0.90**	**N/A**
Clovis[2]	**6.55**	**0.40**	**$51.65**	**$3.20**	**$7.90**	**7.00%[3]**
FCRTA[4]	6.40	0.40	$44.85	$3.00	$7.00	15.10%
Auberry	1.30	0.10	$41.10	$2.85	$32.10	6.60%
Coalinga	5.30	0.20	$58.90	$2.70	$11.00	15.80%
Eastside	1.30	0.10	$36.30	$2.00	$27.30	19.70%
Firebaugh	10.85	0.90	$38.30	$3.10	$3.50	15.40%
Fowler	9.60	1.50	$37.80	$5.50	$3.60	17.90%
Friant	1.60	0.10	$43.90	$1.80	$26.80	5.30%
Huron	17.60	3.80	$38.65	$8.40	$2.20	16.90%
Kerman	4.20	0.50	$33.80	$3.80	$8.10	12.50%
Kingsburg	5.85	0.60	$43.10	$4.60	$7.40	9.90%
Laton	5.90	0.10	$45.50	$1.10	$7.70	13.90%
Mendota	4.60	0.30	$40.65	$2.80	$8.90	12.10%
Orange Cove	7.00	0.50	$41.80	$2.80	$5.90	30.80%
Parlier	6.40	0.60	$43.35	$4.10	$6.70	13.80%
Reedly	11.70	0.75	$45.40	$2.90	$3.90	18.10%
Sanger	4.95	0.40	$50.00	$4.30	$10.10	10.10%
San Joaquin	1.50	0.10	$41.90	$2.40	$28.10	9.40%
Selma	8.10	0.60	$47.60	$3.60	$5.90	9.95%
Southeast	2.60	0.15	$39.95	$2.40	$15.40	19.90%
Westside	3.10	0.10	$51.70	$2.00	$16.50	21.80%

Notes:
[1] FAX performance indicators are based on revenue miles and revenue hours
[2] Clovis performance indicators are based on vehicle miles and vehicle hours
[3] Farebox ratio without Measure C
[4] It is unclear if FCRTA performance measures are based on vehicle or revenue miles/hours

Transit Supportive Policies and Service Issues/Recommendations

Recommendations[2] are provided for each transit service under the jurisdiction of FCRTA.

Auberry Transit

- Ridership has been marginal; users are primarily seniors attending the hot meal nutrition program. Inter-city service to Fresno has not attracted a consistent minimum ridership base. The recommendation is to decrease service to one day a week for medical trips.

Coalinga Transit

- Coalinga Transit operates four modes of service. As ridership has decreased for all four modes, Saturday service should be reevaluated to determine if service is needed. Additionally, the New State Mental Hospital may require additional transit services, ridesharing education and promotion.

Del Rey Transit

- None

Eastside Transit

- A new inter-city transit service connecting with the Regional Center in Selma may be warranted in the 2005-06 Fiscal Year to further address pending transit service needs associated with the decision to establish the Eastern Fresno County Regional Job Initiative Center in Mendota.

Firebaugh Transit

- Firebaugh Transit continues to attract a significant and consistent ridership base. The service may be reaching its maximum capabilities with a single vehicle. A second vehicle's operation may be warranted.

Fowler Transit

- None

Friant Transit

- None

Huron Transit

- None

Kerman Transit

- The FCRTA with the City of Kerman provides demand-responsive public transportation service with a FCRTA vehicle eight hours a day, Monday to Friday. Westside Transit service provides

2 Recommendations for issues not related to service are not included in this document.

two round trip Monday through Friday trips on a scheduled fixed-route basis via Firebaugh, Mendota and Fresno with connections to San Joaquin Transit for service to Cantua Creek, El Porvenir (Three Rocks), Halfway and Tranquillity. FCRTA staff recommends the service day be extended to 7:00am to 4:00pm, Monday through Friday.

Kingsburg Transit

- None

Laton Transit

- None

Mendota Transit

- Mendota Transit and Westside Transit may have to be modified to accommodate commuters to the new prison in Mendota. Additionally, the City of Mendota has been selected to host the Western Fresno County Regional Job Initiative Center. Inter-city transit connectivity will have to addressed in 2005-06 to facilitate transporting program clients from all Westside Communities.

Orange Cove Transit

- None

Parlier Transit

- None

Reedley Transit

- The FCRTA and the City of Reedley provide demand-responsive public transportation nine and a half hours a day, Monday through Friday, utilizing 3 lift-equipped vans. FCRTA staff recommends introducing a fourth 23-passenger vehicle to be operated on a fixed-route basis, 8:00am to 5:00pm Monday to Friday.

Sanger Transit

- None

San Joaquin Transit

- None

Selma Transit

- The City of Selma under Agreement with FCRTA operates public transportation service within Selma, utilizing five FCRTA lift-equipped vans. Three operate on a demand-responsive basis for an average of eight hours a day. Service is also available on Saturdays for eight hours. The Selma Transit Trolley operates on a thirty minute route and connects commercial centers within the community. FCRTA staff recommends a second fixed-service route.

South Sierra Transit

- None

Southeast Transit

- None

Westside Transit Service

- Westside Transit Service is provided by the Rural CTSA. The service links the communities of Firebaugh, Mendota, San Joaquin, Tranquillity, Cantua Creek, Three Rocks and Kerman to the City of Fresno. The service operates Monday through Friday, 7:00am to 6:00pm. FCRTA staff recommends expanding the service in 2005-06 to facilitate inter-city connectivity and address pending transit service needs associated with the decision to establish the Western Fresno County Regional Jobs Initiative Center in Mendota.

In addition, the Council of Fresno County Governments (COFCG) recommends that:

1. Some type of multi-modal interface should be established between FCRTA, the metropolitan area transit operators and long distance carriers such as Greyhound and Amtrak.

2. FCRTA should consider implementing new inter-city services to replace those eliminated by common carriers, including Greyhound.

FRESNO ALTERNATIVE MASS TRANSPORTATION PRE-MAJOR INVESTMENT STUDY (2003/04)

Pre-MIS Technical Memorandum #1

The objectives of the Fresno Pre-Major Investment Study (Pre-MIS) were to:

- Assess the feasibility of high capacity transit within four candidate corridors, and
- Identify a "preferred corridor" which can be further evaluated in a Federal Major Investment Study

The four candidate corridors include:

1. Blackstone Avenue

Blackstone Avenue runs parallel to State Route 41, connecting downtown Fresno with the city's northern end. Much of the land uses along Blackstone are single story retail with a particularly high presence of auto-oriented services. With the completion of River Park, a large mixed-use project on North Blackstone Avenue, the northern end of the corridor has become a major local and regional destination for shopping, dining, and entertainment. FAX Route 30 services the corridor.

2. Shaw Avenue

Shaw Avenue is a major east-west arterial connecting Highway 99 on the Westside with the Bullard neighborhood, Cal State Fresno and Clovis on the eastside. Much of Shaw Avenue is lined with single story retail strips and the occasional two-story office building. The corridor is serviced by Fax Routes 9 and 28.

3. Cedar Avenue

Cedar Avenue provides a north-south connection between the City of Fresno's Woodward Park Area and the Roosevelt Area. Although there are clusterings of single-story retail at certain intersections, much of Cedar Avenue is either directly fronted with single-family homes or lined with the edges of low-density residential neighborhoods. FAX Route 38 services the corridor.

4. Ventura/Kings Canyon

Ventura/Kings Canyon connects downtown Fresno with the Roosevelt Area and approaches the city's Southeast Growth Area. A mixture of uses including light industry, retail strips, single-family housing, and entertainment venues characterize the Ventura/Kings Canyon corridor. FAX Routes 20, 28, and 29 serve the corridor.

Service Improvement Scenarios from 2001 Long Range Transit Master Plan

As part of the 2001 Transit Long Range Plan (LRP), two short-term scenarios were developed for changing FAX Service by 2005.

- The Productivity Scenario focuses all resources on maximizing system-wide ridership.
- The Coverage Scenario retains transit service in all area currently served, and expands the coverage area to include most developed parts of the city.

The following summarizes the Productivity and Coverage Scenarios for each of the four corridors:

1. Blackstone Avenue

- Productivity Scenario - frequencies on Route 30 between downtown and North Riverpark Transit Center would be increased to operate 15 minutes all day. Lower ridership parts of the line would be replaced by other, less frequent service.
- Coverage Scenario: frequencies on Route 30 would be increased to 15 minutes all day. The Scenario also proposes flex routes including the 71 Northwest Flex and the 74 Northwest Flex.

2. Shaw Avenue

- Productivity Scenario and Coverage Scenario - Under both scenarios, there would be a Northwest Transit Center at San Jose and Brawley, just north of Shaw Avenue. This new hub would organize northwest area services, and provide a terminal for many major commercial sites, as well as extensive and growing apartment development. Another potential location for a transit center along the Shaw Avenue corridor would be one close to the core of the CSU Fresno campus. Additionally, Route 28 would have a northern terminus at CSU but would no longer serve the Shaw corridor between First Avenue and Clovis. Frequencies on Route 9 would be raised to 15 minutes and would terminate at the Northwest Transit Center on the west end. Service further west along Shaw Avenue to Interstate 99 would be provided by Route 39 that would also serve the Northwest Transit Center.

3. Cedar Avenue

- Productivity Scenario - frequencies on Route 38 would be increased to operate 15 minutes all day, improving crosstown access to CSU.
- Coverage Scenario - no frequency upgrade proposed.

4. Kings Canyon/Ventura

- Productivity Scenario **and** Coverage Scenario - there will be a Southeast Transit Center at Lamb and Winery, near Kings Canon and Chestnut. This center would be a hub for east-west transit service on Kings Canon and Butler, and also north-south service on Chestnut. Also under both scenarios, Routes 20 and 28 will no longer serve the Kings Canyon/Ventura Corridor but instead focus service to areas north of downtown Fresno. Route 29 will provide service along the corridor between downtown Clovis Avenue, continuing northward to a new East Riverpark Transit Center at Clovis and Belmont.
- Productivity Scenario - Route 29 will operate at 15 minute frequencies.
- Coverage Scenario - there would be the new 61 Southeast Flex Route that would cover Fresno's southeast area and serve the Southeast Transit Center.

Pre-MIS Technical Memorandum #2

The second technical memorandum prepared for the Fresno Pre-Major Investment Study (Pre-MIS) assessed the economic and land use issues associated with the potential implementation of high capacity transit technologies on the four proposed corridors.

The key findings of the assessment were:

Commercial development (retail & office) is moving north, away from the four corridors.

The northern end of Blackstone has become the city's most desirable area for retail development. Although this is spurring some redevelopment of properties to the south, most of the current activity is north of Highway 41, beyond the proposed transit corridor. The City of Clovis has also built a significant amount of retail space, potentially reducing future retail development in Fresno. The main exception to this pattern is a rejuvenation of the retail market in the southeastern portion of the city, on and near the Ventura/Kings Canyon corridor, which is beginning to see significant investment.

Office development continues to move north, following the pattern set over the last half century. The area north of Herndon Avenue is the most popular location for new office space due to the amount of available land and freeway access. Older office areas such as Shaw suffer from congestion and obsolete space, and draw mainly small local-serving professionals. Other than the northernmost end of Blackstone and the eastern end of the Ventura/Kings Canyon corridor, the study corridors do not appear to be in a favorable position to attract office development.

Partial exceptions to this pattern are the downtown area, which is seeing an increase in office space built for the public sector, and the southeastern portion of the city, where a planned business park will include some office space. However, these facts do not signal a shift away from the preferred northern areas: the private sector has so far shown little inclination to build office space downtown, and the nature of the business park (which will include industrial space) implies that the southeast will not compete with the northern areas for prime office space.

Residential development is following a different pattern, with more areas experiencing growth

The city's General Plan projects that the Community Plan Areas that will experience the greatest net addition of new population are all in the southern and western portions of the city, as well as in areas of the county just beyond the southeastern corner of Fresno.

This view appears to be playing out on the ground. As land values have increased in the northern areas of the city, there has been increased residential activity in other areas, including the southeastern area of the city. There is new residential development occurring in that area, which is spurring some redevelopment of retail properties for neighborhood-serving uses.

Other than the Cedar corridor, none of the other corridors currently appear to have significant potential for residential development, although Shaw connects to quickly-growing areas (the area west of Highway 99 and Clovis) and some developers see future potential in the Blackstone corridor.

Residential development potential is more important than commercial development potential when making transit decisions

First, the residential real estate market is currently stronger than the commercial market. Given the economic downturn and the amount of vacant commercial space in the city, there is little demand for new office space. The market for retail development is healthier, but prime locations for regional projects are very concentrated geographically. The residential market, in contrast, is being driven by strong projected population growth. The multi-family housing market is seeing a resurgence and there is an opportunity to build a significant number of new apartments—and possibly condos—to meet pent-up demand. Residential development has the best prospects for the near future, and since the study corridors are unlikely to capture much commercial growth, residential growth is the best option for spurring redevelopment along any future transit line.

Second, interviews with real estate brokers suggest that transit has no impact on location decisions for commercial tenants, while it has at least some impact on residential decisions. This is particularly true in the case of the more transit-dependent population.

It is important to consider what kind of housing will be developed, not just how much

Although the corridor selected should show potential for residential growth, it should also show potential for creating a mix of housing types that includes multi-family housing, a mixture of rental and ownership units and, if feasible, infill projects on the corridor itself. This will ensure that the development supports higher ridership while also helping to ensure that the most transit-dependent segments of the population will have housing choices along the new transit corridor.

Because of equity and ridership concerns, corridor selection should take into account population characteristics such as vehicle access and transit ridership, as well as the suitability of corridors for multi-family housing, especially rental housing. Although it is not possible to obtain figures on vehicle access in single-family homes compared to condominiums, it is likely that the former figure is higher, even if the disparity is not as great as the difference between ownership and rental housing. This suggests that it is desirable to select a corridor conducive to the development of multi-family housing, both rental apartments and condominiums.

Although extremely high densities are not needed, careful attention is needed to ensure that appropriate densities and a mix of housing types becomes the norm around any transit corridor. Densities could be increased over time, perhaps by identifying certain key nodes and reserving them until land values are higher and higher densities are possible.

Transit can provide a moderate stimulus to development when conditions are right

A literature review reveals that, in general, the introduction of a rail system raises land values and real estate prices in the surrounding area. However, transit alone cannot stimulate new development—other supporting market conditions must be in place.

The first phase of any high-capacity transit system should serve downtown

Downtown Fresno has an important concentration of jobs, and if city efforts are successful, Downtown's role as an activity center will continue to increase in importance. Given the scarcity of housing Downtown and the consequent need to commute to the jobs there, high-capacity transit could play an important role in helping to solidify the role of the area as a major job center. As the most pedestrian-friendly of the city's major activity centers, Downtown is also already designed to work well with transit. Moreover, the

Downtown population is extremely transit-dependent and would benefit from better transit connections to jobs and services.

Finally, there is evidence that a market for Downtown housing is developing. Two projects discussed in this study will add nearly 200 units of housing to the Downtown area, as well as retail space. Residents of these projects are expected to own fewer cars than they would in other parts of the city, as evidenced by the zoning variance granted to one project, which allows a lower parking ratio. High-capacity transit that connects to Downtown could serve not only to bring residents of the corridors served into Downtown, but also to strengthen the Downtown housing market by providing more mobility options for the area's residents.

The Ventura/Kings Canyon corridor and the Blackstone corridor represent the best opportunities to capitalize on residential growth to establish transit-supportive land use patterns

Based on the analysis conducted in this study, of the four corridors the Ventura/Kings Canyon corridor seems best poised to take advantage of market conditions to establish a new relationship between transit and development. The market for multi-family housing is quite strong and growing stronger, and this is spurring neighborhood-serving retail development. This corridor has significant development potential since it runs through one of the areas projected to grow most quickly—the Roosevelt Community Plan Area—and if extended could run through another, the Southeast Growth Area. Development potential is already manifest in the retail and residential projects being planned for that area, as well as the increasing land prices. The corridor also connects to Downtown, providing an important connection between major population growth areas and the downtown core that the city is trying to reinforce. Given that 55,000 new residents are projected to move to the Southeast Growth Area in the next 20 years, the proposed transit corridor could be extended to the east in order to serve that area.

Furthermore, there are strong equity arguments in favor of the Ventura/Kings Canyon corridor, which compared to the other corridors has below-average median income and automobile access, and above-average transit ridership, household size, and Hispanic population.

Although the Blackstone corridor is not projected to see as much residential growth as the Ventura/Kings Canyon corridor, some developers see it as an opportunity. The corridor is anchored by Downtown in the south and by a strong market for commercial real estate in the north. Fresno City College also lies along the corridor. The fact that the corridor connects these uses, plus the perception that Blackstone is safer than parts of Ventura/Kings Canyon and the city-wide orientation of its retail (as opposed to the neighborhood trade area served by Ventura/Kings Canyon retail), lead some to suggest that it may be a more promising transit corridor, although its potential for transit-supportive development is still uncertain.

Since Blackstone and Shaw both have strong arguments in their favor, any investments should be made as part of a larger plan to eventually connect these corridors together into an integrated high-capacity transit system.

All corridors have a combination of one or more obstacles to effective redevelopment

In the case of Blackstone, growth is concentrated in the northern end and composed mainly of regional retail centers and some new office space, which are not designed to work well with transit. Although much of the corridor south of Shaw is in a Redevelopment Project Area, any redevelopment would be very complex and expensive given the amount of existing development and land prices. Given that there is little market support for redevelopment farther south along the corridor, aggressive public involvement would be necessary to stimulate significant change.

Although Shaw has a number of key activity centers, such as Fresno State and some major retail developments, land use patterns and design are not transit supportive in most cases. Moreover, Shaw does not connect to downtown or to any of the key areas of residential growth. In addition, given the condition of the office development in the corridor, which is past its prime but not yet completely obsolete, significant new development or redevelopment does not appear to be financially feasible.

Cedar shares Shaw's problem of not connecting to downtown, and although it does serve the Roosevelt Plan Area that is projected to add a significant number of new residents, most of the corridor is lacking in both major destinations and significant potential for growth.

While the Ventura/Kings Canyon corridor shows the most potential, there may be political resistance to developing more higher-density housing in that area, since that part of the city already contains a significant amount of multi-family housing. Moreover, the small parcel sizes, the cost and complexity of redevelopment, rising land costs, and safety concerns may prove difficult to overcome, particularly in the part of the corridor closest to Downtown.

Given the existing conditions in the corridors, strong public policy is required to stimulate redevelopment and infill. The city is making progress implementing supportive policies, but more remains to be done

The developers interviewed reported that city staff are generally responsive to their concerns. However, they pointed out some areas that could use improvement. One developer said that the process for getting variances is very slow. Another said that while the Development Department has been quite proactive in encouraging mixed-use infill development, the challenges inherent in this type of development go beyond the scope of that department, and that other city departments could play a larger role in facilitating this work.

While the General Plan is supportive of creating transit corridors, some of the specific land use visions fall short. For example, Blackstone is currently zoned exclusively for commercial development. A pending mixed-use ordinance would allow residential and mixed-use development in commercially zoned areas, as well as mixed-use residential and retail in office areas (housing is currently allowed in office areas under certain conditions). This is a significant step towards creating more flexibility in the city's land use policies in order to further the goal of mixed-use and infill development.

There is tenuous support by the market and the public at large for infill housing in the corridors

Even with supportive land use policies, there is no guarantee of infill development actually occurring. Public opposition can be one factor, as in the case of a 1.5 acre property at Clinton and Winery avenues, for which the developer requested a zoning change in order to build at a density of approximately 4.5 units per acre—a fairly typical suburban density, and one that is far too low to support transit. The Planning Commission voted to deny the request due to opposition from neighbors accustomed to large lots and low densities.

Moreover, the market for mixed-use and infill projects is relatively untested, as the developers of two such projects in the Downtown have found. Such projects are not currently viable without public support. Much is riding on these pioneering efforts, which, if successful, would serve as powerful demonstrations of the viability of this type of development and pave the way for more such projects.

Likewise, the housing market in southeastern part of Fresno is also untested, although several recent projects seem likely to fortify its standing. Still, even if housing construction in that part of the city proves popular and successful, it is unclear how strong the market would be for infill projects and more urban-style mixed-use projects along Ventura/Kings Canyon itself. Although the housing market appears stronger there than in any other of the proposed corridors, with the possible exception of the eastern end of Shaw, encouraging urban densities and infill development along the transit corridor will require commitment on the part of the public sector, collaboration with the private sector, and public support. An affordable housing infill project currently under development illustrates the challenges that any such development, including market-rate projects, would face.

Given the untested market and the complexities and cost of infill development, significant public involvement would be necessary to encourage transit-supportive development along the two corridors, particularly the southern part of the Blackstone corridor and the western part of the Ventura/Kings Canyon corridor.

The experience of the two downtown infill housing projects now in process, as well as a housing development by a non-profit developer in the Ventura/Kings Canyon corridor, yields lessons for any similar projects attempted in the Ventura/Kings Canyon and Blackstone corridors. However, developers stressed that the markets in the corridors are very different from the downtown market. Market-rate infill housing on underutilized parcels along the corridors does not appear viable at present, but further study would be necessary to determine how much public support would be needed.

Large portions of the Ventura/Kings Canyon corridor and the Blackstone corridor are included in Redevelopment Project Areas, making more active public involvement possible to supplement the market forces that are already supportive of redevelopment. Less public involvement in the redevelopment process might be needed in the Ventura/Kings Canyon corridor given that land values are relatively low compared to some of the other corridors and that the conditions seem relatively favorable for redevelopment.

Good urban design and amenities will be key to the success of any corridor

High-quality design is crucial for making development work with transit and for making higher-density residential environments more acceptable in the marketplace. This will be particularly true along a corridor such as Blackstone, where heavy traffic, large commercial lots, and other aspects of the corridor would need to be overcome in order to create a high-quality residential environment that would be successful in the market.

Even more fundamentally, given that the residential real estate market in the southeastern part of the city is still relatively untested, it is important to ensure that it is supported with key amenities such as parks, retail centers, and good design. Furthermore, there may be public opposition to multi-family housing projects, and high-quality design will be a crucial factor in overcoming that opposition.

Pre-MIS Technical Memorandum #3

The third technical memorandum for the Fresno Alternative Mass Transportation Pre- Major Investment Study suggested a range of transit-supportive policies to guide the planning and implementation of a high-capacity transit system in the City of Fresno.

Priority of Transit Service

Both the SRTP and the City of Fresno General Plan policies recognize the importance of providing and funding public transit services to the existing and future populations in Fresno. Although certain policies support the development of a light rail system (E-7-a and E-7-b), none of the policies establish transit as a priority transportation mode. Certain cities such as San Diego have adopted transit first policies that prioritize transit solutions and investments for meeting future travel demand needs. Another policy approach is to classify certain streets as “transit preferential streets.” On these types of streets, certain treatments such as traffic signal prioritization or dedicated transit rights of way make transit service a competitive mode choice to the automobile. This type of policy designation would be appropriate for a high-capacity transit corridor in Fresno.

Intermodal Connections

Both the SRTP and General Plan have good policies about intermodal connections. However, high-capacity transit stops must well integrated into feeder local bus services in order to maximize system coverage and ensure transit access. Consequently, the design of transit stations (including those for

enhanced bus services as well as BRT, light rail, or monorail) should facilitate strong pedestrian linkages to connecting transit services.

Quality of Service

The SRTP and General Plan policies on quality of service (E-9 Objective; Sub-policies 2a, 2b, 2c, 3a; and Policy 3) feature good language on providing clean, reliable, and safe transit service. However, none of the policies underscores the issues of improving the legibility of transit services through the design of stations, signage, schedules, and vehicles. The Metro Rapid system in Los Angeles has been successful partially because the system has been "branded," making the express bus routes and stops identifiable and easy to use.

A second issue is the quality of the pedestrian environment. Besides a high quality of transit service, a high-capacity transit system needs to be served by a high quality pedestrian environment that facilitates safe, convenient, and easy access to the system.

Integration

The SRTP and General Plan policies on integration (E-9-o Policy; Policy 5; Sub-policies 5a, 5b) describe the linkages between transportation services and activity centers, air quality goals, economic goals, and energy impacts. Specific policies should also be established for coordinating high-capacity transit systems with strategies for intensifying land uses and density levels in the selected corridors.

6. TRANSIT-SUPPORTIVE POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The Task 1 review of existing plans and standards clearly identifies policies and goals around transit and land use connections. In developing policy recommendations, we have outlined several policy areas critical in making transit-supportive land use policies and programs.

Existing policies, which have been determined to be most effective in meeting the goals of creating a transit-supportive environment, from jurisdictions within the project area, are identified here. These "Model Policies" are not intended to provide an exhaustive list of policies that support transit in the project area, but are intended to highlight types of policies likely to lead to successful transit services. Some policy area also includes an overall assessment of the state of policies in the project area and suggested policy directions.

Recommended policies, which follow existing policies, include policies that are not necessarily employed by any jurisdiction in the Fresno County region, but are provided by the Steering Committee as examples of additional strategies that may further help to provide desired outcomes.

TRANSIT POLICY

Assessment

Transit access and amenities are critical for supporting transit ridership, and pedestrian access and amenities are an integral component of attracting ridership. Amenities at transit stops and centers make for more comfortable conditions for riders, and the connection between transit and both origins and destinations is important in attracting riders. Policies in the project area are generally supportive of transit access, but many communities lack policies that clearly define the elements of transit access and user amenities.

Model Existing Policies – Transit Planning

- Involve citizens and businesses in planning transportation facilities and services. Special efforts will be made to include those individuals and groups who may not have been included in the past. Direct involvement by under-represented groups will be promoted in transportation planning, project selection, and other transportation issues that affect them. (RTP)
- Support transportation systems that have the lowest feasible levels of energy consumption while meting reasonable mobility needs. (RTP)
- Experimental transit projects should be encouraged to determine which combinations of types best serve the area. Alternatives include car pools, van pools, fixed route buses, or chartered buses for larger groups. (Sierra North Regional Plan)
- Require park and ride lots at appropriate locations to serve long distance and local commuters. (Coalinga CP)
- A well-coordinated transit system should continue to serve the needs of Mendota residents and which will also provide access to Fresno and other County areas. (Mendota CP)
- The County shall work with transit providers to provide transit services within the County that are responsive to existing and future transit demand and that can demonstrate cost-effectiveness by meeting minimum farebox recovery levels required by State and Federal funding programs. (Fresno GP)
- Work with public transit and social service agencies to assist in implementing "welfare-to-work" programs. (RTP)

- Development of the circulation system, which emphasizes the private automobile, includes provisions for alternative travel modes. The most efficient travel modes in the foreseeable future appear to be buses or van pools. Facilities for the operation of a bus line, as well as for cars and van pooling, shall be required in the commercial area. These facilities shall consist of bus turnouts, bus shelters, and park-and-ride areas. In addition, bike storage facilities shall be provided in the core area, higher density housing areas, and at recreation facilities. (Millerton Specific Plan)

Model Existing Policies – Intermodal Connections

- The County shall encourage the development of facilities for convenient transfers between difference transportation systems. (Fresno County GP)
- Maintain opportunities for a transit center within the City where alternative transit modes would connect. (Fowler CP)
- Develop a regional streets and highways system that has a balanced mix of high-speed and local corridors which are functional and flexible for intermodal use. (RTP)

Model Existing Policies – Quality of Service

- Provide quality, convenient and reliable public transportation service. (RTP)
- Promote public transit's service and image in community. (RTP)

Recommended Policies

- Assign a “transit priority” designation for streets supporting a high-capacity transit system.
- Develop performance standards for transit operations and pedestrian movements on a transit-priority street.
- Classify high-capacity transit corridors as “transit preferential” streets that prioritize the efficient movement of transit passengers.
- Design high-capacity transit stations with safe, convenient, and easy pedestrian linkages to connecting transit services.
- Reduce transit travel times through the deployment of dedicated transit lanes and traffic signal prioritization.
- Provide a minimum of 10-minute frequencies on high-capacity transit services during the peak period.
- Develop a branding strategy for transit vehicles, shelters, schedules and signage that improves the image and visibility of transit routes and stops.
- Establish design guidelines for creating a transit-supportive pedestrian environment around transit stations.
- Coordinate planning and phased implementation of high-capacity transit systems with strategies for intensifying land uses and density levels in the selected corridors.

Suggested Policy Directions

Policies should encourage access for a variety of travel modes and roadway design incorporating transit. Pedestrian access, amenities and comfort should be explicitly mentioned in discussing multi-modal access in order to make the connection that transit riders are pedestrians, and both modes of travel should be considered in policies.

Policies should also encourage location of transit around activity centers and destinations, as well as outlining appropriate transit amenities, such as seating, lighting, shelters, and ancillary facilities.

LAND USE POLICIES

Assessment – Land Use Intensification

This policy area has both strengths and weaknesses in the project area. Many of the communities have adopted policies that call for higher densities around cores and corridors that can be served effectively by transit. However, a number of communities do not have policies to focus growth and intensity in cores and corridors. Also lacking are specific standards, e.g. quantified land use densities in cores and corridors.

Model Policies – Land Use Intensification

- Encourage infill development to raise population density in existing settings. (RTP)
- Promote the concentration of urban and other intensive land use around existing urban centers. (Sierra North Regional Plan)
- Aggressively promote economic growth through (1) redevelopment of existing poorly designed and maintained commercial/industrial areas that do not presently provide adequate land use buffers, (2) development of new commercial and industrial uses in the southern and eastern sectors of the community, and (3) assure that regional transportation funds are utilized to complete regionally important facilities such as State Route 180 (east) freeway/expressway. (City of Fresno GP)
- Implement policies and standards to accommodate the full range of urban uses consistent with the areas unique advantages and characteristics (proximity to downtown, walk able neighborhoods, strong historical and architectural features, educational institutions). (City of Fresno GP)
- Establish a network of Urban Villages within each Urban center, based on the concept of neighborhood building blocks, comprised of approximate 160 acre neighborhoods situated around a Village center mixed use activity core, which provides public activities and services within 1/4 to 2 mile distance to high density residential. (City of Clovis GP)
- Pursue a coordinated Regional Land Use and Transportation Planning Program with the City of Clovis, Fresno and Madera Counties, and other cities which:

    Identifies areas suitable for development.

    Directs urban development to incorporated cities.

    Proposes programs to meet federal, state and local air quality requirements.

    Identifies future regional facilities and services, including transportation corridors, water, and sewerage.

    Applies public service impact fees equitably and uniformly throughout the metropolitan region.

    Conserves agricultural land and prevents its premature conversion including requirements for an economic assessment, phasing plan, and criteria to prevent leapfrog development.

    Opposes the creation of new rural residential lots within the identified sphere of influence of the city. (City of Fresno GP)

- Allow high land use densities along major high-capacity transit corridors and around transit stations.
- Adopt mixed use zoning regulations for high-capacity transit corridors
- High-density housing should be designated for high-capacity transit corridors and in the immediate areas around major transit stations.
- Develop Economic Development Plans for high-capacity transit corridors that aggressively pursue businesses and markets that can be effectively served by transit.

Suggested Policy Directions

Land use policies should provide for intensification, including more intense land use categories and/or special planning districts that allow for densities that support transit. These policies should be explicit about the locations of higher intensity uses as well as target land use density thresholds, to ensure "higher intensity" development is at density levels supportive of transit ridership. Also, many policies do not tie the concentration of land uses with transit itself. As stand-alone policies, they will reduce a portion of trip by automobile, but will not necessarily encourage transit ridership if their location is not specifically identified.

Assessment – Mixed Use Land Standards

The vertical and horizontal mixing of uses is critical in making transit-supportive environments. Together with a mixture of uses, planning documents can guide land use standards for individual developments that are transit supportive, including parking standards, as well as site planning and design guidance that support efficiency in the mixing of land uses. Policies addressing the mixture of land use in the project area are confined mainly to the major population centers, while clear standards and guidance is a weakness throughout the project area.

Model Policies – Mixed Use

- Support alternative land use patterns that will allow walking, biking, and transit to become more viable transportation options. (RTP)
- Improve air quality by supporting jurisdictions that take steps to reduce VMT through compact, mixed-use land use patterns. (RTP)
- Discourage non-contiguous development that is widely separated from existing urban services. (RTP)
- Support the development of high density, mixed-use neighborhood centers and transit stops. (RTP)
- The County shall encourage mixed-use development that locates residences near compatible jobs and services. (Fresno County GP)
- Transit centers/stops shall be established to encourage the interface between commercial centers, high density residential uses and the transit system. (Selma CP)
- Utilize innovative strategies to establish appropriately located mixed use developments such as the area east of the Clovis Avenue and north of Kings Canyon Avenue that might include retail commercial/entertainment, business/industrial, residential and public facility activities within an aesthetically pleasing and healthful environment. (City of Fresno GP)
- Utilize the model ordinances contained in the "Livable Neighborhood development" implementation guideline of October 2001 (prepared by the Growth Alternatives Alliance for

"Landscape of Choice") for guidance and preparation of zoning regulations proposing mixing of residential with nonresidential land uses. (City of Fresno GP)

- Parks and open space shall be located so as to be within walking distance (one-quarter mile) for users for which the facility was designated. (Selma CP)
- Encourage and support mixed land use developments that encourage a jobs/housing balance and that make alternative modes more effective. (RTP)

Suggested Policy Directions

Policies should encourage a vertical and horizontal mixture of uses, lower parking standards (that reflect the ability to park once and walk to multiple destinations as well as increased transit ridership); appropriate densities and land uses, and urban design that supports transit ridership. The cities of Fresno and Clovis, in particular, have extensive policies encouraging mixed-use development already, and while only sample model policies have been excerpted here, these communities provide a solid foundation for mixed-use policy throughout the project area.

CONNECTIVITY OF THE PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE NETWORK

Assessment

The connectivity of the pedestrian and bicycle network is essential to providing access to transit routes and support transit ridership. Many jurisdictions in the project area address issues of pedestrian and bicycle connectivity, but there are a number of communities where this issue is not addressed.

Model Policies – Bicycle Network

- Recognition and integration of the bicycle as a valid transportation mode in transportation planning activities. (RTP)
- Ensure that upgrades to existing roads (widening, curb, and gutter, etc.) include bicycle and pedestrian improvements in their plans and implementation where appropriate. (RTP)
- Encourage member agencies to provide for bicycle-friendly development, including bicycle travel in new development or redevelopment plans and projects. (RTP)
- Encourage member agencies to include bicycle parking requirements in all land-use/site development requirements that address automobile parking. (RTP)
- Support the development of a countywide system of designated bikeways that links communities, activity centers, and regional recreational destinations and provides for all types of bicyclists. (RTP)
- Encourage member agencies to provide bicycle parking facilities, including secured storage facilities where appropriate, at public and commercial areas, centers of employment, schools, recreational areas, air and bus terminals, major transit stops, and other places that attract large groups of people. (RTP)
- Encourage local agencies and Fresno County Rural Transit Agency to establish bicycle-to-transit connections throughout the County, including bicycle park-and-ride facilities at transit centers to serve regional route use and the accommodation of bicycles on public transit. (RTP)
- Encourage member agencies to work with major employers to provide incentive programs for bicycling including shower facilities guaranteed ride home programs and mileage reimbursement for work-related bicycling miles. (RTP)

- The County shall support development of facilities that help link bicycling with other modes of transportation. (Fresno County GP)
- Bikeways should be considered at the specific plan level so that developers can provide them and interconnections between adjacent communities. (Sierra North Regional Plan)
- The Engineering and Planning Departments will prepare a bike path design plan. Funds will come from tax increment financing and transportation funds. Bike paths will be required to be built in new subdivisions where required by the bike path design plan. (Kerman CP)

Model Policies – Pedestrian Planning

- The County shall plan adequate pedestrian-oriented neighborhood commercial shopping areas to serve residential development. (Fresno County GP)
- Encourage, where feasible, the construction of overpasses or undercrossings where pedestrian facilities intersect SR 269.
- Pursue all available strategies to establish critical public facilities such as the Shields Avenue overpass of Freeway 99 and the Union Pacific railroad and to address circulation and mobility issues with a multi-model transportation approach that takes advantage of walkable neighborhoods. (City of Fresno GP)
- Coordinate with transit operators to ensure that pedestrian facilities are provided along and/or near transit routes, whenever feasible. New land developments may be required to provide pedestrian facilities due to existing or future planned transit routes even if demand for a pedestrian facility is not otherwise warranted. (Fowler CP)
- Sidewalks in the community should be provided in commercial and residential areas to facilitate pedestrian traffic especially along routes with high pedestrian traffic circulation such as in the vicinity of schools, parks, and the downtown area. (Mendota CP)
- Place emphasis on pedestrian activities and linkages and provide for priority transit routes and facilities to serve activity centers. (City of Fresno GP)

Recommended Policies

Establish design guidelines for creating a transit-supportive pedestrian environment around transit stations. The purpose of these guidelines will be to enable fast, safe, and convenient pedestrian access to transit stations and to encourage use of alternative modes in a transit-oriented environment.

Suggested Policy Directions

Policies in this area should address three aspects of pedestrian and bicycle circulation: (1) retrofitting existing disconnected areas to improve pedestrian and bicycle access, (2) pedestrian and bicycle connectivity in growth areas and in new developments, and (3) improving pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and design standards. Providing additional policy direction to target transit corridors for pedestrian and bicycle improvements would be helpful to maximize transit accessibility. Also, these investments could be prioritized towards areas where the population has low auto ownership rates.

STREET DESIGN POLICIES

Model Policies – Street Design

- Support walkable subdivision design that is based on an interconnected grid of neighborhood streets and small blocks. (RTP)

- Require developers to design project sites to increase the convenience, safety, and comfort of transit users, pedestrians, and bicyclists. (Coalinga CP)
- Promote downtown Coalinga as the primary pedestrian-oriented, commercial, and financial center in the City. (Coalinga CP)
- "Open ended cul-de-sacs" to major streets are encouraged for pedestrian access. (Fowler CP)
- Subdivision layouts should include safe and pleasant designs which promote pedestrian access to arterials and collectors and consider the location of community services, such as schools, parks and neighborhood shopping activity centers in the accessibility of their design for all persons. (Fowler CP)
- Maximize visibility and access for pedestrians and encourage the removal of barriers (walls, easements, and fences) for safe and convenient movement of pedestrians. Special emphasis should be placed on the needs of disabled persons considering ADA regulations. (Fowler CP)
- All residential developments with walls should provide openings for pedestrian and bike traffic. (Orange Cove CP)
- Ensure that children have safe walking and bicycling routes to school. (Orange Cove CP)
- The County shall adopt transit- and pedestrian-oriented design guidelines and incorporate them into community plans and specific plans. The County shall review development proposals for compliance with its adopted transit- and pedestrian-oriented design guidelines to identify design changes that can improve transit, bicycle, and pedestrian access. (Fresno GP)

Recommended Street Design Policies

- Establish comprehensive design guidelines and right-of-way specifications for designing a transit-priority street.
- Establish urban design guidelines that specify the type of architecture, built form, and aesthetics that are appropriate on a transit-priority street, building face to building face.

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT POLICIES

Assessment

Effective Transportation System Management (TSM) of street and road networks, together with Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies at employers and other major traffic generators can help to regulate the demand for travel by shaping how, when, and where people travel.

Model Existing Traffic Policies

- Support the implementation of the Transportation System Management, Transportation Demand Management, and Transportation Control Measures that reduce emissions from the circulation system. This support shall include consultation with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District. (RTP)
- Improve transportation mobility and operations by improving and utilizing transportation demand management strategies which consist of managing human behavior regarding how, when, and where people travel. (RTP)

Recommended Policies

- Adopt aggressive TDM Programs on high-capacity transit corridors

- Evaluate proposed development plans, not only in terms of traffic impacts, but also in terms of its expected transit utilization, TDM programs, parking policies and programs, and contributions to the pedestrian/bike infrastructure.
- Develop Multi-modal Performance Measures for assessing the impact of new development on roadway movements.

PARKING POLICIES

Assessment

Very few policies relating to parking were found in the General Plans. Parking Management is an often overlooked policy tool which can have a dramatic effect on how people choose to travel. For example, reducing the amount of subsidized "free" parking (which is only free to the user, not to the provider) is very effective at shifting travelers to alternative modes.

Recommended Policies

- Adopt parking maximums as the development requirements for new projects built in transit-supportive corridors.
- Develop a downtown parking supply policy that supports utilization of high-capacity transit.
- Consider potential locations for parking fees along high-capacity transit corridors.
- Provide a downtown parking fee structure that encourages commuters to utilize a high-capacity transit service.
- Adopt parking design guidelines that encourage new parking areas to be located behind buildings, preserving the streetscape for pedestrian movements and transit access.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION POLICIES

Assessment

Effective transit requires intergovernmental coordination at all levels: planning, funding and service provision. Coordination of the many agencies involved in the provision of transit is vital to ensure the most efficient use of limited transit resources.

Model Policies

- Communicate with local land use agencies on the likely impacts of transportation policy decisions on land use and development; and strive for consistency (where appropriate) between transportation plans and programs and applicable land use and development plans. (RTP)
- Cooperatively work toward a transportation system that will widen the mode choice available to travelers and shippers. (RTP)
- Incorporate the Regional Transportation Plan and the Fresno County Short- and Long-Range Transit Plans into the Circulation Element, and encourage the active participation of Caltrans in the design of highway capital improvement projects. (Huron CP)
- The County shall work with the Cities of Fresno and Clovis and other agencies to achieve land use patterns and densities that support transit services, preserve adequate rights-of-way, and enhance transit services in the designated transit corridors. (Fresno GP)

AIR QUALITY POLICIES

Assessment

Public Transportation is only one strategy among many that can counter air pollution. However, given the magnitude of air quality issues throughout the San Joaquin Valley, policies that maximize transit's contribution to air quality solutions are essential.

Model Policies

- Attain and maintain national and state air quality standards as set by the Environmental Protection Agency and the California Air Resources Board. (RTP)
- Provide for improved air quality through local planning and enforcement efforts. (RTP)
- Support the use of alternate fuel vehicles and fueling stations for City and County vehicles and public transit vehicles. (Fowler CP)
- Encourage and provide for ride sharing, park and ride, and other similar energy saving and air emission reduction programs. (Fowler CP)

APPENDIX A:
RTP CANDIDATE PROJECTS

RTP Candidate Projects
FAX Transit Projects
(Ranked by Score)

Agency	Route	Project Limits	Project Description	Total Cost	Program
FAX	NA	Fresno-Clovis Metropolitan Area	Various Planning Projects/COFCG Staff/Annual Planning O & M Expenses and Special Projects	$1,550,000	FTA Section 5307
FAX	NA	Fresno-Clovis Metropolitan Area	Various Planning Projects/FAX Staff/Annual Planning O & M Expenses and Special Projects	$2,143,000	FTA Section 5307
FAX	NA	Fresno-Clovis Metropolitan Area	Preventative maintenance	$29,426,600	FTA Section 5307
FAX	NA	Fresno-Clovis Metropolitan Area	Bus Simulator—Phase II	$100,000	FTA Section 5307
FAX	NA	Fresno-Clovis Metropolitan Area	Contracted paratransit service	$13,134,500	FTA Section 5307
FAX	NA	Fresno-Clovis Metropolitan Area	Capital Lease-Handy Ride Facility	$317,000	FTA Section 5307
FAX	NA	Fresno-Clovis Metropolitan Area	Capital Lease – Vehicle Tire Lease	$787,400	FTA Section 5307
FAX	NA	Fresno-Clovis Metropolitan Area	Non-revenue Vehicle Service Expansion/Replacement	$352,200	FTA Section 5307
FAX	NA	Fresno-Clovis Metropolitan Area	Paratransit Vehicle Expansion/Replacement	$852,000	FTA Section 5307
FAX	NA	Fresno-Clovis Metropolitan Area	Fixed Route Facility Equipment Purchase	$2,875,000	FTA Section 5307
FAX	NA	Fresno-Clovis Metropolitan Area	Transit Enhancements	$400,000	FTA Section 5307
FAX	NA	Fresno-Clovis Metropolitan Area	Intermodal Transit Facility – Medical Center	$618,900	FTA Section 5309
FAX	NA	Fresno-Clovis Metropolitan Area	Purchase of 4 non-revenue vehicles	$150,000	FTA Section 5309
FAX	NA	Fresno-Clovis Metropolitan Area	Design and Construction of CNG Facility	$1,500,000	FTA Section 5309
FCRTA	Ops/Main./ Admin.	N/A	Operations/Maintenance/Administration of FCRTA	$4,408,600	FTA Section 5311
			TOTAL:	**$58,615,200**	

RTP Candidate Projects
FAX Transit Projects
(Ranked by Score)

	PID	Agency	Project Name	Project Description	Area Affected	Cost	Criteria and Ranking											Total Score
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
							Consistent with Plans and Policies	Operating Costs are Funded	Improved Access to Services	Maintain Productivity Standards	Promotes Intermodal Connectivity	Fares will Maintain Req'd Minimums	Serves Disadvan. Pop.	Enhances Inter-Agency Coord.	Reduces Reliance on Autos	Enhances Existing Transit Service	Reduces Auto or Parking Congestion	
1	5	City of Fresno	**Transit Mall**	Redesign and consolidation of Downtown Fresno transfer facilities to include enhanced amenities including commercial development and multi-purpose community space (See Downtown Circulation Study).	Downtown Fresno	?	2	0	2	2	2	0	2	1	2	2	2	17
2			**Downtown Rail Trolley/Circulator system**	Fixed guide way circulator for Downtown Fresno. System to connect the Transit Mall, Intermodal Facility, New Exhibit Hall, and Stadium to Fulton Mall.	On Fulton Mall from Fresno St. to Kern St. Then on Kern St. to New Exhibit Hall	$10-20 Million per Mile	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	17
3	3	City of Fresno	**High Capacity Transit Corridor**	Studies currently underway will identify a future High Capacity Transit Corridor (HCTC) for Fresno (see MIS Project). The HCTC could be light rail, bus rapid transit, or any other high capacity transit system.	Corridors under consideration include Blackstone, Cedar, Shaw and Ventura	$10-50 Million per mile	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	16
4	4	City of Fresno	**Intermodal Facility**	The planned intermodal facility will link high-speed rail, the local HCTC, transit and park & ride services. The facility will include commercial retail and residential development.	Broadway and Tulare Northeast corner	$15 Million for Phase I	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	1	2	2	2	15
5			**Transit Transfer Centers (4)**	Transit Centers are designed to facilitate convenient transfers between multiple transit routes and multi-modal travel. The FAX LRP identified four such facilities that could include public space, art, restrooms, and FAX service support.	Northwest North East Southeast	$250,000 each	2	0	1	0	1	0	2	2	2	2	2	14
6		City of Fresno	**Park and Ride Facility**	Park and Ride to be located at the SE corner of Friant and Copper. This will be a multimodal hub for transit, multi-purpose trails, and vehicles	Friant/Copper	$750,000	1	2	1	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	2	11

	PID	Agency	Project Name	Project Description	Area Affected	Cost	Consistent with Plans and Policies	Operating Costs are Funded	Improved Access to Services	Maintain Productivity Standards	Promotes Intermodal Connectivity	Fares will Maintain Req'd Minimums	Serves Disadvan. Pop.	Enhances Inter-Agency Coord.	Reduces Reliance on Autos	Enhances Existing Transit Service	Reduces Auto or Parking Congestion	Total Score
7			**Increased Bus Fleet (400 to 500 buses)**	Based on a projected population of 1.3 million people in Fresno County for 2025, similar sized transit agencies and/or districts require up to 500 buses.	Regional Service	$150,000,000	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	5
8	8	City of Fresno	**Regional Trip Planning System**	System will provide individual automated trip planning services via phone, internet or kiosk locations. Multi-modal trips combining transit, automobile, bike and pedestrian travel can be coordinated through out the region.	On internet, at large employment centers, and via phone	$500	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4
9			**Expansion of Clean Air Vanpool Program**	Expand the City of Fresno's Clean Air Express Vanpool program		$400,000 per year	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4
10			**Expansion of On Street Information Sign System**	Place On Street Information signs at all major stop and station locations including large employer and trip generator sites.	Major Transit Stops and Stations	$1.5 Million	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4
11			**Stop and Station Improvement**	Improve major stops with amenities similar to light rail stations. Amenities to include information/emergency phones, security cameras, level boarding capability, comfortable and secure waiting areas.	Major corridors and HCTC stations		2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4
12			**Bus Signal Preemption System**	Equip all transit buses with traffic signal preemption to improve service reliability		$500,000	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3
13	2	City of Fresno	**Downtown Circulation Study**	Update Downtown Circulation Plan that will be used to improve access, circulation, and mobility issues within the Downtown area while reducing reliance on the automobile.	Downtown Fresno	$750,000	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
14	6	City of Fresno	**Major Investment Study**	Initiate Major Investment Study of one of the High Capacity Corridors currently being evaluated.	Blackstone, Cedar, Shaw, or Ventura/Kings Canyon	$1,500,000	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
15	7	City of Fresno	**Regional Farebox System**	A countywide farebox system allowing transit passengers to access all transit services using common farebox media.	On all transit vehicles.	$2,500,000	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
			Second Transit Operations and Maintenance Facility	To accommodate HCTC vehicles and increased bus fleet of 500 buses.	Along or near HCTC Corridor	$10-15 Million	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
				TOTAL FOR REGION:		$156,000,500												

Bicycle RTP Candidate Projects

Agency	Route	Project Limits	Description	Total Cost	Program
Coalinga	Monterey	Washington to Cambridge	Construct paved shoulders for bikes	$102,202	CMAQ
Fresno	Various Locations	Fresno-Clovis Metropolitan Area	Construct paved bikeways on various eligible routes	$1,296,600	CMAQ
Fresno	Various Routes	City of Fresno	Bicycle Facilities including lanes, racks, and traffic control devices to assist bicyclists	$903,600	CMAQ
Fresno County	Auberry Road	Copper Avenue to Millerton Road	Construct 4 foot wide bike lane	$408,500	CMAQ
San Joaquin River Conservancy	Friant Road	Community of Friant	Construct a bicycle/pedestrian rest area with park and ride lot	$380,150	CMAQ
			TOTAL:	**$3,091,052**	

								Criteria and Ranking									
								1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
	PID	Agency	Project Location	Project Limits	Complete Date	Dist	Project Type	Total Cost Estimate	Part of Existing Facility	Provide Enhanced Usage	Accom. Trail and Bike Patrons	Reduces Out of Direction Travel	Provides Connect. To Other Modes	Consistent with Plans and Policies	Local Match is Available	Improves Trail or Bike User Safety	Total Score	Cumulative Total
1	10	City of Fresno	Copper Trail	Willow to Friant	2009	2	Extension to multi-use trail along North side	$800,000.00	1	2	2	0	2	2	1	2	12	$800,000.00
2	53	County of Fresno	Golden State Corridor Trail	Fresno to Kingsburg		19	Class I Bike/Pedestrian Facility	$6,000,000	1	2	2	0	1	2	2	2	12	$6,800,000.00
3	50	County of Fresno	McKenzie Trail	(County portions)	2005	0.4	Rehabilitate class I trail	$10,000	2	2	2	0	0	2	2	2	12	$6,810,000.00
4	15	City of Fresno	McKenzie Trail	Clovis to Willow	2006	1.5	Reconstruct trail	$320,000.00	2	2	2	0	1	2	1	2	12	$7,130,000.00
5	52	County of Fresno	SJ River Trail	SJ River Gorge to Italian Bar Road		15	Hiking Trail	$2,000,000	2	2	1	0	0	2	2	2	11	$9,130,000.00
6	48	County of Fresno	Auberry Road	MP 2.3 to MP 4.2	2005	1.9	class II bike lanes	$470,000	2	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	10	$9,600,000.00
7	5	City of Fresno	Cedar	Holland to 1/2 Block South of Holland	2005	0.1	Install class II bike lane West side only	$2,500.00	2	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	10	$9,602,500.00
8	4	City of Fresno	Cedar	Los Altos to Sierra	2005	0.8	Install class II bike lane, West side only. East side exists.	$10,000.00	2	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	10	$9,612,500.00
9	6	City of Fresno	Cedar	Shields to Fountain Way	2005	0.2	Install class II bike lane, East side only. West side exists.	$2,500.00	2	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	10	$9,615,000.00
10	9	City of Fresno	Church	Elm to M. L. King	2005	0.5	Install class II bike lane, North side only	$14,848.00	2	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	10	$9,629,848.00
11	8	City of Fresno	Church	Maple to Sierra Vista	2005	0.25	Install class II bike lane south side. North side exists	$9,653.00	2	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	10	$9,639,501.00

	PID	Agency	Project Location	Project Limits	Complete Date	Dist	Project Type	Total Cost Estimate	Part of Existing Facility	Provide Enhanced Usage	Accom. Trail and Bike Patrons	Reduces Out of Direction Travel	Provides Connect. To Other Modes	Consistent with Plans and Policies	Local Match is Available	Improves Trail or Bike User Safety	Total Score	Cumulative Total
12	7	City of Fresno	Church	Willow to Chestnut	2005	0.5	Install class II bike lane, North side only	$13,674.00	2	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	10	$9,653,175.00
13	37	Clovis	Enterprise Canal Trail	Adjacent to Alluvial Drain Basin	2005	0.3	Class I Bike/Pedestrian Facility	$174,000	2	1	2	0	0	2	1	2	10	$9,827,175.00
14	13	City of Fresno	First	Dakota to Ashlan	2007	0.5	Install class II bike lane in both directions	$279,782.00	2	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	10	$10,106,957.00
15	14	City of Fresno	First	Shaw to Barstow	2005	0.5	Install class II bike lane on West side. East side exists	$8,256.00	2	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	10	$10,115,213.00
16	49	County of Fresno	Kearney Blvd	Fresno CL to Kearney Park	2005	4.5	reconstruct class I trail	$130,000	2	0	2	0	0	2	2	2	10	$10,245,213.00
17	17	City of Fresno	Palm	Browning to Bullard	2005	0.25	Install class II bike lane in both directions	$13,140.00	2	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	10	$10,258,353.00
18	20	City of Fresno	Palm	Olive to McKinley	2005	0.5	Install class II bike lane in both directions	$23,322.00	2	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	10	$10,281,675.00
19	43	Clovis	Peach	Shepherd to Clovis Old Town Trail	2006	1.3	Class II Bike Facility Striping	$80,000	2	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	10	$10,361,675.00
20	44	Clovis	SE Water Feature Trail	Shaw to Ashcroft	2015	0.8	Class I Bike/Pedestrian Facility	$937,500	1	2	2	0	0	2	1	2	10	$11,299,175.00
21	21	City of Fresno	Shields	Channing to West	2008	0.15	Install class II bike lane North side. South side exists	$2,000.00	2	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	10	$11,301,175.00
22	22	City of Fresno	Shields	Fruit to Thorne	2008	0.25	Install class II bike lane in both directions	$5,000.00	2	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	10	$11,306,175.00
23	23	City of Fresno	Shields	Palm to Wilson	2008	0.15	Install class II bike lane in both directions	$3,000.00	2	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	10	$11,309,175.00
24	30	City of Fresno	West	Princeton to shields	2008	0.25	Install parking bays for bike lane, West side (East side exists)	$62,531.00	2	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	10	$11,371,706.00
25	29	City of Fresno	West	Yale to Clinton	2008	0.2	Install parking bays for bike lane, West side (East side exists)	$28,620.00									10	$11,400,326.00
26	31	City of Fresno	Willow Trail	Shepherd to Copper	2008	2	Extension of multi-use trail	$750,000.00									11	$12,150,326.00
27	32	Clovis	Alluvial	Clovis to Fowler	2010	1	Class II Bike Facility Striping	$45,000									9	$12,195,326.00
28	33	Clovis	Alluvial	Willow to Peach	2005	0.5	Class II Bike Facility Striping	$62,000	2	1	1	0	0	2	1	2	9	$12,257,326.00
29	3	City of Fresno	Ashlan	Blackstone to Fresno	2005	0.5	Install class II bike lane in both directions	$25,000.00	1	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	9	$12,282,326.00
30	1	City of Fresno	Ashlan	Fresno to Angus	2005	0.25	Install class II bike lane in both directions	$22,875.00	1	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	9	$12,305,201.00
31	2	City of Fresno	Ashlan	Maroa to Blackstone	2005	0.5	Install class II bike lane in both directions	$24,957.00	1	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	9	$12,330,158.00
32	34	Clovis	Dog Creek	Enterprise Canal to Gould Canal	2010	2.5	Class I Bike/Pedestrian Facility	$3,400,000	1	1	2	0	0	2	1	2	9	$15,730,158.00
33	35	Clovis	Dry Creek Trail	Bullard to Willow	2006	1	Class I Bike/Pedestrian Facility	$250,000	1	1	2	0	0	2	1	2	9	$15,980,158.00
34	38	Clovis	Enterprise Canal Trail	Highland to Bullard	2008	1	Class I Bike/Pedestrian Facility	$1,250,000	1	1	2	0	0	2	1	2	9	$17,230,158.00
35	36	Clovis	Enterprise Canal Trail	Temperance to Herndon	2007	1.5	Class I Bike/Pedestrian Facility	$800,000	1	1	2	0	0	2	1	2	9	$18,030,158.00
36	11	City of Fresno	Fresno	California to C st.	2008	0.9	Install class II bike lane in both directions	$31,000.00	1	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	9	$18,061,158.00
37	12	City of Fresno	Friant	Copper	2009	0.1	Construct trail underpass to Eaton trail	$1,100,000.00	1	0	2	0	2	2	0	2	9	$19,161,158.00
38	40	Clovis	Gould Canal	Basin 1E to Temperance	2007	1.5	Class I Bike/Pedestrian Facility	$800,000	1	1	2	0	0	2	1	2	9	$19,961,158.00
39	39	Clovis	Gould Canal	Highland to Locan	2015	1.5	Class I Bike/Pedestrian Facility	$1,200,000	1	1	2	0	0	2	1	2	9	$21,161,158.00
40	41	Clovis	Jefferson Canal Trail	Enterprise Canal to Locan	2008	1.5	Class I Bike/Pedestrian Facility	$2,100,000	1	1	2	0	0	2	1	2	9	$23,261,158.00

	PID	Agency	Project Location	Project Limits	Complete Date	Dist	Project Type	Total Cost Estimate	Part of Existing Facility	Provide Enhanced Usage	Accom. Trail and Bike Patrons	Reduces Out of Direction Travel	Provides Connect. To Other Modes	Consistent with Plans and Policies	Local Match is Available	Improves Trail or Bike User Safety	Total Score	Cumulative Total
41	51	County of Fresno	Millerton Road	MSRA entrance to Sky Harbour	2005	2.1	Class II bike lanes	$575,000	1	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	9	$23,836,158.00
42	42	Clovis	Minnewawa	Nees to Alluvial	2005	0.5	Class II Bike Facility Striping	$38,000	1	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	9	$23,874,158.00
43	16	City of Fresno	Palm	H st to Olive	2005	0.5	Install class II bike lane in both directions	$33,631.00	1	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	9	$23,907,789.00
44	18	City of Fresno	Palm	McKinley to Clinton	2005	0.5	Install class II bike lane in both directions	$18,838.00	1	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	9	$23,926,627.00
45	19	City of Fresno	Palm	Shields to Dakota	2005	0.5	Install class II bike lane in both directions	$16,886.00	1	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	9	$23,943,513.00
46	45	Clovis	Sierra	Armstrong to Temperance	2005	0.5	Class II Bike Facility Striping	$30,000	2	1	1	0	0	2	1	2	9	$23,973,513.00
47	26	City of Fresno	Sierra	Fresno to Palm	2008	1.5	Install class II bike lane in both directions	$10,000.00	1	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	9	$23,983,513.00
48	46	Clovis	Teague	Willow to Peach	2006	0.5	Class II Bike Facility Striping	$70,000	1	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	9	$24,053,513.00
49	47	Clovis	Third	Clovis to Sunnyside	2005	0.5	Class II Bike Facility Striping	$30,000	1	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	9	$24,083,513.00
50	28	City of Fresno	Ventura	H st. to B st.	2008	0.5	Install class II bike lane in both directions	$10,000.00	1	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	9	$24,093,513.00
51	25	City of Fresno	Sierra	First to Fresno at Callisch	2008	0.1	Open barrier for bike traffic only	$4,000.00	1	1	1	0	0	2	1	2	8	$24,097,513.00
52	27	City of Fresno	Sierra	Palm to Marks	2008	2	Designate as bike route (50 % County)	$7,000.00	1	1	1	0	0	2	1	2	8	$24,104,513.00
	24	City of Fresno	Sierra	Willow to Cedar	2008	1.3	Designate as bike route	$2,000.00	1	1	1	0	0	2	1	2	8	$24,106,513.00
							TOTAL:	**$24,106,513**										
							TOTAL FROM ABOVE:	**$3,091,052**										
							TOTAL FOR ALL PROJECTS:	**$27,197,565**										

Pedestrian RTP Candidate Projects

Agency	Route	Project Limits	Description	Total Cost	Program
Fowler	Various Routes	City of Fowler	Pedestrian Facilities	$92,800	CMAQ
Fresno	Various Routes	City of Fresno	Construction of new trails to serve Fresno/Clovis Metropolitan Trail System	$451,800	CMAQ
Fresno	Various Routes	City of Fresno	Pedestrian facilities to include sidewalks and signal upgrades	$647,400	CMAQ
Mendota	2nd Street/5th Street	At railroad tracks	Construction of pedestrian and bicycle crossing across railroad tracks	$445,700	CMAQ
Mendota	Various Routes	City of Mendota	Pedestrian Facilities	$160,700	CMAQ
Orange Cove	Railroad Right-of-Way	From Anchor to Hills Valley Road	Purchase Abandoned AT and SF Railroad ROW from Anchor to Hills Valley Road for Construction of Future Pedestrian/Bicycle Trail	$243,300	CMAQ
Parlier	Various Routes	City of Parlier	Pedestrian Facilities	$122,900	CMAQ
Reedley	Reedley Rail Trail	Manning Avenue to kings River	Acquire ROW/Construct Bike/Pedestrian Trail Adjacent to UPRR Tracks	$182,450	TEA
Fresno	Various Routes	City of Fresno	Construction of grade crossing along pedestrian/bike trails	$734,200	CMAQ
			TOTAL:	**$3,081,250**	

								Criteria and Ranking								
								1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
PID	Agency	Project Location	Project Limits	Complete Date	Dist	Project Type	Total Cost Estimate	Part of Existing Facility	Provide Enhanced Usage	Reduces Out of Direction Travel	Provides Connect. To Other Modes	Consistent with Plans and Policies	Local Match is Available	Improves Pedestrian Safety	Total Score	Cumulative Total
7	City of Fresno	Maple	Clinton to Shields	2010	0.7	Construct curb, gutter & sidewalk	$175,000.00	2	1	0	2	2	0	2	9	$175,000.00
1	City of Fresno	Blackstone Avenue	N/O Shaw West Side	2010	0.1	Sidewalk improvements	$20,000	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	8	$195,000.00
1	City of Fresno	Blackstone Avenue	Shields to Dayton West Side	2010	0.2	Sidewalk improvements	$35,000	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	8	$230,000.00
5	City of Fresno	Clovis	California to Kings Canyon	2009	1	Construct curb, gutter & sidewalk	$1,000,000.00	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	8	$1,230,000.00
6	City of Fresno	Fresno	Herndon to Sierra	2008	0.25	Construct curb, gutter & sidewalk	$250,000.00	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	8	$1,480,000.00
1	City of Fresno	Kings Canyon	Chestnut to Peach South side	2008	0.1	Sidewalk improvements	$12,000	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	8	$1,492,000.00
2	City of Fresno	Barstow	Palm to Maroa	2015	0.1	Construct curb, gutter & sidewalk	$250,000.00	2	1	0	2	2	0	0	7	$1,742,000.00
1	County of Fresno	Barstow Avenue	Fruit to Gibson Elementary	2006	0.3	School sidewalk	$65,000	2	1	0	2	2	0	0	7	$1,807,000.00
3	City of Fresno	Chestnut	North to California	2012	1.7	Construct curb, gutter & sidewalk	$1,200,000.00	2	1	0	2	2	0	0	7	$3,007,000.00
4	City of Fresno	Clovis	Jensen to California	2008	1	Construct curb, gutter & sidewalk	$1,000,000.00	2	1	0	2	2	0	0	7	$4,007,000.00
			TOTAL:				**$4,007,000**									
			TOTAL FROM ABOVE:				**$3,081,250**									
			TOTAL FOR ALL PROJECTS:				**$7,088,250**									

APPENDIX B:
LAND USE SURVEY SUMMARY – RAIL CORRIDORS WITHIN FRESNO COUNTY

Source: Fresno County Rail Corridor Preservation/Acquisition and Transportation Alternatives Study (Council of Fresno County Governments, 1997.)

Land Use Survey Summary
Rail Corridors Within Fresno County

Jurisdiction	Planning Special Land Use Designation	Specific Goals, Policies, Strategies Standards	Zoning	Special Studies	Alternative Use	Other Issues
Clovis	Yes	Yes	Adjacent	Yes	Yes	Yes
Coalinga	No	No	Adjacent	Yes	Yes	No
Firebaugh	No	No	Adjacent	No	No	Yes
Fowler	No	No	Adjacent	No	No	Yes
Fresno	Yes	Yes	Adjacent	Yes	Yes	Yes
Huron	No	No	Adjacent	No	No	Yes
Kerman	No	No	Adjacent	No	No	Yes
Kingsburg	No	No	Adjacent	No	No	Yes
Mendota	No	No	Adjacent	No	No	Yes
Orange Cove	No	No	Adjacent	No	No	Yes
Parlier	No	No	Adjacent	No	No	Yes
Reedley	No	No	Adjacent	No	Yes	Yes
Sanger	No	No	Adjacent	No	No	Yes
San Joaquin	No	Yes	Adjacent	No	No	Yes
Selma	No	No	Adjacent	Yes	No	Yes
Fresno County	Yes	Yes	Adjacent	Yes	Yes	Yes

APPENDIX C:
GENERAL PLAN STATUS – FRESNO COUNTY INCORPORATED AREAS

Fresno PTIS
General Plan Status
Fresno County Incorporated Areas

				General Plan Element Updates						
Incorporated Areas	*No. of Planners*	*Population*	*Area (Sq. Miles)*	*Land Use*	*Circulation*	*Housing*	*Open Space*	*Conservation*	*Safety*	*Noise*
Fresno County	*20*	*799,407*	*6,000*	*2000*	*2000*	*1991*	*2000*	*2000*	*2000*	*2000*
Clovis	*9*	*68,468*	*16*	*1993*	*1993*	*2002*	*1993*	*1993*	*1993*	*1993*
Coalinga	*1*	*11,668*	*5*	*1994*	*1994*	*1997*	*1994*	*1998*	*1994*	*1993*
Firebaugh	*2*	*5,743*	*2*	*1992*	*1992*	*1992*	*1992*	*1992*	*1992*	*1992*
Fowler	*0*	*3,979*	*2*	*2004*	*2004*	*1992*	*1976*	*1976*	*1976*	*1976*
Fresno	*17*	*427,652*	*105*	*2002*	*2002*	*2002*	*2002*	*2002*	*2002*	*2002*
Huron	*2*	*6,306*	*1*	*1994*	*1994*	*1994*	*1994*	*1994*	*1994*	*1994*
Kerman	*1*	*8,551*	*2*	*1993*	*1993*	*1991*	*1993*	*1993*	*1993*	*1993*
Kingsburg	*1*	*9,199*	*3*	*1992*	*1992*	*2002*	*1992*	*1992*	*1992*	*1992*
Mendota	*2*	*7,890*	*2*	*1991*	*1991*	*1992*	*1991*	*1991*	*1991*	*1991*
Orange Cove	*2*	*7,722*	*2*	*2003*	*2003*	*1995*	*1979*	*1979*	*1979*	*1979*
Parlier	*1*	*11,145*	*2*	*1998*	*1998*	*1998*	*1998*	*1998*	*1998*	*1998*
Reedley	*1*	*20,756*	*5*	*1993*	*1993*	*2003*	*1994*	*1994*	*1994*	*1994*
San Joaquin	*2*	*3,270*	*1*	*1996*	*1996*	*1996*	*1996*	*1996*	*1996*	*1996*
Sanger	*2*	*18,931*	*4*	*2004*	*2004*	*2004*	*2004*	*2004*	*2004*	*2004*
Selma	*2*	*19,444*	*4*	*1998*	*1998*	*1993*	*1983*	*1983*	*1991*	*1991*

Sources:

The California Planners' 2004 Book of Lists, Governor's Office of Planning and Research (April 2004)

www.calpin.ca.gov/information/default.asp

Bruce O'Neal, March 18, 2005 and May 12, 2005