

RECEIVED

Agenda Item: ID17-0022 (10:00 A.M.)

2017 JAN 25 AM 9 50

Date: 1/26/17

CITY CLERK, FRESNO CA

FRESNO CITY COUNCIL



Supplemental Information Packet

Agenda Related Item(s) – ID17-0022 (10:00 A.M.)

Contents of Supplement: 2 letters and 1 email

Agenda Item Title

CONTINUED HEARING to consider Plan Amendment Application No. A-16-015, and related environmental finding filed by the Development and Resource Management Department Director pertaining to the Active Transportation Plan (ATP)

Supplemental Information:

Any agenda related public documents received and distributed to a majority of the City Council after the Agenda Packet is printed are included in Supplemental Packets. Supplemental Packets are produced as needed. The Supplemental Packet is available for public inspection in the City Clerk's Office, 2600 Fresno Street, during normal business hours (main location pursuant to the Brown Act, G.C. 54957.5(2)). In addition, Supplemental Packets are available for public review at the City Council meeting in the City Council Chambers, 2600 Fresno Street. Supplemental Packets are also available on-line on the City Clerk's website.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA):

The meeting room is accessible to the physically disabled, and the services of a translator can be made available. Requests for additional accommodations for the disabled, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or translators should be made one week prior to the meeting. Please call City Clerk's Office at 621-7650. Please keep the doorways, aisles and wheelchair seating areas open and accessible. If you need assistance with seating because of a disability, please see Security.



RECEIVED

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

City Hall
2600 Fresno Street, 4th Floor
Fresno, California 93721
Ph. (559) 621-8650 FAX (559) 488-1045
www.fresno.gov

2017 JAN 25 AM 9 35

Scott L. Mozier
Public Works Director

CITY CLERK, FRESNO CA

January 23, 2017

Genoveva Islas, MPH
Program Director, Cultiva La Salud
2409 Merced Street, Suite 101
Fresno, CA 93721

RE: Active Transportation Plan (ATP) Project Prioritization Tool Comments

Dear Ms. Islas:

On behalf of the City of Fresno Public Works Department, I would like to thank you again for meeting with our staff in December to discuss the possibility of including a Project Prioritization Tool with the ATP. The sample project scoring method you provided from the City of Rancho Cucamonga was a good starting point. Our Public Works staff utilized the suggestions made by Cultiva La Salud as well as Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability, along with criteria from the Statewide ATP and considerations of our local conditions, to create a Project Prioritization Tool. We also appreciated the comments contained in your letter of January 18, 2017 regarding this scoring rubric and wanted to inform you of what our staff will be recommending to the Fresno City Council. Attached, please find the revised version of the scoring matrix.

1. **Access and Equity Category:** The staff recommendation is for this overall category to be assigned 20 points (or 20 percent of the total), as originally proposed in our January 10th transmittal to you. However, we appreciated your recommendation for criteria A-2 to be worth additional points and have increased the weight from 8 points to 10 points. In order to keep the overall category at 20 points, criteria A-3 (Community Identified Priority) and A-4 (Vehicle Ownership) have each been reduced by one point.
2. **Connectivity:** Staff recommends this overall category remain at 30 points (or 30 percent of the total). As such, we do not recommend increasing the relative weight of schools from 10 to 15 points at the expense of other criteria, such as connectivity to public transit, parks and key destinations (4 points each). We do agree that Bus Rapid Transit is encompassed within the FAX system and would therefore assign these points as projects are evaluated. Likewise under criteria C-8, the "anchored place type" reflects existing location efficiency.
3. **Traffic Control, Mode Shift and User Comfort:** We understand your letter to propose reducing the relative weight of bicycle or pedestrian collisions from 20 points to 15 points. Staff strongly recommends this particular criteria remain at 20 points, given the high importance of safety in creating a more walkable City for all users of the roadways.


Letter to Genoveva Islas
January 23, 2017
Page 2

4. Feasibility and Engineering Considerations: We understand your suggestion to reduce this overall category from 15 points to 11 points. However, given the key nature of having right-of-way available, or more easily attainable for minor acquisitions such as corner cuts for ADA curb ramps, as well as the significant benefits in cost-effectiveness that result from having storm drains or curb and gutter in place, staff will continue to recommend the 15 percent allocation.

We again thank you for your participation in the development of the ATP and your work with City staff in the development of the Project Prioritization Tool. We look forward to evaluating potential ATP projects with our community partners and putting this tool to work. The continued hearing for the ATP will be considered on January 26, 2017, at 10:00am or shortly thereafter. It is our hope that Cultiva La Salud and Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability will be pleased to speak in support of ATP adoption.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at (559) 621-8811 or Jill Gormley at (559) 621-8792.

Sincerely,



Scott L. Mozier, PE
Public Works Director

c: Jennifer Clark, AICP, Director, Development and Resource Management
Jill Gormley, TE, City Traffic Engineer
Randy Bell, PE, Capital Program Manager
Wilma Quan-Schechter, Assistant City Manager

Active Transportation Project Prioritization - DRAFT						
Variables		Score	Description	Midtown Trail McKinley [EXAMPLE]	School Area Traffic Signals [EXAMPLE]	L Street Signals [EXAMPLE]
Access and Equity				Project Score	Project Score	Project Score
A-1	Accessibility	5	Project addresses an accessibility complaint from a person with a disability filed with the office of the ADA Coordinator	4	4	5
		4	Project addresses multiple existing barriers to access identified by the City of Fresno's ADA Transition Plan for the Public Right of Way or confirmed by the ADA Coordinator.			
		2	Project address a single existing barrier to access identified by the City of Fresno's ADA Transition Plan for the Public Right of Way or confirmed by the ADA Coordinator			
		0	Project does not address any existing barriers to access			
A-2	Equity	10	Project is located within severely disadvantaged census tracts as determined by the CalEnviroScreen tool (score falls into 91 to 100 percentile range)	5	4	8
		8	Project is located within disadvantaged census tracts as determined by the CalEnviroScreen tool (score falls into 76 to 90 percentile range)			
		6	Project is located within 1/2 mile radius of disadvantaged census tracts as determined by the CalEnviroScreen tool.			
		4	≥60% of project is located within disadvantaged census tracts as determined by the CalEnviroScreen tool.			
		2	≥60% of project is located within 1/2 mile radius of disadvantaged census tracts as determined by the CalEnviroScreen tool.			
		0	Project does not provide direct access to disadvantaged community.			
A-3	Community Identified Priority	4	Identified as a high priority in the Active Transportation Plan	5	0	0
		2	Requested as part of a community planning process or adopted plan in the last 5 years.			
		0	Not identified through a community planning process in the last 5 years or is identified as a low priority in the Active Transportation Plan			
A-4	Vehicle Ownership	1	The percent of households with zero automobiles in the project area is ≥ 50%.	0	0	2
		0	The percent of households with zero automobiles in the project area is < 50%.			
Total:		20		14	8	15
Connectivity				Project Score	Project Score	Project Score
C-1	Connectivity to Existing Network	3	Fills a network gap between any two existing bicycle or pedestrian facilities.	0	2	2
		2	Connects with one existing bicycle or pedestrian facility.			
		0	Provides no connections to existing bicycle or pedestrian facilities or is immediately adjacent to existing and equivalent alternative path of travel.			
C-2	Connectivity to Schools	10	Provides direct access to two or more K-12 schools within 1/4 mile radius of the project	8	10	0
		8	Provides direct access to one K-12 school within 1/4 mile radius of the project.			
		6	Provides direct access to two or more K-12 schools within 1/2 mile radius of the project			
		4	Provides direct access to one K-12 school within 1/2 mile radius of the project			
		0	Does not provide access to a K-12 school.			
C-3	Connectivity to Public Transit	4	Located within 1/2 mile of public transportation including: FAX, Amtrak, Greyhound or High Speed Rail station.	3	5	5
		0	Does not provide direct access to public transit.			
C-4	Connectivity to Parks	4	Project is located within 1/4 mile of an existing park	3	3	3
		2	Project is located within 1/2 mile of an existing park			
		0	Project is not located near existing parks			
C-5	Connectivity to Key Destinations - excludes schools & parks	4	Located within 1/4 mile of grocery store, health provider, civic center, large employment center or other regional destination	4	4	4
		3	Located within 1/2 mile of grocery store, health provider, civic center, large employment center or other regional destination.			
		0	Does not directly provide access to an activity center			
C-6	Connectivity to Future Network	2	Fills a bikeway network gap between an existing and a funded near term (5 years) proposed facility of any type.	2	0	0
		0	Does not provide access to an existing bikeway or shared use paths			
C-7	Regional Significance	1	Provides connectivity within 1/4 mile of regional network in one or more neighboring jurisdiction(s)	0	0	0
		0	Project provides no direct connectivity to a neighboring jurisdiction's network			
C-8	Place Type	2	Anchored place type - location efficiency factors will increase over time; land use supports high levels of non-motorized travel and transit use	2	2	2
		0	Transitional place type - location currently "evolving", likelihood of future development of the adjacent property.			
Total:		30		22	26	16

Variables		Score	Description	Midtown Trail McKinley [EXAMPLE]	School Area Traffic Signals [EXAMPLE]	L Street Signals [EXAMPLE]
Traffic Control, Mode Shift and User Comfort				Project Score	Project Score	Project Score
T-1	Bicycle or Pedestrian Collisions	20	One fatality reported within 1/4 mile of project area in the last five years AND the proposed project provides countermeasures appropriate to collision type as determined by the Local Roadway Safety Manual.	15	10	10
		15	Three or more bicycle or pedestrian related collisions reported within 1/4 mile of proposed project area in the last five years AND the proposed project provides countermeasures appropriate to collision type as determined by the Local Roadway Safety Manual.			
		10	Two bicycle or pedestrian related collisions reported within 1/4 mile of proposed project area in the last five years AND the project provides countermeasures appropriate to collision type as determined by the Local Roadway Safety Manual.			
		8	One bicycle or pedestrian related collision reported within 1/4 mile of proposed project area in the last five years AND project provides countermeasures appropriate to collision type as determined by the Local Roadway Safety Manual.			
		0	Proposed path that did not experience any bicycle or pedestrian related collisions within 1/4 mile of the project area in the last five years AND/OR the proposed project does not provide countermeasures appropriate to collision type(s) as determined by the Local Roadway Safety Manual.			
T-2	Project Type	4	Project is ≥ 1 mile in length for Class II or IV facilities or project is $\geq 1/2$ mile for Class I or sidewalk facilities or project creates a controlled crossing.	4	4	4
		0	Project does not meet above project type criteria.			
T-3	Potential for Mode Shift and Greenhouse Gas Reduction	7	Greatest greenhouse gas reduction benefits anticipated, ADT on immediately adjacent corridor $\geq 24,000$ vehicles.	7	6	6
		6	Greenhouse gas reduction benefits anticipated, current ADT on immediately adjacent corridor $<24,000$ to 12,001 vehicles.			
		4	Greenhouse gas reduction benefits anticipated, current ADT on immediately adjacent corridor $\leq 12,000$.			
		0	Greenhouse gas reduction benefits negligible, current ADT on immediately adjacent corridor ≤ 1000 to vehicles.			
T-4	Location Efficiency: Population Density	4	Population $\geq 30,000$ within 1/2 mile radius of proposed project.	3	2	1
		3	Population $\geq 20,000$ within 1/2 mile radius of proposed project.			
		2	Population $\geq 10,000$ within 1/2 mile radius of proposed project.			
		1	Population $> 1,000$ to 9,999 within 1/2 mile radius of proposed project.			
		0	Population $\leq 1,000$ within 1/2 mile radius of proposed project.			
Total:		35		29	22	21
Feasibility and Engineering Considerations				Project Score	Project Score	Project Score
F-1	Right of Way	7	Project can be implemented within existing public right-of-way or may require minor acquisition for project type.	7	7	7
		0	Project may require major public right-of-way acquisition or utility relocations.			
F-2	Existing Infrastructure	8	Project area contains existing drainage, pavement and other street infrastructure.	5	8	8
		5	Project area requires investment in infrastructure, primarily directly related to the proposed bicycle or pedestrian facilities needs.			
		0	Project area requires significant investment in infrastructure facilities which significantly exceed proposed bicycle or pedestrian facilities needs.			
Total:		15		12	15	15
Total Points Available:		100	Grand Total Score(s):	77	71	67

RECEIVED

2017 JAN 25 AM 9 35

CITY CLERK, FRESNO, CA



January 18, 2017

Scott Mozier,
City of Fresno
2600 Fresno Street, Room 4016
Fresno, CA 93721-3623

Dear Scott Mozier,

Cultiva La Salud and Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability would like to thank you for meeting with us to discuss the City of Fresno's Active Transportation Plan (ATP). We recognize the hard work and effort that has gone into creating the plan. We are particularly glad that residents were engaged and helped to shape the plan. Low-income residents in southeast Fresno have expressed satisfaction with the overall plan but continued to be concerned that the implementation portion did not sufficiently prioritize the need for investments in their disadvantaged neighborhoods. From this concern we recognized a need to evaluate and further address the implementation chapter of the ATP. We appreciate your staff taking the time to discuss and consider comments from residents as well as suggestions from our organizations on how to improve the implementation chapter. Your willingness to adopt a scoring rubric is commendable and we believe it will help to advance greater equity of infrastructure in Fresno. We've shared the scoring rubric with fellow advocates who have been involved in active transportation issues. Based on our combined input, we submit the following comments for your further consideration.

Access and Equity Category

- **A2- Equity**, should have a higher score. The group of advocates recommended an increase to 12 points. In addition, since most of the City is considered disadvantaged per CalEnviroScreen, it is strongly recommended that the scoring field be reflect as follows:

A-2	Equity	12	Project is located within a severely disadvantaged census tract as determined by the CalEnviro Screen tool (score falls into 95%-100%)
		8	Project is located within a severely disadvantaged census tract as determined by the CalEnviro Screen tool (score falls into 90%-94.99%)
		0	Project does not provide direct access to a severely disadvantaged community (score falls under 84.99%)

Connectivity

- C2 Connectivity to Schools, in order to increase scoring for safety of school age children as well as to recognize previous recommendations by residents, the advocate group has recommended this category increase in ranking and score to 15, 10, 5, 3, and 0.
- C-3 Connectivity to Public Transit, the advocate committee recommends the inclusion of language specific to the Bus Rapid Transit line be included.
- C4 Connectivity to Parks, due to the limitations in the availability of amenities neighborhoods throughout the city, and especially disadvantaged communities, the committee of advocates strong recommended that the distances be adjusted to ½ mile and ¾ mile radius to parks.
- C5 Connectivity to Key Destinations, due to the limitations in the availability of amenities neighborhoods throughout the city, and especially disadvantaged communities, the committee of advocates strong recommended that the distances be adjusted to ½ mile and ¾ mile radius to key destinations.
- C-8 Place Type, adding an additional score item to include “Existing Location Efficiency” is recommended for City Staff consideration.

Traffic Control, Mode Shift and User Comfort

- T-1 Bicycle or Pedestrian Collision, the committee strongly recommends adjusting the ranking criteria as well as the overall score. The committee recognizes that fatalities are cause for drastic action but we also recognize that there are often indicators such as high collision rates that indicate the potential for loss of life. In addition often time’s collisions go unreported especially in low-income neighborhoods with mixed documentation status and strained relationships with law enforcement. The committee recommends that the overall score for this item be decreased to 15 and adjusted in ranking as follows:

T-1	Bicycle or Pedestrian Collision	15	One fatality OR three or more bicycle or pedestrian related collisions reported within ¼ mile of proposed project area in the last five years AND the project provides countermeasures appropriate to collision type as determined by the Local Roadway Safety Manual.
		10	Two or more bicycle or pedestrian related collisions reported within ¼ mile of proposed project area in the last five years AND the project provides countermeasures appropriate to collision type as determined by the Local Roadway Safety Manual
		5	One bicycle or pedestrian related collision reported within ¼ mile of proposed project area in the last five years OR have be identified by community as hazardous with non-reported incidents AND the project provides countermeasures appropriate to collision type as determined by the Local Roadway Safety Manual
		0	Proposed path has not experienced any bicycle or pedestrian related collision within ¼ mile of proposed project area in the last five years AND/OR the project does not provide countermeasures appropriate to collision type as determined by the Local Roadway Safety Manual

- T-2, it is recommended that City Staff consider including a new criteria under project type to reflect the inclusion of Class 1/Class 4 networks as given priority.

Feasibility and Engineering Considerations

- F-1 Right of Way, the advocate committee recommends the city reconsider the ranking and decrease the maximum points to five. Given that the ranking is all or none it seems a score higher than 5 would be unnecessary. In addition, the committee would like clarification on the criteria for minor acquisition and major acquisition of right-of-way.
- F-2 Existing Infrastructure, the advocate committee recommends the score in this category to decrease to a maximum of 6 points. In addition, the committee requests the consideration of an additional ranked score of two points for communities that experience flooding which prevents opportunities to participate in active transportation in order to prioritize infrastructure investments.

We hope you will consider revising the document based on the comments aforementioned. We look forward to continued collaboration as well as hearing back from you on a final draft of this rubric. Please feel free to contact Esther Postiglione at (559) 498-0870 x 105 or via email at Esther@CultivaLaSalud.org.

Sincerely,



Genoveva Islas, MPH
Program Director, Cultiva La Salud

Randy Bell

RECEIVED

From: Jill Gormley
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 4:43 PM
To: Randy Bell
Subject: FW: City of Fresno ATP Stakeholder Advisory Committee

2017 JAN 25 AM 9 35

CITY CLERK, FRESNO CA

jmg

From: Lee Ayres [mailto:lee@treefresno.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 2:54 PM
To: Jill Gormley
Subject: RE: City of Fresno ATP Stakeholder Advisory Committee

Jill - Thanks. We have moved toward using the term greenways. See phrase in signature block below. It appears that the Class 1 trail category does not require trees. We wish to encourage the city to move toward a system of greenways with a tunnel or stop light when the greenway crosses an arterial street. Thanks, Lee

Lee Ayres

San Joaquin Green™

*Let's transform the San Joaquin Valley
with trees, greenways and beautiful landscapes . . .
one school, park, business or home at a time*

Tree Fresno www.treefresno.org

3150 E. Barstow Avenue Fresno, California 93740

(O) 559-221-5556 (M) 559-285-3906 lee@treefresno.org

From: Jill Gormley [mailto:Jill.Gormley@fresno.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 11:38 AM
To: Lee Ayres
Cc: Randy Bell
Subject: RE: City of Fresno ATP Stakeholder Advisory Committee

Lee,

Thank you for taking the time to review and comment on the Prioritization Tool. Currently, staff is in the process of preparing a Trail Design Guidelines document to address the elements you mention. The document will be sent out for public review soon.

Please feel free to contact Randy Bell or myself if you have any questions about the Prioritization Tool or the Trail Design Guidelines.

Jill Gormley, TE
City Traffic Engineer / Traffic Engineering Manager

City of Fresno, Public Works Department
2600 Fresno Street, 4th Floor
Fresno, CA 93721-3623
www.fresno.gov/publicworks/traffic-engineering

P: 559/621-8792
F: 559/457-1107

From: Lee Ayres [<mailto:lee@treefresno.org>]
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2017 5:27 PM
To: Randy Bell
Cc: Jill Gormley
Subject: RE: City of Fresno ATP Stakeholder Advisory Committee

Randy, Jill – Thanks for the opportunity to comment. The missing element is the user experience. Need to address distance from moving traffic and width of landscaping. Let's move away from public investments in sidewalks next to arterials (which should be paid for by the adjacent property owner and not by measure c). Let's invest in projects like the McKinsey Trail with tunnel crossings of arterials; and the Mid-town trail with landscape easements, building setbacks and trees on the adjacent properties . . . so the user experience is positive and the facility gets high use. Thanks, Lee

Lee Ayres

San Joaquin Green™

*Let's transform the San Joaquin Valley
with trees, greenways and beautiful landscapes . . .
one school, park, business or home at a time*

Tree Fresno www.treefresno.org
3150 E. Barstow Avenue Fresno, California 93740
(O) 559-221-5556 (M) 559-285-3906 lee@treefresno.org

From: Randy Bell [<mailto:Randy.Bell@fresno.gov>]
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2017 4:56 PM
To: Randy Bell
Cc: Jill Gormley
Subject: City of Fresno ATP Stakeholder Advisory Committee

ATP Stakeholders:

You may have heard that the adoption of the Active Transportation Plan by the City Council was rescheduled to January 26, 2017. One item that came up from discussions of the Plan was a method to prioritize the projects. We have developed a tool that can be used to prioritize our bike and pedestrian projects that we are considering.

The attached document is the tool that we have developed with the scoring for various projects the City has applied for. We are sharing this with the group to get your feedback on our methodology. If you have any feedback on the Prioritization Tool, please send me an email and let me know. We will be presenting this Tool to the City Council along with the ATP on January 26th.

Your presence is welcome at the City Council meeting which is scheduled for 10:00 AM.

Thank you for your help with the development of the ATP over the last year and looking over this Prioritization Tool. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Randy Bell, PE
Capital Program Manager
City of Fresno Public Works Dept
2600 Fresno Street, 4th Floor
Fresno, CA 93721
Phone: (559) 621-8679
Email: randy.bell@fresno.gov