CITY OF SELMA active transportation plan

APPROVED APRIL 2018

THEFTY BOUTIQUE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The City of Selma thanks all residents, community members, and public agencies who contributed to the creation of this plan.







Cover Photo: Corner of Second Street and Tucker Street, Downtown Selma

CHAPTERS

	Executive Summary1
1.	Introduction
2.	Relationship to Other Plans & Policies13
3.	Existing Conditions
4.	Planned Networks
5.	Implementation
	Appendix A: Plan Conformance with ATP Guidelines
	Appendix B: Public Participation
	Appendix C: Relationship to Other Plans and Policies
	Appendix D: Cost Estimates
	Appendix E: Funding Sources
	Appendix F: City Resolution Adopting the Plan

TABLES

3-1 Existing Facilities
3-2 Traffic Stress on Existing Streets
3-3 Walking & Biking to Work
4-1 Planned Facilities
4-2 Recommended Level of Enhancement at Crosswalks
4-3 Recommended Crosswalk Treatments or Enhancements
4-4 Mode Share Comparison
5-1 Project Cost Estimates
5-2 Unit Costs for Other Equipment 59
5-3 Funding Sources

FIGURES

1-1	Class I Bikeway (Bike Path)
1-2	Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane)
1-3	Class III Bikeway (Bike Route)
1-4	Class IV Bikeway (Separated Bikeway)
3-1	Existing Bikeways & Trails 19
3-2	Existing Sidewalks & Trails
3-3	Bicyclist Stress - Existing Conditions 25
3-4	Pedestrian Stress - Existing Conditions
3-5	Key Destinations
3-6	General Plan Zoning
3-7	Zero Automobile Households
3-8	Free or Reduced Price Meal Eligibility By School
3-9	CalEnviroScreen 3.0 Percentile
3-10	Household Median Income
3-11	Bicyclist Collisions, 2011-2015
3-12	Pedestrian Collisions, 2011-2015
3-13	Existing Bicycle Parking
3-14	Planned ATP and HSIP Pedestrian Improvements
4-1	Planned Bikeways and Trails
4-2	Planned Trail Cross-Sections
4-3	Planned Bike Parking
4-4	Proposed Sidewalks and Trails 51
5-1	High Priority Bikeways and Trails60
5-2	Prioritized Sidewalk and Intersection Improvements

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Selma Active Transportation Plan (ATP) is a comprehensive guide outlining the vision for biking, walking, and other human-powered transportation in the City of Selma and a roadmap for achieving that vision. The ATP envisions a complete, safe, and comfortable network of trails, sidewalks, and bikeways that serves all who live and work in Selma. This plan seeks to achieve the following goals:

- Create a network of safe and attractive trails, sidewalks, and bike lanes that connect Selma residents to key destinations, especially local schools and parks
- Increase walking and bicycling trips in Selma by creating user-friendly facilities
- Increase safety by creating bicycle facilities and improving crosswalks and sidewalks for pedestrians

To achieve these goals, the ATP proposes a comprehensive network of citywide bikeways, trails, and sidewalks that connect all parts of Selma. This network provides links to key destinations, supports existing and future walking and biking activity areas, and connects neighborhoods throughout the City.

At build out, the recommended network would add 5.3 miles of Class I bike paths, 39.8 miles of Class II bike lanes, 8.9 miles of Class III bike routes, 0.9 miles of Class IV separated bikeways, and 6.1 miles of sidewalks. The ATP also makes recommendations for cross sections of a proposed trail along the east side of the City, roadway crossing improvements, and bicycle parking. The estimated total cost of the proposed network is \$18.0 million. Implementation of the entire network facilities will occur over many years. Some improvements can be implemented relatively easily; however, other improvements are more complex and are not anticipated to occur in the near future. Facilities will be constructed in conjunction with adjacent land development, roadway maintenance and capacity enhancement projects, as well as active transportation infrastructure projects using funds available from several different local, state, and federal funding sources.





Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION

Active transportation is human-powered travel, including walking, bicycling, and using a wheelchair. These activities have many important health, economic, environmental, and social benefits. Active transportation:

- o Helps kids and families get to schools and parks
- Helps people get to work, shopping, restaurants, and bus stops
- Improves overall health and reduces the incidence of chronic diseases like heart disease, high blood pressure, diabetes, mental illness, and obesity
- Reduces road congestion and air pollution by replacing single occupancy vehicle trips with walking, biking and transit
- Provides personal financial savings on gas, parking, auto insurance, and vehicle upkeep

1.1 PURPOSE

The City of Selma is a community of 24,844 residents at the intersection of State Routes (SR) 99 and 43. Known as the "Raisin Capital of the World," Selma is located in the central San Joaquin Valley, a prime American agricultural region. Selma's flat topography and warm climate create good conditions for walking and bicycling much of the year. Selma averages only 12 inches of rain per year, and though summer daily high temperatures are often over 90 degrees Fahrenheit, winters are mild.

Despite these good environmental conditions, many parts of Selma were developed without good trails, sidewalks, or bike lanes that make walking and biking safe and comfortable for everyone. Disadvantaged communities are also less likely to have these facilities than other neighborhoods.

Selma residents also suffer from high rates of asthma and cardiovascular disease. According to CalEnviroscreen 3.0, census tracts in Selma are in the worst 20% for asthma, and all but one census tract is in the worst 20% for cardiovascular disease. Biking and walking can help improve these health challenges. The City of Selma is working to address these needs. This Active Transportation Plan will make Selma eligible for new funding to create new trails, sidewalks, bike lanes, and other improvements for bicycling and walking.

The plan will support City applications for funding from the statewide Active Transportation Program. The plan will also support the use of funds provided through sources such as the Fresno County Measure C program.

This plan meets all requirements for active transportation plans as specified by the California Transportation Commission's 2017 Active Transportation Program Guidelines. A summary of these requirements and where they are addressed within this plan is provided in Appendix A, "Plan Conformance with ATP Guidelines."

This plan updates and supersedes the existing 2003 City of Selma Bicycle Transportation Plan and the bike plan presented in the City of Selma General Plan Update 2035, released in 2010.

1.2 VISION AND GOALS

The City of Selma Active Transportation Plan envisions a complete, safe, and comfortable network of trails, sidewalks, and bikeways that serves all residents of Selma. Specifically, this plan has been developed to accomplish the following goals:

 Create a network of safe and attractive trails, sidewalks, and bike lanes that connect Selma residents to key destinations, especially local schools and parks

- Increase walking and bicycling trips in Selma by creating user-friendly facilities
- Increase safety by creating bicycle facilities and improving crosswalks and sidewalks for pedestrians

1.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Obtaining input from the residents of Selma was an important part of the ATP development process. The public helped identify recommended improvements to the bicycling and walking facilities as well as priorities for projects. Participation was solicited through:

- Outreach with flyers in English and Spanish, including distribution at Selma's popular Raisin Festival
- An online crowdsourced interactive map, with both English and Spanish captions
- An interactive workshop held to obtain input from the public, with Spanish translation provided

Appendix B, Public Participation, provides additional details of the public input received.

1.4 BICYCLE FACILITIES

Bicycle facilities have many components. This section describes the bikeways and supporting



facilities that comprise a complete bicycle network.

Bikeways are classified in Chapter 1000 of the Highway Design Manual (Caltrans, 2015) into four primary types: Class I bike paths (including shared use paths), Class II bike lanes, Class III bike routes, and Class IV separated bikeways.

1.4.1 CLASS I BIKEWAY (BIKE PATH)

Bike paths, often referred to as shared-use paths or trails, are off-street facilities that provide exclusive use for non-motorized travellers, including bicyclists and pedestrians (Figure 1-1). Bike paths have minimal cross flow with motorists and are typically located along landscaped corridors. Bike paths can be utilized for both recreational and commute trips. These paths provide an important recreational amenity for bicyclists, pedestrians, dog walkers, runners, skaters, and those using other non-motorized forms of travel. They are frequently designed to offer a benefit to users, such as a connection not previously included in the bicycle or pedestrian network, or traversing a barrier such as a freeway or river. Unless specifically allowed by local laws, equestrians are generally prohibited from using bike paths. If horses and riders are allowed to use the path, the facilities should be designed to accommodate all users, typically with wider widths than traditional multi-use paths.

Important considerations when designing a Class I Bikeway include:

- Separation from traffic
- Scenic attributes such as landscaping and trail placement highlighting views
- \circ Shade
- Connections with other bikeways and activity centers
- Well-designed street crossings with measures such as grade separation, bike and pedestrian activated traffic signals, median islands, and

FIGURE 1-1



warning signs

- Curb ramps and curb cuts that are convenient and conform to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
- Adequate trail width, sight distance, and drainage
- $\circ~$ Pavement markings and wayfinding signs
- Long-term maintenance needs

1.4.2 CLASS II BIKEWAY (BIKE LANE)

Class II bike lanes are on-street facilities that use striping, stencils, and signage to denote preferential or exclusive use by bicyclists. On-street bikes lanes are located adjacent to motor vehicle traffic (Figure 1-2). Bike lanes are intended to alert drivers about the predictable movements of bicyclists and provide adequate space for comfortable riding.

Key considerations when designing a Class II Bikeway include:

 \circ Existing conditions

FIGURE 1-2

- Most helpful on streets with greater than 3,000 vehicle average daily traffic (ADT) and a posted speed that is greater than 25 mph
- Curb-to-curb width and parking

considerations in older neighborhoods can present challenges to design due to narrow roadways

- Design principles
 - Provide the maximum bike lane widths available to allow bicyclists to pass other riders safely and navigate around parked cars and other road hazards
 - Lane striping (six inches wide) should be dashed through heavily trafficked merging areas, including turn lanes at intersection approaches
 - Skipped green markings may also be used in conflict zones
 - Drainage grates must be designed to avoid catching bicycle tires
 - Left-side painted buffers on bike lanes improve separation between bicycles and vehicles with speeds greater than 35 mph on roads with high vehicle volumes
 - Right-side painted buffers can be added between parallel parked cars and the bike

 On-street striped lane for one-way bike travel

 Bike Lane Sign

 Image: Construct of the striped lane for one-way bike travel

 Not to scale
 Sidewalk
 7-8'
 5'-6'
 Travel Lane
 5'-6'
 Sidewalk

 Parking
 Bike Lane
 Bike Lane
 Bike Lane
 Bike Lane

CLASS II BIKEWAY (BIKE LANE)



lane to create a separation in the door zone, an area in which a driver may open their car door and hit a bicyclist

- $\circ~$ Maintenance needs
 - Conduct maintenance frequently to avoid roadway hazards such as potholes and debris
 - Refresh striping and repair or replace damaged or faded signage

1.4.3 CLASS III BIKEWAY (BIKE ROUTE)

Class III bike routes are streets with pavement markings or signage where bicyclists travel on the shoulder or share a lane with motor vehicles (Figure 1-3). Class III bike routes can be utilized on lowspeed and low-volume streets to connect bike lanes or paths along corridors that do not provide enough space for dedicated lanes. Shoulders are preferable but not required on streets with Class III bike routes. In addition to alerting motorists to the presence of bicyclists, bike routes help bike riders find their way to other bikeways or regional destinations like schools and parks.

Shared-lane markings, or sharrows, are a common Class III pavement marking that alerts drivers that bicyclists are sharing the road and facilitate wayfinding through neighborhoods. They are best used on streets with less than 3,000 ADT.

The chevrons in sharrow markings should be painted near the center of the travel lane, out of the parked vehicle door zone in which a driver may open their door and hit a bicyclist.

Key considerations when designing a Class III Bikeway include:

- Existing conditions
 - Best on streets with less than 3,000 ADT and





FIGURE 1-3

a posted speed equal to or less than 25 mph • Design principles

- Shoulders are preferable but not required
- Sharrow marking can be used to alert drivers to presence of bikes
- Maintenance needs
 - Conduct maintenance frequently to avoid roadway hazards such as potholes and debris

1.4.4 CLASS IV BIKEWAY (SEPARATED BIKEWAY)

Class IV separated bikeways, commonly known as cycle tracks, are physically separated bicycle facilities that are distinct from the sidewalk and designed for exclusive use by bicyclists. They are located within the street right-of-way, but provide comfort similar to Class I bike paths. The key feature of a separated bikeway is a vertical element that provides further separation from motor vehicle traffic. Common vertical elements used for separation include a vertical curb, a painted buffer with flexible posts, parked cars, a landscaped area, large planters, or a fixed barrier. Separated bikeways may also be constructed by creating a bike lane at a height above the vehicular lanes, with a continuous sloped transition. Separated bikeways can be either one-way or two-way, accommodating a single direction of travel or both (Figure 1-4).

Streets with high vehicular volumes and speeds are appropriate candidates for separated bikeways since they increase the separation between bicyclists and motor vehicle traffic. Separated bikeways necessitate wider right-of-way than Class II and III facilities and are best placed in areas with fewer driveways, and thus require careful planning.

Key considerations when designing a Class IV Bikeway include:

- \circ Existing conditions
 - Especially useful on streets with high ADT and a posted speed greater than 30 mph
 - Curb to curb width and post considerations can present challenges to design due to narrow roadway
- \circ Design principles
 - The preferred bike lane width for a separated bikeway is seven feet to allow for passing and maintenance. Minimum buffer width should be three feet
 - Appropriate intersection treatments should be paired with separated bikeways
 - Skipped green markings may also be used in conflict zones
 - Drainage grates must be designed to avoid catching bicycle tires
 - Careful planning required
- \circ Maintenance needs
 - Conduct maintenance frequently to avoid roadway hazards such as potholes and debris
 - Maintain posts, bollards, or other physical buffer
 - Refresh striping and repair or replace damaged or faded signage
 - Smaller street cleaning equipment may be required

FIGURE 1-4



1.4.5 BICYCLE PARKING

Bicycle parking is a key component to encouraging ridership by supporting the final stage of a bicycle trip. Locations with high ridership are excellent candidates for bicycle parking, including civic, residential, commercial, and office spaces. At these locations, both short-term and long-term parking should be accommodated. Bicycle parking can be classified into two types:

LONG-TERM PARKING



Short-term bicycle parking is temporary bicycle parking intended for visitors. Bicycle racks are a common form of short-term parking. Bicycle racks in front of stores and other destinations allow patrons to park their bike for short periods, typically around two hours. Bike parking should be located in well-lit areas to discourage theft. Installing permanent bicycle racks near main entrances also helps bicyclists feel welcome and encourages them to ride their bicycle again on a return trip. Bicycle racks that allow at least two points of contact, such as the wheel and frame, provide the most protection against theft and accidental damage.



BIKE LOCKERS



Long-term bicycle parking is intended for employees, students, commuters, and residents to protect bicycles for long periods. Long-term facilities are more secure than short-term bicycle parking and should fully protect bicycles from the weather. Long-term bicycle parking includes bike lockers, bike cages, and bike rooms. Bike lockers are outdoor enclosures that accommodate one or two bicycles and are usually leased on a monthly basis or paid short-term use. Bike cages are fully enclosed, roofed shelters that house racks of bicycle parking, typically found at schools. Bicycle rooms are commonly found inside office or residential buildings, and provide secure indoor parking. Bicycle rooms may feature amenities such as bike pumps and quick-fix tools for employees and residents.

1.5 PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

1.5.1 TRAILS

Class I bikeways, or bike paths, are also used by pedestrians and thus frequently known as shared-use trails. See section 1.4.1 for further discussion.

1.5.2 SIDEWALKS

Sidewalks are paved areas immediately adjacent to the vehicular right-of-way for the exclusive use of pedestrians, and may be used by people riding bicycles unless prohibited. Unlike shared-use paths, they are directly adjacent to the main right-of-way. As with trails, shade is important to encourage walking in Selma's hot summer climate.

1.5.3 CROSSWALKS

Marked crosswalks feature striping and other enhancements to delineate a street crossing for pedestrians. There are two types of marked crosswalks: controlled and uncontrolled. At uncontrolled crosswalks, drivers are legally required to yield to pedestrians, but do not have to stop when a pedestrian is not present. Controlled crosswalks are located at intersections with stop signs or traffic signals. Curb ramps provide access to the sidewalk for pedestrians, including people who use wheelchairs or other mobility devices.





THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



Chapter 2 RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER **PLANS & POLICIES**

The ATP was developed with consideration of the existing plans and policies of Selma and other jurisdictions and agencies.

2.1 BICYCLE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

The City released a Bicycle Transportation Plan in 2003. The most recent version of this plan was included as Figure 2-3 in the City's General Plan. This figure consists of two parts: a planned network of regional bikeways and a planned network of Class I bike paths and Class II bike lanes within the City's planning area. These planned networks were used as a starting point for development of the bicycle network in the ATP.

2.2 GENERAL PLAN

Goal 1 of the 2009 General Plan Circulation Element is "To design and maintain a fully integrated local network that provides for safe and convenient circulation using a variety of transportation modes." The plan includes several policies, listed below, specifically for bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The ATP is consistent with and supports enactment of these policies.

- Policy 2.44: The City will develop, through various funding mechanisms and sources, a city wide bicycle path/lane/route system in conformance with the City's 2003 Bicycle Transportation Plan. The bicycle path/lane/route system will utilize existing or future railroad right-of-way and water courses. The paths (class I), may also include landscaping, lighting, mileage markers, directional signage and benches. The on-road lanes (class II) would include striping and the on-road routes (class III) would not include striping. Reference Figure 2-3 for the proposed city-wide bike plan. The class I bike paths can also be utilized by pedestrians if the proposed paths are wide enough to allow both bicyclists and pedestrians.
- Policy 2.45: Sidewalks, paths, and appropriate crosswalks should be located to facilitate

Left Photo: Lincoln Park 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 2.46: 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 2.47: The City shall promote safe, convenient, and accessible pedestrian ways within the community.
- Policy 2.48: 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, commercial facilities, educational facilities, and recreation areas operating on the street.
- Policy 2.49: Street lighting shall be provided for all public streets and pedestrian signals shall be provided at all traffic signal locations.

Table 2-1, Permitted Traffic Calming Measures, of the General Plan includes raised crosswalks and bulbouts on low-volume collector, minor collector, and local streets.

Figure 2-1, Street Cross Sections, of the General Plan includes bike lanes on arterial and major arterial streets.

Other sections of the General Plan also encourage the development of bicycle and pedestrian networks.

2.3 STANDARD DRAWINGS

City standard drawings provide sidewalk widths for each roadway functional class in drawing ST-12. Widths are five feet for local streets and collectors and ten feet for arterials and major arterials.

2.4 MUNICIPAL CODE

The City Municipal Code Title 10, Traffic, includes chapters for pedestrians and bicycles.

Chapter 9, Pedestrians, governs establishment, placement, and use of crosswalks. The code states that no pedestrian shall cross a roadway other than by a crosswalk in the central traffic district or in any business district. No specific reference is made to unmarked crosswalks, though the codes states, "No pedestrians shall cross a roadway at any place other than by a route at right angles to the curb or by the shortest route to the opposite curb except in a marked crosswalk."

This chapter also controls placement of midblock crosswalks: "Other than crosswalks at intersections no crosswalk shall be established in any block which is less than four hundred feet (400') in length. Elsewhere not more than one additional crosswalk shall be established in any one block and such crosswalk shall be located as nearly as practicable at midblock."

Chapter 10, Bicycles, governs licensing of bicycles and sales of secondhand bicycles and also prohibits sidewalk riding in the central business district. Licensing is required for all bicycles, and secondhand bicycle sales are required to be reported daily to the Chief of Police.

The 2013 California Green Building Standards



contain specific requirements for the amount and type of both short-term and long-term bicycle parking that can help increase the supply of bicycle parking. The Selma Municipal code contains no additional bicycle parking requirements.

Providing showers and changing spaces at employment centers make commuting by bicycle more desirable. Showers and changing rooms are particularly useful to bicycle commuters during the hot summer months. Selma Municipal code contains no shower or changing space requirements.

2.5 AMBERWOOD SPECIFIC PLAN

The August 2015 Draft Amberwood Specific Plan includes a conceptual map of Class I bike paths and Class II bike lanes providing good connectivity throughout the neighborhood. This plan was considered when developing the proposed bicycle and pedestrian networks for the ATP.



2.6 GOLDEN STATE CORRIDOR DESIGN PLANS

The Fresno Council of Governments is facilitating infrastructure improvements along the Golden State Corridor. These plans include development of trails, bike lanes, bicycle and pedestrian crossings, and other improvements along Golden State Boulevard and city roads in this corridor. Design plans have been developed for the corridor segments within Selma.

2.7 REGIONAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL PLANS AND DOCUMENTS

Several regional, State, and federal plans and other documents contain goals, policies, and requirements relevant to the Selma ATP. These plans and documents are listed below and summarized in Appendix C, Relationship to Other Plans and Policies.

- Fresno Council of Governments Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy
- Fresno County Regional Bicycle and Recreational Trails Master Plan
- Fresno County Transportation Authority Measure "C"
- Fresno Council of Governments
 Transportation Needs Assessment
- Caltrans Bicycle Guide for District 6
- $\circ~$ California State Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan
- o California Green Building Code
- California Assembly Bill 32
- California Senate Bill 375
- California Assembly Bill 1358
- o California Assembly Bill 743
- US DOT Policy Statement on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Regulations and Recommendations
- $\circ~$ US Americans with Disabilities Act



Chapter 3 **EXISTING** CONDITIONS

This chapter describes the status of walking and biking facilities in the City of Selma. The existing bicycle and pedestrian networks are presented along with a description of the socioeconomic and land use context of walking and biking in the City. The chapter also describes the facilities and programs that support active transportation networks.

Although Selma's flat terrain and relatively dry climate is conducive to bicycling and walking, other local environmental conditions make active transportation more challenging. Summers are hot, with average high temperatures of 96 and 95 degrees Fahrenheit in July and August, respectively, and daily highs frequently exceeding 100 degrees Fahrenheit. Air quality in Selma frequently reaches the unhealthy range or higher, both due to ozone and particulate matter.



3.1 EXISTING NETWORKS

Currently there are 134.6 miles of sidewalks and no bikeways or trails within Selma. Class II bike lanes exist on some county roads adjacent to Selma. These networks are summarized in Table 3-1 and depicted in Figure 3-1 and Figure 3-2. Sidewalks have been built in segments over time, and may contain discontinuities or gaps as shown in Figure 3-2.

A paved side path currently exists along the east side of Orange Avenue from just south of Oak Street to Rose Avenue. This path is along the west bank of the Centerville and Kingsburg Canal. The length of this path is included in the sidewalk total. An informal unpaved path also exists along the east bank of the canal.

TABLE 3-1: EXISTING FACILITIES

Туре	Miles	
Sidewalks	134.6	
Class I Bike Paths	0	
Class II Bike Lanes	0	
Class III Bike Routes	0	
Class IV Separated Bikeway	0	

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2017





EXISTING BIKEWAYS & TRAILS





EXISTING SIDEWALKS & TRAILS





3.1.1 BICYCLIST AND PEDESTRIAN COMFORT

Trails, bike lanes, sidewalks, and other facilities should be comfortable and attractive to a wide range of bicycle riders and pedestrians.

Bicycle riders vary in experience, skill, ability, and confidence. Some people are comfortable riding in traffic and value bikeways and routes that are direct and limit unnecessary delay. These cyclists more comfortably utilize facilities that share the roadway with automobiles or have limited bicycle infrastructure. Other people with less confidence bicycling and lower or developing bicycle skills, such as children and older adult riders, may need more separation from traffic to feel comfortable enough to ride. Different bicycle types also require more space in bicycle facilities, such as trailers for children or cargo or adult tricycles. For these reasons, facilities should be designed to accommodate the lowest skill levels and a wide variety of bicycle types, especially in heavily traveled areas.



Research has correlated these different types of bicycle riders with the level of traffic stress (LTS) that they are willing to experience while cycling. Traffic stress is the discomfort and unease that a bicyclist may feel due to vehicle traffic, roadway conditions, bicycle facility design, and other factors. Metrics have been developed to quantify the LTS that a typical rider may experience so that new bicycle facilities can be targeted to reduce this stress. The methodology uses a "weakest link" approach, as roadways are classified based on their segments with the highest level of traffic stress, assuming that only those that are comfortable riding under the higher stress would travel on that road. Factors influencing LTS include:

- Number of travel lanes
- Speed of traffic
- Number of vehicles
- Presence of bike lanes
- Width of bike lanes
- Presence of physical barrier



Using these factors, a bicycle level of traffic stress (BLTS) score can be assigned from 1 to 4 for each roadway segment, with 1 being the least stressful and 4 being the most stressful:

BLTS 1: The lowest level of traffic stress and the design goal for a network that truly accommodates people of all ages and abilities. This level of traffic stress allows children trained in traffic safety to bicycle to school by themselves as well as the mainstream adult population, people interested but concerned about bicycling.

BLTS 2: The highest level of stress that the mainstream adult population will tolerate while still feeling safe. This is the threshold for a low traffic stress bicycle network that truly accommodates people of all ages and abilities.

BLTS 3: This level of traffic stress accommodates a much smaller segment of population, people who are excited and more familiar with biking and will therefore accept a higher level of traffic stress. Bicyclists who are considered enthused and confident but still prefer having their own dedicated space for riding will tolerate this level of stress and feel safe while bicycling.

BLTS 4: This level of stress is tolerated only by those characterized as strong and fearless, which comprises a small percentage of the population. These roadways have high speed limits, multiple travel lanes, limited or non-existent bike lanes and signage, and large distances to cross at intersections.



Similarly, pedestrians vary in experience and confidence. Some pedestrians are comfortable walking close to busy traffic on narrow sidewalks, while others will only walk if there is greater distance from rapidly traveling vehicles. Factors including pedestrian comfort include:

- Usable sidewalk width
- Frequency of driveways
- Lighting
- Street trees and landscaping
- Sidewalk quality
- Speed of traffic
- Number of vehicles
- Number of vehicle travel lanes



Using these factors, a pedestrian level of traffic stress (PLTS) score can be assigned from 1 to 4 for each roadway segment, with 1 being the least stressful and 4 being the most stressful:

PLTS 1: Highly comfortable, pedestrian-friendly, and easily navigable for pedestrians of all ages and abilities, including seniors or school-aged children walking unaccompanied to school. These streets provide an ideal pedestrian-friendly environment.

PLTS 2: Generally comfortable for many pedestrians, but parents may not feel comfortable with children walking alone. Seniors may have concerns about the walking environment and take more caution. These streets may be part of a pedestrian-friendly environment where it intersects with a more auto-oriented roadway or other environmental constraints.

PLTS 3: Walking is uncomfortable but possible. Minimum sidewalk and crossing facilities may be present, but barriers are present that make the walking experience uninviting and uncomfortable.

PLTS 4: Walking is very uncomfortable or even impossible. Streets have limited or no accommodation for pedestrians and are inhospitable and possibly unsafe environment for pedestrians.

Existing traffic stress for both bicyclists and pedestrians was assessed on priority corridors in Selma. Most of the arterial and collector streets within Selma have a high level of traffic stress (LTS 3 or LTS 4) as shown in Table 3-2 and Figure 3-3 and Figure 3-4. Important contributors to the high stress scores include:

- High traffic speeds, frequently 45 mph
- o Missing sidewalks
- High truck volumes on some streets

TABLE 3-2: TRAFFIC STRESS ON EXISTING STREETS

Street	Segment (From/To)	Bicycle Stress Score (BLTS)	Pedestrian Stress Score (PLTS)
McCall Avenue	Dinuba Avenue/Floral Avenue	4	4
	Dinuba Avenue/Huntsman Avenue	4	4
Thompson Avenue	Huntsman/Floral	4	3
	Floral/Rose	4	3
Front Street	Whitson Street/Whitson Street	4	4
Whitson Street	Highland Avenue to Park Avenue	4	4
Second Street	Nebraska Street/E. Front Street	3	3
Lichland Avenue	Dinbua Avenue to Golden State Boulevard	4	4
Highland Avenue	Golden State Boulevard to Nebraska Street	4	4
Wright Street	Dinuba Avenue/Arrants Street	3	3
Orange Avenue	City Limit/Mill Street	4	3
Dipuba Ayapua	Mitchell Avenue to Wright Avenue	4	4
Dinuba Avenue	Wright Avenue to Orange Avenue	4	4

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2017

BICYCLIST STRESS - EXISTING CONDITIONS





PEDESTRIAN STRESS - EXISTING CONDITIONS





3.1.2 OTHER PEDESTRIAN CONDITIONS

The following factors also influence safety and comfort of walking in Selma:

- Some crosswalks change direction in the middle of the street or cross the street at an angle. These conditions increase crossing distances and times and increase the difficulty of crossing the street for visually-impaired pedestrians.
- Gaps exist in the sidewalk network, most notably at railroad crossings.
- Many curb ramps are not aligned directly with the crosswalk and lack tactile paving. These conditions increase the difficulty of crossing the street for visually-impaired pedestrians.









3.2 LAND USE AND SOCIOECONOMICS

Effective active transportation networks connect to key destinations in the city and to all neighborhoods, especially those which serve disadvantaged communities where transportation options may be limited.

Figure 3-5 depicts important destinations used by people in Selma for their daily activities. Figure 3-6 similarly shows the General Plan zoning map, which identifies residential, commercial, and industrial areas of Selma.

The identification of disadvantage and underserved communities is a key metric in many grant funding programs such as California's Active Transportation Program. Figures 3-7 through 3-10 present four different indicators of disadvantaged communities, often referred to as environmental justice communities:

- Zero automobile households: share of households in each census tract that do not own a car.
- Free or reduced price meal eligibility: the share of students at a school who are eligible for subsidized meals. Schools with higher shares are more disadvantaged. All schools in Selma have at least 70% of students eligible for free or reduce price meals.
- CalEnviroScreen 3.0 score percentile: a measure of environmental health by census tract. Inputs include socioeconomic factors, population characteristics, pollution factors, and environmental factors. Tracts with higher percentiles are more disadvantaged. All census tracts within Selma scored in the worst scoring 15% of the over 8,000 census tracts in California.
- Household median income: census tracts with median households under 80% of the statewide median. Census tracts in the western portion of the City have lower incomes that census tracts in the eastern portion.

KEY DESTINATIONS





FIGURE 3-6

GENERAL PLAN ZONING





Source: City of Selma, 201

ZERO-AUTOMOBILE HOUSEHOLDS





FIGURE 3-8 FREE OR REDUCED PRICE MEAL ELIGIBILITY BY SCHOOL

active transportation plan


CALENVIROSCREEN 3.0 PERCENTILE





HOUSEHOLD MEDIAN INCOME





3.3 **BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN TRIPS**

Based on data collected through the U.S. Census American Community Survey, approximately 1% of Selma workers commute to work by walking and 0.1% commute to work by bicycling. These shares are much lower than the statewide averages, as shown in Table 3-3.

These statistics include only a portion of active transportation commuters because they fail to measure people who walk or ride only one or two days per week. They also fail to measure non-commute activities such as trips to stores, to schools, or for recreation. As a percentage of trips, non-commute active transportation trips are generally greater than commute trips because commute trips tend to be longer. Anecdotally, many students walk to local schools. Thus, bicycling and walking facilities provide key infrastructure for many trips and are a key amenity for residents, though some uses are often not captured in U.S. Census data. Improving and increasing these facilities is likely to have benefits beyond that suggested by these statistics.

3.4 **BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN** COLLISIONS

Improving safety for bicyclists and pedestrians is an important goal of this plan. The charts on the next page summarize collisions by severity and year. Although pedestrians and bicyclists are involved in a relatively small number of trips, more than half of severe injuries occurred to pedestrians or bicyclists, and all fatalities were pedestrians. There is no clear trend for any of the collision types.

Figure 3-11 shows locations of collisions involving bicyclists and Figure 3-12 shows locations of collisions involving pedestrians. Bicycle collisions mostly occurred on or within one block of Whitson Street / Golden State Boulevard. Pedestrian collisions were distributed more evenly around Selma.

TABLE 3-3: WALKING AND BIKING TO WORK

	Wal	k	Bicycle					
Jurisdiction	Estimate	Share	Estimate	Share				
Selma	122	1.4%	13	0.1%				
California	458.523	2.9%	188.736	1.2%				

Note: Workers aged 16 years and older

Source: U. S. Census 201-2015 American Community Survey,2016, Fehr & Peers, 2016.





COLLISIONS, SEVERE INJURIES, & FATALITIES 2011-2015

COLLISIONS BY YEAR, 2011-2015



Source: California Highway Patrol Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System, 2017; Fehr & Peers, 2017

BICYCLIST COLLISIONS, 2011-2015





PEDESTRIAN COLLISIONS, 2011-2015





3.5 BICYCLE PARKING

A bicyclist is much more likely to make a bicycle trip if they can leave their bicycle without fear of theft. Thus, safe and secure bicycle parking is important to increasing bicycle usage. Selma has bicycle parking at some schools, parks, public buildings, and other locations across the City. Figure 3-13 depicts this parking at these locations. Notably, the City reported that demand for bicycle parking at the Senior Center exceeds current capacity and additional bike racks will be installed in 2017. However, some bicycle parking in the city was of an older design that was difficult to use or blocked and unable to be accessed.

3.6 CONNECTIONS WITH TRANSIT

Selma is served by three transit routes:

- Fresno County Rural Transit agency serves
 Selma with their Southeast route and Kingsburg-Reedley Route. All buses have bike racks.
- Kings Area Rural Transit serves Selma on its Hanford-Fresno route. All buses have bike racks.

Stops for these routes are shown in Figure 3-5.

Selma is also served by dial-a-ride on-demand transit service, which the City reports is used by most seniors accessing the senior center. Senior center visitors peak at about 90 visitors per day.

3.7 PAST EXPENDITURES

Selma has won a \$468,000 Active Transportation Program grant and a \$258,000 Highway Safety Improvement Program grants to improve pedestrian safety in the City, especially near schools. These improvements will be constructed starting in 2018. Locations of these improvements are shown in Figure 3-14.





EXISTING BICYCLE PARKING





FIGURE 3-14 PLANNED ATP AND HSIP PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS

active transportation plan



3.8 MAINTENANCE POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

The City of Selma currently maintains pedestrian networks and facilities according to the following guidelines:

- Regular sweeping and other necessary maintenance is performed to clear walkways of dirt, glass, gravel, and other debris and maintain the integrity of the bicycling network.
- 2. Crosswalk striping maintenance (and roadway striping) is performed annually.
- 3. Sidewalks are maintained in accordance with City of Selma Standards, ADA standards and in accordance with the City of Selma ADA Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan.
- 4. As crosswalks are re-striped, they are re-striped using utilizing thermoplastic high visibility paint.



3.9 FIVE E'S

The E's of active transportation are a way to view active transportation efforts. The E's include programming and outreach efforts as well as infrastructure:

- Education: programs to teach safe walking and bicycling, such as safety rodeos.
- Encouragement: programs and events to increase participation in walking and bicycling. Examples include community walks and bike rides.
- Enforcement: efforts by law enforcement to ensure laws relating to pedestrians and bicyclists are enforced. These efforts may be directed at motorists as well as pedestrians and bicyclists, for example, crosswalk yielding monitoring
- Engineering: infrastructure improvements that increase the extent, safety, and quality of networks and facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Evaluation: review of data related to pedestrians and bicyclists. Collision data is one example.

Current efforts in Selma include the following:

- Selma has received several grants from the Office of Traffic Safety. Some of this funding has been used to host bicycle safety rodeos in conjunction with the City's "Bringing Broken Neighborhoods Back to Life" events. Each event draws approximately 750-1,000 people, and over the last three years the City has averaged 5-6 events per year. The first event of 2017 was held on Saturday, April 22, and included bicycle safety as well as a bike licensing, with 800-1,000 people in attendance.
- The City has successfully received funding for and made pedestrian improvements around many elementary schools. More improvements are planned for 2018.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



Chapter 4 PLANNED NETWORKS

This chapter discusses the planned bicycle networks, pedestrian networks, and support facilities for the City of Selma. The build-out pedestrian and bicycle networks are the long-term vision of the active transportation facilities for Selma. The networks include shared-use paths, bike lanes and routes, sidewalks, and crosswalk improvements. The proposed networks are designed to connect to Selma's neighborhoods, to provide access to key destinations, and to serve as recreational assets. Table 4-1 summarizes the proposed facilities.

TABLE 4-1: PLANNED FACILITIES

Facility Type	Existing (miles)	Planned (miles)	Total (miles)
Sidewalk	134.6	6.1	140.7
Class I Bike Path	0	5.3	5.3
Class II Bike Lane	0	39.8	39.8
Class II Buffered Bike Lane	0	4.8	4.8
Class III Bike Route	0	8.9	8.9
Class IV Separated Bikeway	0	0.9	0.9

Right Photo: Lincoln Park The networks were developed with the following primary considerations:

- Connectivity to key destinations, especially schools, parks, and civic buildings
- Creation of a system of trails
- Collision history
- Level of traffic stress
- o Existing Selma Bicycle Transportation Plan and connections to facilities in the Fresno County **Regional Bicycle and Recreational Trails Master** Plan and Fresno Council of Governments Transportation Needs Assessment
- Public comment

Based on the indicators of disadvantaged communities presented in Chapter 3, Existing Conditions, these facilities all support disadvantaged communities.

4.1 BICYCLE NETWORK

The proposed bikeway network is presented in Figure 4-1.

The trail system includes a trail along Orange Avenue and the Centerville and Kingsburg Canal. Potential cross sections for typical sections of the trail are shown in Figure 4-2.

4.1.1 BICYCLE LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS

To reduce the bicycle level of traffic stress along key streets, the City of Selma should also pursue additional improvements along important corridors.

- Golden State Boulevard/W. Front Street: The Golden State Corridor Class I bike path and other improvements will reduce stress in this corridor and provide a lower stress alternative to Whitson Street.
- Orange Avenue: The Class I bike path along the Centerville and Kingsburg Canal and Class IV separated bikeway along a section of this street will similarly reduce stress in this corridor.
- Dinuba Avenue: The Class II buffered bike lane will reduce stress in this corridor.
- Other streets where Class II bike lanes are planned should consider characteristics that will reduce bicycle level of traffic stress during design. These improvements could include:
 - Reducing vehicle travel lane width to allow greater bike land width
 - Slowing traffic by reducing land widths and adding traffic calming features
 - Eliminating parking to allocate more space for bike lanes.
- Highland Avenue will require particular consideration during design at the intersection with Floral Avenue and interchange with SR
 99. Due to the complexity of the streets, high vehicle volumes, and high vehicle speeds, additional feasibility studies are recommended.

4.1.2 BICYCLE PARKING

Bicycle parking is available at several key destinations as discussed in Chapter 3, Existing Conditions. Figure 4-3 recommends additional locations for implementation of bicycle parking, including at schools, parks, and other public facilities.

Bicycle parking is also available at or near most transit stops serving intercity routes. One additional bike parking location is recommended to serve one stop on the Fresno County Rural Transit Agency Southeast route which does not have nearby bicycle parking.

To improve existing bicycle parking, replacement of obsolete bike parking at the library and enforcement to ensure that bicycle parking is not blocked is also recommended. Business owners should be encouraged to work with the City to provide bicycle parking in visible areas within the downtown commercial core to entice riders to stop and frequent local businesses.



PLANNED BIKEWAYS & TRAILS





FIGURE 4-2 PLANNED TRAIL CROSS-SECTIONS



Orange Avenue North of Floral Avenue

Orange Avenue South of Nelson Boulevard Class IV Separated Bikeway Option



PLANNED BICYCLE PARKING





4.2 PEDESTRIAN NETWORK

The proposed pedestrian network is presented in Figure 4-4. The trail network, used by pedestrians as well as bicyclists, was discussed in Section 4.1. The sidewalk improvements are primarily focused on connections to schools and to the trails system. The projects identified are organized based on proximity to each other and into fundable sized projects. The improvements can be implemented in part or by combining focus areas together into larger efforts.

4.2.1 PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS

Several intersection improvement projects are also shown in Figure 4-4 to improve pedestrian comfort and safety:

- SR 99 ramps at Second Street: full signalization, if warrant is met
- Improvement of irregular intersection at Third Street/W. Front Street/McCall Avenue
- Improvement of irregular intersection at Third Street/Mill Street/Keith Street/Grove Street
- Crossing improvements at the intersection of McCall Avenue and Nelson Boulevard, a connection to several schools and retail

The decision to install a marked crosswalk or other crosswalk enhancement should take into account good engineering judgement, engineering study, and/or other necessary considerations as appropriate for each individual case. Some of these considerations include:

- Pedestrian travel demand, typically 20 pedestrians/hour or more
- Service of a facility or use that generates higher pedestrian travel or serves a vulnerable population (e.g., children, elderly, persons with disabilities). This may include schools, hospitals, senior centers, recreation/community centers, libraries, parks, or trails. Service of such facilities can justify pedestrian improvements to areas of less demand than 20 pedestrians/hour
- Sight distance requirements, using appropriate stopping sight distance guidance from AASHTO's A Policy on Geometric Design for Highways and Streets or Caltrans' Highway Design Manual
- Delay to pedestrian movements
- Distance to nearest crossing
- Meeting California Manual for the Uniform Control of Traffic Devices (MUTCD) pedestrian signal warrant

Depending on the characteristics of a specific location, a marked crosswalk alone may not be sufficient to ensure efficient function for all users and maintain pedestrian safety. If a location is suitable for a marked crosswalk, Table 4-2 outlines the appropriate level of enhancement that may be necessary based on the number of travel lanes, average daily traffic, and posted speed limit (assuming speed limits are set at the 85th percentile speed). Three levels of enhancement are identified in Table 4-3 ranging from Level A to Level C.

PLANNED SIDEWALKS & TRAILS





	Vehicl	e ADT≤	\$ 9,000	Vehicle ADT Vehicle ADT >9,000 to 12,000 >12,000 to 15,000		Vehicle ADT≥15,000						
Roadway Type	≤30 mph	35 mph	40 mph	≤30 mph	35 mph	40 mph	≤30 mph	35 mph	40 mph	≤30 mph	35 mph	40 mph
Residential	R	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-
2 Lanes	A	А	В	А	А	В	А	А	С	А	В	С
3 Lanes	A	A	В	A	В	В	В	В	С	В	С	С
4 Lanes with Raised Median	А	А	С	А	В	С	В	В	С	С	С	С
4 Lanes without Raised Median	A	В	С	В	В	С	С	С	С	С	С	С

TABLE 4-2: RECOMMENDED LEVEL OF ENHANCEMENT AT CROSSWALKS

TABLE 4-3: RECOMMENDED CROSSWALK TREATMENTS OR ENHANCEMENTS

Level	
R	High visibility crosswalk
	All of the following:
٨	High visibility crosswalk
A	Signs
	Pavement word markings
	All of the following:
	Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons
В	High visibility crosswalk
	Signs
	Pavement word markings
	All of the following:
	Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon or Pedestrian Signal
С	High visibility crosswalk
	Signs
	Pavement word markings

Level Recommended Treatment or Enhancement

4.2.2 PEDESTRIAN LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS

Reducing pedestrian level of traffic stress is challenging in areas where sidewalks are already built and limited width exists from the edge of the right-of-way to the curb. The two trails discussed for the planned bicycle network will also reduce pedestrian level of stress in these corridors. Where possible, the following features should be added or included in new construction:

- Sidewalk width of at least six feet, preferably eight feet in commercial or retail areas. City standard drawings should be updated to meet these minimum widths
- Landscape buffer between the sidewalk and street
- Street trees for shading
- Crosswalks at least every 400 feet
- Slowing traffic by reducing land widths and adding traffic calming features

4.3 SUPPORTING PROGRAMS

Selma should continue to work on its education and encouragement programs. Partnering with other organizations provides a good opportunity to engage the community. In Fresno County, groups such as Cultiva La Salud and Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability have hosted successful events that encourage active transportation and other healthy activities in disadvantaged communities. Hosting events with these organizations will allow Selma Police and City staff to better reach local children and other residents.

Selma should also consider other improvements to the community environment that will enhance residents' safety and perceptions of safety. Adding lighting improvements can deter crime and increase walking and bicycling outside of daylight hours. Enforcing leash laws and otherwise deterring loose dogs will also diminish another deterrent to walking and bicycling frequently noted in Fresno County. As discussed in section 4-1.2, Bicycle Parking, enforcement efforts aimed at ensuring bike racks are not blocked will help ensure that bicycle riders have a place to safely park their bicycles and encourage bicycle use.

Crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) can also be used to reduce the fear and incidence of crime and improve the quality of life by creating attractive, livable, and safe places. CPTED relies on four main strategies that can be employed in the development of active transportation facilities in Selma:

- Natural surveillance: The placement of physical features (windows, lighting, landscaping), activities (waiting for transit, sitting on a bench, walking), and people in a way that maximizes visibility of buildings, people, parking areas, and entrances. Natural surveillance can increase the number of "eyes on the street" and create visual connections between the street, sidewalk, and nearby land uses.
- Natural access control: Directing the flow of people by controlling access to and through a site to decrease the opportunity for crime by. Design elements (walkways, lighting, signage, landscaping, and physical barriers) can direct users to public routes and areas and discourage access to private areas.
- Territorial reinforcement: Use of physical attributes (fences, landscaping, sidewalks, and signage) to express ownership and distinguish between private and public space and define property lines.
- Maintenance: Continued use of a space for its intended purpose. Proper maintenance can serve as an additional expression of ownership and can help maximize public safety and visibility of a space, while deterioration and debris can indicate lack of concern and control and encourage unintended uses.

4.4 WAYFINDING

Wayfinding signage can be used on both bicycle and pedestrian facilities to direct users to connecting facilities and key destinations within the city and region. These signs provide the most value at trail junctions and at intersections of key bicycling and walking routes. Integrating good wayfinding into the Golden State Corridor improvements will also encourage trail users to explore other parts of Selma. Chapter 9B of the 2014 California MUTCD provides guidance on sign design and installation. These standard signs may also be augmented by signs depicting distances in miles to encourage walking and bicycling.



4.5 POTENTIAL OUTCOMES

Following implementation of the planned networks and supporting programs, substantial improvements may be achieved in active transportation use and safety of people who walk and ride bikes. By increasing the facilities available to users, mode share may increase to levels seen in other comparable cities. As improvements are made, walking and biking mode share may be expected to rise to the level of Fresno County as a whole (Table 4-4). As the network continues to expand towards build-out, usage may be expected to be similar to cities with comparable characteristics. Sacramento is a city in the Central Valley with a comparable climate to that of Selma. Though no single city is exactly comparable to Selma, these comparisons provide reasonable targets for Selma to achieve by implementing the ATP. Achieving mode share similar to Sacramento would result in approximately 200 workers commuting by bike and 300 workers commuting by walking, representing about 400 trips by biking and 600 trips by walking daily. As discussed in Chapter 3, Existing Conditions, because these number do not include shopping, school, or recreational trips, or commuters who only walk or bike to work part time, the actual number of future trips would be higher.

By implementing this plan, pedestrian and bicyclist safety will also be improved and the number of collisions involving pedestrians and bicyclists reduced. A 50% or greater reduction in injuries and fatalities is a reasonable expectation if all aspects of this plan, including supporting programs, are implemented. In addition to these direct health improvements due to collision reduction, implementation will also support increased physical activity by Selma residents, improving community health by reducing incidence of heart disease, high blood pressure, Type 2 diabetes, mental illness, and obesity.

TABLE 4-4: MODE SHARE COMPARISON

	Mode Share						
Mode	Selma	Fresno County	City of Fresno	Clovis	Sacramento		
Bicycle	0.1%	0.9%	1.1%	1.1%	2.2%		
Walking	1.4%	1.9%	1.7%	1.6%	3.3%		
Courses LIC Consuls	American Community C	1010 2010 2015					

Source: US Census American Community Survey 2010-2015



Chapter 5 IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation of the planned bikeway and pedestrian network is anticipated to occur in multiple ways:

- Active transportation projects pursued to implement this plan
- In conjunction with adjacent land development projects as the City requires new development to construct roadway and sidewalk frontage improvements in accordance with City standards and the planned facilities identified in this plan
- In conjunction with maintenance and capacity enhancement projects, such as slurry seals, pavement reconstruction, roadway widening, or sidewalk rehabilitation projects

Active transportation projects will be implemented based upon the priorities identified in the next section. Implementation will require many years to complete: implementation of priority projects will be targeted for completion in the next five to ten years. Improvements associated with work on adjacent roadways or development of adjacent land uses will provide opportunities for implementation relatively easily or at lower cost than if implemented separately. In these cases, lower priority improvements may be implemented before higherpriority improvements, depending on the location of these land development and roadway projects.

Completion of projects in this plan will be reported by planning staff to the City Council and on the City website. The City will update this plan periodically, approximately every five years, to reflect changing conditions and needs and progress toward completion.

5.1 PRIORITIZATION

The elements of these networks were prioritized based on several criteria:

- Proximity to key destinations, including schools, parks, bus stops, and activity centers
- $\circ~$ Collision locations
- Disadvantaged community indicators
- $\circ~$ Level of traffic stress
- o Public comment
- Judgement of City staff

Maps highlighting priorities are shown in Figures 5-1 and 5-2. Lists of projects with priorities are provided in Appendix D, Project Priorities and Cost Estimates.

5.2 COSTS

The estimated costs to implement each type of facility are summarized in Table 5-1. On-street bike routes and bike lanes are the least expensive to construct per mile, while separated bikeways, sidewalks, and bike paths are most expensive to construct. If land must be acquired to implement any of these facilities, costs will increase. However, many of these facilities may be implemented during development of adjacent land uses or in conjunction with other projects. Therefore, some of these costs will not be directly borne by the City.

Cost estimates are based on local unit cost estimates. These estimates were developed based on relevant project experience in the area. Assumptions for each bikeway type and details of these estimates are described in Appendix D. Note that these are high-level cost estimates, and more detailed study and design of individual project will be required to refine them.



TABLE 5-1: PROJECT COST ESTIMATES

Facility Type	Cost per Mile	High Priority	Other	Total
Class I Bike Path	\$1,250,000	\$2,275,000	\$5,162,500	\$7,437,500
Class II Bike Lane	\$175,000	\$1,298,500	\$4,830,000	\$6,128,500
Class II Buffered Bike Lane	\$192,500	\$924,000		\$924,000
Class III Bike Route	\$10,000	\$2,400	\$86,600	\$89,000
Class IV Separated Bikeway	\$325,000		\$299,000	\$299,000
Sidewalk	\$237,600	\$813,000	\$646,000	\$1,459,000
Intersection improvements		\$1,300,000	\$325,000	\$1,625,000
	Total	\$6,612,900	\$11,349,100	\$17,962,000

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2017

Unit costs for other equipment, including installation are presented in Table 5-2.

TABLE 5-2: UNIT COSTS FOR OTHER EQUIPMENT

Equipment Type	Cost
Bike Rack	\$1,500
Wayfinding Signage	\$500
Lighting	\$8,000
Crosswalk Striping	\$1,500
Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (pair)	\$25,000
Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon (pair)	\$350,000

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2017

HIGH PRIORTY BIKEWAYS & TRAILS





FIGURE 5-2 PRIORITIZED SIDEWALK & INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS

active transportation plan



5.3 FUNDING

Federal, state, regional, county, and local organizations provide funding for pedestrian and bicycle projects and programs. The most recent federal surface transportation funding program, Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST), was signed into law in December 2015. This is the first long-term federal transportation authorization enacted since 2012, and the first long-term funding since the signing of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) in 2005. The new authorization brings changes to typical funding sources and structures. FAST funding is distributed to federal and state surface transportation funds. Most of these resources are available through Caltrans and Fresno COG.

Senate Bill 1, The Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, was signed in April 2017. It will increase funding for the Active Transportation Program by \$100 million statewide and encourages complete streets improvements in a majority of its funding allocations for local roadways. Measure C, administered by the Fresno County Transportation Authority, is another important source of funding. The measure is a half-cent sales tax aimed at improving the overall quality of Fresno County's transportation system. This Local Transportation Program can be used on pedestrian and bicycle facilities and trails. Funding is allocated to cities and the county based on population. Measure C funding will also be used to construct the Golden State Corridor bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Table 5-3 summarizes the applicability of these various funding sources to projects, planning efforts, and programs proposed in this plan. Detailed descriptions of the grant funding sources are presented in Appendix E, Funding Sources. The most applicable funding sources for the improvements proposed by this Plan are the Active Transportation Program, Highway Safety Improvement Program, and Measure C. This appendix includes details about current programs that are used to fund existing scheduled projects and an assessment of upcoming programs as of July 2017. These may change as state and local programs adapt to the new SB 1 funding.



TABLE 5-3: FUNDING SOURCES

Funding Source	Class I Bicycle Path	Class II Bicycle Lane	Class III Bicycle Route	Class IV separated Bikeways	Pedestrian Projects	Other Projects	Planning and Programs
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)	\bullet						\bigcirc
Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)							
Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Grants	\bigcirc	\bullet	\bullet				\bigcirc
Caltrans Transportation Planning Grants	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	
Local Transportation Fund (LTF)							\bigcirc
California State Parks Recreational Trails Program (RTP)		\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCP)		\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc
Active Transportation Program (ATP)							
Transportation Development Act (TDA)							
Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program (AHSC)	\bullet						
California Office of Traffic Safety Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Grants	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	
FCTA Measure C							
SJVAPCD Bikeway Incentive Program				\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc	\bigcirc

Notes:

1. • indicates that funds may be used for this category; \bigcirc indicates that funds may not be used for this category, and • indicates that funds may be used, though restrictions apply.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2017

APPENDIX A: PLAN CONFORMANCE WITH ATP GUIDELINES

Item	Requirement	Page
1	The estimated number of existing bicycle trips and pedestrian trips in the	Existing: 35
	plan area, both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of all trips, and	Future: 54-55
	the estimated increase in the number of bicycle trips and pedestrian trips	
	resulting from implementation of the plan.	
2	The number and location of collisions, serious injuries, and fatalities suffered	Existing: 35-38
	by bicyclists and pedestrians in the plan area, both in absolute numbers and	Future: 54
	as a percentage of all collisions and injuries, and a goal for collision, serious	
	injury, and fatality reduction after implementation of the plan.	
3	A map and description of existing and proposed land use and settlement	28-30
	patterns which must include, but not be limited to, locations of residential	
	neighborhoods, schools, shopping centers, public buildings, major	
	employment centers, and other destinations.	
4	A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transportation	Existing: 18-19
	facilities, including a description of bicycle facilities that serve public	Proposed: 46-47
	and private schools and, if appropriate, a description of how the five Es	5 E's: 42, 53
	(Education, Encouragement, Enforcement, Engineering, and Evaluation) Will	
	be used to increase rates of bicycling to school.	
5	A map and description of existing and proposed end-of-trip bicycle parking	Existing: 39-40
		Proposed: 46, 48
6	A description of existing and proposed policies related to bicycle parking	15
	In public locations, private parking garages and parking lots and in new	
		F : 1: 00 40
	A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transport and	Existing: 39-40
	parking facilities for connections with and use of other transportation modes.	Proposed: 46, 49
	these must include, but not be inflited to, bicycle parking facilities at transit	
	stops, rail and transit terminals, ferry docks and fandings, park and fide	
	vehicles or ferry vessels	
<u> </u>	A map and description of existing and proposed pedestrian facilities	Evicting: 18, 20
	including those at major transit hubs and those that serve public and private	Droposod: 49.50
	schools and if appropriate a description of how the five Fs (Education	FT0p0seu. 47-50
	Encouragement, Enforcement, Engineering, and Evaluation) will be used to	5 ES: 42, 53
	increase rates of walking to school. Maior transit hubs must include, but are	
	not limited to, rail and transit terminals, and ferry docks and landings.	
9	A description of proposed signage providing wavfinding along bicvcle and	54
	pedestrian networks to designated destinations.	

Item	Requirement	Page
10	A description of the policies and procedures for maintaining existing and	42
	the maintenance of smooth payement. ADA lovel surfaces, freedom from	
	on croaching vegetation, maintenance of traffic control devices including	
	encroaching vegetation, maintenance of trainc control devices including	
		40
	A description of bicycle and pedestrian safety, education, and	42
	encouragement programs conducted in the area included within the	
	plan, efforts by the law enforcement agency having primary traffic law	
	enforcement responsibility in the area to enforce provisions of the law	
	impacting bicycle and pedestrian safety, and the resulting effect on collisions	
	involving bicyclists and pedestrians.	
12	A description of the extent of community involvement in development of the	4
	plan, including disadvantaged and underserved communities.	Appendix B
13	A description of how the active transportation plan has been coordinated	13-15, 45
	with neighboring jurisdictions, including school districts within the plan area,	Appendix C
	and is consistent with other local or regional transportation, air quality, or	
	energy conservation plans, including, but not limited to, general plans and a	
	Sustainable Community Strategy in a Regional Transportation Plan.	
14	A description of the projects and programs proposed in the plan and a listing	57-61
	of their priorities for implementation, including the methodology for project	Appendix D
	prioritization and a proposed timeline for implementation.	
15	A description of past expenditures for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and	Past: 39, 41
	programs, and future financial needs for projects and programs that improve	Anticipated:
	safety and convenience for bicyclists and pedestrians in the plan area.	58-59, 62-63
	Include anticipated revenue sources and potential grant funding for bicycle	Appendix E
	and pedestrian uses.	
16	A description of steps necessary to implement the plan and the reporting	57
	process that will be used to keep the adopting agency and community	
	informed of the progress being made in implementing the plan.	
17	A resolution showing adoption of the plan by the city, county or district.	Appendix F
	If the active transportation plan was prepared by a county transportation	
	commission, regional transportation planning agency, MPO, school district	
	or transit district, the plan should indicate the support via resolution of the	
	city(s) or county(s) in which the proposed facilities would be located.	

APPENDIX B: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Public input to this plan was gathered through three primary methods:

- Outreach with flyers, including distribution at Selma's popular Raisin Festival. A copy of the flyer is included in this appendix.
- An online crowdsourced interactive map, with both English and Spanish captions. Nine comments were received. A snapshot of this map shown below.
- An interactive workshop held to obtain input from the public, with Spanish translation provided. Two people attended this workshop.



B-1: Online Crowdsourced Map

B-2: Public Outreach Flyer

Help create the City of Selma **Active Transportation Plan**

Mathematical Active Transportation

is human-powered travel, including walking, bicycling, and using a wheelchair. These activities are not only fun, but they have many important health, economic, environmental, and social benefits:

- Helping kids and families get to schools, parks, work, shopping, restaurants, and bus stops
- Improving overall health and reducing the incidence of heart disease, high blood pressure, Type 2 diabetes, mental illness, and obesity
- Reducing road congestion and air pollution
- Providing personal financial savings on gas, parking, and car maintenance

However, many parts of Selma were developed without good trails, sidewalks, and bike lanes that make walking and biking safe and comfortable for everyone.

What is an ATP?

The Selma Active Transportation Plan (ATP) will be a comprehensive guide that creates a vision for a network of trails, bike lanes, sidewalks, and other elements to support safe walking and bicycling across the City.

Why we need your help Nobody knows your neighborhood better than you! We need your help to identify where the biggest needs and opportunities are to make walking and biking safer, more enjoyable, and a great way to get around Selma.

Mar alas Go to SelmaATP.fehrandpeers.net Provide your input and stay up-to-date on the plan as it is created.

Later this year there will be also be a workshop and open house where you can learn more and provide input in person, so visit the website to stay involved!



Frankie Olivares 559.891.2200 $folivares@cityofselma.com \ \ a.engel@fehrandpeers.com$











B-4: Interactive Workshop B


B-3: Interative Workshop A

e a sticker next to the purpose t best applies to you for each mode.	Walk	Bike	
	To get to work or school		
	To get my kids to school		
Place Stickers Here	To exercise	•••	
	To run errands at local stores or offices		
	To visit or socialize with friends and neighbor	s	
	To enjoy the outdoors		
	Other		

APPENDIX C: RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS AND POLICIES

The ATP was developed with consideration of the following regional, state, and federal plans, policies, and other documents:

FRESNO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY

The plan's bicycle and pedestrian policies are described extensively in the Non-Motorized Transportation Element. An important component of the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) is a commitment to complete streets policies and implementation measures. The plan seeks to have every transportation project make the street network safer for pedestrians and bicyclists as well as transit users and drivers. Additionally, the Policy Element contains a number of goals, with supporting objectives and policies, relating directly to walking and bicycling. These goals include:

- $\circ~$ An efficient, safe, integrated, multimodal transportation system
- Maximize bicycling and walking through their recognition and integration as valid and healthy transportation modes in transportation planning activities
- Safe, convenient, and continuous routes for bicyclists and pedestrians of all types which interface with and complement a multimodal transportation system
- o Improved bicycle and pedestrian safety through education and enforcement.
- Increased development of the regional bikeways system, related facilities, and pedestrian facilities by maximizing funding opportunities.

The ATP is consistent with the 2014 RTP/SCS. An update to the RTP/SCS is currently being developed.

FRESNO COUNTY REGIONAL BICYCLE AND RECREATIONAL TRAILS MASTER PLAN

The Fresno County Regional Bicycle and Recreational Trails Master Plan, adopted in 2013, provides a comprehensive long-range view for the development of an extensive regional bikeway and recreational trails network that connects cities and unincorporated areas countywide. Connections to the networks in this plan were included in development of the ATP.

FRESNO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY MEASURE C

Measure C is a ½ cent tax applied to retails transactions. Revenues from Measure C go towards transportation improvements in Fresno County until 2027, when it will require a vote of approval for its continuation. The funding allocation programs specifically finance bicycle facilities through several programs:

- Local Transportation Program
 - The Pedestrian/Trails Facilities Subprogram (3.10% of total Measure C funding) provides funding for pedestrian/bicycle trail facilities, signage and striping, Master Plan preparation and updates, and other Program-related facilities and support facilities. Measure C specifies certain design criteria for bicycle paths and multi-purpose trails.
 - The Bicycle Facilities Subprogram (0.90% of total Measure C funding) provides funding for significant improvements to the existing and planned bicycle system. Eligible projects include Class II bike lanes, signage and striping, master plan preparation and updates, and other Program-related facilities and support facilities.
 - The Flexible Funding Category of the Local Allocation Subprogram (14.80% of total Measure C funding) provides funding for any type of transportation project, including bicycle, trail, and pedestrian projects.

- Alternative Transportation Program
 - The Rail Consolidation Subprogram (6.00% of total Measure C funding) specifies that should consolidation of the BNSF tracks occur, the land will revert to the City and County of Fresno for trails, bikeways, and pedestrian facilities.

Additionally, Measure C requires that any new highway, expressway, super-arterial, arterial, or collector constructed or reconstructed with Measure C funds include accommodations for pedestrian and bicycle travel.

FRESNO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TRANSPORTATION NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The Fresno COG Transportation Needs Assessment addressed significant accessibility problems within Fresno County, with a particular focus on disadvantaged communities. The project consisted of two parts. Part 1 analyzed bicycle and trail facilities in Fresno County to identify gaps between local jurisdictions and recommend projects to close those gaps. Part 2 analyzed connectivity between communities within the region and ten major regional and sub-regional destinations, with a focus on disadvantaged communities who may have limited transportation options. Projects were recommended to improve connectivity, including for pedestrians and bicyclists. This ATP includes connections to recommended bikeways included in the needs assessment.

CALTRANS BICYCLE GUIDE FOR DISTRICT 6

The Caltrans Bicycle Guide for District 6 maps and describes bicycle access on Caltrans facilities in Fresno County and neighboring counties. It also includes alternative routes to roads on which bicycle travel is prohibited.

CALIFORNIA STATE BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PLAN

In June 2017, Caltrans finalized Toward an Active California, the State Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. The plan sets targets to greatly increase walking and bicycling in California and identifies objectives and strategies to achieve these targets.

CALIFORNIA GREEN BUILDING CODE

The 2013 California Green Building Standards contain specific requirements for the amount and type of both short-term and long-term bicycle parking.

CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 32 & SENATE BILL 375

Senate Bill (SB) 375 is the implementation legislation for Assembly Bill (AB) 32. AB 32 requires the reduction of greenhouse gases (GHG) by 28 percent by the year 2020 and by 50 percent by the year 2050. Greenhouse gases are emissions — carbon dioxide chief among them — that accumulate in the atmosphere and trap solar energy in a way that can affect global climate patterns. The largest source of these emissions related to human activity is generated by combustion-powered machinery, internal combustion vehicle engines, and equipment used to generate power and heat. SB 375 tasks metropolitan and regional transportation planning agencies with achieving GHG reductions through their Regional Metropolitan Transportation Plans. The reduction of the use of the automobiles for trip making is one method for reducing GHG emissions. This can be achieved through the use of modes other than the automobile such as walking, bicycling, or using transit.

72 CITY OF SELMA ATP

CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 1358

Assembly Bill 1358 is the Complete Streets Act. It calls for the inclusion of all modes (pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and automobile) into the design of roadways. AB 1358 stipulates that roadways should be accessible by all users.

CALIFORNIA SENATE BILL 743

Senate Bill 743 changes how transportation impact analysis is performed as part of compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The new criteria, under development by the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, will promote the development of multimodal transportation networks.

US DOT POLICY STATEMENT ON BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ACCOMMODATION REGULATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In 2010, the United States Department of Transportation (US DOT) issued a policy directive in support of walking and bicycling, encouraging transportation agencies to go beyond minimum standards in fully integrating active transportation into projects. As part of the statement, the US DOT encouraged agencies to adopt similar policy statements in support of walking and bicycling considerations such as:

- o Considering walking and bicycling equal with other transportation modes
- Ensuring availability of transportation choices for people of all ages and abilities
- Going beyond minimum design standards
- o Integrating bicycling and pedestrian accommodations on new, rehabilitated, and limited access bridges
- Collecting data on walking and bicycling trips
- $\circ~$ Setting mode share for walking and bicycling and tracking them over time
- $\circ~$ Removing snow from sidewalks and shared use paths
- o Improving non-motorized facilities during maintenance projects

US AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

The Americans with Disabilities Act Title III is legislation enacted in 1990 that provides thorough civil liberties protections to individuals with disabilities concerning employment, state and local government services, and access to public accommodations, transportation, and telecommunications. Title III of the Act requires places of public accommodation to be accessible and usable to all people, including those with disabilities. While the letter of the law applies to "public accommodations," the spirit of the law applies not only to public agencies but also to all facilities serving the public, whether publicly or privately funded.

APPENDIX D: COST ESTIMATES

Project priorities were developed as discussed in Chapter 5, Implementation. Cost estimates are based on unit costs provided in Chapter 5. All project cost estimates are high-level, and more detailed study of individual project will be required to refine them. Land acquisition costs are not included. Specific costs will vary based on local conditions.

TABLE D-1: BICYCLE PROJECTS

Roadway	Segment	Туре	Facility Length (miles)	Cost`	High Priority
Dinuba Ave	Golden St Blvd to Ditch St	Class II Bikeway (Buffered Bike Lane)	4.80	\$924,000	High
Dinuba Ave	Ditch St to SOI	Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane)	2.26	\$395,500	
*Golden St Blvd/ Front St	SOI to 2nd St	Class I Bikeway (Bike Path)	2.93	\$3,662,500	
*Golden St Blvd	Todd Ave to SOI	Class Bikeway (Bike Path)	0.56	\$700,000	
*Front St/Golden State Blvd	Golden St Blvd to 2nd St	Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane)	2.62	\$458,500	
*Golden St Blvd	2nd St to Todd Ave	Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane)	0.72	\$126,000	
Highland Ave	Dinuba Ave to Nebraska Ave	Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane)	4.04	\$707,000	
Thompson Ave	Dinuba Ave to Rose Ave	Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane)	2.98	\$521,500	High
Wright St	Dinuba Ave to Northhill St	Class III Bikeway (Bike Route)	0.56	\$5,600	
Wright St	Northhill St to Floral Ave	Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane)	1.98	\$346,500	
McCall Ave	Dinuba Ave to 2nd St	Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane)	3.14	\$549,500	High
Mill St	2nd St to Orange Ave	Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane)	0.32	\$56,000	High
Orange Ave	Mill St to Dinuba Ave	Class I Bikeway (Bike Path)	1.82	\$2,275,000	High
Orange Ave	Oak St to Dinuba Ave	Class IV Bikeway (Separated Bikeway Option, 2-Way)	0.92	\$299,000	
Nelson Blvd	Highland Ave to Thompson Ave	Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane)	0.96	\$168,000	
Northhill St	Thompson Ave to McCall Ave	Class III Bikeway (Bike Route)	1.00	\$10,000	
Nelson Blvd	McCall Ave to Orange Ave	Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane)	1.22	\$213,500	
Huntsman Ave/Lee St	Thompson Ave to Barbara St	Class III Bikeway (Bike Route)	1.06	\$10,600	
Barbara St	Wright St to McCall Ave	Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane)	0.50	\$87,500	
Floral Ave	De Wolf Ave to Dockery Ave	Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane)	5.02	\$878,500	

74 CITY OF SELMA ATP

Art Gonzalez Pkwy	Pioneer Village to Highland Ave	Class III Bikeway (Bike Route)	0.22	\$2,200	
Dockery Ave	Floral Ave to Rose Ave	Class III Bikeway (Bike Route)	1.02	\$10,200	
Stillman St	McCall Ave to Dockery Ave	Class III Bikeway (Bike Route)	1.00	\$10,000	
Rose Ave	Highland Ave to Thompson Ave	Class III Bikeway (Bike Route)	1.00	\$10,000	
Rose Ave	Orange Ave to SOI	Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane)	3.52	\$616,000	
Mitchell Ave	Rose Ave to Nebraska Ave	Class III Bikeway (Bike Route)	1.00	\$10,000	
Nebraska Ave	Highland to Thompson	Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane)	1.08	\$189,000	
2nd St	Nebraska Ave to Front St	Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane)	0.98	\$171,500	High
2nd St	Front St to McCall Ave	Class III Bikeway (Bike Route)	0.24	\$2,400	High
Pine St/Thompson Ave	Mitchell Ave to Valley View St	Class III Bikeway (Bike Route)	1.80	\$18,000	
Valley View St	Thompson Ave to McCall Ave	Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane)	0.98	\$171,500	
McCall Ave/3rd St	Blaine Ave to Mill St	Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane)	1.34	\$234,500	
De Wolf Ave/ Huntsman Ave	Floral Avenue to park	Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane)	1.36	\$238,000	
Pedestrian Bridge	Rockwell Pond Regional Park	Class I Bikeway (Bike Path)	0.08	\$900,000	

*Being developed as part of regional priorities

TABLE D-2: SIDEWALK PROJECTS

Planning Zone	Facility Length (feet)	Cost	High Priority
1	5,220	\$235,000	
2	1,950	\$88,000	
3	1,860	\$84,000	
4	6,900	\$311,000	High
5	7,990	\$360,000	High
6	2,790	\$126,000	
7	2,520	\$113,000	
8	3,160	\$142,000	High

TABLE D-3: INTERSECTION PROJECTS

Intersection	Improvement	Cost	High Priority
2nd St/SR 99 Ramps	Improve Crossings	\$1,000,000	High
3rd St/W Front St/McCall Ave	Reconfigure pedestrian crossings at irregular intersections	\$300,000	
3rd St/Grove St/ Mill St/Keith St	Reconfigure pedestrian crossings irregular intersections	\$300,000	High
McCall Ave/Nelson Blvd	Improve Crossings	\$25,000	

*Specific costs will vary based on local conditions. Actual design of the crossing treatment will require additional study and should meet MUTCD standards.

APPENDIX E: FUNDING SOURCES

Table 5-3, Funding Sources, listed many funding programs available for projects discussed in this plan. These programs are further described below.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS

The majority of public funds for bicycle, pedestrian, and trails projects are derived through a core group of federal and state programs. Federal funding is authorized through the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP). The STBGP provides flexible funding that may be used by states and localities for projects on any federal-aid highway. In the past this funding was authorized by the Surface Transportation Program (STP) in the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21). Funding for STBGP is now authorized through the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, with the same goals as STP funding.

FAST continues the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). These federal funds are allocated by Caltrans and described in further detail below.

The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), authorized through MAP-21, provides funding for programs and projects defined as transportation alternatives, including on- and off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities, transit access, mobility, and recreation trails program. This program is now part of the STBGP in FAST instead of a stand-alone program as it was under MAP-21.

The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program also authorizes federal funds, including education programs. FAST maintains the existing CMAQ program from MAP-21.

Federal funds from STBGP, TAP, and CMAQ programs are allocated to Fresno COG. Distribution is allocated either competitively or proportionally according to jurisdiction population.

The HUD-DOT-EPA Interagency Partnership for Sustainable Communities periodically offers funding opportunities. Previous programs have included Urban Circulator grants, TIGER grants, and Sustainable Communities Planning grants.

STATE PROGRAMS

There are a number of statewide funding sources and regionally administered funds.

Active Transportation Program

The Active Transportation Program was created by SB 99 / Assembly Bill 101 to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation such as biking and walking. The program consolidates five existing state funded programs: Transportation Alternatives Program, Recreational Trails program, Safe Routes to Schools, Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program and the Bicycle Transportation Account. It provides a comprehensive program that improves program planning and flexibility and is more efficient than multiple programs. Another benefit is that funds can be directed to multi-year projects to make greater long-term improvements to active transportation.

The Active Transportation Program mixes state and federal funds and provides approximately \$130 million annually, with a focus on implementing active transportation improvements to support the goals of local SB 375 sustainable community strategies. This program is funded from a combination of federal and state funds

from appropriations in the annual state budget act. Forty percent of the funding will go toward metropolitan planning organizations in urban areas with populations greater than 200,000. Ten percent of the funds go to small urban and rural regions. The remaining funds will go to the California Transportation Commission for statewide projects. The ATP ensures that disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program by requiring that a minimum of 25% of funds be distributed to disadvantaged communities.

In order to maximize the effectiveness of program funds and to encourage the aggregation of small projects into a comprehensive bundle of projects, the minimum request for statewide Active Transportation Program funds that will be considered is \$250,000. This minimum does not apply to non-infrastructure projects, Safe Routes to Schools projects, and recreational trails projects.

Project types allowed under the ATP include: new bikeways serving major transportation corridors, new bikeways to improve bicycle commuting options, bicycle parking at transit and employment centers, traffic control devices to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety, improving and maintaining safety on existing bikeways, recreational facilities, Safe Routes to School projects, Safe Routes To Transit projects, education programs, and other improvements to bicycle-transit connections and urban environments.

For a project to contribute toward the Safe Routes to School funding requirement, the project must directly increase safety and convenience for public school students to walk and/or bike to school. Safe Routes to Schools infrastructure projects must be located within two miles of a public school or within the vicinity of a public school bus stop. Other than traffic education and enforcement activities, non-infrastructure projects do not have a location restriction.

Highway Safety Improvement Program

Caltrans administers the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) specified as part of the FAST Act. This program uses cost-benefit ratios as a primary factor in the awarding of applications. Because the program focuses on roadway safety, projects with documented collision history – through frequency of collision but particularly collision severity – are typically ranked higher. Roadways with documented bicycle and pedestrian collision history may be well qualified for HSIP applications, particularly since many of the proposed projects would improve bicyclist and pedestrian safety at a lower cost than many of the highway projects also eligible under this funding source.

While this funding source is often used for major roadway improvement projects, installation of traffic signals, and most other cost-intensive projects, funding has routinely been awarded to bicycle and pedestrian projects. Successful projects have included:

- o Median refuges and curb extensions
- $\circ~$ Curb, gutter, and sidewalk
- Paved shoulders
- $\circ~$ Upgraded traffic signals with pedestrian countdown signals and pedestrian-scale lighting
- Bicycle lane striping
- o Crosswalk striping
- $\circ~$ In-pavement flashers and rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFB) at crossings

Many of these projects were applied for as standalone bicycle and pedestrian improvement projects; some bicycle and pedestrian improvements were included with a broader package of roadway improvement projects.

78 CITY OF SELMA ATP

More information is available online at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/hsip.htm.

Other Statewide Funding Programs

Caltrans Transportation Planning Grants are available to jurisdictions and can be used for planning or feasibility studies. The Division will award approximately \$9.8 million in funding through two grant programs for Fiscal Year 2016-17. The maximum funding available per project is \$500,000.

Limited amounts (2%) from the Local Transportation Fund (LTF), which is part of the Transportation Development Act (TDA) and derived from a ¼ cent of the general sales tax collected statewide, can be used for bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Article 3 funds for planning and construction of pedestrian and bicycle facilities are administered locally through Fresno COG and are allocated to member agencies based on population and taxable sales.

The California State Parks administers the state's Recreational Trails Program (RTP). The RTP provides funds annually for recreational trails and trails-related projects. Cities are eligible applicants for the annual funding (\$8.4 million in 2015). The program requires an applicant match of 12 percent of the total project cost.

The National Park Service and California State Parks administer the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCP). The LWCF Program provides matching grants to states and local governments for the acquisition and development of public outdoor recreation areas and facilities. Grants require a 50 percent local match.

The Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program is administered by the Strategic Growth Council. AHSC funds can be used for projects which demonstrate VMT reduction through fewer or shorter vehicle trips or mode shift to transit use, bicycling or walking within areas lacking high quality transit, with an emphasis on providing disadvantaged community benefits. The project area must be served by at least one transit stop. More information is available at https://www.sgc.ca.gov/s_ahscprogram.php.

The Office of Traffic Safety provides grants for safety outreach to schools and community groups. More information is available at http://ots.ca.gov/Grants/.

Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)

The Surface Transportation Program (STP) block grant provides MAP-21 and FAST funding for transportation projects, including pedestrian and bicycle projects (see above discussion about federal programs for details). This program is administered by Fresno COG, which can prioritize projects for RSTP funding.

Fresno COG RSTP program information: http://www.fresnocog.org/regional-surface-transportation-program.

FRESNO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (FCTA) MEASURE C

Measure C is a half-cent sales tax aimed at improving the overall quality of Fresno County's transportation system. The Local Transportation Program can be used on pedestrian and bicycle facilities and trails. Funding may also be used for maintenance, with certain conditions. Funding is allocated to cities and the county based on population.

SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT (SJVAPCD) BIKEWAY INCENTIVE PROGRAM

SJVAPCD provides funds to increase commuter bicycle accessibility and utilization as an alternative transportation measure. Funds may be used for Class I, II, or III bikeways in amounts up to \$150,000 (depending on bikeway type).

More information is available online: http://valleyair.org/grants/bikepaths.htm.

APPENDIX F: CITY RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE PLAN

RESOLUTION NO. 2018 – 28 R

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SELMA APPROVING THE SELMA TRANSPORTATION PLAN

WHEREAS, the Selma Active Transportation Plan complies with the California Transportation Commission 2017 Active Transportation Program Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, the Selma Active Transportation Plan is in compliance with the 2014 Fresno Council of Governments Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy; and

WHEREAS, the Selma Active Transportation Plan is an implementation tool to the Selma General Plan Circulation Element; and

WHEREAS, the Selma Active Transportation Plan promotes walking and biking for transportation and recreation by all members of the community by creating a connected and complete network of trails, walkways, and bikeways that provides safe, convenient, and enjoyable connections to key destinations and neighborhoods in Selma; and

WHEREAS, the Selma Active Transportation Plan promotes pedestrian and bicyclist safety and collision reduction; and

WHEREAS, the Selma Active Transportation Plan will improve the accessibility of funding for pedestrian and bicycle related-related improvements in Selma; and

WHEREAS, approval of the Selma Active Transportation Plan meets eligibility requirements for Active Transportation Program funding.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Selma hereby approves the Selma Active Transportation Plan.

I, Reyna Rivera, City Clerk of the City of Selma, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly approved at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Selma on the 2nd day of April, 2018, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES:5NOES:0ABSTAIN:0ABSENT:0

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Montijo, Derr, Franco, Robertson, Avalos COUNCIL MEMBERS: None COUNCIL MEMBERS: None COUNCIL MEMBERS: None

Attest:

n morn

In Cake

Jim Avalos Mayor of the City of Selma

Reyna Rivera City Clerk