

## Existing Streets and Roads

Writer	Comments
Kay Bertken, League of Women Voters	<p>Be explicit in the local streets narrative referencing the idea of complete streets. This is the concept behind integrating active transportation with street paving under this funding category.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· In the potential projects list under the local streets heading, please include tree planting for heat abatement and shade. It is mentioned as landscaping in a narrative paragraph but not in the list.</li> <li>· Prioritize street-calming measures to streets with high numbers of traffic/pedestrian/bicycle accidents</li> <li>· Prioritize tree planting on streets identified by the COG study.</li> <li>· To maximize the use of funds and where feasible, integrate sidewalk, bike lane, landscaping and/or internet cabling in street paving work.</li> </ul>
Joby Jones, Pastor, Stop the Violence Fresno	<p>“Measure C funds shall be allocated using an equity-first framework that prioritizes project areas demonstrating persistent, documented need within disadvantaged neighborhoods and communities. Need shall be defined through objective, publicly verifiable metrics—including but not limited to CalEnviroScreen scores, Healthy Places Index data, collision and safety data, transit access gaps, and documented histories of underinvestment. Jurisdictions must apply these criteria consistently across all project submissions. Allocation decisions shall be accompanied by an annual Equity Impact Report detailing how funds were prioritized, which communities benefitted, and how outcomes align with the established metrics. This process shall ensure that investments are proportionate to need, transparent to the public, insulated from political influence, and structured to correct historic disparities rather than reproduce them.”</p> <p>“For too long, some neighborhoods in our county have carried the weight of neglect—broken streets, unsafe crossings, poor transit access, and infrastructure that never seems to reach their side of town. Measure C’s equity commitment is simple: the communities with the greatest need should get the greatest attention. This isn’t about taking from one neighborhood to give to another; it’s about finally investing where the damage has been the deepest. By using real data, transparent reporting, and community accountability, we ensure every dollar goes where it can do the most good. Equity isn’t a slogan—it’s a promise that the people who’ve been overlooked the longest will no longer be last in line.”</p>
Dr. Esmeralda Diaz, Organización La Panchas	<p>I have a suggestion for the Vision and Priorities section on page 2. Under Fix What Matters Most, I recommend including the phrase “worst of the worst” (as evidenced by the Triennial PCS) to emphasize the greatest areas of need in our communities.</p>
Artie Padilla, CVCF	<p>CVCF agrees with including 'Transit Oriented Development' as an eligible project under Local Streets and Roads within the Implementation Guidelines. We request that the following language be added: "A local jurisdiction may use 'Local Streets and Roads' funding to support infrastructure and other costs associated with developing mixed-use housing in zone districts that allow a mix of uses and include multi-family housing within existing neighborhoods. Each jurisdiction shall ensure that at least 20% of units within the project are restricted to extremely low, very-low, and low-income units."</p>
Scott Mozier, City of Fresno	<p>1. Page 10, “Definitions”, “Reconstruction” should read “includes any milling &amp; overlay or pavement structural section replacement (i.e. full reconstruction, cold-in-place recycling, full depth reclamation), or widening of the roadway, if the widening is necessary... [“sealing” should be removed from the “Reconstruction” definition]</p>

2. Page 13, section 8, “Complete Street features”: At the end of the first sentence (“...shall include ‘Complete Street’ features”), add the following: “...where feasible, unless the project qualifies for an exception as noted in this section.” At the end of paragraph 8, add a new sentence: “Exceptions to the Complete Street feature requirements may be made by the agency for the following reasons: (a) The street to be repaved has developable parcels within the project limits, which will be required to construct curb, gutter and sidewalk frontage improvements at time of development; (b) The complete street features would cost more than 25% of the street repaving; (c) Acquiring the necessary right-of-way to construct the complete street features would either result in a full acquisition or require eminent domain to obtain; (d) The planned complete street features have generated significant community opposition at a public meeting.
3. Page 17: “Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Maintenance” – The “Ongoing maintenance” list should be expanded to include: “pavement maintenance, re-striping, signage (install and replace), watering and electricity bills”. These four items need to be moved from the “does not include” list to the “including” list.
4. Page 14, paragraph 6, add “traffic signal timing, traffic operations centers and Intelligent Transportation System components”.
5. Pages 14-15, “Examples of eligible projects/phases:”, 11<sup>th</sup> bullet should be expanded to state: “Labor, materials, vehicles and equipment for day labor”. Add a new bullet: “Vehicles and equipment for engineers, surveyors and inspectors.”

Paul Armindariz, City of  
Clovis

Any hiring preference needs to be in compliance with the Public Contract Code and be compatible with federal and state funding requirements, since agencies often use Measure C funds as a match.

Tina Sumner, Bike Fresno

Page 6 - First paragraph Performance Indicators and Measurements: We do not understand the intent of the second sentence of this paragraph. Is this going to be part of the SIP process? Where do these subcommittees come from?

Page 7 - First sentence word change: "measured by engineers though" should be changed to "**by** engineers **using** a Pavement Management System".

Page 7 - Second Paragraph second line word change per Street and Highways Code 890.4: Class 1 (trails) to Class 1 (**shared use paths**).

Page 7 - Second Paragraph second line word change per Street and Highways Code 890.4: Class 4 (protected bike lanes) to Class 4 (**Cycle Tracks**).

Page 7 - Second Paragraph second line word change "Safe Routes to School & access" to "Safe Routes to School **Program and** access".

Page 7 - When saying Mixed-Use Development do you mean **Transit Oriented Development**? Use of Mixed-Use Development goes on throughout the document with no explanation of what mixed use has to do with the use of transit funds. Whereas Transit Oriented Development clearly relates to the use of transportation funds.

Page 8 - Purpose Paragraph first bullet point: add expressways. Part of Herndon Avenue is an expressway.

Page 8 - Purpose Paragraph second bullet change per Street and Highways Code 890.4: "new bike lanes" to "new **shared use paths, cycle tracks or trails**".

Nathan Vosburg, Mayor,  
City of Coalinga

**1. The draft plan requires that any new or reconstructed road using Measure C funds must include sidewalks AND protected bike lanes on both sides, regardless of context.**

Replace the mandate with a **context-sensitive design** requirement.

Allow each city to determine whether a sidewalk or bike facility is needed based on:

Traffic volume

Land use

Right-of-way constraints

Cost-effectiveness

Measured bike/ped demand

**Proposed Amendment Language**

“For small cities under 35,000 population, Complete Streets elements (sidewalks, bike lanes, etc.) shall be based on context-sensitive design and local adopted plans, rather than mandated on all new or reconstructed roads.”

**2. Modify or Remove the “150-Mile Bike Lane Requirement” and Assign Proportional Targets**

**Recommended Fix**

Shift from a strict mileage mandate to:

A percentage of projects including active transportation **OR**

Allowing small cities to meet the requirement through **maintenance**, not just new construction

The guidelines already allow 20% to be maintained, but this is still unrealistic for rural communities.

**Proposed Amendment Language**

“Small cities may meet the bike/trail mileage requirement through maintenance, striping, shared-use paths, Safe Routes to School projects, or by documenting that construction is infeasible due to right-of-way or cost constraints.”

**3. Remove the 5% Cap on Road Expansion OR Create Small-City Exceptions**

**Recommended Fix**

Create a small-city exemption for:

Safety-driven widening

Industrial/farm-to-market routes

Emergency access projects

School congestion mitigation

New housing developments

**Proposed Amendment Language**

“Small cities may use up to 20% of Local Streets & Roads funds for safety-oriented widening, turn lanes, shoulders, or industrial access roads.”

**4. Remove the “Must Reduce VMT” Requirement for Local Road Projects**

**Recommended Fix**

Exempt rural cities (<35,000 population) from VMT-reduction scoring for Local Streets & Roads.

**Proposed Amendment Language**

“Rural cities are exempt from VMT-reduction requirements due to geographic and economic conditions.”

**5. Remove Climate Mandates That Increase Construction Costs Unnecessarily**

**Recommended Fix**

Make climate requirements optional for small cities.

**Proposed Amendment Language**

“Climate-resiliency elements are encouraged but not required for small-city projects unless supported by local plans or funding availability.”

**6. Remove or Relax the “Five Safe Routes to School Projects Per Year” Requirement**

**Recommended Fix**

Allow small cities to:

Complete SRTS projects every 3–5 years **OR**

Meet requirements regionally as a group

Count crosswalks, striping, lighting, ADA ramps, and signage toward SRTS compliance

**Proposed Amendment Language**

“SRTS compliance for small cities may be met on a 3–5-year cycle or through regional collaboration.”

**8. Give Small Cities Flexibility in Meeting the PCI 70 Requirement**

**Recommended Fix**

Allow small cities to:

Reach PCI 70 over a **longer timeline**

Use alternative compliance pathways (safety, patching, ADA improvements)

Prioritize high-traffic routes rather than every residential street

**Proposed Amendment Language**

“For cities under 25,000 population, PCI compliance may be achieved over an extended timeline, prioritizing arterials and collectors before neighborhood streets.”

**9. Create a Small-City Exemption from the Sidewalk + Protected Bike Lane Mandate on Both Sides of New or Reconstructed Roads**

**Recommended Fix**

Create an **exemption** so small cities can apply context-sensitive design instead of automatic Complete Streets mandates.

The exemption should allow small cities to determine sidewalks/bike lanes based on:

Local circulation patterns

ROW width and geography

Cost and feasibility

Safety conditions

Community demand

Local Active Transportation Plans

Also remove the requirement for **protected** or **separated** bike lanes unless specifically justified by the jurisdiction.

**Proposed Amendment Language**

“Cities with a population under 35,000 shall be exempt from mandatory requirements for sidewalks and bicycle facilities on both sides of new or reconstructed roads. Complete Streets elements—including sidewalks and bicycle facilities—shall be based on context-sensitive design, right-of-way constraints, safety considerations, and locally adopted transportation plans. Protected or separated bicycle lanes shall not be required in small cities unless locally determined to be feasible and necessary.”

Paul Nerland, County of  
Fresno

✓ Increase the Local Neighborhood Streets and Roads allocation from 65% to 70%. It remains clear in every survey that fixing and maintaining existing streets, roads and highways has been and remains the highest priority to Fresno County residents and voters.

## Existing Streets and Roads

- ✓ The Guidelines require Fresno County to set aside \$5 million annually for unincorporated disadvantaged communities. Although this provision is well-intentioned; it could harm projects in those communities unless modified. The Guidelines need to be revised and clarified that the \$5 million is a total project cost and not just contract construction cost and it includes all sources of funding (not just Measure C as Measure C funds are leverage against other grants). Furthermore, since most projects take approximately 5 years to deliver, the \$5 million annual expenditure in unincorporated disadvantage communities should be an average over a 5-year review period. In some years, the County may spend over \$5M and in some years under.
- ✓ The Guidelines need to acknowledge that continued maintenance of roads is required even after achieving the 70 PCI and that future funding for this category should be left to the local agency to decide and prioritize. Our local Elected leaders are accountable to the voters and should be empowered to make decisions that are responsive to the highest priorities.
- ✓ Remove reference from the Guidelines to "Vehicle Miles Traveled" and any other terms/items that are already required to be addressed by the cities or county as part of their discretionary and/or environmental review process. There is no need to add layers of requirements that are duplicative.

Paul Armendariz, City of  
Clovis

Requirements for reducing VMT and residents having increased access to jobs, services, school, housing via pedestrian, bike facilities and public transit services should be part of overall goals, not metrics.

Why not maintain the current system of PCS maintenance (instead of requiring a regional version)?

### **Under Required Metrics**

Jeffery Martin, County of  
Fresno

"The current countywide PCI is approximately 65 and raising it to a PCI of 70 will cost approximately \$5.4 billion over 10 years." - Just above.  
Over ten years, this measure will bring in roughly \$1.4b - with roughly \$800m allocated to road maintenance and misc. carveouts from that for active transportation. Gas tax allocations are inadequate to close the resultant gap (hence the continually increasing deferred maintenance costs). These things combine to ensure this metric will be unmet without a substantial additional dollar injection.

Nicole Zieba, City of  
Reedley

Suggested added language (underlined):

"2. The goal for the average Pavement Condition Index for jurisdictions under 50,000 should be 70, but minimally should increase by 50% over the life of the Measure."

\*New developments are excluded from using Measure C funds, which means that after 30 years, they may be in more decayed stages than other parts of the city. These should not be in the PCI calculation at any point in the process then, if they cannot be maintained using Measure C. However, suggest language stating that "Measure C may not be used on any roads in any developments that were not in existence at the time of Measure C passage until at least 15 years after the development has been opened." (Page 13, Item 5)

\*\*It is going to take decades for some cities to get to 70, so what is the date that the average of 70 must be met?

It should be clearly stated that alleys, while an eligible Measure C use, should not be included in the PCI calculation.

Some cities, like San Joaquin, are at a 35. It would take a tremendous amount of Measure C money to get them to 70, probably more than they will receive through the Measure. Perhaps a notation that cities under 50,000 should have a goal of increasing their PCI percentage rather than a hard and fast 70.

## Existing Streets and Roads

Paul Armendariz, City of  
Clovis

(The 65 PCI) is too restrictive. This should be an average, not for every street.

Elizabeth Cabrera, City of  
San Joaquin

San Joaquin was tied for lowest PCI along with Orange Cove at 36. This has been a result of decades of not receiving adequate resources to maintain our City roads. Although the current plan proposed by Measure C Steering Committee includes a significant increase in funds for communities like us I do not feel confident we can make such a significant increase and maintain for 30 years a PCI of 70 in addition to meeting other requirements outlined for ATP.

- Setting a goal to meet, measured by a percentage seems more appropriate than setting the same 70 PCI for all Cities as some are starting as high as 50 or 60 PCI.

Jeffery Martin, County of  
Fresno

**Under the metric: "Maintain and build 150 miles of new bike lanes (Class I or Class IV) and trails by 2057, as identified by the Master Plan for each jurisdiction."**

This seems vague and underdeveloped. Agency responsibilities seem meshed. Point 'c' seems mostly disconnected / triggered by vague conditions.

Nicole Zieba, City of  
Reedley

Cities under 50,000 should have a goal of expanding their trail system, but should not have a mandated number, as there is no ability for the City to guarantee it can acquire right-of-way from private property owners except through the use of eminent domain, which is strongly discouraged. Bigger cities may have the ability to reroute trails and avoid costly pieces of land, but small cities simply do not have the geographic benefit of being large enough to do that. Also, smaller cities cannot apply for many grants or are not as competitive as larger cities in these grants, as they do not have the required match dollars and staffing capacity to complete these projects at the pace that is expected, or are not as competitive due to smaller mileage of segments.

Smaller cities do not have capacity to do trail projects annually, and it may take years and a lot of \$\$\$ to acquire right-of-way, relocate PG&E and other utilities that the City does not control, and acquire other funds to possibly extend water, sewer, and storm drain mains. The goal is good, but a mandate is not.

Suggested language:

b. The goal for the remaining cities and the County is 45 miles, or at least a 50% increase in the miles of existing trails. Priority in funding competitive trail projects for cities under 50,000 will be given to projects that demonstrate the ability to connect existing trails, expand trail systems, and provide shade through trees and other means for pedestrian areas along the trail.

Mona Cummings, Tree  
Fresno

### **Complete Rewrite:**

Maintain a jurisdiction's Class I, II and IV facilities to ensure both safety and comfort.

In addition, build 90 miles of new Class I and 60 miles of new Class IV facilities in the Fresno and Clovis urban area by 2057.

Once a city's population exceeds 50,000, it will be subject to similar proportional requirements regarding Class I and Class IV facilities.

(Note: Does not include "maintain" as part of the "new build" requirements.)

### **Complete Rewrite:**

The requirement of new Class I and Class IV facilities will be limited to the urban areas of Fresno and Clovis (including County islands) until any remaining city's population exceeds 50,000.

**Complete Rewrite:**

The remaining cities shall be responsible for building a comparable number of miles of Class I and Class IV standards once their population exceeds 50,000.

**Complete Rewrite:**

Every 10 years of the Measure, the cities of Fresno and Clovis, as well as the County of Fresno, will be responsible for building their proportional amount in the urban areas of Fresno and Clovis (based on the square miles each jurisdiction is responsible for) of at least: 30 miles of new Class I facilities and 20 miles of new Class IV facilities.

Safe Routes to Schools projects that include new Class I or Class IV facilities may be counted toward satisfying this requirement.

**Key deletion:** "Up to 20% of this requirement may be met by routine maintenance."

**Suggested language:** Rural trails do not qualify for Class I funding under Measure C. Rural trails will generally be located in areas outside of the incorporated cities. Rural trails will typically be recreational in nature.

**Complete Rewrite:**

Funding for newly built Class I and Class IV requirements may also be met through a combination of other State, Federal and local funding sources, aside from Measure C. Safe Routes to Schools projects that include Class I or Class IV facilities may be counted toward satisfying the Class I and Class IV requirements.

Paul Armendariz, City of  
Clovis

What's the rationale behind the 150-mile target? This should also include Class II.

Does this include all trails? Can unimproved trails along canal banks be included?

New bike and trail facilities as shown in the Master Plan will largely be constructed by new development and is tied to when/if that development occurs.

What are the respective shares (of the 105 miles) for Fresno and Clovis? How was this determined?

What is the basis for the 20% (maintenance) figure? Routine maintenance should be defined.

Tina Sumner, Bike Fresno

An overall comment is that the 150 mile requirement is quite low as it is only five miles a year for the entire county. It is our recommendation that the requirement be increased to 225 miles or more. The increased requirement is even more important given that the required miles can be met with non-construction activities.

Page 8 - Required Metrics Paragraph number 1: add expressways.

Page 8 - Required Metrics Paragraph number 2: change per Street and Highways Code 890.4: "new bike lanes" to "new **shared use paths, cycle tracks or trails**".

Page 8 - Required Metrics Paragraph letter C: at least 50 miles of trails should read at least 50 miles of **new shared use paths, cycle tracks or trails**. This should be consistent with language as stated above. Regarding the language "target is not reached in any given year" this does not make sense as it has never been stated what the annual target is.

Page 9 - Required Metrics number 3: change "improved walkability, safety" to improved walkability, **bikeability**, safety".

Page 10 - Active Transportation Plan Requirements Paragraph second checkmark: change "bike lanes" to "**bikeways**".

Elizabeth Cabrera, City of San Joaquin	<p>San Joaquin General Plan currently includes a City wide multipurpose trail around the perimeter of the City that will be constructed in phases. However, only two phases have been constructed. Currently phase three is halted as we have run into issues acquiring the right of way from the property owner. Property owner has refused to sell us the area needed and his only option for us is to buy out his entire 40+ acre property. Cities under 50,000 should have a goal of expanding their trail system, but should not have a mandated number, as there is no ability for the City to guarantee it can acquire right-of-way from private property owners except through the use of eminent domain, which is strongly discouraged. Also, smaller cities cannot apply for many grants or are not as competitive as larger cities in these grants, as they do not have the required match dollars and staffing capacity to complete these projects at the pace that is expected, or are not as competitive due to smaller mileage of segments.</p> <p>Smaller cities do not have capacity to do trail projects annually, and it may take years and a lot of money to acquire right-of-way, relocate PG&amp;E and other utilities that the City does not control, and acquire other funds to possibly extend water, sewer, and storm drain mains.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The goal for the remaining cities and the County is 45 miles, or at least a 50% increase in the miles of existing trails. Priority in funding competitive trail projects for cities under 50,000 will be given to projects that demonstrate the ability to connect existing trails, expand trail systems, and provide shade through trees and other means for pedestrian areas along the trail.</li> </ul>
Susana Ledesma Camacho, City of Orange Cove	<p><b>1. "The average Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for each jurisdiction will be 70, including arterials, collectors, and neighborhood streets."</b></p> <p>BY WHEN WILL THIS NEED TO BE MET? BY THE END OF THE 30 YEAR PLAN? BY THE 10-YEAR MARK? SUGGESTION TO INCLUDE A TIMEFRAME.</p> <p><b>a. "By year 11, at least 50 miles of trails must be completed if the target is not reached on any given year"</b></p> <p>Please elaborate. Will this be collectively, just urban areas, or proportional?</p>
Jeffery Martin, County of Fresno	<p><b>Under Eligible Agencies/Formula Split</b></p> <p>The County maintains more than half of the road miles in our area. The regional road network allows goods and people to transit between the cities, between many of the largest businesses in the area, and even through and within the islands. The more rural roads also tend to take heavier-duty traffic that require costlier repair options.</p> <p>The inevitable combined impact of the 80/20 shift, almost eliminating the regional road allocation, complete street requirements, preventing reasonable allocations for capacity expansions, and shifting substantial additional funding to the barely used transit systems, would be costlier repair/reconstruction options and a continually deteriorating road network outside of short distances from the urban core and suburban outlier cities.</p>
Erin Haagenson, County of Fresno	<p>75/25 split as in the current measure would be preferred.</p>
Jeffrey Martin, County of Fresno	<p><b>Under Other Requirements "No more than 5% can be spent on road expansion or capacity projects"</b></p> <p>This would limit annual capacity expansion projects to ~\$1m/year. For the County's regional connectors, that amounts to virtually nothing (maybe an occasional passing lane?). It may take 30 years to complete a single decent-sized project between two cities.</p>
Paul Armendariz, City of Clovis	<p>How was the 5% derived? Seems too restrictive for gap projects.</p> <p>Recommended language: The Measure encourages limiting spending on road expansion or capacity-enhancing projects; however, such projects remain eligible for funding when they demonstrate significant safety, mobility, or economic benefits. Eligible projects include: a. Dedicated transit lanes b. Dedicated and protected bike lanes or trails c. Safety-motivated turn lanes or intersection improvements d. New or reconstructed roads funded by the Measure should include sidewalks and bike lanes on both sides, where feasible</p>



Existing Streets and Roads

Susana Ledesma  
Camacho, City of Orange  
Cove

"No more than 5% can be spent on road expansion or capacity projects"  
Elaborate on what the 5% is.  
i.e.: 5% of the allocation of Measure C dollars by jurisdiction....

Paul Armendariz, City of  
Clovis

Suggest deleting (provision disallowing widening under reconstruction). Some reconstruction projects may require a need to complete an unwidened section.  
Delete section addressing roadway restriping to repurpose existing travel lanes for bicycle facilities as long as it doesn't increase overall paved width.  
Rural trails definition should include unimproved pathways along waterways.  
Requirement in Metro area that Class I facilities shall be built so that at-grade crossings are limited to one every one-half mile at signalized intersections are too restrictive. These should be designed and built as is needed for respective jurisdictions.  
Language prohibiting funds to be used to support new growth areas or new town development not already in existence is too restrictive. Measure C funds should be allowed to be used to maintain improvements constructed after passage of the Measure.

Elizabeth Cabrera, City of  
San Joaquin

San Joaquin currently has a housing plan for the next five years that would significantly increase the population and roof tops by at least 40% of current. With new housing developments being excluded from using Measure C funds, we could be faced with a future problem of decayed streets in significant parts of the city. These should not be in the PCI calculation at any point in the process if they cannot be maintained using Measure C.  
• However, suggest language stating that "Measure C may not be used on any roads in any developments that were not in existence at the time of Measure C passage until at least 15 years after the development has been opened." (Page 13, Item 5)

**Under Other Requirements "d. New roads constructed or reconstructed in whole or in part with Measure funds shall include sidewalks and protected bike lanes on both sides of the road for use by pedestrians and cyclists"**

Jeffery Martin, County of  
Fresno

Sidewalks and protected bike lanes are an impractical and expensive requirement in all non-urbanized settings, owing to right of way concerns and project lengths.

Susana Ledesma  
Camacho, City of Orange  
Cove

**"New roads constructed or reconstructed in whole or in part with Measure funds shall include sidewalks and protected bike lanes on both sides of the road for use by pedestrians and cyclists "**

This will not always be feasible or appropriate. Some projects may have ROW acquisition issues, grading issues, etc. that may overburden a project.  
Suggestion to include verbiage that it will be recommended but not a must:  
..., if feasible as determined by the (Jurisdiction/FCTA).  
Elaborate on reconstruction. What will differentiate maintenance measures from reconstruction?

**Under Other Requirements: "The County of Fresno is annually required to spend a minimum of \$5 million per year of its local allocation in identified Disadvantaged Unincorporated Communities as defined by Government Code 65302.10.**

Erin Haagenson, County of  
Fresno

Could be expressed either as an annual percentage or over the life of the measure. Also if transportation grants from other sources for disadvantaged communities were able to count towards this requirement (leveraging) it could incentivize DUC investments.

**Under Other Requirements: 8. All streets and roads constructed or improved in whole or in part with Measure C funds shall include “Complete Street” features.**

Jeffery Martin, County of Fresno	Full complete streets components don’t make sense outside of population centers. Curbs, gutters, sidewalks, bike lanes and drainage facilities are not reasonable or cost effective options in most rural areas, where a maintained shoulder and proper slope can provide most of the same operational benefits.
Nicole Zieba, City of Reedley	Item 4, suggested language (underlined) – Projects funded in part of entirely with Measure revenues must incorporate design and implementation elements that address heat, increased precipitation and flooding, wildfire management, and air quality improvement. Depending upon the project, this may include: a. <u>Where feasible, adding and maintaining shade trees along pedestrian walkways, bike lanes, and trails in public right-of-way. All projects shall show an analysis of which elements have been considered for each project. If found not to be feasible to include trees or shade canopy elements, projects shall be required to document why elements were not included.</u>
Erin Haagenson, County of Fresno	<b>Under Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Maintenance: "Ongoing maintenance shall NOT include paying for the cost of water or electricity"</b> For the County, some allowance should be made to pay for these ongoing costs, even if it was a very limited percentage of an allocation; as lack of funding for ongoing costs may prevent them from being installed, especially in unincorporated areas.
Paul Armendariz, City of Clovis	Suggest deleting "resurfacing of asphalt except for spot repairs" and "paying for cost of water and electricity." If new or replacement signage is needed along an existing Bike and Ped Facility, Measure C should be available to fund those improvements
Tina Sumner, Bike Fresno	Page 10 - Active Transportation Plan Requirements Paragraph second checkmark: change "bike lanes" to " <b>bikeways</b> ". Page 10 Performance Indicators Paragraph: dots 11 and 12 change " miles of bike lanes" to "miles of <b>bikeways</b> ".  Page 11 Program Implementation Paragraph definitions: drop the second and third arrows regarding rural trails as we concur with Mr. Westerlund’s comments that Measure C is intended to fund transportation projects not recreational projects; however, Class 1 bikeways in rural areas that link rural communities and/or cities should be built in accordance with the California Highway Design Manual Chapter 1000 as defined in the following arrow.  Page 12 Program Implementation Other Requirements Paragraph item 3b: change "protected bike lane" to " <b>cycle tracks</b> " and change "trails" to " <b>shared use paths</b> ". Page 12 Program Implementation Other Requirements Paragraph item 3d: change "shall include sidewalks and protected bike lanes" to " <b>shall include sidewalks and either bike lanes or cycle tracks</b> ". Page 14 Paragraph Eligible Projects Item 7: after "traffic calming" in the second line there should be a comma instead of a parenthesis. You can eliminate the words "protected bike lanes" because bikeways include protected bike lanes. Page 15 Paragraph Eligible Projects Active Transportation item 3: why have expressways been dropped? It is recommended that expressways be included. As stated above Herndon Avenue is an expressway. Expressway corridors need to have bicycle and pedestrian accommodations for through travel for these mode of transportation.  Page 15 Paragraph Eligible Projects Active Transportation item 3: change "shall include sidewalks, paths" to "shall include sidewalks, <b>bikeways</b> , paths". Also add to the end of Item 3: "Expressways constructed in an urban area can meet this requirement by including a sidewalk, bikeway, path, walkways or equivalent facility on one side of the roadway." This relates to construction or reconstruction on Herndon Avenue.

Page 15 Paragraph Eligible Projects Active Transportation item 6: Why was expressway dropped? The four foot shoulder referred to in the second sentence would not be wide enough for a cycle track. This same language is used in the last sentence on the page. Cycle track should be dropped. In the third sentence reading "superarterial or collector" should read "**super-arterial, arterial or collector**".

Elizabeth Cabrera, City of San Joaquin      Comment: Strike entire section on "Ongoing Maintenance does not include". All of the items listed in that section should be eligible expenses for maintaining bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Susana Ledezma Camacho, City of Orange Cove      **1. "Projects funded in part or entirely with Measure revenues must incorporate design and implementation elements that address heat, increased precipitation and flooding, wildfire management, and improve air quality. This includes: ..."**

Like the previous point. Implementation of this as a "must" will not always be feasible. Adding trees and corresponding maintenance is expensive and can significantly overbudget a project.

Suggestion to include verbiage that this is recommended when applicable : "...if feasible as determined by the (Jurisdiction/FCTA). "

Elizabeth Cabrera, City of San Joaquin      Suggested Language-Where feasible, adding and maintaining shade trees along pedestrian walkways, bike lanes, and trails in public right-of-way. All projects shall show an analysis of which elements have been considered for each project. If found not to be feasible to include trees or shade canopy elements, projects shall be required to document why elements were not included.

**Under Active Transportation**

Paul Armendariz, City of Clovis      The determination of appropriate bicycle accommodations must rest with the traffic engineer's professional review. A blanket requirement for a 4-foot striped shoulder may not align with site-specific safety, operational, or cost considerations. Engineering judgment ensures that bicycle facilities are provided where they enhance safety and mobility.

**Under Program Management**

Susana Ledezma Camacho City of Orange Cove      **"In addition, two 10-year review periods (in 2037 and 2047) will be incorporated into the Measure's timeline, with a robust public outreach process and notification requirements to determine whether the established metrics are meeting their intended goals and whether new transportation options should be included or older ones removed. "**

Verbiage used can be interpreted as limiting to including and removing only. Suggestion to change to: "...modified."

**Under Program Implementation**

Susana Ledezma Camacho City of Orange Cove      **"Every three years there will be a compliance evaluation where jurisdictions must show how they have spent their Existing Neighborhood Streets and Roads Repair and Maintenance Program funds. Agencies, however, will be allowed to accumulate funds for up to six years if needed for match purposes or for a large project."**

Smaller Cities will be affected by this. They will need to account for time spent on RFP finding consultants, funds, staffing, ROW acquisitions, design challenges, etc. Each project will face their own challenges that may take +4 years rather than 3 years. Suggestion to reword the last sentence to: Agencies, however, will be allowed to accumulate funds for up to six years, or any time extension as approved by the FCTA, if needed for match purposes or for a large projects.

**Under Safe Routes to Schools**

Existing Streets and Roads

Susana Ledezma Camacho  
City of Orange Cove     **"Funds may be used to reach compliance with AB 382, lowering speed limit in school zones to 20 MPH by January 1, 2031. When updating signage and other compliance needs in school zones, jurisdictions may and are encouraged to make other SRTS improvements at projects where needed and appropriate."**

Who will decide what counts as appropriate or necessary. Will this be determined solely by the jurisdiction? I left as is, this may lead to misunderstandings during the compliance review.

Susana Ledezma  
Camacho, City of Orange Cove     **"Every 10 years throughout the life of this measure, numbers of serious injuries and fatalities of students will be assessed for reductions in all school districts. If reductions are not met every 10 years, a plan shall be required for meeting reduction metrics in future years."**

What is the baseline for serious injuries and Fatalities? How much reduction is required?