Introduction

- The Fresno Council of Governments (FCOG), the Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG), the City of Kingsburg, and the City of Selma in cooperation with Caltrans initiated this Feasibility Study.
- The study identified the current safety, geometric, and operational deficiencies and developed short term (less than 3 years), mid-term (3 – 15 years), and long term (20+ year) improvement alternatives.
Study Objectives

- Identify geometric deficiencies
- Perform a Safety Analysis
- Research ways to divert truck traffic along 18th Avenue in Kingsburg
- Develop short term improvements to improve safety
- Identify potential interim capacity improvements
- Analyze interim improvement alternatives
- Develop preliminary drawings and estimates for interim alternatives
- Determine failure year of interim alternatives
- Develop preliminary long term alternative drawings and estimates
- Draft report with conclusions
# Geometric Deficiencies

## Mountain View Avenue Interchange

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Deficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR 99/Mountain View Avenue Interchange</td>
<td>Interchange Configuration Does Not Meet Currently Accepted Interchange Types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 99/Mountain View Avenue Interchange</td>
<td>Non-Continuous Sidewalks with Poor Pedestrian Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View Avenue</td>
<td>Profile Has Non-Standard Sight Distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View Avenue Overcrossing</td>
<td>Non-Standard Vertical Clearance Over State Route 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View Avenue/SB Off-Ramp Intersection</td>
<td>Ramp Terminal Connects Where Grade Is Greater Than 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View Avenue/Van Horn Intersection</td>
<td>Non-Standard Intersection Skew Angle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View Avenue/Van Horn Intersection</td>
<td>Local Road Across from Ramp Terminal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Traffic Data Collection

- Traffic counts were collected when schools were in session
- An additional Sunday traffic count was collected to account for Selma Flea Market traffic
- Traffic data was collected on the following dates
  - Thursday, September 13, 2018, 6:00 - 9:00 AM, and 3:00 - 6:00 PM
  - Wednesday, September 26, 2018, 6:00-9:00 AM, and 3:00 – 6:00 PM
  - Sunday, October 28, 2018, 5:00-9:00 AM, and 2:00 – 6:00 PM
ANALYSIS YEAR

- 2018 is the base year
- 2025 was used as projected construction year
- 2035 & 2045 were used as the 10 and 20-year design period
This corridor study used several urban transportation planning procedures for forecasting:

- Trip generation
- Historical trends
- Travel Demand Model (Fresno COG)
- Turnsw32
- Paramics / Visim
Operational Measures of Effectiveness (MOE)

Level of Service LOS, V/C Ratio, Delay, Density, Queue Length, and Speed were calculated using:

- HCS 2010 for un-signalized intersections (TWSC and AWSC)
- Synchro 10th for signalized intersections
- SIDRA Intersection 8 for roundabouts
Existing Facility
Mountain View Avenue

TWSC at 1 and 4
## Existing LOS
### Mountain View Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Delay (sec)</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>NB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 99 NB Off-Ramp</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C(C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 99 SB Off-Ramp</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A(A)</td>
<td>C (C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mountain View Avenue Intersections, 2018 Existing Level of Service Summary. Queue and delay time on the southbound Off-Ramp left turn are the dominant problems.
## Mountain View Avenue Intersections
### Failing Year for No-Build

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Project</th>
<th>Failing Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR 99 NB Off-Ramp/Mountain View Avenue</td>
<td>2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 99 SB Off-Ramp/Mountain View Avenue</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mountain View Avenue Proposed Improvements

- No-Build Alternative

**Near Term Alternative**
- Add AWSC at SB off-ramp and redelineate slip on-ramp intersection to create perpendicular right turn (will negatively affect LOS)

**Mid-Term Alternatives**
- Alternative 1- Realign On-Ramps with All Way Stop Control (AWSC)
- Alternative 2- Realign On-Ramps with Signalized Intersections
- Alternative 3- Realign On-Ramps with Roundabout Intersections

**Long Term Alternative**
- Alternative 4 –L-9 Interchange
Near Term
All Way Stop Control (AWSC)
Signalized Intersections
Roundabout Intersections
L-9 INTERCHANGE
# Mountain View Mid-Term Alternatives

## Level of Service Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>Alternative 1* (AWSC)</th>
<th>Alternative 2* (SIGNALIZED)</th>
<th>Alternative 3* (ROUNDABOUT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>DELAY</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>SR99 NB off Ramp / Mountain View</td>
<td>C(F)</td>
<td>24.3(51.2)</td>
<td>B(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR99 SB off Ramp / Mountain View</td>
<td>C(F)</td>
<td>18.7(58.1)</td>
<td>C(C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>SR99 NB off Ramp / Mountain View</td>
<td>F(F)</td>
<td>86.2(153.7)</td>
<td>B(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR99 SB off Ramp / Mountain View</td>
<td>E(F)</td>
<td>43.9(138.5)</td>
<td>C(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2045</td>
<td>SR99 NB off Ramp / Mountain View</td>
<td>F(F)</td>
<td>221.6(338.0)</td>
<td>B(C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR99 SB off Ramp / Mountain View</td>
<td>F(F)</td>
<td>105.8(266.7)</td>
<td>D(F)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Mountain View Avenue Alternatives - Preliminary Cost Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENT</th>
<th>Alternative 1 (AWSC)</th>
<th>Alternative 2 (Signalized)</th>
<th>Alternative 3 (Roundabout)</th>
<th>Long Term Alternative (L-9 Interchange)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roadway</td>
<td>$3.6M-$4.5M</td>
<td>$5.4M-$6.8M</td>
<td>$5.2M-$6.5M</td>
<td>$11.3M-$14.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$12.4M-$15.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$1.1M-$1.4M</td>
<td>$1.1M-$1.4M</td>
<td>$1.5M-$1.9M</td>
<td>$23.8M-$29.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>$4.7M-$5.9M</td>
<td>$6.5M-$8.2M</td>
<td>$6.7M-$8.4M</td>
<td>$47.5M-$59.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Cost</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Capital Cost</td>
<td>$7.1M-$8.9M</td>
<td>$9.8M-$12.3M</td>
<td>$10.1M-$12.6M</td>
<td>$61.8M-$77.4M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mountain View/SR99 & Mendocino (18th Avenue)/SR99 Feasibility Study

Questions ?
CODE ENFORCEMENT STAFF PRESENTATION
CASE LOAD, PROCESSES, AND CODES

PROCESS – JAVIER VIDRIO, CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER

CASE LOAD – ISAAC MORENO, ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER

CODES – SHOPPING CARTS – BIANCA SPARKS ROJAS, CITY ATTORNEY
ADMINISTRATIVE CITATIONS & ABATEMENT PROCESS

- Notice of Violation (14 days for compliance) (Section 9-3-5)
- 1st Administrative Citation issued (10 days for compliance and $100.00 fine) (Section 1-20-6)
- 2nd Administrative Citation issued (10 days for compliance and $200.00 fine)
- 3rd Administrative Citation issued (10 days for compliance and $500.00 fine)
- Council authorize City to obtain abatement warrant
- Abate nuisance
- Lien property
## CASE LOAD

**Code Enforcement Case Transactions Report**

**Period:** August 1 through August 28, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opened Cases in Current Month</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Cases From Current Period</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Cases from Prior Period</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The top three violation types are Weed Abatement, Property Maintenance, and Public Nuisance for this period.
- Number of Citations Issued from January 2018 – August 2019:
  - Police Issued – 19
  - Code Enforcement Department - 10
- City’s current Code provides for both administrative citation and abatement processes
- Must comply with Fourth Amendment by obtaining an abatement warrant before nuisances are abated
- May consider consolidating all of the public nuisance sections to make the City’s Code more user friendly for both the public and Code Enforcement Staff
SHOPPING CARTS

- Health and safety hazards, public nuisance issues associated with abandoned shopping carts
- Overview of State Law
- City’s current Code has provisions regulating shopping carts (Section 8-4-1)
- May consider amending the Code to require retailers to implement a shopping cart containment system to address public nuisance issues
SUMMARY & DIRECTION

- Administrative citation and abatement processes take time
- Consider consolidating public nuisance section to make more user friendly
- Consider amending shopping cart ordinance to include containment system
## Districting Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Two Initial Hearings                     | Held prior to release of draft maps.  
Education and to solicit input on the communities in the District.  
Hearings must be within 30 days of each other |
| Aug. 5 & 12                               |                                                                             |
| Release draft maps                        | Maps must be posted at least 7 days prior to 3rd hearing.                   |
| Aug. 26                                   |                                                                             |
| Two Hearings on Draft Maps                | Two meetings to discuss and revise the draft maps and to discuss the election sequencing.  
Hearings must be within 45 days of each other. Possible map selection 9/16. |
| Sept. 3 & 16                              |                                                                             |
| Final Hearing & Map Adoption              | Map must be posted 7 days prior to adoption.                                |
| Oct. 7                                    |                                                                             |
| 2020                                      | First three districts hold by-district elections                            |
| 2021                                      | Map adjusted using 2020 Census data                                        |
| 2022                                      | Remaining two districts hold first by-district elections                    |
## Districting Rules and Goals

### Federal Laws
- Equal Population
- Federal Voting Rights Act
- No Racial Gerrymandering

### Traditional Redistricting Principles
- Communities of interest
- Compact
- Contiguous
- Visible (Natural & man-made) boundaries
- Respect voters’ choices / continuity in office
- *Planned future growth*
Latino eligible voters are concentrated everywhere except the east and west edges of the City.

There are no large geographic concentrations of Asian-Americans, African-Americans or Native Americans.
Public Submissions P101 – P104
None were population balanced
(overall plan deviations ranged from 45% to 138%)

Interactive Map
Draft Maps II

Public Submissions P105 – P108
None were population balanced
(overall plan deviations ranged from 44% to 78%)

Interactive Map
Draft Maps III

All are population balanced.

Interactive Map
Discussion

1. Which of the population balanced map(s) do you prefer?
2. Any direction on / requests for revisions to those preferred maps?
3. Any questions or direction on election sequencing?
   - Proposed sequencing is listed on the PDF maps
4. 2nd hearing and possible map selection Sept. 16