

## **Comment 1 for Fresno County Governments Regional Transportation Plan (fcog2015) - Non-Reg.**

First Name: JP

Last Name: Sweeney

Email Address: jpatrick@centraltransit.com

Affiliation:

Subject: Fresno COG's RTP/SCS

Comment:

It is a matter of great importance to a concerned citizen that there are many items in Fresno COG's RTP/SCS proposal which raise the question of how such a proposal can attain the AB32 targets of greenhouse gas reduction (GGH).

There is no mention in the sustainable community strategy (SCS) of what the term ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION means. FCOG recommends: more roads, more bikepaths, more sidewalks and more buses. There is NO mention of alternative transportation modes. Walking is currently available and an impractical mode of alternative transportation. Taking a bus is currently available, albeit on a selective time availability. The selective route mapping and selective service time availability make it impossible for the general public at large to use as a realistic mode of alternative transportation. Riding a bicycle is also currently available to many but, the long distances to destination points in Fresno County only allow the true bicycle enthusiasts accommodation to serve as a commute possibility. Driving a car is designated as the only useable mode of transportation: it has been the foundation of our Western Society's land-use design orientation for the past 80+ years and is the root of unsustainable growth.

To FCOG's statement on page 4-20: "California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) Program requires a reduction in the carbon intensity of transportation fuels that are sold, supplied, or offered for sale in the state by a minimum of 10% by 2020. CARB regulations require transportation fuel producers and importers to meet specified average carbon intensity requirements for fuel." Is that to be interpreted as a claim that all of California's GHG reductions are to be met by automobile manufactures and it renders the entire FCOG SCS exercise irrelevant?

As for the 5% decrease as mandated by SB375; are there numbers of supporting documentation? Are there enough people riding bicycles and walking to validate a significant reduction of vehicle miles traveled (VMT)? Or, by merely adding another bus route on Shaw along with the two other routes that will cause increased congestion by halting opposing traffic through traffic light manipulation, where, or how, does this effectively reduce GHG?

Also, with all of the other Fresno County municipalities growing, does the increase of sidewalk and bike paths along with the additional bus route; adequately account for the automobile increase to the outlying area automobile centric growth?

How can one of the goals of the 2014RTP/SCS be to encourage more compact development when the nature of Fresno's growth is automobile centric? It is a tragically illogical assumption that 8 houses per acre will somehow magically reduce traffic congestion from 4 houses per acre. That logic is incomprehensible. Rational thought dictates that twice as many houses will double street traffic load and exacerbate congestion at an appropriately exponential rate. Where are FCOG's math numbers which support a doubling of automobile traffic and exponentially increasing traffic congestion that propose to reduce GHG?

In following the notably popular data collected by groups encouraging sustainable urban growth, there is a consistent theme: sustainable urban growth occurs with Transit Oriented Development. Fresno does not have a fixed rail transit system and thereby all of its growth is automobile centric.

Over the past 80 years, all of Fresno County's land-use growth is based on an automobile centric design. Or am I the only one that has ever attended a COG meeting that has noticed? There will be NO reduction of GHG until Fresno's automobile centric land-use development is curtailed by replacing the foundation of its growth pattern. To suggest that Fresno will reduce its GHG and achieve the AB32 GHG reduction targets with new sidewalks, wonderful empty bike lanes, and several bigger buses is, excuse the harsh term but, that concept is ludicrous.

FAX ridership caters to the impoverished. FAX is incapable of serving the general public as an alternative form of transportation. The function of its bus lines is to shuttle poor people to government offices. The ridership is not targeted even for the government office workers because the long destination arrival times take far too long for anyone that owns a car and can afford gas money. The point is: FAX is designed for the poor.

Through designed ridership targeting aimed at the low income financial segment of society, FAX has earned a reputation for providing the community with a transportation system that is socially segregated to serve that section of society. Can anyone be gullible enough to believe that bigger buses averaging 4mph faster would be able to convince the general public to join the social stigma and become members of the low income ridership?

Again, what is missing from COG's SCS? What is missing is addressing the key points of Fresno's land-use design. Fresno's urban land-use design is automobile centric. There can be NO REDUCTION of GHG without significant reduction of VMT. Fresno's automobile centric land-use design can not accommodate the needed Transit Oriented Development (TOD) without an adequate fixed rail transit system. Sustainable Urban Growth will not happen; it can not happen with the automobile as the foundational component to urban design.

Are the Fresno Planners incompetent or is its leadership so mired in political fear that it has to appear without the reality of cognitive presents?

One of the issues with FCOG's SCS proposal is that it lacks accounting of the available funds which support alternative transportation options.

COG has been presented with several opportunities to investigate

New Technology Transit options. Each opportunity was thwarted with hostile turn-downs from COG's leadership. This community needs alternative transportation options but, the community's non-elected political powers operate in a very status-quo manner which promotes its automobile centric growth.

The automobile, however, is wholly unsustainable.

To measure what FCOG deems is appropriate in what it calls an alternative form of transportation; can what it proposes as an alternative form of transportation in the SCS serve an individual of the general public in an emergency? Could a person get across town to a hospital? Could a person wait at a bus stop at 10:00pm for a bus to the hospital? Or could a person ride a bicycle in one of FCOG's new bike lanes to a hospital in an emergency?

Again, it is a prevarication for FCOG to refer to any other form of alternative transportation than what already exists that has caused the need for AB32.

As a concerned citizen, I plead with the ARB to please consider these words. Please allow COG to reconsider its SCS that includes an adequate alternative mode of sustainable transportation.

In 2006 Fresno voters passed the 1/2cent sales tax to be allocated for transportation. Fresno COG is responsible for the New Technology Transit fund. "The goal of the New Technology Reserve Subprogram is to set-aside Measure "C" funding to finance new transit technologies that may be developed in the future, such as Personal Rapid Transit (PRT) or similar systems." This is the alternative transportation that the 2014 RTP/SCS fails to recognize as Fresno's sustainable transportation alternative. These systems can provide the "T" for effective sustainable TODs.

Or is ARB satisfied with the FAX 34,000 average daily ridership; where one might logically assume an additional 10,000 riders on the proposed 3 BRT lines will give COG the 5% threshold required for its SCS target number. So then, is this rebuttal another useless waste of time and forgotten?

Attachment: "

Original File Name:

Date and Time Comment Was Submitted: 2015-01-26 08:01:12

No Duplicates.

**There are no comments posted to Fresno County Governments Regional Transportation Plan (fcog2015) that were presented during the Board Hearing at this time.**