

**Clean Mobility Options Voucher Pilot Program (CMO)
 Summary Report: Fresno Metro Ministry CTNA Project
 June 2021**

Introduction

Fresno Metro Ministry launched the Clean Transportation Needs Assessment survey process in November 2020 targeting three census tracts along the southern Blackstone Ave. transportation corridor in central Fresno. The three census tracts in central Fresno that have a total population of 14,257 residents based in CalEnviroScreen 3.0 data and that are severely impacted by poor air quality, poverty, unemployment, and lack of affordable housing. The demographic data is as follows for each tract:

6019003500

Hispanic	51%	Poverty	77
White	33%	Unemployment	93
		Housing	
African-American	6%	Burden	88
Asian	6%		

6019002400

Hispanic	68%	Poverty	98
White	9%	Unemployment	95
		Housing	
African-American	5%	Burden	96
Asian	16%		

6019002300

Hispanic	58%	Poverty	93
White	28%	Unemployment	98
		Housing	
African-American	7%	Burden	91
Asian	5%		

Transportation Access Data revealed the following about the target census tracts use of alternative transportation modes:

<u>Census Block Group</u>	<u>Households</u>	<u>AllTransit Score</u>	<u>% Commuters That Use Transit</u>	<u>% Commuters that Walk</u>	<u>% Commuters that Bike</u>
---------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------

60190023001	312	8.1	0	2.95	0
60190023002	408	7.9	7.48	4.99	0
60190023003	498	7.9	0	4.88	4.88
60190024001	300	6.8	14.22	9.95	0
60190024002	268	7.3	0	7.1	0
60190024003	431	7.6	11.52	6.46	0
60190024004	335	7.3	3.72	3.72	0
60190035001	348	7.8	7.67	0	0
60190035002	419	7.7	0	0	0
60190035003	482	7.7	0	0	9.78
60190035004	421	7.7	1.62	0	0
60190035005	<u>367</u>	7.6	1.24	0	0

Totals for all census tracts **4,589**

Median Household Income for the targeted tracts is as follows based on Census data:

<u>Census Block Group</u>	<u>Median HH Income</u>
60190023001	\$36,042
60190023002	\$28,261
60190023003	\$24,444
60190024001	\$24,432
60190024002	\$14,243
60190024003	\$29,375
60190024004	N/A
60190035001	\$24,619
60190035002	\$42,628
60190035003	\$59,194
60190035004	\$47,054
60190035005	\$51,955

To reach as many of the residents within these census tracts while working under the State-mandated restrictions for community meetings and public gatherings due to COVID-19 infection risk, Fresno Metro Ministry had to employ a carefully designed door-to-door outreach campaign combined with social media outreach. The following section discusses the methods Metro used to reach residents and try to get surveys completed for the project and some of the results of that outreach.

Methodology.

Faced with reaching over 4,500 households across the three census tracts with COVID restrictions, Metro devised a process using door-to-door survey workers with a supervising coordinator and over all project manager that reported to the Executive Director. Metro recruited and hired three survey workers starting in November and began the door-to-door work in December 2020. Special precautions to reduce COVID infection risk, such as N-95 masks, hand sanitizer, and a very specific protocol for recording surveys for residents that did not want to use the Survey Monkey on-line method, was implemented with the survey team members. Metro used the model CTNA survey questions supplied by the Administrator and developed an on-line survey using Survey Monkey. Both an English and Spanish version were developed. The total number of questions was over 45 once the process was completed and there was initial concern this number of questions would deter people from completing or even starting to take the survey. This concern turned out to be valid, but this will be discussed in detail in the Observations section.

Metro survey workers visited 10,494 home sites and left flyers for the survey at each one. Considering that there are only 4,500 residences total in the three census tracts, the data shows the survey workers visited each home at least twice in an effort to get people to complete the CTNA survey. The team was able to actually speak with 1,955 residents during the course of this outreach and posted 516 flyers at businesses and on informational kiosks.

In addition to the door-to-door outreach, the Metro survey team also conducted phone banking with residents to inform them about the survey and encourage them to take it. The team engaged with each census tract separately with phone banking starting with Census Tract 6019003500. Two rounds of phone calling were done with 1,912 calls made for Round 1 from a voter outreach phone list Metro received. The results from Round 1 are 642 answered; 711 did not answer, or had disconnected numbers; 558 had voicemail left about CTNA survey. Round 2 involved 711 calls; 127 answered; 228 no answer or had same issues as in the first round; 356 had voicemail left about CTNA survey. For Census Tract 6019002400, Metro survey team called 1,044 homes in a first round of calling with 255 answered calls, 435 no answer or disconnected; 354 voicemails left about the CTNA survey. Round 2 involved making 435 calls with 135 answered, 188 with no answer or disconnected phone, and 112 with voicemail left about CTNA survey. Phone banking was not done for Census Tract 6019002300 due to lack of valid phone contact list, but phone banking was determined to not be an effective tool to get people to take the survey based on responses from the other census tracts.

Metro utilized a social media campaign on Twitter and Facebook to promote the CTNA survey and this method of outreach appears to have been the most effective at getting surveys completed.

Metro attempted to do two webinars about the CTNA survey, but neither webinar attracted any registrants in spite of extensive promotion on social media platforms. Both of these attempted webinars were scheduled during the height of restrictions on public gatherings due to COVID infection risk.

As COVID infection numbers began to drop, Metro survey team attempted an outdoor booth on a Saturday along a popular walking trail where 12 people stopped to talk, but none of them took the survey.

Finally, on May 22 as COVID infection dropped due to vaccinations, Metro held a public display event of Clean Shared Mobility technology at the Manchester Center parking lot and offered \$10 Habit Burger gift card incentives for residents that took the survey. The event was promoted heavily on social media and the team was set up with several vehicles and three tents for 4 hours. 17 people attended and completed surveys.

Observations

Participation from residents was about 4%, which is low, but compares with similar recent transportation survey efforts by Fresno Council of Governments for regional transportation planning efforts which achieved about a 4.5% response rate (1,000 responses from 22,000 residents).

Detailed survey findings.

40% of respondents were White-Caucasian, 41% Hispanic, 10% Black or African-American, 6% Asian, and 3% that identified as Other- This compares to CalEnviroScreen 3.0 data showing an average across the three census tracts of: 23% White-Caucasian, 59% Hispanic, 6% Black-African American, and 9% Asian.

76% had some college or higher education

41% had household income of \$50k annually or better, and 58% were below \$50k annually- This compares with an average median household income of \$34,750 from Census data.

76% of respondents don't use transit with the primary reason being it takes too long to get where they need to go.

92% have driver's licenses

53% own 2 cars or more per household

45% paying over \$200 per month on car costs

73.6% of respondents in the newer survey would use shared mobility for some of their transportation needs and 43.6% of respondents in the older survey would use shared mobility in place of owning a car. 41% of respondents said no to using shared mobility in place of a car and 18% were unsure.

78-82% of respondents said they would be interested in using a shopping shuttle service

A. Describe the main underlying causes in transportation gaps and challenges in the project area.

There are really very few gaps in transportation currently in Fresno based on respondents to the first survey which asked if it was easy for people to get around. Only 9% (8 out of 88) of

respondents said they had challenges getting where they need to go in Fresno. Transit services are readily available in the three census tracts with an average AllTransit score of 7.67, yet 76% of respondents don't use transit and cite that it takes too long to get where they need to go as a primary reason. The majority of respondents to both surveys indicated they use the personal automobile as their primary source for transportation and that they mostly drive alone. Less than 45% of respondents were interested in shared mobility as a replacement for an automobile. The respondents showed an aversion to using shared mobility for work commuting, school trips, or medical appointments which all have a common theme of requiring on-time arrival at the destination; reinforcing the deduction that a personal automobile is preferred over shared mobility because of the greater freedom of movement a personal automobile provides the user. This also seems to explain why available transit services are not being used by residents in the study area.

B. Main factors that are, or could, contribute to successful transportation options in the project area.

There appears to be a general willingness to consider using a shared mobility service for at least some transportation needs in the census tracts surveyed. Pre-pandemic, the Fresno City College campus had over 34,000 students attending classes each week. Now that COVID restrictions are being lifted, students will be returning to the campus for in-person classes again. Parking at the campus is a historically major issue for students, so shared transportation services could reduce the stress of finding parking on the campus and thereby may be attractive for students. There are also few convenient shopping locations for food and basic household goods within the census tracts which could explain the interest in a shopping shuttle service.

C. Any additional assessments and measurements that could be conducted to better understand some of the issues raised upon completion of the assessment.

Based on the lack of interest and response participating in the CMO CTNA survey, further assessments or surveys in the three census tracts studied with this project would likely not be worth conducting or produce any new information. However, similar surveys conducted in neighborhoods in southwest and southeast Fresno could be valuable to determine if shared mobility services that included a broader service area could be viable and/or would be the same type of services.

Solutions

D. List of actions that could be taken to enhance clean mobility in the community. Describe the process for how actions or solutions were identified and prioritized.

1. Increase the number of publicly accessible EV chargers and include charging for e-bikes at Fresno City College (FCC). There are currently only two EV chargers at the FCC campus and no e-bike chargers. This lack of EV charging infrastructure at the FCC campus has been known for some time, but there has not been a study conducted until this project that showed a community interest in an e-bike sharing program that could benefit FCC.

2. Work with businesses along the southern Blackstone corridor to install publicly accessible EV chargers, including Manchester Center which is just outside the three census tracts studied in this project. Interest in a shopping shuttle service through the CMO CTNA survey project supports the need to install more publicly accessible EV chargers at business locations where people that use the shuttle would shop. These chargers would be used to charge the shuttle vehicle while people shop and allow the vehicles to be used more widely without range restrictions.
3. Implement a shopping shuttle service that could provide food and household commodity delivery to homes and/or provide transport for residents to popular shopping locations. 78-82% of respondents to the CMO CTNA survey indicated they would use or would consider using such a service. If the service was offered across a larger service area which included southwest and southeast Fresno, the likelihood of it being successful would be much higher.
4. Implement a small-scale e-bike-share service pilot project at Fresno City College that connects with Manchester Center where added charging infrastructure would be deployed. Manchester Center has significant parking space that is currently underutilized and converting a portion of that space to a park-and-ride location for students using the shared e-bike service could be attractive. 47% of respondents to the second survey (37 of 93) indicated they would use a bike-sharing service if available. 46% of respondents indicated they would use a car-sharing service, but due to the significantly higher cost to establish a car-share service, the bike-share service is the recommended action, especially given the limited number of survey respondents.

E. Describe if:

i. Community members are supportive of solutions that are eligible project models for Clean Mobility Options Project Voucher funding.

The respondents to the CMO CTNA survey were supportive of bike-sharing, car-sharing, and a shopping shuttle service that use electric vehicles.

ii. There are any “quick start” actions (i.e. small, simple, inexpensive projects like installing a bicycle rack, etc.) that could be implemented to immediately improve the quality of the built environment for transportation in community.

Bike racks are currently available at FCC and other common destinations in the study area. There is no evidence that adding more bike racks or designated clean vehicle parking stalls would increase use of these sources for transportation.

iii. There are any entities with whom this information could be shared to help promote better land use and transportation planning needs (i.e. local planners, elected officials), and explain how this information will be provided to them.

Fresno Metro Ministry will share all the results of the CTNA survey and Summary Report with City of Fresno and Fresno Council of Governments land use planning staff. The data is also being made available to the Fresno State Transportation Institute to help guide future transportation planning students as they train to do work here in the San Joaquin Valley.

Next Steps

F. Describe how the progress in increasing access to clean transportation and mobility options will be monitored over time.

Fresno Metro Ministry is closely tied to efforts to increase clean transportation and mobility throughout the San Joaquin Valley region through various projects, such as the Better Blackstone project in Fresno, the Fresno Council of Governments Regional Transportation Planning process, and relationships with all eight transportation planning organizations from Stockton to Bakersfield.

G. Discuss a plan for ongoing communication and engagement with community members and key decision-makers in the community.

As mentioned above, Fresno Metro Ministry has on-going work locally to revitalize the Blackstone Ave. corridor through regular engagement meetings with community members and businesses. Now that COVID restrictions are being lifted, these meetings will resume and continue through 2023 at least.