

Fresno Vision Zero Action Plan

Safety Corridors and Intersections – Prioritization Methodology

The Fresno Vision Zero Action Plan prioritizes safety investments to reduce fatal and severe injury crashes in a transparent, data-driven, and equity-centered manner. This prioritization methodology establishes the framework used to identify and sequence high-impact projects over the next five years.

The methodology ensures that projects are selected based on:

- Documented safety need
- Exposure and activity levels
- Equity considerations
- Community input
- Alignment with vulnerable road user risk patterns

Prioritization Overview

The project team used a two-step process to identify priority corridors and intersections for targeted safety investment.

Step 1: Crash-Based Screening

Collision data were analyzed to identify the 21 highest collision corridors and intersections in the city of Fresno, including:

- The 10 corridors with the highest rate and concentration of fatal and severe injury crashes
- The 11 intersections with the highest rate and concentration of fatal and severe injury crashes

All candidate locations are on Fresno’s High Injury Network and collectively account for over 25% of fatal and severe injury crashes citywide.

These 21 locations formed the candidate pool for further evaluation and prioritization.

A full description of the crash-based analysis, and a list of the top 21 highest collision intersections and corridors is provided in Appendix C – Collision Analysis – Priority Locations.

Step 2: Context, Equity, and Community-Based Refinement

The 21 candidate corridors and intersections were then evaluated using additional screening criteria that reflect safety risk exposure, land use context, equity, and community priorities. Corridor screening results were normalized by segment length (e.g., factors per mile) to ensure longer corridors did not skew prioritization results.

Because corridors and intersections function differently within the network, buffer distances vary slightly between the two.

Context, Equity, and Community-Based Prioritization Factors

The following prioritization factors were used to score each of the top 21 highest collision intersections and corridors.

Table 1: Context, Equity, and Community-Based Prioritization Factors

Factor Category	Measure/Metric		Buffer / Threshold		Maximum Possible Score	
	Intersection	Corridor	Intersection	Corridor	Intersection	Corridor
Community Engagement	Engagement feedback		Location identified as a priority during surveys and/or in-person events		5	5
Transit Proximity						
Bus Routes	Bus Route Count		# within .25 miles	# within .25 miles (normalized)	2	2
Bus Stops	Bus Stop Count					
Community Destinations						
Schools	Schools Count		# within .5 miles	# within .25 miles	3	3
Parks	Parks Count				1	3
Community Centers	Community Centers Count				1	2
Concentration of Vulnerable Road User Crashes (from Safe Streets Priority Finder)	Alignment with SSPF Vulnerable Road User segments		Location overlaps SSPF VRU segment		1	1
Equity (Caltrans EQI)	Caltrans EQI Transportation-Based Priority Population designation		Location falls within designated EQI area		1	1
Network Overlap	Corridor/Intersection Overlap		Corridor overlaps with intersection or intersection overlaps with corridor		0.5	0.5

The rationale for each factor is as follows:

- **Community Engagement and Feedback:** Community-identified safety concerns were incorporated into the prioritization process. Locations received points if they were:
 - » Frequently cited in survey responses
 - » Raised during in-person engagement events
 - » Identified as locations where residents feel unsafe walking, biking, or accessing transit
 This ensures lived experience and perceived risk inform investment decisions alongside crash data.
- **Transit Proximity (Bus Routes and Bus Stops):** Transit access increases pedestrian activity and multimodal conflict points. Locations serving transit riders were prioritized.
- **Community Destinations (Schools, Parks, and Community Centers):** Proximity to high-activity destinations increases pedestrian volumes and the presence of youth, older adults, and families. Shorter buffer distances for corridors reflect direct frontage exposure and higher pedestrian crossing demand along segments.
- **Concentration of Vulnerable Road User Crashes:** Candidate locations were evaluated for consistency with the Vulnerable Road User segments identified through the Safe System Priority Framework (SSPF) tool. Locations received a point if the intersection or corridor overlapped with a VRU-identified segment from the SSFP output.
- **Equity Considerations (Caltrans EQI Data):** Advancing equitable safety outcomes is central to Fresno’s Vision Zero strategy. Locations received a point if they fell within an area designated a Caltrans Equitable

Transportation Index (EQI) Transportation Based Priority Population. These areas reflect communities that experience disproportionate transportation burdens and safety risks.

- **Network Overlap:** To support coordinated implementation, locations received an additional half a point if a corridor overlapped with an intersection (and vice versa), reflecting the potential to bundle improvements and maximize safety benefits.

Prioritization Results

Based on the prioritization factors described above, the project team assigned points to each candidate corridor and intersection to reflect the presence of each factor. Locations were then scored and ranked based on total points. The highest-scoring locations were selected as the **top five priority corridors** and **top five priority intersections** for near-term investment and are described below.

Table 2: Top 5 Priority Corridors

Street Name	From	To
Blackstone Avenue	Nees Avenue	Herndon Avenue
Blackstone Avenue	Ashlan Avenue	Shields Avenue
Belmont Avenue	Palm Avenue	Cedar Avenue
Fresno Street	César Chávez Boulevard	Divisadero Street
Shields Avenue	West Avenue	First Avenue

Table 3: Top 5 Priority Intersections

Cross Street A	Cross Street B
Blackstone Avenue	Herndon Avenue
Blackstone Avenue	Dakota Avenue
Shields Avenue	First Avenue
Clinton Avenue	Fresno Street
César Chávez Boulevard	Chestnut Avenue

Table 4 shows all factor scores and total scores for each of the highest collision corridors and intersections in the City of Fresno.

Table 4: Corridor and Intersection Prioritization Scoring

	Bus Stop Points	Bus Route Points	Community Center Points	Park Points	School Points	Engagement Points	VRU Segment Points	Caltrans EQI TBPP	Segment / Corridor Overlap	TOTALS	TOP 5 SCORES
Intersections											
Blackstone Avenue & Dakota Avenue	0.5	1.5	0	1	3	2.5	1	1	0.5	11	x
Fresno Street & Clinton Street	2	1.5	0	1	2	2.5	0	1	0	10	x
Shields Avenue & First Avenue	1.25	1	0	1	2	2.5	0	1	0.5	9.25	x
Blackstone Avenue & Herndon Avenue	1	1	1	1	1	2.5	0	1	0.5	9	x
Cesar Chavez Boulevard & Chestnut Avenue	1.25	1	0	1	2	2.5	1	0	0	8.75	x
Ashlan Avenue and Blackstone Avenue	1.25	1	0	0	1	2.5	1	1	0.5	8.25	
Cesar Chavez Blvd and Peach Avenue	1.5	1	0	0	2	2.5	0	1	0	8	
Shepherd and Friant	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	6.25	
Shaw Avenue and Cedar Avenue	1.25	1	0	0	0	2.5	0	1	0.5	6	
Fruit Avenue and Clinton Avenue	1	0.5	0	0	1	2.5	0	0	0	5	
Sierra Avenue and Blackstone Avenue	0.5	0.5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	
Corridors											
Blackstone Avenue (Shields Avenue to Ashlan Avenue)	2	2	0	1	1	5	1	1	0.5	13.5	x
Fresno Street (Cesar Chavez Boulevard to Divisadero Street)	2	1.7	0	2	3	2.5	1	1	0	13.2	x
Shields Avenue (West Avenue to First Street)	2	1.2	0	2	3	2.5	1	1	0.5	13.2	x
Blackstone Avenue (Herndon Avenue to Nees Avenue)	2	2	0	1	1	5	0	1	0.5	12.5	x
Belmont Avenue (Palm Avenue to Cedar Avenue)	2	1.3	2	3	2	0	1	1	0	12.3	x
Ashlan Avenue (Blackstone Avenue to Cedar Avenue)	2	1.2	0	2	2	2.5	1	1	0.5	12.2	
E Shaw Avenue (Blackstone Avenue to Cedar Avenue)	2	1.2	0	1	2	2.5	1	1	0.5	11.2	
Herndon Avenue (Palm Avenue to Fresno Street)	2	1.3	0	0	0	5	0	1	0.5	9.8	
Clinton Avenue (Marks Avenue to West Avenue)	2	2	0	0	1	2.5	1	1	0	9.5	
W Shaw Avenue (Golden State Blvd to Marks Avenue)	2	1.1	0	0	1	2.5	0	1	0	7.6	