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1. INTRODUCTION

The Fremont Pedestrian Master Plan guides the future development and enhancement of pedestrian facilities within the city, and intends to make walking an integral mode of transportation in Fremont. This plan was developed with extensive input from the community and seeks to meet Fremont’s needs and desires for pleasant, enjoyable and safe places to walk.

Fremont has a long history of pedestrian activity centered on the “main streets” of its historic neighborhood districts. Many of the pedestrian districts of yesterday are still pedestrian districts today, including Niles, Centerville, Mission San Jose and Irvington. These districts, as well as other neighborhood centers in Fremont, are excellent places for walking now, but with some enhancements can be made even more enjoyable for walking. With its well-defined neighborhoods, parks, schools, multi-use trails, and civic facilities, Fremont has great potential for creating vibrant pedestrian areas, especially given the area’s rich history.

Fremont City leaders, staff and residents are committed to ensuring that future growth results in a city with a truly multi-modal transportation network, where pedestrian facilities are fully integrated and residents can walk comfortably and pleasurably between a variety of destinations. This pedestrian plan builds on Fremont’s past planning efforts to enhance the pedestrian environment in future development through the district area specific plans. Providing these walking opportunities will decrease residents’ dependence on vehicles, and will help to preserve and promote Fremont as a place where people want to live, work, and visit.

What will Fremont be like for pedestrians in the future? This Master Plan offers a vision of a future Fremont where:

- People can conveniently walk to their destinations.
- People feel safe walking.
- Facilities are provided for people from all age groups.
- People with disabilities are more easily mobile.
- Visitors are attracted to the enhanced walking environment.
- Commercial streets are exciting places to visit.

The goals, policies and strategies outlined in this Plan can turn this vision into a reality. It includes phased recommendations that will encourage people to walk more for short trips, enhance the environment for people with disabilities and children walking to school, and lead overall to an increase in the number of pedestrian trips. It focuses on enhancing pedestrian safety in crosswalks and along streets, and provides a blueprint for improving residents’ quality of life, creating a more sustainable environment, and reducing traffic, noise and energy consumption.
1.1. PLAN CONTENTS

The Fremont Pedestrian Plan is organized according to the following chapters:

Chapter 2. Benefits of Walking
This chapter presents why walking is good for the environment, individuals and Fremont’s community. It also includes Fremont’s existing walking statistics.

Chapter 3. Vision Statement and Goals
This chapter presents the vision for Fremont’s pedestrian network. It includes qualitative and quantitative goals to increase pedestrian mobility in Fremont.

Chapter 4. Existing Conditions
This chapter presents the state of overall pedestrian mobility in Fremont. It discusses existing conditions of the eight planning areas, collision patterns, pedestrian needs, and uses Geographic Information Systems (GIS) mapping data to analyze pedestrian collisions.

Chapter 5. Policy Review
This chapter presents an overview of existing policies in Fremont that relate to walking and the pedestrian environment.

Chapter 6. Recommended Projects
This chapter presents pedestrian projects to improve pedestrian accessibility and circulation in Fremont. The total cost for implementing all of the recommended improvement projects in Chapter 6 is approximately $11.2 million.

Chapter 7. Recommended Programs
This chapter presents pedestrian programs to improve pedestrian accessibility and circulation in Fremont.

Chapter 8. Funding
This chapter outlines available local county, state and federal funding sources that can provide project funding and a brief description of program features such as minimum local match requirements or limitations on eligible projects.

1.2. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS

This plan is a result of Circulation Element policies and an extensive public participation process and vision. An extensive public outreach effort played an invaluable role in understanding the needs and priorities of local residents and stakeholders. The public process included input provided at a public workshop held on September 20, 2006. Participants discussed such issues as pedestrian crossing safety, sidewalks, and other general and specific pedestrian issues in the City. Members of the public identified specific locations with safety issues. Participants in the workshop were also asked to brainstorm about their vision of Fremont’s pedestrian network in the future. These ideas and specific locations were studied in the planning process and incorporated into the needed improvements list. Detailed notes from the workshop are available through the City of Fremont Transportation & Operations Department.
The public review process also included the following meetings: four public meetings in conjunction with the Bicycle Pedestrian Technical Advisory Committee, meetings with the Recreation Commission, at the Senior Center, with Irvington and Centerville Business Associations, Fremont Parent Teacher Association, and the Mission San Jose Rotary. Copies and information about the Plan were also sent to Fremont Unified School District, the Niles Community and Warm Springs Business Association. The California School of the Deaf and Blind were also invited to attend and provide public input.

1.3. HOW CITIZENS CAN USE THIS PLAN

Citizens can use this Pedestrian Master Plan to ensure that pedestrian needs and conditions are properly identified, and assist the City in keeping this Plan accurate over time as it is updated. Citizens can also identify City priorities and proposals and how and when they may impact their own neighborhoods or walking routes. Most importantly, citizens can use this Plan to identify the various tools and strategies that are available to improve conditions on their streets, and work with the City to help fund and implement these improvements.

1.4. HOW THE CITY WILL USE THIS PLAN

This document will serve as a technical resource for the City to guide the implementation of goals and policies in Chapter 3. This document will help City staff with the following steps:

- Understand the constraints, opportunities and setting that will define project feasibility
- Identify appropriate programs and plans
- Identify areas where further neighborhood input is necessary
- Prioritize projects
- Identify funding sources
- Update design and management plan policies
- Update guidelines, standards and policies
This Page Intentionally Left Blank.
2. BENEFITS OF WALKING

2.1. WHY WALKING IS IMPORTANT

Walking is important to Fremont’s future due to its potential to address several interrelated challenges, including traffic, air quality, public health and creating a sense of community. By planning a city that is more walkable than current development patterns allow, the City can affect all of these areas, which collectively can have a profound influence on existing and future quality of life in Fremont.

2.1.1. Traffic and Air Quality

Each time a Fremont driver chooses to walk, one car is removed from the road. As Fremont’s eight districts become more inviting to pedestrians, increasing numbers of shopping, restaurant, school and recreational trips will be made on foot. Cumulatively, this pattern may reduce traffic in some neighborhoods, which can also improve air quality. Because pedestrians breathe air without benefit of air conditioning and tend to respire at a faster rate than automobile occupants, improving air quality in walkable communities is even more important than elsewhere.

2.1.2. Public Health

In recent years, public health professionals and urban planners have become increasingly aware that the impacts of automobiles on public health extend far beyond asthma and other respiratory conditions caused by air pollution. There are several additional ways in which walking affects public health: obesity and related diseases, collisions with automobiles, and personal security.

Today, there is a much deeper understanding of the connection between the lack of physical activity resulting from communities, such as Fremont, designed primarily with cars in mind, obesity, and certain chronic diseases. Although diet and genetic predisposition also contribute to these conditions, physical inactivity is now widely understood to play a significant role in the most common chronic diseases in the US, including coronary heart disease, stroke and diabetes1—each of which is a leading cause of death in Fremont. In 2000-02 (the most recent period for which data is available) 28 percent of all deaths in Fremont were from heart disease2. Stroke and diabetes were responsible for an additional ten percent of deaths during this period.

In response to these trends, which mirror those across Alameda County, California and the nation—the public health profession has begun to advocate for the creation of walkable neighborhoods as one of the most effective ways to encourage active lifestyles. Studies show that 43 percent of people with safe places to walk within ten minutes of home meet recommended activity levels, compared to only 27

---


2 Select Health Indicators for Cities in Alameda County, tables B-22 and B-32, 2004.
percent of those without safe places to walk. As Fremont becomes a more walkable city, Fremont’s population will have more opportunities to exercise and these figures will likely increase.

Although people who walk frequently may have lower rates of heart disease, stroke and diabetes, those walking on city streets would be more likely encounter conflicts with cars. Please see the discussion of pedestrian collisions with motor vehicles in Chapter 4- Existing Conditions.

2.1.3. Sense of Community

Districts in which people walk provide more opportunities for chance meetings than do areas where travel is primarily by automobile. Such serendipitous encounters help neighbors get better-acquainted and provide eyes on the street, which can make an area feel and be safer. Fremont residents’ sense of living in a cohesive community will be enhanced as the City focuses future residential growth in compact, walkable communities, creates shopping districts that cater to those on foot, and provides facilities that enhance the pedestrian experience.

2.1.4. Fremont’s Planning Areas

The most exciting opportunities to improve walkability lie in the five Fremont Planning Areas for which specific or neighborhood plans have been written: the Central Business District, Niles, Centerville, Irvington, and Mission San Jose. A specific plan for the proposed Warm Springs BART Station is currently underway. With the exception of the central business district, the cores of each of these historic districts developed before the automobile and are, therefore, naturally more pedestrian-friendly. (The Central Business District Concept Plan calls for redevelopment to emulate the scale and layout of the City’s historic districts.)

Finally, at the core of three of these Planning Areas are existing or proposed BART stations, around which varying degrees of transit-oriented residential, employment and mixed-use development are envisioned. Walkability is a critical component of any type of transit-oriented development because it allows more BART passengers to arrive at the station and run errands on foot, thus reducing parking demand and congestion immediately surrounding the station.

2.2. HEALTH BENEFITS OF WALKING

Walking is vitally important for public health. Public health experts now recognize that walking is an easy way to help prevent obesity related diseases. With Fremont increasing its walkability and improving design around commercial districts, the number of pedestrians will likely increase resulting in an improvement in public health and a decrease in air pollution.

In the public health profession today, there is acceptance of the connection between communities being designed for vehicles and the negative health effects caused by physical inactivity. Since the 1950s in the US, including Fremont, design of communities has focused on movement of vehicles. Streets and buildings are developed for the most efficient and effective vehicle movement and access by way of automobile. Unfortunately, this has negatively impacted pedestrian networks, making them less safe and less appealing for potential pedestrians. Figure 2-1 shows that walking statistics for Alameda County are a small margin greater than statewide statistics. The Figure shows responses to the survey question:

---

“Have you walked for transportation, fun, or exercise during the past week?” As shown, over 20 percent of Alameda County and California respondents did not walk for any purpose in the previous week.

![Figure 2-1: Walking Trips based on California Health Interview Survey](image)

Physical inactivity can lead to the growing trend of obesity. As Figure 2-2 shows, obesity or body mass index (weight in kilograms divided by height in meters squared) has been on the rise for the last decade in California. Like the state of California, Alameda County also has a trend of obesity. Figure 2-3 shows BMI categorized as underweight, normal, overweight and obese. As shown, Alameda County has approximately two-percent more respondents within the normal category than the state of California; however a majority of respondents were either overweight or obese in both the County and the entire state.

Obesity alone is a health issue and it can also lead to other chronic diseases such as heart disease and diabetes. According to Alameda County Public Health Department, heart disease was the leading cause of death between 2001 and 2003 in the County. By providing a pedestrian-friendly environment more people will walk on a regular basis and can help reverse these health trends.
Figure 2-2: Annual Obesity in California by Body Mass Index

Figure 2-3: Obesity in California and Alameda County
**2.3. CURRENT WALKING RATES IN FREMONT**

Nine percent of all trips made in Fremont—one in eleven—is made on foot. This rate varies from four percent in the hills east of Warm Springs to 14 percent in the blocks south of Centerville (see Table 2-1). In comparison, the average Alameda Countywide weekday walk trip rate is 11 percent, while the rate is ten percent across the nine Bay Area counties. These rates include trips to work, school, shopping, restaurants and recreation, but do not include commercial trips such as truck deliveries.

To understand what forces contribute to Fremont’s walk rate, data was disaggregated by district and by trip purpose. The walk rates of Fremont’s six Planning Areas are shown in Table 2-1. Rates are at or below the city’s average in Warm Springs (four percent), Centerville (six percent), Mission San Jose and Niles (each seven percent), and the central business district (nine percent). Until adopted plans for pedestrian-oriented development in these communities are realized, current land uses, building siting, parking policies and roadway configurations will continue to keep walking rates low in these districts. Irvington’s walk rate is 12 percent, higher than the citywide, countywide and region-wide averages. Irvington’s relatively high walk rate is likely due to the walkability of the Five Corners area and the presence of four schools near residential development.

People traveling to work generally walk less frequently than they do for other trip purposes because employment sites are often farther from home than is local shopping and schools and than lunchtime destinations are from the workplace. This pattern holds in Fremont where the walk-to-work rate is just one percent of all trips. Fremont’s rate ranges from negligible in the Mission San Jose and Warm Springs districts to two percent in Irvington and the central business district. For the most part, reaching employment from housing in Mission San Jose and Warm Springs requires crossing wide, arterials, a major barrier to walking. Minimal employment levels in these two districts also reduce the likelihood that a resident of either will work in their home district. Although most employment in the Irvington district is limited to the Five Corners shopping area, the walkability of the area and the presence of nearby residential areas allow a higher-than-average walk-to-work rate. The central business district’s medium density residential development, plentiful jobs and growing pedestrian network are likely responsible for that area’s high walk rate. Centerville’s walk-to-work rate is equal to the citywide average of one percent.

---

4 Transportation Improvement Program 2007 Forecast, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, based on 2000 US Census Journey-to-Work data.
Table 2-1  
Estimated Weekday Walk Trips in Fremont, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Home-based work trips</th>
<th>All trip purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walk #</td>
<td>Total #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvington</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>19,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niles</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission San Jose</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centerville</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>13,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm Springs</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District Totals</strong></td>
<td>777</td>
<td>62,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citywide Total</strong></td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>142,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alameda County</strong></td>
<td>31,454</td>
<td>1,036,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region-wide</strong></td>
<td>153,647</td>
<td>4,892,332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Transportation Improvement Program 2007 Forecast, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
3. VISION STATEMENT & GOALS

3.1. BACKGROUND

The pedestrian infrastructure improvements and programs that will be recommended in the City of Fremont Pedestrian Master Plan will be shaped by the Plan’s vision statement, goals and objectives. This Chapter includes the vision statement, goals and objectives for Fremont’s Pedestrian Master Plan.

The Plan’s vision statement should provide an overarching view that describes Fremont’s future physical pedestrian environment. The Plan’s goals should be more specific than the vision statement and, when possible, be measurable and describe outcomes. The goals will provide a framework for the Plan’s objectives and other action-oriented steps needed to implement the Plan.

3.2. VISION STATEMENT

The Plan’s vision statement should provide an overarching view that describes Fremont’s future physical pedestrian environment. The recommended language is:

3.2.1. Recommended Vision Statement

Fremont will be a city where walking is a safe, inviting and practical way to travel on a comprehensive system of sidewalks and pathways. New development in Fremont will encourage and prioritize walking, particularly in the City’s Central Business District and Community Commercial Centers.

Four components comprise the recommended vision statement:

1. Words suggested by participants at the 9-20-06 public workshop participants are the following:

   Safe(ty)                     Shopping
   Inviting                    Recreation
   All-weather                 
   Accessibility               
   Paths (i.e., off-street)    
   Comprehensive               
   Practical                   
   Education                   
   
   Driver education
   Amenities
   Destinations
   School
   Transit
2. General Plan fifth “Fundamental Goal” calls for an intensity of development in the Central Business District suitable to support an active pedestrian environment.

3. The vision put forth by the Irvington Concept Plan, which also speaks to land use: The Plan envisions a “walkable neighborhood with shopping and dining opportunities available to both local residents and the larger community; pedestrian scale of the Five Corners area, the heart of Irvington; well-designed pedestrian amenities to support the historic character, commercial opportunities and pedestrian scale of Irvington and to contribute to safe and walkable streets; pedestrian-oriented development in close walking proximity to a planned BART station near Washington Blvd.”

4. The vision statement contained in the Alameda Countywide Strategic Pedestrian Plan:

*Alameda County will be a community that inspires people to walk for everyday trips, recreation and health, where development patterns, connections to transit, and interconnected pedestrian networks offer safe, attractive, and widely accessible walking routes and districts.*

The recommended vision statement on the previous page encompasses most of the words suggested at the September 20, 2006 public meeting, with the exception of “all-weather,” “education,” “driver education,” and “amenities.” While critical, these components of a safe and inviting pedestrian environment are better saved for the Plan’s goals or its objectives.

### 3.3. GOALS

The Pedestrian Master Plan goals are the areas in which efforts need to be focused in order to support the vision statement. Whenever possible, the recommended goals draw from goals in already-adopted Fremont planning documents. The goals of the Alameda Countywide Strategic Pedestrian Plan were also consulted in the preparation of the following recommended goals.

#### 3.3.1. Recommended Vision Statement (for reference)

*Fremont will be a city where walking is a safe, inviting and practical way to travel, on a comprehensive system of sidewalks and pathways. New development in Fremont will encourage and prioritize walking, particularly in the City’s Central Business District and Community Commercial Centers.*

#### 3.3.2. Recommended Goals

**GOAL 1 Number of pedestrians**

Increase the number and percentage of trips made on foot, to reduce traffic congestion, preserve air quality and improve public health.

**GOAL 2 Safety & Security**

Create a pedestrian network that is designed to be safe and is also perceived to be safe and secure.
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GOAL 3  Infrastructure & design
Establish a world class pedestrian environment in Fremont’s Central Business District and Community Commercial Centers and improve the pedestrian experience throughout Fremont with additional infrastructure, thoughtful design and integration, and routine maintenance.

GOAL 4  Connectivity & accessibility
Ensure safe, continuous and convenient pedestrian access to essential pedestrian destinations and districts throughout Fremont for all residents, workers and visitors.

GOAL 5  Land development
Plan, design and construct new development to celebrate and invite walking, particularly in the city’s Central Business District and Community Commercial Centers.

3.4. OBJECTIVES
Objectives are the specific steps needed to accomplish each goal, and ultimately achieve the Plan’s vision. Objectives are measurable whenever possible.

3.4.1. Recommended Objectives

Goal 1 - Number of pedestrians: Increase the number and percentage of trips made on foot, to reduce traffic congestion, preserve air quality and improve public health.
   a. Strive to increase the percentage of walking trips for all trip purposes, from nine percent to 13.5 percent by 2025.¹

   b. Develop educational programs for the public about the environmental and health benefits of walking.

   c. Encourage incorporating walking into everyday activities to improve health.

Goal 2 - Safety & security: Create a pedestrian network that is designed to be safe and is also perceived to be safe and secure.

   a. Strive to improve driver awareness of pedestrian rights.

   b. Provide educational programs for pedestrians to encourage walking safely, particularly schoolchildren and senior citizens.

   c. Continue collection and analysis of collision data.

   d. Strive to reduce annual pedestrian collisions by 50 percent by 2025.²

¹ According to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, nine percent of all trips were on foot in 2005. Caltrans 2002 California Blueprint for Bicycling and Walking calls for a 50 percent increase in walk trips between 2000 and 2010, a ten year period.

²
e. Implement pedestrian safety and security improvements in locations with the highest collision rates and security issues.

**Goal 3 - Infrastructure & design:** Establish a world class pedestrian environment in Fremont’s Central Business District and Community Commercial Centers and improve the pedestrian experience throughout Fremont with additional infrastructure, thoughtful design and integration, and routine maintenance.

a. Prioritize and implement improvements to the pedestrian environment, according to the recommendations of the Pedestrian Master Plan.

b. Improve and standardize the state of the practice of pedestrian infrastructure design by developing and following citywide pedestrian design guidelines.

c. Include pedestrian facilities in all City transportation projects where feasible and appropriate.

d. Prioritize pedestrian circulation along local and collector streets in Fremont’s Central Business District and Community Commercial Centers, through the use of pedestrian improvement measures.

e. Provide appropriate pedestrian roadway crossings throughout Fremont, to facilitate and invite safe and secure pedestrian travel.

f. Routinely ensure that public access complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

g. Create both public and private open spaces and activities that invite pedestrian use.

h. Design and construct pedestrian facilities to conform to the guidelines and standards of the City of Fremont, Alameda County, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and state and federal agencies.

i. Dedicate adequate resources in the Capital Improvement Program for maintaining existing and future pedestrian facilities.

j. Optimize the experience of walking with amenities such as landscaping, public art, seating, and drinking fountains where appropriate.

k. Identify and apply for public funding sources to finance pedestrian facilities, education and safety programs.

---

2 Caltrans 2002 *California Blueprint for Bicycling and Walking* calls for a 50 percent decrease in pedestrian fatality rates between 2000 and 2010, a ten year period.
Goal 4 - Connectivity & accessibility: Ensure safe, continuous and convenient pedestrian access to essential pedestrian destinations and districts throughout Fremont for all residents, workers and visitors.

a. Work towards providing safe, continuous and convenient walking routes from neighborhoods to all schools, transit hubs, commercial districts, parks and other recreational destinations, and between employment centers and nearby shops and restaurants.

b. Promote planning and design for safe, accessible and convenient pedestrian circulation design from the public street right-of-way to entrances of shopping centers and new developments.

c. Promote on-site design for safe and convenient pedestrian circulation and connectivity within developments and shopping centers.

d. Work towards completing Fremont’s pedestrian network by closing existing gaps.

e. Create a comprehensive system of trails that links major destinations throughout Fremont and is accessible to a large number of people.

f. Promote accessibility and mobility for special needs people such as elderly and disabled people.

g. Promote increasing the pedestrian access share to BART from eight percent to 8.5 percent.3

Goal 5 - Land development: Plan, design and construct new development to encourage and invite walking, particularly in the City’s Central Business District and Community Commercial Centers.

d. Plan, design and construct new development sufficiently compact and dense to support an active pedestrian environment at a human scale.

e. Orient new construction around public plazas and esplanades, pedestrian pathways and other open spaces.

f. Encourage a mix of land uses and activities in development and redevelopment projects that will maximize pedestrian travel.

g. Encourage retail at the ground level of new development in the Central Business District and Community Commercial Centers.

4. EXISTING CONDITIONS

4.1. SETTING

4.1.1. Location

The City of Fremont is situated on the eastern edge of the San Francisco Bay in southwest Alameda County. Fremont encompasses about 92 square miles of land, and is bordered on the north by the cities of Union City and Hayward, on the south by the city of Milpitas, on the east by unincorporated Alameda County lands. The city of Newark is located to the west of Fremont's urbanized area, and is completely surrounded by the city of Fremont incorporated area. Fremont’s city limits extend to the San Francisco Bay, approximately halfway across the Dumbarton Bridge, and include the shoreline areas of the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge. With a population of approximately 209,000 Fremont is the fourth most populous city in the Bay Area, and the fifth largest city in California in land area. The topography of Fremont varies, from the low bayfront hills of Coyote Hills Regional Park, to the relatively flat urbanized core of the city between I-880 and Mission Boulevard, to the steep terrain rising east of the city up to Mission Peak.

4.1.2. Land Uses

Fremont has a relatively dispersed development pattern, and planning for the pedestrian network must take into account the fact that people live everywhere within the urbanized area of Fremont, that employment, shopping and recreational destinations are located throughout the city (or outside of Fremont), and that pedestrian facilities need to provide access to and from all areas of the city. This section discusses Fremont’s major community and business districts and recreational destinations, in order to help identify some of the major destinations and attractors for bicycle trips.

Fremont is comprised of five major community districts originally – Centerville, Irvington, Mission San Jose, Niles, and Warm Springs – that were separate towns until 1956 when they joined to form the incorporated City of Fremont. These historic town districts, along with the newer Planning Areas of Baylands, Ardenwood, and the Central Business District, form the modern city of Fremont. These three Areas are a focus of the Pedestrian Master Plan given that they serve as major nodes of employment, shopping, and civic activity. They are shown on Figure 4-1. Each of these areas has a unique urban form that affects its pedestrian environment.

4.2. DESCRIPTION OF PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

The foundation of a pedestrian–friendly community is compact mixed-use development and economically viable and vital places. This foundation is achieved in part through use of design elements like:

- Continuous sidewalks;
- Access for disabled citizens (compliance with the American’s with Disabilities Act);
- Ease of navigating intersections;
- Manageable walking distances;
- Scale of sidewalks and adjacent building facades;
• Personal security;
• Aesthetic and visual interest;
• Suitable climate for walking including shade protection;
• Limited pedestrian exposure to high levels of noise and poor air quality; and,
• Access to efficient transit and/or vehicle parking facilities

Pedestrian facilities must be compliant with all state and federal standards for access. Sidewalks must provide enough width to accommodate a throughway for disabled citizens, along with room for landscaping and street furniture. Pedestrian facilities become more inviting when elements like scale and visual interest are incorporated into the environment. For this reason, design standards for pedestrian facilities should introduce elements like zero lot line setbacks, architectural design review of new development projects, public space elements, and landscaping requirements for sidewalks and rights-of-way. Streetscapes should be designed with a human scale in mind, enabling pedestrians to feel comfortable and in control as they use the pedestrian environment.

Including a mix of business, residential and commercial uses at a pedestrian scale will ensure an environment that functionally supports a choice to walk. A mix of well-designed uses provides numerous reasons for pedestrians to patronize businesses, transit and civic amenities during all business hours. Ample pedestrian traffic contributes to actual security in the pedestrian environment, as well as perceived security. Clear signage for both businesses and city streets will help pedestrians to navigate between destinations. Safe intersections will enable pedestrians to move between streets and between shops and restaurants.

The safety and efficiency of pedestrian facilities is shaped significantly by the character of intersections of roadways of all types and classifications. Intersection design is an integral part of overall pedestrian design, and safety is the preeminent goal of intersection design. Many of Fremont’s existing roadways present challenges to enhance pedestrian intersection design. For example, in Fremont Central Business District (CBD) where intersections prioritize vehicle mobility, there are opportunities to retrofit them into more walkable facilities. Appendix A – Pedestrian Design Guidelines, provides concepts and design standards for intersections that promote pedestrian safety.

4.3. FREMONT’S PLANNING AREAS

Centerville is centrally located around the intersection of Fremont Boulevard and Thornton Avenue. The district has a traditional downtown commercial area along Fremont Boulevard that supports a variety of retail shops and restaurants. The area is bound on the west by Interstate 880. The historic Centerville Depot train station serves the Amtrak Capital Corridor and Altamont Commuter Express trains, linking Fremont to San Jose in the south, Oakland and Sacramento in the north, and the Tri-Valley area and Stockton in the east.

Irvington is centered around the “Five Corners” area where Washington and Fremont Boulevards converge, and is a central activity area in Fremont. This area is one of the larger, older, and more historic sections of Fremont. As part of the long-range Warm Springs extension BART plans, an Irvington BART station is proposed at the southwest corner of Washington Boulevard and Osgood Road.
Figure 4-1: Fremont Pedestrian Plan - Eight Study Districts
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Niles, located in the northeastern corner of Fremont, is a center for specialty retail, antique stores, and dining. The historic district is situated between Alameda Creek and the rolling hills, just off of Mission Boulevard and Niles Canyon Road. Niles is centered around a traditional downtown main street, with over eighty businesses. In 1996, the State of California Main Street Program chose Niles as an official Main Street Community.

Warm Springs, located in the southeastern part of Fremont, is home to hundreds of Fremont’s high-tech firms in the industry clusters of software, hardware, telecommunications, semiconductors, and biotechnology. Warm Springs will also be home to a new BART station, located at Warm Springs Boulevard and South Grimmer Boulevard, part of the BART extension from Fremont's CBD into Santa Clara County.

The Mission San Jose area, located in the foothills in southeastern Fremont below Mission Peak, is home to the Mission San Jose which was established in 1797. This historic district also includes Ohlone College, the Olive Hyde Art Gallery, and the Gary Soren Smith Center for the Fine and Performing Arts. The Mission San Jose district is accessible by Driscoll Road and Mission Boulevard.

Fremont’s Central Business District is east of Centerville and west of Fremont Central Park. In the CBD there is the Fremont BART Station, Washington Hospital, and a variety of commercial and office uses built in the last 30 years.

Baylands Business District is located west of I-880 between Stevenson Road and Fremont’s southern boundary. The District is comprised of over 3,000 acres zoned for non-residential uses. This district is possibly the future home of the Oakland Athletics.

Ardenwood Business Park is in northwest Fremont bound by the Fremont border adjacent to Union City and Route 84. Ardenwood is an evolving bio-tech and high-tech job center.

Because it was not possible to survey attributes of every street in Fremont, the inventory of pedestrian facilities focused on the city’s eight Planning Areas: Centerville, Irvington, Mission San Jose, Niles, Warm Springs and the Central Business District, Baylands and Ardenwood. Because the vast majority of urbanized parts of Fremont have sidewalks, the inventory did not solely focus on sidewalk gaps, but also focused on curb ramps. Curb ramps are one of the most basic elements of the pedestrian network, and are particularly important for providing mobility for persons with disabilities, children, and senior citizens. As part of this Pedestrian Master Plan, compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) will be discussed, and the inventory of curb ramps provides the city with a baseline upon which to make future ADA improvements. Other attributes of these areas observed include:

- Type and character of existing facilities
- Development pattern of the district
- Intersection treatments and crossings.

A description of each of these districts’ attributes follows.
4.3.1. Centerville

Centerville is in northwest Fremont and adjacent to the CBD. Central to this District is the Amtrak Capital Corridor and Altamont Commuter Express train station located near the Fremont Boulevard and Peralta Boulevard intersection. Through Centerville, Fremont Boulevard is a four-lane arterial street that also acts as the main pedestrian area through the district. On Fremont Boulevard there are continuous sidewalks, business facades adjacent to the sidewalk and some pedestrian-scaled lighting. A Farmers’ Market occurs every Saturday that brings a multitude of pedestrians to the District.

4.3.2. Irvington

Southeast of Fremont’s CBD is the Irvington District. This area has residential neighborhoods and several schools. The center of the District is located at the five corners intersection of Washington Boulevard, Fremont Boulevard and Bay Street. At this node of Irvington, there is a small retail area with buildings that date back to the late 19th century and front the street as well as more modern commercial developments with large setbacks and parking lots adjacent to the street. This area of Irvington has continuous sidewalks with limited or no buffers between the street and the pedestrian zone.

Adjacent to Irvington, along Osgood Road and parallel to the railroad tracks, there are industrial-type land uses. On Osgood Road, there are gaps in the sidewalk network and locations where there is only a sidewalk on one side of the street. Osgood Street improvement is currently underway. The project will provide for four lanes, bike lanes, and sidewalks between S. Grimmer Boulevard and Washington Boulevard.

4.3.3. Niles

Niles is historic and attracts many visitors to its Silent Film Museum and the Niles Canyon Railway. The state of California designated the Niles area as a Main Street Community that is walkable with curb extensions, accessible businesses to the sidewalks and potted plants.

Other than the Niles Canyon Railway for tourists and visitors, Niles has the Union Pacific Railroad line that runs between Mission and Niles Boulevards. In the area, there are only two pedestrian connections across the tracks, on Nursery Avenue and the Sullivan Underpass. These two existing connections have relatively high pedestrian volumes. Many of these pedestrians include school children who reside north of Mission Boulevard and travel to schools south of the train tracks. At the Nursery Avenue location there is a sidewalk on one side of the street causing some pedestrians to cross the street three times to access the sidewalk.

4.3.4. Warm Springs

An area growing with new development in south Fremont is the Warm Springs Area. This area has industrial, commercial and office land uses. Warm Springs is also attracting larger commercial centers, such as Fry’s Electronics and Home Depot. The large office centers that are the largest in Fremont are
shown on Figure 4-2. Like in the CBD, these developments can prevent pedestrian access from sidewalks across large parking lots.

Warm Springs has wide streets and does not have a continuous pedestrian network. For example, near the I-680 overcrossing on Durham Road there are areas without sidewalks. Also, the major arterial through the district, Warm Springs Boulevard, has gaps in the sidewalk. On this major arterial, pedestrians also contend with high traffic volumes from drivers who use it as a bypass to I-880 congestion.

4.3.5. Mission San Jose

In the Mission San Jose district, both the Mission San Jose and Ohlone College are situated on Mission Boulevard, a four-lane arterial that runs from I-880 in south Fremont to Union City in north Fremont. In this area, Mission Boulevard serves as the main street district with businesses adjacent to sidewalks. This pedestrian area features pedestrian-scaled lighting and street furniture. Mission Boulevard presents a crossing obstacle to pedestrians; students accessing the businesses on Mission Boulevard cross the high-traffic street at non-crosswalk locations that connect with informal paths on the Ohlone College campus.

North of Ohlone College, at the Mission San Jose, Mission Boulevard narrows to two lanes and sidewalks and pedestrian-scaled lighting continues. It is a comfortable environment that connects through trees adjacent to Mission Boulevard. The sidewalk crosses over wooden bridges on both sides of Mission Boulevard.

South of the College there are new residential developments built in the last 20 years. Within these developments as well as where the developments connect with Mission Boulevard there are sidewalks. However, on Mission Boulevard, between these developments there are several gaps in the sidewalk network.

4.3.6. Downtown / Central Business District

The CBD has a growing number of medium density residential units with access to the BART Station. Fortunately, the newer development led to the creation of a relatively standardized pedestrian network. The CBD also has large commercial and office centers with large parking lots. Though there is a complete pedestrian network, these patterns of development are not focused on pedestrian access. Oftentimes, pedestrians must maneuver from the sidewalk through parking lots to access the front door. Other than commercial and office uses, more residential development is occurring in-close proximity to the BART Station. As a result, there will be more pedestrians that access and egress from the BART Station and increases the need for a safe pedestrian network in Fremont’s CBD.
The CBD has many large four-to six-lane arterial roadways including Fremont Boulevard, Mowry Avenue, and Walnut Avenue. Blocks on these streets are long and vehicle speeds are high. This, in combination with no buffers between sidewalks and the roadway may make an uncomfortable experience for pedestrians at some locations. Also, since the streets are wide, there is more exposure time for pedestrians crossing streets and potentially coming into conflict with vehicles.

4.3.7. Baylands Business Area
The Baylands Business Area is home to a variety of businesses, including a major retail center, an auto mall and hotels. This area is comprised of newer style developments with relatively large parking lots. Surrounding the development in Baylands are sidewalks that are wide (10 feet). Many of the developments do not face the main streets, therefore pedestrian access is limited.

Since there are large parking lots for retail centers and business parks, pedestrian circulation is limited around Baylands. Access and circulation between sites is through parked vehicles. With a proposed baseball village and housing development in the area, pedestrian volumes will most likely increase, making pedestrian access and circulation inside and outside of the retail and business developments even more critical.

4.3.8. Ardenwood Business Park
Ardenwood Business Park has many newly constructed office developments with more likely on the way. The Ardenwood area also has newer suburban style residential development. The area has a continuous pedestrian network along the arterial and neighborhood streets. However, like Baylands, the challenge for pedestrians in the Ardenwood Business Park area is walking between buildings or through parking lots.

Currently, there is a lack of pedestrian connections in Ardenwood. Due to the lack of connections through parking lots, pedestrians are not comfortable walking to access sidewalks. Also, deterring pedestrian activity and connections are vehicles traveling at high speeds in the large lots.

4.4. OTHER KEY PEDESTRIAN GENERATORS/ATTRACTORS
An inventory of key pedestrian generators and attractors was performed in the six districts and through the remaining areas of Fremont. Areas most suitable for walking with short blocks and a mix of land uses have the greatest potential for pedestrian activity. Areas of Centerville, Niles, Irvington, and Mission San Jose have short blocks with main streets and mixed-land uses. These areas are potentially major attractors for pedestrians. The CBD could also potentially become a pedestrian activity area due to the number of jobs and transit options in the area.

Major pedestrian destinations in Fremont include schools, public transportation and shopping centers. Figure 4-2 shows Fremont’s key pedestrian generators and attractors. There are over 80 schools spread throughout Fremont that attract students walking to school. Fremont’s transit providers include Amtrak, BART, Alameda Contra Costa (AC) Transit, and Santa Clara Valley Transit Authority (VTA). AC Transit has over 600 bus stops all over Fremont with connections to VTA and BART at the Fremont BART Station. Amtrak provides train and bus service through the Fremont Train and Bus Stations. In addition to the existing BART Station, there are two additionally proposed stations for Fremont. The locations are the Irvington District near the intersection of Washington Boulevard/Osgood Road/Driscoll Road, and the Warm Springs district at the southwest quadrant of Warm Springs Boulevard/S. Grimmer Boulevard.
Figure 4-2: Fremont Pedestrian Plan - Pedestrian Generators/Attractors
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4.4.1. Schools

Schools are key pedestrian activity centers. Fremont has over 80 schools, as shown on Figure 4-2 and listed in Table 4-1. Currently, there is no formal Safe Routes to School programs in the Fremont Unified School District. However, the Council of PTAs adopted a resolution to improve crosswalk safety with better signage around schools. School Safety Committees and the City have developed safety studies at several elementary schools and two high schools in Fremont.

Table 4-1:
Elementary, Middle, and High Schools, Colleges, and Adult Schools in Fremont

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ardenwood Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>33955 Emilia Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azevada Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>39450 Royal Palm Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacow Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>40404 Sundale Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookvale Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>3400 Nicolet Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabrillo Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>36700 San Pedro Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadbourne Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>801 Plymouth Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>40292 Leslie St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Park Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>34400 Maybird Cir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glankler/Brier Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>39207 Sundale Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenmoor Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>4620 Mattos Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gomes Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>555 Lemos Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimmer Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>43030 Newport Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey Green Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>42875 Gatewood St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leitch Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>47100 Fernald St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maloney Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>38700 Logan Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattos Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>37944 Farwell Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millard Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>5200 Valpey Park Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission San Jose Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>43545 Bryant St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>41700 Denise St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niles Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>37141 2nd St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliveira Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>4180 Alder Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkmont Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2601 Parkside Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>35521 Cabrillo Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallejo Mills Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>38569 Canyon Heights Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm Springs Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>47370 Warm Springs Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>3375 Warwick Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weibel Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>45135 S Grimmer Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centerville Jr. High</td>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>37720 Fremont Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins Jr. High</td>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>600 Driscoll Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horner Jr. High</td>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>41365 Chapel Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity School</td>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>4455 Seneca Park Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity School</td>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>4455 Seneca Park Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton Jr. High</td>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>4357 Thornton Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walters Jr. High</td>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>39600 Logan Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American High</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>36300 Fremont Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvington High</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>41800 Blacow Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy High</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>39999 Blacow Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission San Jose High</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>41717 Palm Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson High</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>4455 Seneca Park Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington High</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>38442 Fremont Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2-3 Learning Center</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>46280 Briar Pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Childs Hideaway</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>37531 Fremont Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achiever Institute</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>43475 Ellsworth St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annoor Foundation</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>33330 Peace Ter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atid Jewish Day School</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>42000 Paseo Padre Pkwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel Christian Academy</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>36060 Fremont Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Academics</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>39138 State St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britetree</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>39275 State St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvary Baptist School</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>41354 Roberts Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childrens Galaxy</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>34735 Ardenwood Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Community School</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>39700 Mission Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Life School</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>40155 Blacow Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeVry Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>6600 Dumbarton Cir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Center</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>39100 Gallaudet Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Sisters</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>43326 Mission Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont Adult School</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4700 Calaveras Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont Christian School</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4760 Thornton Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont Church School</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>40546 Mission Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy Bear Forest</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>39600 Mission Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Spirit School</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>3930 Parish Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiddie Kare</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>2450 Durham Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinder Care Learning Center</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>38700 Paseo Padre Pkwy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Hills Christian School</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>225 Driscoll Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Valley Regional Center</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>40230 Laiolo Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monarch Christian Preschool</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>38895 Mission Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montessori Children's Center</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>33170 Lake Mead Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montessori School of Centerville</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4209 Baine Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montessori School of Fremont</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>155 Washington Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Horizons School</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4350 Hansen Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Horizons School</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>2550 Peralta Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern Polytechnic University</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>117 Fourier Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Savior Lutheran Preschool - Kindergarten</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>858 Washington Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkmont Day School</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4727 Calaveras Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince of Peace Lutheran School</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>38451 Fremont Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Joseph Elementary School</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>43222 Mission Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Josephs Adult Education</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>43148 Mission Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Leonard Elementary School</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>3635 Saint Leonards Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scribbles Montessori</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>38660 Lexington St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca Center</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>40950 Chapel Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequoia Institute</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>200 Whitney Pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silicon Valley College</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>41350 Christy St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Parent/CAL-Safe</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4455 Seneca Park Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victory Academy</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4950 Tenor Ct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.2. Employment Centers

There is a concentration of Fremont’s largest employers in the Warm Springs and Ardenwood Areas. Of these employers, shown in Table 4-2, eight are within two miles of the Warm Springs Area and two with the potential of many more are located in Ardenwood. These employers create a minimal effect on pedestrian generation and attraction as they provide parking spaces and infrastructure that accommodate driving to these sites. Plus, Warm Springs does not have a comfortable pedestrian environment with a continuous sidewalk network.

Commercial centers located along the Fremont Boulevard corridor, in the CBD, and Baylands are potential pedestrian generators or attractors if the streets are reconfigured to the recommendations established in this Plan and the Specific Area plans. The present configuration prioritizes vehicle mobility by locating expansive parking lots between sidewalks and buildings. Many of the shopping centers are set back over 200 feet from the street where the sidewalks are located and as a result many businesses along this corridor are inaccessible by pedestrians on the sidewalk.

Table 4-2: Fremont’s Largest Employer Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Estimated Number of Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altatron Inc</td>
<td>47951 Westinghouse Dr</td>
<td>1,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardenwood Business Park</td>
<td>34790 Ardentech Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asyst Technologies</td>
<td>48761 Kato Road</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lam Research Company</td>
<td>4650 Cushing Parkway</td>
<td>2,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Equipment Technology</td>
<td>6900 Pasco Padre Pkwy</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New United Motor Manufacturing</td>
<td>45500 Fremont Boulevard</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seagate Magnetics</td>
<td>47050 Kato Road</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solectron Corporation</td>
<td>401 Kato Terrace</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitek</td>
<td>4670 Auto Mall Parkway</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Hospital</td>
<td>2000 Mowry Ave.</td>
<td>1,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fremont</td>
<td>3300 Capitol Avenue, Bld. A</td>
<td>1,121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.3. Transit

Given much of Fremont’s relatively low density pattern of development, most residents commute to work with automobiles. People will utilize public transit if the walking route to access stops is obvious and convenient. Bus stops feed commuters to the BART Station and if stops and routes are strategically located, it could encourage more people to navigate the multiple mode shifts, i.e. walking to a bus stop and boarding the bus that takes the commuter to the BART Station. The design and locations of these stops greatly influence use of services.

4.4.3.1. Bay Area Rapid Transit

BART is an intra-regional commuter rail system that connects Fremont with San Francisco and Contra Costa Counties. The Fremont BART station is located adjacent to Fremont’s Central Business District between Mowry and Walnut Avenues. There are 34 lockers at the station where patrons can store bicycles. Bicycles are allowed on BART at all times except, inbound to San Francisco during morning commute times. Also, during morning and evening commute times bicycles are not allowed in 12th and
19th Street Oakland Stations and during evening commute times, westbound travelers with bikes must exit at Embarcadero Station. The primary destinations for Fremont BART riders are locations in Alameda County and San Francisco. Only a small number of passengers are destined for Contra Costa County. Fremont is served by BART’s Daly City-Fremont line and the Richmond-Fremont Direct Lines, with connections to the Pittsburg/Bay Point and Dublin/Pleasanton lines.

Immediately adjacent to the Fremont BART Station is Washington Hospital and within a half-mile of the Station are commercial and residential developments. The development of medium density residential units is increasing in this area and will potentially increase the number of pedestrians accessing the BART Station for commuting and other trip purposes.

There are also two proposed BART Stations for Fremont with the proposed Warm Springs extension. An Irvington BART Station is planned near Washington Boulevard at Osgood Road and a Warm Springs Station is planned south of Grimmer Boulevard at Warm Springs Boulevard. Ensuring pedestrian access is prioritized is important for existing and future BART stations given their proximity to offices, parks, commercial centers as well as planned future development projects. With the parking lots included at each station, routing pedestrian traffic circulation to these sites, while minimizing conflicts with vehicle traffic accessing the lots is essential to maximize pedestrian utilizing these stations.

### 4.4.3.2. AC Transit

The Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit) District 2 is comprised of Fremont and Newark. Together they have thirteen different bus lines with a route network oriented to the Union City and Fremont BART stations. AC Transit also has a shuttle that serves as an express commuter bus from Fremont to the Stanford Industrial Park in Palo Alto.

All AC Transit buses are equipped with bicycle racks that hold two bicycles. Figure 4-2 shows that there are over 600 bus stops in Fremont with a concentration in the Central Business District and many connections at the Fremont BART Station. Bus stops are on the major arterials such as: Fremont Boulevard, Blacow Road, Peralta Boulevard, Paseo Padre Parkway, Mission Boulevard and Mowry Avenue. As Figure 2-3 shows the majority of bus stops with shelters are on Fremont Boulevard, Paseo Padre Parkway and Mission Boulevard and most of the other stops do not have a shelter or bench. In some locations along Fremont Boulevard, the bus shelters are in the sidewalk and are an obstruction for passing pedestrians.

### 4.4.3.3. Amtrak/Altamont Commuter Express Trains

Amtrak Capital Corridor train's and the Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) trains stop at the Centerville Depot located at Fremont Boulevard and Peralta Boulevard in the Centerville district. The train station, originally built in 1910, is within walking distance to the small businesses on Fremont Boulevard. Amtrak California’s Capitol Corridor trains run between San Jose and Auburn, with stops in Fremont, Hayward, Oakland, Richmond, and Sacramento. Bicycles are allowed on the trains. Capitol Corridor trains and buses stop in Fremont at the Centerville station, located at the intersection of Peralta and Fremont Boulevards. The Altamont Commute Express (ACE) trains run between Stockton and San Jose. ACE stops include Tracy, Livermore, Pleasanton, Fremont, and Santa Clara. Passengers may bring one bicycle per person aboard ACE trains.
Every Saturday, east of the station in Bill Ball Plaza, is the Centerville Farmer’s Market. In Bill Ball Plaza there are public benches and planted trees. The train service, Farmer’s Market, and civic plaza are all attractors for pedestrians.

There are sidewalks on Fremont Boulevard and in the area surrounding the train station as well as some trees adjacent to the sidewalk and the street. The high-speeds of traffic on Fremont Boulevard and the at-grade railroad crossing on Fremont Boulevard could be barriers to pedestrians connecting with the Train Station and Farmers’ Market.

4.4.3.4. VTA
Destinations within Santa Clara County are served by Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) bus service. VTA bus routes serve several destinations within Santa Clara County from Fremont, including Milpitas, San Jose, Santa Clara, Sunnyvale and Mountain View. All VTA routes into Fremont terminate at the Fremont BART station, with stops along Mission Boulevard and Stevenson Boulevard. VTA buses are equipped with racks for up to two bicycles. If the rack are full, drivers may permit up to two bicycles inside if there is a light passenger load.

4.4.3.5. Dumbarton Express Bus
This weekday express bus service across the Dumbarton Bridge connects the Union City BART station and the Palo Alto Caltrain station, with a stop in Fremont at the Ardenwood Park and Ride. Dumbarton Express service is provided through a consortium of AC Transit, BART, Union City Transit and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority. Each bus has a rack for two bicycles.

4.4.4. Parks and Recreation Areas
The Fremont Parks and Recreation Department oversees a variety of neighborhood and community parks, playgrounds, community centers, historical sites, and other recreational areas in Fremont. These facilities include over two hundred fifty picnic areas, thirty six tennis courts and over forty sport fields. The largest city-operated park is Central Park, located in central Fremont at Stevenson Boulevard and Paseo Padre Parkway, comprised of 434 acres of land including the 83-acre Lake Elizabeth. In addition to its size, the park’s prominent elements include its six softball fields, a driving range, a skate park, a dog park, eighteen tennis courts, four picnic sites, ten soccer fields, and boat amenities.

Regional Parks in Fremont include Coyote Hills Regional Park, located in western Fremont near the bayfront, and Mission Peak Regional Preserve, located in the eastern hills of Fremont. The Quarry Lakes Regional Recreation Area in northern Fremont includes several lakes that offer opportunities to picnic, boat, hike, view wildlife, swim and fish.

The Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge consists of several sites covering over 25,000 acres in the South Bay, from southwestern Fremont to Redwood City. The refuge consists of ponds, sloughs and marshes and is home to a wide array of wildlife. The building that serves as the headquarters and visitor center for the Refuge is located west of Newark and south of Highway 84 and is bound on the east by Thornton Avenue.
The Alameda Creek Regional Trail is a major multi-use trail that extends through northern Fremont along Alameda Creek from Niles Canyon west to the San Francisco Bay. Segments of the San Francisco Bay Trail extend through Fremont within the Don Edwards National Wildlife Refuge and Coyote Hills Regional Park.

4.4.5. Trails and Pathways

Fremont has a network of off-street trails and pathways for pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrians as shown on Figure 4-3. This section briefly describes four of Fremont’s major trails.

4.4.5.1. San Francisco Bay Trail

The Bay Trail Plan proposes the development of a paved regional hiking and bicycling trail around the perimeter of San Francisco and San Pablo Bays. Approximately one-half of the 400-mile trail has been constructed, either hiking or bicycling paths or as on-street bicycle lanes or routes. The Bay Trail designated a “spine” for a continuous through-route around the Bay and “spurs” for shorter routes to Bay resources. The goals of the Plan include providing connections to existing park and recreation facilities, creating links to existing and proposed transportation facilities, and preserving the ecological integrity of the Bays and their wetlands.

In Fremont, the Bay Trail segments are the Newark Slough Trail and Shoreline Trail within the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge, Bayview Trail in Coyote Hills Regional Park, a segment of the Alameda Creek Trail between the bay shoreline and Ardenwood Boulevard, a segment of the Alameda Creek Trail between the bay shore and Ardenwood Boulevard, and the bicycle path along the south side of the Dumbarton Bridge. Future Bay Trail segments are planned to connect south out of Fremont to Dixon Landing Road in Milpitas, as well as a segment along the railroad right of way extending through Newark toward Cushing Road in Fremont. The pedestrian network in this plan will ensure connectivity to the Bay Trail.

4.4.5.2. Alameda Creek Trail

The Alameda Creek Trail runs along the banks of Alameda Creek, beginning in the Niles District of Fremont at the mouth of Niles Canyon and running westward toward Coyote Hills Regional Park and the San Francisco Bay. The trail is approximately twelve miles long. Trails are provided on both sides of the creek -- the southern trail is located within Fremont, while the northern trail is located within both Fremont and Union City. The south side is paved and suggested for bicyclers, hikers, joggers, and runners, and the north side is designed as an equestrian trail. As noted above, a segment of the Alameda Creek Trail between the bay shore and Ardenwood Boulevard is a designated segment of the San Francisco Bay Trail.

4.4.5.3. Quarry Lakes Park Trails

Several paved trails exist within Quarry Lakes Regional Recreation Area, including the 0.5-mile Niles Canyon Trail, the 1.3-mile Western Pacific Trail, the 0.3-mile Wood Duck Trail, and the 1.1-mile California trail. The bike path network encircles the lakes and provides access to picnic areas and other park amenities. The trails also connect with the Alameda Creek Trail.
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4.4.5.4. Coyote Hills Park Trails

Coyote Hills Regional Park has an extensive network of paved and unpaved trails. The main paved trail segment is the Bay View Trail, a loop trail that begins and ends at the Visitors Center and connects to the Alameda Creek trail. The Bay View trail connects to a variety of unpaved gravel trails and footpaths, including the unpaved Bay Trail route that heads south into the Don Edward National Wildlife Refuge and crosses SR-84 at a pedestrian/bicycle bridge over the Dumbarton Toll Plaza.

4.5. PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS

Pedestrian exposure at intersections directly affects safety, especially for older persons and children who may not be able to cross streets quickly or discern (or be seen by) on-coming traffic. In some intersection locations, such as across Fremont Boulevard, the distance to cross the street is relatively long due to the number and width of traffic lanes. At this intersection and others in Fremont, pedestrians must travel across left-turn lanes and then cross free or yielded right-turns.

At other intersections, wide curb radii create long pedestrian crossings and encourage higher speed vehicle turn movements such as at the intersection of Fremont Boulevard and Paseo Padre Parkway. It is not necessary for vehicles to stop at free-right turns because there is a lane for the turning traffic. Many locations in Fremont have yielded right-turns, where vehicles must slow down in order to merge with on-coming traffic. In both of these situations, vehicles travel faster than if they must come to a complete stop.

At mid-block locations, crosswalks across multiple lanes of fast moving vehicles and no median can create uncomfortable conditions for pedestrians as well. For example, on Fremont Boulevard through Centerville, there is fast moving traffic, four through-lanes and a left-turn lane and a crosswalk. At this location there is a high-degree of traffic exposure to pedestrians. At mid-block locations where there are multiple lanes of traffic, it creates a challenge to cross the street.

4.6. CURB RAMP INVENTORY

The collection of existing conditions also includes a curb ramp and curb cut inventory in Fremont. Curb ramps and curb cuts are essential for providing access to the public right-of-way for wheelchairs and mobility impaired individuals. Curb cuts are at street-grade and used in medians and islands that separate traffic lanes at intersections. They must be wide enough for wheelchairs to pass. Curb ramps allow a user to ramp up between the street level and the sidewalk level at intersections and crossings. Properly designed curb ramps and curb cuts allow these pedestrians to cross the street and return to the sidewalk with ease. Other pedestrians including children, the elderly and people walking with carts and strollers use curb ramps to easily ramp up and down to the street. For the existing conditions inventory, the same six Planning Areas (Centerville, Irvington, Mission San Jose, Niles, the CBD and Warm Springs) were
studied for the curb ramp count and inventory. The curb ramp and curb cut inventories provide information on a variety of different attributes.

The curb ramp inventory includes the collection of different attributes of the ramp including precise measurements. Type of curb ramp refers to whether the ramp is diagonal or perpendicular to traffic flow. Diagonal ramps require crosswalks to include a four foot buffer to allow a wheelchair to turn the chair towards the path of travel after ramping down. These curb ramps are appropriate for areas where there is not enough room to provide perpendicular curb ramps. Perpendicular curb ramps situate a wheelchair in the direction of the crosswalk so that there is no need to correct the direction of travel upon ramping down. Perpendicular curb ramps are most appropriate for intersections with high-traffic volumes, helping to prevent users from traveling into traffic. Slope of curb ramps is the grade change between the sidewalk and the street; steep slopes present a challenge to wheelchair users. The inventory includes three of these slope measurements for each ramp. Other slopes in the inventory include cross slope, slope of the flares on each side of the ramp, and the slope of the landing at the top of the ramp. An additional inventory measurement taken was the transition between the street and the gutter of the street. This should be smooth because an uneven transition is difficult for wheelchairs to maneuver and finally, whether or not truncated domes are installed on curb ramps to alert vision impaired individuals to the street edge was noted.

In the six study areas, there are 319 corners, approximately 248 with curb ramps and 72 with curb cuts. There are seven locations without curb ramps and all are within Niles. The two corners without curb cuts are in Centerville and the CBD. As Figure 4-4 shows, 96 percent of the surveyed corners have curb ramps or curb cuts. Figure 4-5 shows the locations without accessible corners. Of the 240 curb ramp locations, four locations are perpendicular ramps making a total of 248 inventoried curb ramps. Figure 4-6 shows that 46 percent of the ramps meet the minimum gradual-slope guideline, 74 percent meet the cross-slope guideline, 16 percent meet the flare-slope guideline and 50 percent meet the landing-slope and smooth transition guidelines. Only two of the curb ramps in the study districts have truncated domes.

Of the 72 curb cuts in the study areas, 80 percent of the curb cuts meet the necessary width requirement.

Other measures of the inventory include whether pedestrian push buttons are present, and the push-buttons’ height. Children as well as wheelchair users should be able to reach push buttons on poles adjacent to intersections. The push-button height recommendation is 42 inches and the average height of the 151 push-buttons measured is 42 inches. Of the 151 push-buttons, 86 are curb ramp locations and 65 are at curb cut locations. Audible signals are also important for visually-impaired pedestrians. In the study locations, Fremont has 37 audible signals that emit sounds when it is safe for pedestrians to cross the street.
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Chapter 4: Existing Conditions

4.7. PEDESTRIAN COLLISION ANALYSIS

Collisions involving pedestrians are much more likely to result in fatalities or severe injuries than vehicle-vehicle collisions. Plotting collision locations can help determine areas requiring special attention or further monitoring. Pedestrian collisions for five years between 2001 and 2006 were collected from (SWITRS) Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System. There were 210 reported collisions over this period of time: 55 in 2001 and 2002, 25 in 2003, 35 in 2004 and 40 in 2005.

Figure 4-5 shows the location of each collision from 2001 through 2005 including at intersections and at mid-block locations. A large number of the collisions surround the Fremont Boulevard corridor through central Fremont. Two intersections (Fremont Boulevard and Clough Avenue, and Fremont Boulevard and Peralta Boulevard) had five pedestrian-involved crashes, the most of any intersections. Through the City, Fremont Boulevard is a four-to six-lane arterial that runs southeast, from I-880 near the northern Fremont boundary to south of I-880 near the southern Fremont boundary. Fremont Boulevard has long blocks and the traffic speeds are what is expected for arterial classification. While walking, pedestrians must travel long distance for safe crossings at signalized intersections.

From the total number of collisions reported between 2001 and 2005, 12 fatalities (6 on Fremont Boulevard) were reported and 201 injuries. A majority of the crashes (142) occurred during daylight hours with a spike in crashes during the commuting hours. As Figure 4-7 shows, the greatest number of collisions occurred between 6:00 PM and 7:00 PM (22). The greatest three hours, 8:00 AM, 5:00 PM and 6:00 PM account for about 30 percent of the total collisions. These hours are during the morning and evening commute times when the most vehicles and pedestrians are on the road. The distribution of crashes throughout the days of the week shows most of the crashes taking place during weekdays (168), again when more vehicles and pedestrians are present on the road.
4.8. ENCOURAGEMENT AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS

4.8.1. Educational Programs

The City of Fremont offers traffic safety and education through the Transportation and Operations Department. The scope of the program is to provide traffic safety workshops, school rodeo events, and community traffic safety rodeo events. Smartz Moves hosts up to four community bike rodeo events per year. A bike rodeo is a public event combining group activities with education and entertainment aimed at educating parents and students about good riding and walking behaviors. Children use this realistic training environment to practice bicycle handling skills, pedestrian safety, and their ability to recognize and react to traffic hazards.

Smartz Moves educational programs are geared towards increasing the awareness of bicycle and pedestrian safety among elementary school children and parents in Fremont. The instructors discuss bicycle, pedestrian and general traffic safety at school workshops during school hours. They conduct several school workshops a year at the elementary schools in Fremont.

The City of Fremont publishes bicycle and pedestrian safety tips both in print and on their website. These tips outline behaviors that will increase safety for bicyclists and pedestrians and describe not only compliance with applicable traffic laws. Pedestrian safety tips inform readers about how the technology of traffic signals work and how observing those signals can increase pedestrian safety.

4.8.2. Enforcement

The City of Fremont actively enforces pedestrian and motorist traffic violations through its traffic unit. Currently there are fifteen sworn officers in the traffic unit and two community service officers.

4.8.3. Adult Crossing Guards

The city of Fremont’s Police Department contracts with ACMS, a management firm, to employ 24 professionally-trained crossing guards to work at 17 of Fremont’s 32 schools while school is in session.
The necessity for a crossing guard is determined by a specific set of warrants established by the City. These warrants address traffic volume, number of students crossing, and availability of alternate routes and nearby signalized intersections. Although crossing guards are focused on pedestrian crossings, they are important to mention here in the context of children bicycling to school, particularly younger children who may be riding on sidewalks and crossing in crosswalks (vs. vehicular cycling turning movements).

### 4.8.4. Junior Safety Patrol

The Junior Safety Patrol is the result of a partnership between the Police Department, Transportation Engineering, the Fremont Unified School District, and the California State Automobile Association (CSAA). Each school provides either a staff member or parent volunteer who organizes and supervises the Patrol. Fifth and sixth grade students are selected for the Patrol based upon merit, attendance, and good citizenship. Members of the Patrol take a post at school crossings and work to ensure the safety of fellow students.

The police department provides training, safety lectures, and an ongoing enforcement effort in areas surrounding the schools. School staff and/or parent volunteers provide direct supervision and support, while equipment for the Safety Patrol is provided by CSAA, at either a substantially reduced cost, or no cost at all.

### 4.8.5. Student Valet Pick-up and Drop-Off

Currently, the Fremont Police Department and Transportation Engineering are implementing a valet pick-up and drop-off program at grade schools to address congestion during peak school hours.
5. POLICY REVIEW

5.1. INTRODUCTION

This Chapter summarizes 17 planning documents that describe existing conditions for pedestrians throughout the City of Fremont and/or dictate how future infrastructure improvements will improve Fremont’s walkability. These plans have been grouped into three categories: citywide plans, district (i.e., sub-citywide), and regional plans. This Chapter also evaluates the institutional challenges that must be addressed in order to implement projects and programs that would improve conditions for pedestrians.

Citywide Plans

5.2. POLICY REVIEW - CITYWIDE PLANS

5.2.1. City of Fremont General Plan, Fundamental Goals

The City’s General Plan specifies 14 “fundamental goals,” upon which the rest of the General Plan is built and which together form the vision for Fremont’s future. One of these goals calls for a vibrant, well-defined central business district with an intensity of development suitable to support an active pedestrian environment.

5.2.2. City of Fremont General Plan, Transportation Chapter

The City’s General Plan, including the Transportation and Land Use elements, was adopted in 1991 and is scheduled to be updated in 2007-09. The 1991 Transportation Chapter acknowledges that “Fremont’s transportation system and pattern of land development were planned around the use of the automobile.” Although the majority of the chapter therefore pertains to autos, the following pedestrian-related discussions are included:

- **Sidewalks**: “It is the policy of the city to require installation of concrete sidewalks on both sides of all public streets at the time of adjacent development.” The policy goes on to allow a sidewalk along only one side of the street on private streets in the hill area, while acknowledging that this policy has occasionally impaired pedestrian circulation, particularly for children walking to school.

- **Pedestrians**: Pedestrians are addressed in the context of Fremont’s recreational trail system, the above-mentioned City sidewalk policy, and “an extensive pedestrian system proposed and planned for the City’s Central Business District: ”Recent trends towards an increase in shopping and walking as recreational pursuits underscore the importance of a comfortable pedestrian environment to an active and successful retail/commercial environment. Portions of the City can be (and are now) oriented toward pedestrian use. Further enhancement of pedestrian environments in the older commercial areas and in the Central Business District would encourage more walking and less use of the auto for shopping and other needs.”

- **Transportation alternatives**: The Transportation Chapter discusses Transportation Demand Management (TDM), which refers to a variety of means to reduce the number of single-occupant
vehicles on the road during peak periods. Although walking is not cited as a TDM strategy, in fact pedestrian improvements are necessary to allow safe and convenient access to public transit (a cited TDM strategy).

- **Plan Goals:** The Transportation Chapter of the General Plan contains a goal and a number of corresponding objectives, policies and implementation measures aimed at encouraging walking. Transportation (T) Goal 2 calls for encouraging alternatives to the auto, in part, by providing walkway systems in community commercial centers, in the Central Business District, neighborhood shopping centers and major transit facilities.

### 5.2.3. City of Fremont General Plan, Land Use Chapter

This chapter describes the policies that guide land use decisions in Fremont. The chapter lays out the City's ten “Planning Areas,” which are land use divisions that allow the Plan to address unique issues and planning concerns associated with various districts. These planning areas are: Baylands, Centerville, Central Area, Industrial, Irvington, Mission San Jose, Niles, Northern Plain, Warm Springs, and the Hill Area. Specific plans have been written for five of these areas: Centerville, the Central Business District of the Central Area, Irvington, Mission San Jose, and Niles, summaries of which as they pertain to pedestrian-related issues and policies appear below. Citywide policies relevant to various types of commercial and neighborhood districts—which mostly express the City’s desire for pedestrian orientation in commercial districts—are summarized immediately below.

#### 5.2.3.1. Community Commercial Centers (CCCs)

- A CCC should be a pedestrian-oriented commercial environment. To maintain an active pedestrian environment, buildings oriented toward sidewalks or public plazas and walkways shall be strongly encouraged. Retail uses shall be encouraged at the ground level.

- Auto services, drive-in services, and equipment leasing and rental can be allowed in a Community Commercial Center if the use does not have a significant negative impact on the CCC’s visual character and pedestrian orientation.

- Regionally-oriented retail sales could be located in the CCC areas if the design of the use can also be compatible with the visual characteristics and pedestrian orientation of the area.

- Fast-food type restaurants are allowed to the degree they can be incorporated into the character of a pedestrian-oriented commercial center.

- Design and development plans recommended for the CCC districts should allow for mixed use development to foster vitality and pedestrian activity.

- Design and development plans for CCCs should identify parking strategies for the commercial area as a whole so as to foster a pedestrian-oriented shopping environment.

#### 5.2.3.2. Four Historic Planning Areas (Irvington, Centerville, Mission San Jose and Niles)

- These CCCs should provide safe, convenient and continuous pedestrian walkways linking building entrances to adjacent building entrances and activity centers where appropriate.

- Each of the four historic commercial centers shall be oriented toward pedestrians to the degree feasible. New development should strengthen the “Main Street” character of these areas. Projects
should be planned to create active pedestrian frontages oriented towards sidewalks, streets or, when appropriate, towards a public plaza.

- Where appropriate, buildings shall be oriented toward the street and sidewalk. Whenever feasible, parking should be at the rear of buildings or in joint parking areas rather than in front of buildings and businesses.

### 5.2.3.3. Northern Plain (Ardenwood)

- Plans for this area call for a pedestrian-oriented community commercial center, with a mixture of local-serving offices, retail and public uses.
- Ardenwood should be oriented as much as feasible to pedestrians and should be visually integrated with and, if feasible, physically connected to the surrounding neighborhood.

### 5.2.3.4. Neighborhood Commercial Districts

- Auto-oriented uses are discouraged because they are typically not compatible with the pedestrian-orientation of the shopping area.
- Mixed-use developments shall be permitted where the vitality and pedestrian activity of the commercial district is maintained.

### 5.2.4. City of Fremont General Plan, Open Space Chapter

The *Open Space Chapter* describes the current extent of and plans for Fremont’s pathways and trails, although a map of these facilities is in the transportation chapter.

- **Alameda Creek Regional Trail**: This trail borders the Alameda Creek flood control channel and links Coyote Hills Regional Park and the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge with the Alameda Creek quarries. A gravel path on the northern side is used for horses, and a paved path on the south side for bicyclists; both paths are used by pedestrians.
- **Other local trails**: Fremont has six linear easements with developed pathways, which provide shortcuts between streets for bicyclists and pedestrians. Some are on flood control district or PG&E rights-of-way. There are also several privately-owned linear open space areas within residential and industrial subdivisions.
- **Hiking trails**: In addition to trails and paths within urbanized areas, there are extensive trail systems within the Mission Peak Regional Preserve, Coyote Hills Regional Park and the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge.
- **Regional trails**: The East Bay Regional Park District proposes two major trails: a Garin Regional Park to Mission Peak trail (a portion of the Bay Area Ridge Trail), and a Niles Canyon Trail connecting the Alameda Creek Trail with Sunol. The San Francisco Bay Trail, which will eventually encircle San Francisco Bay, is proposed to pass through Fremont west of I-880 between Stevenson Boulevard and the southern city limits. There will also be a connection from the Bay Trail to Mission Peak Regional Preserve. Most of the Bay Trail’s proposed alignment is along future streets. As these trails are implemented, the Open Space chapter says that the City can assist in planning their implementation, provide improved connections with local trails and identify opportunities for parking and staging areas.
In order to complete earlier City of Fremont plans for an integrated trail and path system, the Open Space chapter calls for identifying utility easements and rights-of-way (such as the Hetch Hetchy underground water lines and flood control channels) for local paths.

5.2.5. Fremont Development Policies, 2002 revision

This document is a compilation of Fremont City Council resolutions and ordinances related to planning and development. Pedestrian issues are primarily addressed in the Pedestrian & Vehicular Circulation in the Central Area portion of the Transportation and Circulation section. (The Central Area is bounded by Mowry Avenue, Argonaut Way, Walnut Avenue, Fremont Blvd., Stevenson Blvd., and the Route 238 freeway, but excludes the Central Business District.) The objectives of this section are to provide a system of pathways and esplanades that separate pedestrian and vehicular circulation in the Central Area and “provide for visual and physical links within the Area.”

Other Development Policies sections that influence the pedestrian environment include:

- **Commercial Development, Drive-In Enterprises and Service Stations:** Specifies that such facilities should be designed to be compatible with and, if appropriate, contribute to vehicular and pedestrian circulation systems, and will not unduly interfere with these systems.
- **Hillside Streets:** An objective of these policies is to provide for a safe means of ingress and egress of vehicular and pedestrian traffic to and within the hillside areas. The section specifies that walkways of four-foot minimum width shall be provided along or in the proximity of public streets (and some private streets), to provide a maximum of pedestrian safety while maintaining the character of the hill area.
- **Industrial areas:** Historically, the City of Fremont has waived sidewalk requirements in industrial districts. While the document refers to the City as having terminated this practice, it recognizes that requiring sidewalks for all new development in industrial areas would result in “tiny, isolated segments of rarely-used, limited-purpose sidewalks.” This policy restricts the granting of exemptions to sidewalk requirements to development that is near development without sidewalks and where the absence of sidewalks will not create a significant pedestrian obstacle between major employment centers and public transportation lines.
- **Temporary sidewalks in Industrial Area Subdivisions:** This section allows developers of industrial subdivisions the right to build temporary sidewalks across vacant lots, until a building is constructed.
- **Mobile home parks:** Site should have a convenience market and personal services within walking distance.
- **Multi-family dwellings:** Required parking reductions of up to 25% may be approved if proposed project is in the “Residential, 50-70 dwelling units per acre” area, within one-half mile of the BART station, and the project would be linked directly to BART by pedestrian and bicycle trails.

5.2.6. City of Fremont Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

The City of Fremont’s capital improvement program (CIP) is a planning tool used to prioritize the delivery of public facilities and infrastructure systems such as streets, parks and buildings as well as other important community projects. It consists of a list and funding schedule of projects to be implemented.
during the multi-year period covered by the CIP and identifies the cost and sources of funding for each project. While the CIP primarily covers the construction, renovation or purchase of physical structures, generally with a useful life of at least several years, it also includes certain operational and maintenance projects.

The City of Fremont’s five-year CIP for the 2007-2012 period includes 16 projects that have a focus on pedestrian improvements or at least include pedestrian components. Most of the projects are the responsibility of the City’s Engineering Department though two projects are under the direction of the Office of Housing and Redevelopment and one is at the hands of the Maintenance Department. The “big ticket” pedestrian-related items in the Fremont CIP tend to be multi-year roadway projects that incorporate sidewalks or other pedestrian facilities. Such projects include the widening of Central Avenue from Fremont Boulevard to Dusterberry Way; improvement of the Osgood Road frontages from South Grimmer Boulevard to Washington Boulevard; and construction of grade separations—an underpass at Paseo Padre Parkway and an overpass at Washington Boulevard—at the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) tracks and proposed BART extension.

Other pedestrian-related capital improvement projects in the CIP include construction of sidewalks and drainage facilities along Lincoln Street and various traffic improvements at the intersection of Fremont Boulevard and Nicolet Avenue; design of Niles Canyon Railway Pedestrian Bridge, Transit Enhancement; installation of traffic-calming devices at elementary schools and along residential portions of Davis Street; upgrading of non-standard pedestrian signals; and installation, repair or reconstruction of sidewalks, curbs and gutters, curb ramps and handicap-accessible ramps at various locations throughout the city. Lastly, the CIP includes the development of the citywide pedestrian master plan; preparation of a feasibility study for a multi-use trail along the UPRR corridor between the Niles and Warm Springs areas; continuation of a pedestrian and bicycle safety education program; and nearly $1.1 million for the development (including staff administration) of miscellaneous pedestrian and bicycle projects.

5.2.7. City of Fremont Municipal Code

The Fremont Municipal Code is a compilation of all the City of Fremont’s ordinances, codified into regulations. In the code, regulations are grouped by subject matter into “titles,” each of which is subdivided into chapters which, in turn, are subdivided into articles or sections. The Fremont Municipal Code contains eight titles. With a few minor exceptions, regulations dealing with pedestrian-related issues are found in Title III, “Public Safety, Welfare and Morals,” and Title VIII, “Planning and Zoning.” (The most note-worthy exceptions are regulations on encroachments on streets and walkways, found in Title VI, Article 4.) Below is a summary of the main pedestrian-related regulations found in Titles III and VIII.

Title III includes regulations on traffic-control devices (§3-2300 to §3-2307); erection of stop signs and vehicle stops prior to sidewalks (§3-2600 and §3-2602); driving on sidewalks and pedestrians’ use of freeways (§3-2702 and §3-2705); establishment of crosswalks, restrictions to pedestrian crossings and standing in roadways (§3-2800, §3-2802 and §3-2803); stopping or parking prohibited within 20 feet of a crosswalk (§3-2908); declared *prima facie* speed limits (§3-21100 to §3-21103); bicycle-riding and bicycle—parking on sidewalks (§3-4103 and §3-4104); special events and parades (§3-7100 to §3-7112); use of, and obstructions to, trails and paths (§3-7206 and §3-7207); obstructions to pedestrian travel from special-event signage (§3-81101); and temporary street closures due to nighttime street racing (§3-20100 to §3-
Title III also includes the City’s trip reduction and travel demand management ordinance (Chapter 14), which assigns responsibilities to the City and to large employers in Fremont for promoting commute alternatives, including walking.

Title VIII includes regulations on the design of streets in new subdivisions (§8-1500 to §8-1534); pedestrian-friendly architecture and site design for multi-family developments (§8-2754 and §8-2756); use of pervious materials for walkways (§8-11206); zoning standards for pedestrian-oriented commercial districts (§8-21100 to §8-21106); compatibility of fast-food restaurants with pedestrian traffic (§8-21204); reduction of parking standards in order to promote a pedestrian orientation (§8-22003); pedestrian-oriented building signage and safety hazards to pedestrians from the location and placement of signs (§8-22102 and §8-22106); pedestrian-friendly design of drive-in businesses (§8-22137.5); safety hazards to pedestrians from fences and hedges (§8-22211); and pedestrian safety with regard to proposed conditional uses (§8-22509). Title VIII also includes the City’s street right-of-way and improvement ordinance (Chapter 3), which governs the acquisition of street rights-of-way and construction of street improvements, including for pedestrian access.

5.2.8. City of Fremont, Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, 2002

This short plan—20 pages including maps and a project list—represents Fremont’s first initiative to plan for non-motorized transportation modes. The Plan includes ten “goals and objectives” that pertain to bicycling and walking (see separate “Fremont Pedestrian Plan Vision, Goals & Objectives” memo). With respect to pedestrians, a primary goal of the Plan is to promote and encourage pedestrian travel along the City’s “walkway system,” which includes access to all development that abuts improved and unimproved streets, as well as “recreation trail systems,” such as the Alameda Creek Trail and the regional Bay Trail.

The emphasis of the pedestrian walkway system is focused in the City’s emerging Central Business District, its “community commercial centers,” and at rail and transit facilities, all of which have been the subject of separate planning efforts (see discussion of each, below). The Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan also calls for walkways in all future development and describes the City’s programs to maintain existing pedestrian facilities, including sidewalks, striping and traffic signals, as well as programs and services provided by the Fremont Police Department, such as traffic safety education, crossing guard training, and monitoring of pedestrian accidents.

The Plan’s bicycle and pedestrian project list includes projects to install new and reconstruct and/or widen existing sidewalks and pathways and construct curb ramps in specific locations, as well as citywide improvement of pedestrian intersection crossings and maintenance of existing pedestrian facilities. The Fremont Bicycle Master Plan and Pedestrian Master Plan supersedes this document.

5.2.9. City of Fremont Bicycle Master Plan, 2005

The Bicycle Master Plan provides a comprehensive look at the issues facing Fremont’s bicyclists and ways to improve conditions citywide. Walking is addressed in the Plan in the following limited areas:

- **Multi-use pathways:** The Plan contains a listing of all existing Class I (paved, multi-use) facilities, including endpoints and mileage, as well as one-page project sheets for each of the five Class I trail
projects recommended, including project descriptions, project status and recommended actions for the City of Fremont to take in order to proceed with development of each trail.

- **Encouragement and education programs**: The Bicycle Master Plan describes programs to educate and encourage safe walking, including Safe Moves bicyclist and pedestrian education programs; published and online pedestrian safety tips; and adult and junior crossing guards.

- **Bicycle accident analysis**: This analysis includes reports of collisions between bicyclists and pedestrians, including which party was at fault. Related to this is a discussion of the issue of younger bicyclists riding on sidewalks, which can create dangerous conflicts with pedestrians.

- **Implementation**: Cost estimates are provided for construction of Class I trails.

- **Pathway planning and design**: Design standards for “Class I bike paths” make reference to their concurrent use as pedestrian pathways, including specifications for trails where particularly high pedestrian volumes are expected.

### 5.3. POLICY REVIEW - DISTRICT PLANS

The City of Fremont has established District Plans that are reviewed in this Section of the Plan. The District Plans are available on the City of Fremont’s Planning Division website at http://www.ci.fremont.ca.us/CityHall/Departments/Planning.htm.

#### 5.3.1. Central Business District Concept Plan, 2001

The *Concept Plan* for Fremont’s Central Business District (CBD) defines, focuses and illustrates the vision for the development of Fremont’s CBD for the 20 years following publication of the plan. According to the plan, although for 30 years the City’s *General Plan* has had a goal of creating a “well-defined, visually distinctive and vibrant commercial, governmental, and cultural center” in the CBD, the area today lacks the character of a “downtown,” including a focus on pedestrian-oriented uses.

The study area for the *CBD Plan* is centrally located between the five original towns that joined to become the City of Fremont: Niles, Centerville, Irvington, Mission San Jose and Warm Springs. The area’s boundaries are Mowry Avenue to the north, the Fremont BART station to the east, Stevenson Boulevard and Sundale Drive to the south, and Argonaut Way to the west. Today, there are office, medical, retail and banking services in the CBD, and a small amount of housing. Buildings are typically surrounded by parking lots, streets are wide with no on-street parking, and blocks are long.

The Plan begins by citing the *General Plan* policies that pertain to the CBD, including those with a pedestrian focus (see *General Plan Land Use Chapter* summary, above). The *Existing Conditions* chapter documents the following characteristics of the CBD that currently influence the pedestrian environment:

- Over 50 percent of the development parcels are dedicated to surface parking, which creates an automobile environment instead of a pedestrian-oriented environment.

- The Fremont Hub shopping center has recently (as of 2001) undergone renovations, including pedestrian amenities.
• The CBD is divided into very large street blocks, which are generally too large to accommodate a functional and attractive pedestrian network.

• The distances between cross streets are too long to be easily traveled by pedestrians. These large blocks provide the opportunity for creation of new streets and block patterns.

The Concept Plan’s CBD Concept chapter details plans for a pedestrian-oriented downtown, including new pedestrian walkways and plazas, shorter blocks, pedestrian-oriented building façades, and the like. Specifically,

• Within the CBD will be a smaller Focus Area that serves as the hub of activity. This Focus Area—bounded by Mowry Avenue, Fremont Boulevard, Walnut Avenue and Paseo Padre Parkway—will be walkable, containing improved streetscape and pedestrian environments, with Capital Avenue as the main street of the Area. The city center will be well-connected to the remainder of the CBD through a series of pedestrian, vehicular, bicycle, and transit connections linking important destinations such as BART, Washington Hospital, and the Fremont Hub.

• Block sizes in the Focus Area would be reduced through the construction of new streets, improved private roadways and new pedestrian walkways.

• Capital Avenue, State Street and BART Way (extended to connect Civic Center Drive with Paseo Padre Parkway) would be fundamental components of the pedestrian-oriented street network, while improvements to make other streets more pedestrian-friendly are also important.

The most detailed discussion of pedestrian circulation, facilities and amenities in the CBD Concept Plan is in the Street Network and Parking chapter, which calls for making some existing streets considerably more pedestrian-friendly, constructing new local roadways to reduce block sizes and improve local pedestrian circulation, and creating new public plazas. This chapter contains a number of sketches and sections illustrating these concepts.

The Regulatory Framework chapter contains an overview of current zoning in the CBD and corresponding implications for creating a pedestrian-oriented downtown, regulatory incentives that could help spur this development, and regulations to guide the district’s design. The Building Design Guidelines chapter details architectural and site plan guidelines that will be implemented to create more pedestrian-oriented development in the CBD.

5.3.2. Centerville Specific Plan, 1993 (amended 1997-2006)

Due to the pending departure (at the time) of auto dealers from Centerville’s commercial district, the Fremont City Council appointed a Centerville Study Group, whose recommendations informed the Centerville Specific Plan. The Plan—which divides the District into 13 sub-areas—emphasizes promotion of pedestrian-oriented uses, especially in the historic business district, and improvement of pedestrian circulation between neighborhoods and commercial districts. These improvements are focused on the pedestrian environment in sub-area 1 (the historic district located along Fremont Boulevard in Centerville’s center) and sub-areas 5 and 7 (the residential areas directly south of sub-area 1).

The Plan calls for the creation of a pedestrian-oriented retail environment along Fremont Boulevard’s historic district, including new sidewalks, street trees, pedestrian-scale lighting, 200-to-300 foot-long
block faces, and on-street parking to act as a buffer between the street traffic and the sidewalk. Driveways are to be shared and limited to reduce needed curb cuts and minimize conflicts with pedestrians. Design guidelines for Fremont Boulevard between Peralta Boulevard and Central Avenue include “Main Street” improvements, such as awnings to provide weather protection and add to the pedestrian scale, articulated building façades to provide visual interest to pedestrians; bicycle rack placement that does not impede pedestrian circulation; and outdoor seating and patios along the street, especially at bus stops, to activate the pedestrian character of the street.

In the residential sub-areas called out for pedestrian improvements, residential buildings shall front on a public or private street with the main point of pedestrian access being directly from the street. The plan also proposes continuous sidewalks in the residential development in Sub-areas 5 and 7 to provide pedestrian linkage to the retail uses and transit opportunities in Sub-area 1.

5.3.3. Niles Concept Plan, 2001

Niles is a historic railroad junction, located in the northeast corner of Fremont. The District is bordered by foothills and railroad tracks to the north and east, and the Alameda Creek and the Quarry Lakes to the south and west. The vision for this community commercial center (see CCC discussion, above) is to revitalize the Niles District, including strengthening its pedestrian-friendly traditional “main street.”

The Existing Conditions chapter documents the lack of traffic control devices on Niles Boulevard (which makes walking across the street very difficult), as well as recent (as of 2001) sidewalk and streetscape improvements that have made the Boulevard in the business district more pedestrian-friendly. It describes the recent Mission Boulevard widening project, which added two lanes of traffic and widened the Alameda Creek Bridge to include a pedestrian walkway. The chapter discusses broad community support for establishing a passenger rail stop for the Niles Canyon Railway in Niles (although there is currently weekly passenger rail service between Sunol and Niles, there is not currently a stop in the main district due to the absence of a safe pedestrian track crossing location).

The Vision chapter includes one Vision Concept that pertains to pedestrians: the desire to improve pedestrian connections between Niles and surrounding neighborhoods, parks and open space (e.g., Vallejo Mills Park, Quarry Lakes, Ridgeline trail, and Fremont’s CBD). The Strategic Framework chapter organizes actions and policies suggested by the community to achieve the community vision. This includes new landscaping and streetscape improvements along Niles and Mission boulevards; street tree planting; implementation of signage programs; and fostering community efforts for alleyway improvements in an attempt to improve the character and the comfortable pedestrian atmosphere of Niles.

Specific policies to improve walkability in the Niles District include providing pedestrian facilities and amenities and a pedestrian-oriented commercial environment along Niles and Mission boulevards; constructing a pedestrian rail crossing and train stop and other pedestrian connections from Niles to the surrounding community and open space; locating parking behind (or below grade of) new development; and traffic calming to improve pedestrian safety and enhance the pedestrian atmosphere of the District.

The Niles Concept Plan’s implementation chapter calls for phasing priority development, including building a pedestrian crossing of the railroad tracks in order to allow rail to, once again, serve the District.
and to provide pedestrian access between Niles and Mission boulevards. The Plan expresses a preference for a PUC-approved at-grade crossing, but if this approval cannot be secured, an open, wide and well-lit underpass should be constructed. Other cited implementation measures include continuing the City’s façade improvement program to maintain a pleasant walking environment.

5.3.4. Design Guidelines and Regulations, Mission San Jose Historic Overlay District, 1998

The Mission San Jose Historic Overlay District is located east of the Irvington District and straddles two perpendicular streets: Mission Boulevard between Interstate 680 and Durham Parkway, and Washington Boulevard between Mission Boulevard and Interstate 680. The District’s heart is Mission San Jose, originally built in 1797, destroyed by the 1868 earthquake, and rebuilt in 1985. Ohlone College is also located in the District.

These design guidelines and regulations were written to preserve the existing character of the Mission San Jose Overlay District and apply to new development in the area. They describe and illustrate how to design buildings and landscapes to be consistent with the historic village context of the area and are meant to expedite the project review process.

One key element of the historic district is the original pedestrian-orientation of development. The guidelines call for continuous sidewalks with pedestrian amenities, including street trees. The guidelines point to existing pedestrian lanes and linkages in the core area and stipulate that other interconnections between courtyards, parking areas, and public sidewalks should be developed. The guidelines emphasize the use of courtyards to support public life by providing pleasant places where people may pause as they go about their activities. Courtyards and connecting pedestrian pathways are to be designed to be an extension of the public sidewalk and should include lighting and trash receptacles. The guidelines encourage pedestrian connections between surface parking areas, public sidewalks and courtyards.

5.3.5. Irvington Concept Plan, 2005

The Irvington Concept Plan identifies the City’s vision for development of Fremont’s Irvington District over the next 20 years, and provides guidelines for that development. The document includes chapters on existing conditions, goals, development concepts, design guidelines and implementation measures.

Irvington is one of the City’s five historic towns that joined together to become the City of Fremont. Irvington is located just south of the central city and is bordered by Grimmer Boulevard to the west, the Central Business District to the north, Mission San Jose to the east and the City’s Industrial Area to the south. The heart of the District is the intersection of five streets (aptly named, “Five Corners”): Bay, Main, and Union streets, and Fremont and Washington boulevards. A new BART station is planned for the nearby intersection of Washington Boulevard and Osgood Road.

Consistent with General Plan Land Use Policies (see discussion above), the District is envisioned to be a pedestrian-oriented commercial center, the development impetus for which will be, in part, the existing pedestrian scale of the Five Corners area.

The Irvington Concept Plan includes many mechanisms for accomplishing this goal, including:
Chapter 5: Policy Review

• Identification of “Pedestrian Streets”: Bay, Union and Main Streets offer walking opportunities for connecting existing and potential Irvington District development with Five Corners. The Plan calls for Bay and Main to become the primary pedestrian corridors in the district, linking the Monument Center and existing Bay Street retail with the proposed new BART station. Development along these streets is to be pedestrian-oriented, while continuing to provide appropriate vehicular circulation through the area. Design guidelines for these streets are contained in the Plan, and include requirements and other guidelines for buildings (i.e., setbacks, rhythm and massing, façades, awnings and materials), corners, signs, lighting, parking, and plazas and open space.

• Analysis of pedestrian facilities and amenities: The Plan describes Irvington’s existing and planned sidewalks, pedestrian-scale lighting, landscaping buffers, bulb-outs, plaza areas and street furniture, and identifies the major pedestrian constraints. These include that the majority of lighting is currently oriented towards vehicles, and that the District lacks continuous sidewalks and consistent sidewalk standards (including on Main and Bay streets). Pedestrian facilities and amenities that are envisioned include textured crosswalks, bulb-outs, attractive seating, landscaping, grouped auto parking, pedestrian pathways and plazas, and pedestrian-scale street lamps.

• Building design: The Irvington Concept Plan calls out the generally high level of existing architectural detailing that helps to create a comfortable scale and environment for pedestrians, and suggests that future development in the District can emulate these buildings to create a distinct identity. Building design concepts that are specified to foster walkability include buildings with ground floor retail being built at the back of the sidewalk or, in the case of residential development, providing a small set-back to allow for a porch or front stoop.

• Pedestrian pathways: The Plan’s Goal #6 calls for providing an integrated, safe and well-designed pedestrian and bicycle network, including access to the proposed BART station, Central Park and Laguna Creek.

5.3.6. Warm Springs BART Area Specific Plan, Existing Conditions Report, 2004

The Warm Springs BART Area Specific Plan, Existing Conditions Report is the first stage in the preparation of a specific plan for the area around the proposed Warm Springs BART station in Fremont. The report provides baseline information on the existing conditions within and adjacent to the proposed study area and discusses preliminary planning issues relevant to preparing a specific plan.

The study area is in southern Fremont, and extends approximately 1½ miles in all directions from the future BART station location. It is generally bounded by Auto Mall Parkway on the north, I-680 on the east, SR 262 on the south, and I-880 on the west. Unlike the proposed Irvington BART station area, the area in the vicinity of the proposed Warm Springs site is currently almost exclusively industrial and undeveloped. Therefore, the report has very few references to pedestrian access or facilities. Nonetheless, the report cites some of the deficiencies in terms of pedestrian facilities in the area, including that there are no sidewalks on Warm Springs Boulevard south of Grimmer Boulevard, nor is there a sidewalk on either side of Grimmer Boulevard between Fremont Boulevard and Old Warm Springs Boulevard, or on the south side of Grimmer between Old Warm Springs Boulevard and the I-680 underpass.

A study was underway at the same time as the Existing Conditions Report was being prepared to investigate possible vehicle cross connectors between interstates 680 and 880. As the alignment and design of the
connector is being developed, the Existing Conditions Report suggests that the Cross Connector study should evaluate the impacts on pedestrians and bicycle traffic movements along this route.

The “Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities” section of the report is five paragraphs long, two of which pertain to walking. The first outlines the area’s deficiencies in terms of pedestrian facilities, including a lack of sidewalks on portions of Warm Springs and Grimmer boulevards. The second conveys the 2002 City of Fremont Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan recommendations to provide sidewalk connections to activity centers and transit stations, constructing curb ramps at intersections where they are absent, countdown and audible pedestrian signals, and in-pavement lighted crosswalks.

The market overview mentions pedestrians only in the context of the need to provide on-street parking to ensure active pedestrian traffic. The “Key Opportunities” section includes no mention of pedestrians, while a number of the “Key constraints” pertain to walking, including that the area lacks the fine-grained street system needed for pedestrian travel; the proposed Cross Connector could impact pedestrian access from the surrounding neighborhoods; and the lack of pedestrian facilities on some area roads.

The Next Steps section of the report proposes four concepts to be considered in the development of the ultimate Specific Plan development scenarios. Two of these include transit-oriented development (TOD), which would most likely provide the most hospitable pedestrian environment in the area. The report cites BART’s 2003 TOD guidelines, of which a number pertain to pedestrians, including the following:

- Size and layout of blocks near the station should provide direct pedestrian paths;
- Pedestrian crossings should be provided at street level;
- Main sidewalks and crosswalks should not be disrupted by wide turning radii, driveways, garage entrances or dedicated turn lanes that require pedestrian refuge islands;
- Driveways serving parking garages and lots should avoid crossing main pedestrian circulation routes;
- Parking facilities should “feed” pedestrians onto primary pedestrian routes and should be located to promote retail opportunity along these routes;
- Parking garages should be designed to accommodate retail or other “active” uses at the ground floor to improve casual monitoring and appearance of the main pedestrian routes serving the area;
- Pedestrian connection between workplace and station fare gates should be as short as possible, directly oriented toward the station, and unobstructed by parking and landscaping; and
- Community services in the TOD should be easily visible for pedestrians and should support the primarily transit-oriented function of the station area.

5.4. POLICY REVIEW - REGIONAL PLANS

5.4.1. East Bay Regional Park District Master Plan, 1997

The East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) is the primary provider of regional park facilities and activities in Alameda and Contra Costa counties. EBRPD units in or near Fremont include Vargas Plateau Regional Park, Mission Peak Regional Preserve, Quarry Lakes Regional Recreation Area, and
Alameda Creek and Ohlone Wilderness regional trails. Some trails are part of the larger San Francisco Bay Trail and Bay Area Ridge Trail networks.

In December 1996, the District adopted “Master Plan 1997,” its most recent comprehensive long-range planning document. The document defined the vision and mission of the District and set priorities for the following ten years. Among the priorities laid out in Master Plan 1997 are completing the facility acquisition, expansion and improvement program of Measure AA; establishing a system of regional trails and parks in eastern Alameda County; and completing the missing sections, within EBRPD lands, of the Ridge Trail and the Bay Trail. The EBRPD also committed itself generally to expanding its trail network in order to accommodate the dramatic increase in demand for trails that the District has witnessed in recent years within its park units. Master Plan 1997 identifies missing segments in the EBRPD’s Regional Trail network and proposes preliminary potential alignments for new trails to fill in the gaps. Potential trails are shown schematically as not as specific alignments on the map. Potential new trails in or near Fremont would extend from the Santa Clara County line to Coyote Hills (a current gap in the Bay Trail); from Mission Peak to Vargas Plateau and from Vargas Plateau to Garin/Dry Creek Pioneer Regional Parks (gaps in the Ridge Trail); along Niles Canyon; from Coyote Hills to Ardenwood and from Ardenwood Regional Preserve to Quarry Lakes. and from Ardenwood Regional Preserve to Quarry Lakes.

In 1987, the EBRPD implemented a “Whole Park Access” program to expand opportunities for disabled access to its facilities, and it continues to retrofit existing facilities to accommodate the needs of disabled park users. More recently, in May 2006, the District approved an ADA Self Evaluation and Transition Plan to help modify its policies, programs, procedures and facilities to avoid discrimination against people with disabilities.

5.4.2. AC Transit Short Range Transit Plan (2003/12) and South Alameda County Study, 2004

The Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit) is the main provider of bus service in the East Bay, serving approximately 250,000 riders daily. The District’s service area consists of a strip along the eastern shore of San Francisco Bay stretching from Richmond in the north to Fremont in the south. The City of Fremont, along with Newark, joined the original AC Transit District in the mid 1970s following a popular vote. Fremont was the city of residence for 4.7 percent of AC Transit riders in 2002, according to the agency’s On-Board Passenger Survey of that year.

AC Transit operates a dozen local bus lines in and around Fremont, most of them oriented toward accommodating bus-to-bus and bus-to-train transfers at the Fremont BART station. Frequencies on the Fremont lines are typically 15-30 minutes during the day and 60 minutes in the evenings and weekends. With the help of special state funding, the agency recently began operating a new express bus service between the Fremont BART station and Stanford University across the Dumbarton Bridge with headways of 30-60 minutes. Additionally, AC Transit and BART jointly provide paratransit service in the East Bay. The agency’s FY 2003 - FY 2012 Short-Range Transit Plan outlines efforts to install bus shelters throughout several cities, including Fremont. It also mentions plans to implement ADA-compliant pedestrian enhancements at various transit centers, including the Fremont BART station, in order to improve safety and mobility for persons with visual and other disabilities.
Providing efficient transit service within Fremont, and also within Newark, is a continuing challenge for AC Transit due to the suburban, low-density nature of those cities. To address this issue, AC Transit commissioned a study in 2004 to suggest new cost-effective service delivery concepts for attracting new passengers to transit in Fremont and Newark. The main recommendations in the study’s “recommended service plan” are implementing new routes around Lake Elizabeth and from Newark to Fremont’s Washington Hospital; establishing late-evening “flex” service on Routes 211 (Centerville) and 213 (Mowry), under which passengers could request route deviations within ¾ miles for a premium fare; eliminating routes 215 (Osgood), 231 (Blacow) and 235 (Albrae); and working with BART and area employers to develop commuter shuttle service from the Union City or Fremont BART stations to employment centers in Fremont and Newark.