

---

**FINAL CONFORMITY ANALYSIS  
FOR THE 2019 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT  
PROGRAM AND 2018 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

August 20, 2018



210 N. Church Street, Ste. B  
Visalia, Ca 93291  
(559) 623-0450

This report was funded in part through grant(s) from the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration, U. S. Department of Transportation. The views and opinions of TCAG expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the U.S. Department of Transportation.

---

---

*TULARE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
FINAL Conformity Analysis for 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP*

---

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
CONFORMITY REQUIREMENTS .....	1
CONFORMITY TESTS .....	2
RESULTS OF THE CONFORMITY ANALYSIS .....	3
REPORT ORGANIZATION.....	4
CHAPTER 1: FEDERAL AND STATE REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS .....	5
A. FEDERAL AND STATE CONFORMITY REGULATIONS.....	5
B. CONFORMITY REGULATION REQUIREMENTS .....	7
C. AIR QUALITY DESIGNATIONS APPLICABLE TO THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY .....	8
D. CONFORMITY TEST REQUIREMENTS .....	10
E. ANALYSIS YEARS .....	17
CHAPTER 2: LATEST PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS AND TRANSPORTATION MODELING.....	20
A. SOCIOECONOMIC DATA.....	22
B. TRANSPORTATION MODELING .....	23
C. TRAFFIC ESTIMATES.....	29
D. VEHICLE REGISTRATIONS.....	29
E. STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN MEASURES .....	29
CHAPTER 3: AIR QUALITY MODELING .....	32
A. EMFAC2014 .....	32
B. ADDITIONAL PM-10 ESTIMATES .....	33
C. PM2.5 APPROACH.....	34
D. SUMMARY OF PROCEDURES FOR REGIONAL EMISSIONS ESTIMATES .....	37
CHAPTER 4: TRANSPORTATION CONTROL MEASURES .....	38
A. TRANSPORTATION CONFORMITY REGULATION REQUIREMENTS FOR TCMS .....	38
B. APPLICABLE AIR QUALITY IMPLEMENTATION PLANS .....	40
C. IDENTIFICATION OF 2002 RACM THAT REQUIRE TIMELY IMPLEMENTATION DOCUMENTATION .....	41
D. TCM FINDINGS FOR THE TIP AND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN .....	43
E. RTP CONTROL MEASURE ANALYSIS IN SUPPORT OF 2003 PM-10 PLAN .....	43
CHAPTER 5: INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION.....	46
A. INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION.....	46
B. PUBLIC CONSULTATION .....	47
CHAPTER 6: TIP AND RTP CONFORMITY .....	48
REFERENCES .....	52

## **APPENDICES**

Appendix A: Conformity Checklist

Appendix B: Transportation Project Listing

Appendix C: Conformity Analysis Documentation

Appendix D: Timely Implementation Documentation for Transportation Control Measures

Appendix E: Public Hearing Process Documentation

Appendix F: Response to Public Comments

**TABLES**

Table 1-1: On-Road Motor Vehicle 1997 Ozone Standard Emissions Budgets .....	12
Table 1-2: On-Road Motor Vehicle 2008 Ozone Standard Emissions Budgets .....	13
Table 1-3: On-Road Motor Vehicle PM-10 Emissions Budgets .....	14
Table 1-4: On-Road Motor Vehicle 1997 (24-hour and annual) and 2012 (annual) PM2.5 Standard Emissions Budgets.....	15
Table 1-5: On-Road Motor Vehicle 2006 24-Hour PM2.5 Standard Emissions Budgets.....	16
Table 1-6: San Joaquin Valley Conformity Analysis Years.....	18
Table 2-1: Summary of Latest Planning Assumptions for the TCAG Conformity Analysis .....	21
Table 2-2: Traffic Network Comparison for Horizon Years Evaluated in Conformity Analysis	29
Table 2-3: 2007 Ozone Plan Measures Assumed in Conformity Analysis.....	30
Table 2-4: 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan Measures Assumed in the Conformity Analysis .....	30
Table 2-5: 2008 PM2.5 (1997 Standard) Plan Measures Assumed in the Conformity Analysis	31
Table 2-6: 2012 PM2.5 (2006 Standard) Plan Measures Assumed in the Conformity Analysis	31
Table 6-1: Conformity Results Summary.....	51

---

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report presents the Conformity Analysis for the 2019 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (2019 FTIP) and 2018 Regional Transportation Plan (2018 RTP). The Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG) is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in Tulare County, California, and is responsible for regional transportation planning.

The Clean Air Act Section 176(c) (42 U.S.C. 7506(c)) and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR 93 Subpart A) require that each new RTP and TIP be demonstrated to conform to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) before the RTP and TIP are approved by the MPO or accepted by the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT). This analysis demonstrates that the criteria specified in the transportation conformity regulations for a conformity determination are satisfied by the 2019 FTIP and the 2018 RTP; a finding of conformity is therefore supported. The 2019 FTIP, 2018 RTP and the corresponding conformity analysis were approved by the TCAG Policy Board on [August 20, 2018]. Federal approval is anticipated on or before December 31, 2018. FHWA/FTA last issued a finding of conformity for the 2017 FTIP and the 2014 RTP as amended if applicable, on December 16, 2016.

The 2019 FTIP and the 2018 RTP have been financially constrained in accordance with the requirements of 40 CFR 93.108 and consistent with the U.S. DOT metropolitan planning regulations (23 CFR Part 450). A discussion of financial constraint and funding sources is included in the appropriate documents.

The applicable Federal criteria or requirements for conformity determinations, the conformity tests applied, the results of the conformity assessment, and an overview of the organization of this report are summarized below.

### **CONFORMITY REQUIREMENTS**

The Federal transportation conformity regulations (40 Code of Federal Regulations Parts 51 and 93) specify criteria and procedures for conformity determinations for transportation plans, programs, and projects and their respective amendments. The Federal transportation conformity regulation was first promulgated in 1993 by the U.S. EPA, following the passage of amendments to the Federal Clean Air Act in 1990. The Federal transportation conformity regulation has been revised several times since its initial release to reflect both EPA rule changes and court opinions. The transportation conformity regulation is summarized in Chapter 1.

The conformity regulation applies nationwide to “all nonattainment and maintenance areas for transportation-related criteria pollutants for which the area is designated nonattainment or has a maintenance plan” (40 CFR 93.102). Currently, the San Joaquin Valley (or portions thereof) is designated as nonattainment with respect to Federal air quality standards for ozone, and particulate matter under 2.5 microns in diameter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>); and has a maintenance plan for particulate matter under 10 microns in diameter (PM-10). Therefore, transportation plans and programs for the nonattainment areas for the Tulare County area must satisfy the requirements of

the Federal transportation conformity regulation. Note that the urbanized/metropolitan areas of Kern, Fresno, Stanislaus and San Joaquin Counties have attained the CO standard and maintained attainment for 20 years. In accordance with Section 93.102(b)(4), conformity requirements for the CO standard stop applying 20 years after EPA approves an attainment redesignation request or as of June 1, 2018. Therefore, the conformity analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP no longer includes a CO conformity demonstration.

Under the transportation conformity regulation, the principal criteria for a determination of conformity for transportation plans and programs are:

- (1) the TIP and RTP must pass an emissions budget test using a budget that has been found to be adequate by EPA for transportation conformity purposes, or an interim emission test;
- (2) the latest planning assumptions and emission models specified for use in conformity determinations must be employed;
- (3) the TIP and RTP must provide for the timely implementation of transportation control measures (TCMs) specified in the applicable air quality implementation plans; and
- (4) interagency and public consultation.

On-going interagency consultation is conducted through the San Joaquin Valley Interagency Consultation Group to ensure Valley-wide coordination, communication and compliance with Federal and California Clean Air Act requirements. Each of the eight Valley MPOs and the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (Air District) are represented. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the U.S. EPA, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and Caltrans are also represented on the committee. The final determination of conformity for the TIP and RTP is the responsibility of FHWA, and FTA within the U.S. DOT.

FHWA has developed a Conformity Checklist (included in Appendix A) that contains the required items to complete a conformity determination. Appropriate references to these items are noted on the checklist.

## **CONFORMITY TESTS**

The conformity tests specified in the Federal transportation conformity regulation are: (1) the emissions budget test, and (2) the interim emission test. For the emissions budget test, predicted emissions for the TIP/RTP must be less than or equal to the motor vehicle emissions budget specified in the approved air quality implementation plan or the emissions budget found to be adequate for transportation conformity purposes. If there is no approved air quality plan for a pollutant for which the region is in nonattainment or no emission budget has been found to be adequate for transportation conformity purposes, the interim emission test applies. Chapter 1 summarizes the applicable air quality implementation plans and conformity tests for ozone, PM-10, and PM2.5.

## RESULTS OF THE CONFORMITY ANALYSIS

A regional emissions analysis was conducted for the years 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2023, 2024, 2027, 2030, 2031, 2035, 2037 and 2042 for each applicable pollutant. All analyses were conducted using the latest planning assumptions and emissions models. The major conclusions of TCAG's Conformity Analysis are:

- For 1997 8-hour ozone<sup>1</sup>, the total regional on-road vehicle-related emissions (ROG and NOx) associated with implementation of the 2019 FTIP and the 2018 RTP for all years tested are projected to be less than the approved emissions budgets specified in the *2007 Ozone Plan (as revised in 2015)*. The conformity tests for ozone are therefore satisfied.
- For 2008 8-hour ozone, the total regional on-road vehicle-related emissions (ROG and NOx) associated with implementation of the 2019 FTIP and the 2018 RTP for all years tested are projected to be less than the adequate emissions budgets specified in the *2016 Ozone Plan*. The conformity tests for ozone are therefore satisfied.
- For PM-10, the total regional vehicle-related emissions (PM-10 and NOx) associated with implementation of the 2019 FTIP and the 2018 RTP for all years tested are either (1) projected to be less than the approved emissions budgets, or (2) less than the emission budgets using the approved PM-10 and NOx trading mechanism for transportation conformity purposes from the *2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan (as revised in 2015)*. The conformity tests for PM-10 are therefore satisfied.
- For the 1997 annual and 24-hour and 2012 annual PM2.5 standards, the total regional on-road vehicle-related emissions associated with implementation of the 2019 FTIP and the 2018 RTP for the analysis years are either (1) projected to be less than the approved emission budgets, or (2) less than the emission budgets using the approved PM2.5 and NOx trading mechanism for transportation conformity purposes from the *2008 PM2.5 Plan (as revised in 2011)*. The conformity tests for PM2.5 for the 1997 and 2012 standards are therefore satisfied.
- For the 2006 24-hour PM2.5 standard, the total regional on-road vehicle-related emissions associated with implementation of the 2019 FTIP and the 2018 RTP for the analysis years are either (1) projected to be less than the approved emission budgets, or (2) less than the emission budgets using the approved PM2.5 and NOx trading mechanism for transportation conformity purposes from the *2012 PM2.5 Plan (as revised in 2015)*. The conformity tests for PM2.5 for the 2006 standard are therefore satisfied.
- The 2019 FTIP and the 2018 RTP will not impede and will support timely implementation of the TCMs that have been adopted as part of applicable air quality implementation plans. The current status of TCM implementation is documented in Chapter 4 of this report. Since the

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that FHWA/FTA *Interim Guidance on Conformity Requirements for the 1997 Ozone NAAQS* issued on April 23 does not require that areas in non-attainment of the 2008 Ozone Standard address 1997 ozone in their regional conformity analyses at this time. However, the SJV MPOs have voluntarily included 1997 ozone conformity demonstration for the 2018 RTP/2019 TIP to minimize project delivery risk.



local SJV procedures (e.g., Air District Rule 9120 Transportation Conformity) have not been approved by EPA, consultation has been conducted in accordance with Federal requirements.

## **REPORT ORGANIZATION**

The report is organized into six chapters. Chapter 1 provides an overview of the applicable Federal and State conformity regulations and requirements, air quality implementation plans, and conformity test requirements. Chapter 2 contains a discussion of the latest planning assumptions and transportation modeling. Chapter 3 describes the air quality modeling used to estimate emission factors and mobile source emissions. Chapter 4 contains the documentation required under the Federal transportation conformity regulation for transportation control measures. Chapter 5 provides an overview of the interagency requirements and the general approach to compliance used by the San Joaquin Valley MPOs. The results of the conformity analysis for the TIP/RTP are provided in Chapter 6.

Appendix E includes public hearing documentation conducted on the 2019 FTIP, 2018 RTP and corresponding conformity analysis on June 18, 2018. Comments received on the conformity analysis and responses made as part of the public involvement process are included in Appendix F.

## **CHAPTER 1: FEDERAL AND STATE REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS**

The criteria for determining conformity of transportation programs and plans under the Federal transportation conformity regulation (40 CFR Parts 51 and 93) and the applicable conformity tests for the San Joaquin Valley nonattainment areas are summarized in this section. The Conformity Analyses for and the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP were prepared based on these criteria and tests. Presented first is a review of the development of the applicable conformity regulation and guidance procedures, followed by summaries of conformity regulation requirements, air quality designation status, conformity test requirements, and analysis years for the Conformity Analysis.

TCAG is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for Tulare County in the San Joaquin Valley. As a result of this designation TCAG prepares the TIP, RTP, and associated conformity analyses. The TIP serves as a detailed four year (FY 2018/19 – 2021/22) programming document for the preservation, expansion, and management of the transportation system. The 2018 RTP has a 2042 horizon that provides the long term direction for the continued implementation of the freeway/expressway plan, as well as improvements to arterial streets, transit, and travel demand management programs. The TIP and RTP include capacity enhancements to the freeway/expressway system commensurate with available funding.

### **A. FEDERAL AND STATE CONFORMITY REGULATIONS**

#### **CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS**

Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act (CAA, 1990) requires that Federal agencies and MPOs not approve any transportation plan, program, or project that does not conform to the approved State Implementation Plan (SIP). The 1990 amendments to the Clean Air Act expanded Section 176(c) to more explicitly define conformity to an implementation plan to mean:

“Conformity to the plan's purpose of eliminating or reducing the severity and number of violations of the national ambient air quality standards and achieving expeditious attainment of such standards; and that such activities will not (i) cause or contribute to any new violation of any standard in any area; (ii) increase the frequency or severity of any existing violation of any standard in any area; or (iii) delay timely attainment of any standard or any required interim emission reductions or other milestones in any area.”

Section 176(c) also provides conditions for the approval of transportation plans, programs, and projects, and requirements that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) promulgate conformity determination criteria and procedures no later than November 15, 1991.

## **FEDERAL RULE**

The initial November 15, 1991 deadline for conformity criteria and procedures was partially completed through the issuance of supplemental interim conformity guidance issued on June 7, 1991 for carbon monoxide, ozone, and particulate matter ten microns or less in diameter (PM-10). EPA subsequently promulgated the Conformity Final Rule in the November 24, 1993 *Federal Register* (EPA, 1993). The 1993 Rule became effective on December 27, 1993. The Federal Transportation Conformity Final Rule has been amended several times from 1993 to present. These amendments have addressed a number of items related to conformity lapses, grace periods, and other related issues to streamline the conformity process.

EPA published the Transportation Conformity Rule PM2.5 and PM10 Amendments on March 24, 2010; the rule became effective on April 23, 2010 (EPA, 2010a). This PM amendments final rule amends the conformity regulation to address the 2006 PM2.5 national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS). The final PM amendments rule also addresses hot-spot analyses in PM2.5 and PM10 and carbon monoxide nonattainment and maintenance areas.

On March 14, 2012, EPA published the Transportation Conformity Rule Restructuring Amendments, effective April 13, 2012 (EPA, 2012a). The amendments restructure several sections of the rule so that they apply to any new or revised National Ambient Air Quality Standards. In addition, several clarifications to improve implementation of the rule were finalized.

On March 6, 2015, EPA published *Implementation of the 2008 National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone: State Implementation Plan Requirements* final rule (effective April 6, 2015), which shifted the San Joaquin Valley 2008 Ozone Standard attainment date from December 31, 2032 to July 20, 2032 (EPA, 2015). EPA's March 2015 ozone implementation rule also revoked the 1997 Ozone Standard for transportation conformity purposes. However, on February 16, 2018, the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled against parts of the EPA's 2015 Ozone Implementation Rule related to the revocation of the 1997 ozone standard and the relevant "anti-backsliding" requirements. While EPA has petitioned for a rehearing on April 23, the ultimate outcome and impacts of this lawsuit are currently unknown. Due to this uncertainty, the conformity analysis for the 2018 RTP and 2019 FTIP addresses the 1997 ozone standard.

On July 29, 2016, EPA released its Final Rule titled *Implementing National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Fine Particles: State Implementation Plan Requirements*. According to the implementation rule, areas designated as nonattainment for the 1997 PM2.5 standards, must continue to demonstrate conformity to these standards until attainment (EPA, 2016).

## **MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL GUIDANCE**

EPA reissued Guidance for Transportation Conformity Implementation in Multi-Jurisdictional Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas in July 2012 (EPA, 2012c). This guidance updates and supersedes the July 2004 "multi-jurisdictional" guidance (EPA, 2004a), but does not change the substance of the guidance on how nonattainment areas with multiple agencies should conduct conformity determinations. This guidance applies to the San Joaquin Valley since there are multiple MPOs within a single nonattainment area. The main principle of the guidance is that

one regional emissions analysis is required for the entire nonattainment area. However, separate modeling and conformity documents may be developed by each MPO.

Part 3 of the guidance applies to nonattainment areas that have adequate or approved conformity budgets addressing a particular air quality standard. This Part currently applies to the San Joaquin Valley for ozone and PM-10. The guidance allows MPOs to make independent conformity determinations for their plans and TIPs as long as all of the other subareas in the nonattainment area have conforming transportation plans and TIPs in place at the time of each MPO and the Department of Transportation (DOT) conformity determination.

With respect to PM<sub>2.5</sub>, the Transportation Conformity Rule PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> Amendments published on March 24, 2010 effectively incorporates the “multi-jurisdictional” guidance directly into the rule. The Rule allows MPOs to make independent conformity determinations for their plans and TIPs as long as all of the other subareas in the nonattainment area have conforming transportation plans and TIPs in place at the time of each MPO and DOT conformity determination.

## **DISTRICT RULE**

The San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (Air District) adopted Rule 9120 Transportation Conformity on January 19, 1995 in response to requirements in Section 176(c)(4)(c) of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments. In May 2015, the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District requested ARB to withdraw Rule 9120 from California State Implementation Plan consideration.

In July of 2015, ARB sent a letter to EPA withdrawing Rule 9120 from the California State Implementation Plan. Therefore EPA can no longer act on the Rule. It should also be noted that EPA has changed 40 CFR 51.390 to streamline the requirements for State conformity SIPs. Since a transportation conformity SIP cannot be approved for the San Joaquin Valley, the Federal transportation conformity rule governs.

## **B. CONFORMITY REGULATION REQUIREMENTS**

The Federal regulations identify general criteria and procedures that apply to all transportation conformity determinations, regardless of pollutant and implementation plan status. These include:

- 1) *Conformity Tests* — Sections 93.118 and 93.119 specify emissions tests (budget and interim emissions) that the TIP/RTP must satisfy in order for a determination of conformity to be found. The final transportation conformity regulation issued on July 1, 2004 requires a submitted SIP motor vehicle emissions budget to be found adequate or approved by EPA prior to use for making conformity determinations. The budget must be used on or after the effective date of EPA’s adequacy finding or approval.

- 2) *Methods / Modeling:*

*Latest Planning Assumptions* — Section 93.110 specifies that conformity determinations must be based upon the most recent planning assumptions in force at the time the conformity analysis begins. This is defined as “the point at which the MPO begins to model the impact of the proposed transportation plan or TIP on travel and/or emissions. New data that

becomes available after an analysis begins is required to be used in the conformity determination only if a significant delay in the analysis has occurred, as determined through interagency consultation” (EPA, 2010b). All analyses for the Conformity Analysis were conducted using the latest planning assumptions and emissions models in force at the time the conformity analysis started in December 2017 (see Chapter 2).

*Latest Emissions Models* — Section 93.111 requires that the latest emission estimation models specified for use in SIPs must be used for the conformity analysis. EMFAC2014 was used in the Conformity Analysis and is documented in Chapter 3. EPA issued a federal register notice on December 14, 2015 formally approving EMFAC2014 for use in conformity determinations.

- 3) *Timely Implementation of TCMs* — Section 93.113 provides a detailed description of the steps necessary to demonstrate that the new TIP/RTP are providing for the timely implementation of TCMs, as well as demonstrate that the plan and/or program is not interfering with this implementation. TCM documentation is included in Chapter 4 of the Conformity Analysis.
- 4) *Consultation* — Section 93.105 requires that the conformity determination be made in accordance with the consultation procedures outlined in the Federal regulations. These include:
  - MPOs are required to provide reasonable opportunity for consultation with State air agencies, local air quality and transportation agencies, the USDOT and EPA (Section 93.105(a)(1)).
  - MPOs are required to establish a proactive public involvement process, which provides opportunity for public review and comment prior to taking formal action on a conformity determination (Section 93.105(e)).

The TIP, RTP, and corresponding conformity determinations are prepared by each MPO. Copies of the Draft documents are provided to member agencies and others, including FHWA, Federal Transit Administration (FTA), EPA, Caltrans, CARB, and the Air District for review. Both the TIP and RTP are required to be publicly available and an opportunity for public review and comment is provided. TCAG’s adopted consultation process and policy for conformity analysis includes a 30-day comment period followed by a public meeting.

## **C. AIR QUALITY DESIGNATIONS APPLICABLE TO THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY**

The conformity regulation (section 93.102) requires documentation of the applicable pollutants and precursors for which EPA has designated the area nonattainment or maintenance. In addition, the nonattainment or maintenance area and its boundaries should be described.

TCAG is located in the federally designated San Joaquin Valley Air Basin. The borders of the basin are defined by mountain and foothill ranges to the east and west. The northern border is consistent with the county line between San Joaquin and Sacramento Counties. The southern border is less defined, but is roughly bounded by the Tehachapi Mountains and, to some extent, the Sierra Nevada range. The conformity analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP includes analyses of existing and future air quality impacts for each applicable pollutant.

The San Joaquin Valley is currently designated as nonattainment for the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for 8-hour ozone (1997 and 2008 standards), and particulate matter under 2.5 microns in diameter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) (1997, 2006 and 2012 standards); and has a maintenance plan for particulate matter under 10 microns in diameter (PM-10). Note that the urbanized/metropolitan areas of Kern, Fresno, Stanislaus and San Joaquin Counties have attained the CO standard and maintained attainment for 20 years. In accordance with Section 93.102(b)(4), conformity requirements for the CO standard stop applying 20 years after EPA approves an attainment redesignation request or as of June 1, 2018. Therefore, the conformity analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP no longer includes a CO conformity demonstration.

State Implementation Plans have been prepared to address ozone, PM-10 and PM<sub>2.5</sub>:

- The 2007 Ozone Plan (1997 Standard), as revised in 2015, was approved by EPA on July 8, 2016 (effective September 30, 2016).
- The 2016 Ozone Plan (2008 standard) was adopted by the Air District on June 16, 2016 and subsequently adopted by ARB on July 21, 2016. EPA found the new ozone budgets adequate on June 29, 2017 (effective July 14, 2017).
- The 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan (as revised in 2015) was approved by EPA on July 8, 2016 (effective September 30, 2016).
- The 2008 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan (1997 Standard), as revised in 2011, was approved by EPA on November 9, 2011 (effective January 9, 2012).
- The 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan (as revised in 2015) was approved by EPA on August 16, 2016 (effective September 30, 2016).

EPA's March 2015 final rule implementing the 2008 Ozone Standard also revoked the 1997 Ozone Standard for transportation conformity purposes. This revocation became effective April 6, 2015. However, on February 16, 2018, the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled against parts of the EPA's 2015 Ozone Implementation Rule related to the revocation of the 1997 ozone standard and the relevant "anti-backsliding" requirements. While EPA has petitioned for a rehearing on April 23, the ultimate outcome and impacts of this lawsuit are currently unknown. Due to this uncertainty, the conformity analysis for the 2018 RTP and 2019 FTIP addresses the 1997 ozone standard.

EPA designated the San Joaquin Valley nonattainment area for the 2008 Ozone Standard, effective July 20, 2012. Transportation conformity applies one year after the effective date (July 20, 2013). Federal approval for the eight SJV MPO's 2008 Ozone standard conformity demonstrations was received on July 8, 2013.

On December 22, 2017, EPA released a response to state recommendations outlining draft areas designations for the new 2015 ozone standard of 70 ppb. It is anticipated that final designations will be determined by April 30, 2018. Transportation conformity applies one year after the designations effective date and not until 2019. Accordingly, this conformity analysis does not address the 2015 ozone standard.

On November 13, 2009, EPA published Air Quality Designations for the 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard, effective December 14, 2009. Nonattainment areas are required to meet the standard by 2014; transportation conformity began to apply on December 14, 2010. On January 20, 2016 EPA published *Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; California; San Joaquin Valley; Reclassification as Serious Nonattainment for the 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS* finalizing SJV reclassification to Serious nonattainment effective February 19, 2016. Nonattainment areas are required to meet the standard as expeditiously as practicable, but no later than December 31, 2019. It is important to note that the 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment area boundary for the San Joaquin Valley is exactly the same as the nonattainment area boundary for the 1997 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard.

EPA's nonattainment area designations for the new 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards became effective on April 15, 2015. Conformity for a given pollutant and standard applies one year after the effective date (April 15, 2016). It is important to note that the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards nonattainment area boundary for the San Joaquin Valley are exactly the same as the nonattainment area boundary for the 1997 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard.

On July 29, 2016, EPA released its *Final Rule for Implementing National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Fine Particles*. According to the implementation rule, areas designated as nonattainment for the 1997 PM 2.5 standards, must continue to demonstrate conformity to these standards until attainment. In the San Joaquin Valley, the 1997 standards (both 24-hour and annual) continue to apply.

#### **D. CONFORMITY TEST REQUIREMENTS**

The conformity (Section 93.109(c)–(k)) rule requires that either a table or text description be provided that details, for each pollutant and precursor, whether the interim emissions tests and/or the budget test apply for conformity. In addition, documentation regarding which emissions budgets have been found adequate by EPA, and which budgets are currently applicable for what analysis years is required.

Specific conformity test requirements established for the San Joaquin Valley nonattainment areas for ozone, and particulate matter are summarized below.

Section 93.124(d) of the 1997 Final Transportation Conformity regulation allows for conformity determinations for sub-regional emission budgets by MPOs if the applicable implementation plans (or implementation plan submission) explicitly indicates an intent to create such sub-regional budgets for the purpose of conformity. In addition, Section 93.124(e) of the 1997 rules states: "...if a nonattainment area includes more than one MPO, the implementation plan may establish motor vehicle emission budgets for each MPO, or else the MPOs must collectively make a conformity determination for the entire nonattainment area." Each applicable

implementation plan and estimate of baseline emissions in the San Joaquin Valley provides motor vehicle emission budgets by county, to facilitate county-level conformity findings.

## **OZONE**

### *1997 8-Hour Ozone Standard*

EPA's final rule implementing the 2008 ozone standard also revoked the 1997 ozone standard for transportation conformity purposes. This revocation became effective April 6, 2015. However, on February 16, 2018, the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled against parts of the EPA's 2015 Ozone Implementation Rule related to the revocation of the 1997 ozone standard and the relevant "anti-backsliding" requirements. While EPA has petitioned for a rehearing on April 23, the ultimate outcome and impacts of this lawsuit are currently unknown. Due to this uncertainty, the conformity analysis for the 2018 RTP and 2019 FTIP addresses the 1997 ozone standard<sup>2</sup>.

Under the existing conformity regulation, regional emissions analyses for ozone areas must address nitrogen oxides (NOx) and volatile organic compounds (VOC) precursors. It is important to note that in California, reactive organic gases (ROG) are considered equivalent to and are used in place of volatile organic compounds (VOC).

EPA approved the 2007 Ozone (1997 standard) Plan (as revised in 2015) including conformity budgets on July 8, 2016 (effective September 30, 2016). The revised SIP identified both reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NOx) subarea budgets in tons per average summer day for each MPO in the nonattainment area. For 1997 ozone conformity, the SJV MPOs will continue to conduct demonstrations for subarea emissions budgets as established in the 2007 Ozone Plan (as revised in 2015).

The approved conformity budgets from Table 1 of the August 12, 2016 Federal Register are provided in a table below. These budgets will be used to compare to emissions resulting from the 2019 FTIP and the 2018 RTP.

---

<sup>2</sup> Note that FHWA/FTA *Interim Guidance on Conformity Requirements for the 1997 Ozone NAAQS* issued on April 23 does not require that areas in non-attainment of the 2008 Ozone Standard address 1997 ozone in their regional conformity analyses at this time. However, the SJV MPOs have voluntarily included 1997 ozone conformity demonstration for the 2018 RTP/2019 TIP to minimize project delivery risk.



**Table 1-1:  
 On-Road Motor Vehicle 1997 Ozone Standard Emissions Budgets <sup>(a)</sup>**  
 (summer tons/day)

County	2017 <sup>(b)</sup>		2020		2023	
	ROG	NOx	ROG	NOx	ROG	NOx
Fresno	8.7	29.9	6.8	24.3	5.6	14.6
Kern (SJV)	6.9	26.8	5.7	22.4	4.8	12.9
Kings	1.4	5.5	1.1	4.7	0.9	2.7
Madera	2.0	5.5	1.6	4.5	1.3	2.7
Merced	2.7	10.3	2.1	8.5	1.7	5.1
San Joaquin	6.4	14.1	5.1	11.3	4.3	7.3
Stanislaus	4.1	11.3	3.2	9.2	2.7	5.8
Tulare	4.0	10.3	3.1	8.1	2.5	4.9

<sup>(a)</sup>Note that EPA did not take action on the 2011 and 2014 budgets of the 2007 Ozone Plan (as revised in 2015).

<sup>(b)</sup> 2017 budgets are not in the timeframe of this conformity analysis.

#### *2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard*

Under the existing conformity regulation, regional emissions analyses for ozone areas must address nitrogen oxides (NOx) and volatile organic compounds (VOC) precursors. It is important to note that in California, reactive organic gases (ROG) are considered equivalent to and are used in place of volatile organic compounds (VOC).

Although EPA has not yet issued a full approval of the 2016 Ozone Plan for the 2008 8-hour ozone standard, the agency found the Plan's transportation conformity budgets adequate on June 29, 2017 (effective July 14, 2017). The EPA adequacy notice identified both reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NOx) subarea budgets in tons per average summer day for each MPO in the nonattainment area. For 2008 ozone conformity, the SJV MPOs will continue to conduct demonstrations for subarea emissions budgets as established in the 2016 Ozone Plan.

The adequate conformity budgets from June 29, 2017 Federal Register are provided in a table below. These budgets will be used to compare to emissions resulting from the 2019 FTIP and the 2018 RTP.

**Table 1-2:  
On-Road Motor Vehicle 2008 Ozone Standard Emissions Budgets**  
(summer tons/day)

County	2018		2021		2024		2027		2030		2031	
	ROG	NOx	ROG	NOx	ROG	NOx	ROG	NOx	ROG	NOx	ROG	NOx
Fresno	8.0	27.7	6.4	22.2	5.4	14.1	4.9	13.2	4.5	12.6	4.3	12.5
Kern (SJV)	6.6	25.4	5.5	20.4	4.8	12.6	4.5	11.7	4.2	10.9	4.1	10.8
Kings	1.3	5.1	1.1	4.2	0.9	2.6	0.9	2.5	0.8	2.3	0.8	2.3
Madera	1.9	5.1	1.5	4.1	1.2	2.6	1.1	2.3	0.9	2.0	0.9	2.0
Merced	2.5	9.4	2.0	7.8	1.6	4.8	1.5	4.4	1.3	4.2	1.3	4.1
San Joaquin	5.9	13.0	4.9	10.3	4.2	6.9	3.8	5.2	3.5	5.7	3.3	5.5
Stanislaus	3.8	10.5	3.0	8.3	2.6	5.6	2.3	5.1	2.1	4.7	2.0	4.7
Tulare	3.7	9.5	2.9	7.2	2.4	4.7	2.2	4.1	1.9	3.8	1.9	3.7

<sup>(a)</sup> Note that 2016 ozone budgets were established by rounding up each county's emissions totals to the nearest tenth of a ton.

As noted above, since transportation conformity for the 2015 ozone standard will not apply until 2019, this conformity analysis does not address the 2015 ozone standard.

### PM-10

The 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan (as revised in 2015) was approved by EPA on July 8, 2016 (effective September 30, 2016), which contains motor vehicle emission budgets for PM-10 and NOx, as well as a trading mechanism. Motor vehicle emission budgets are established based on average annual daily emissions. The motor vehicle emissions budget for PM-10 includes regional re-entrained dust from travel on paved roads, vehicular exhaust, travel on unpaved roads, and road construction. The conformity budgets from Table 2 of the August 12, 2016 Federal Register are provided below and will be used to compare emissions for each analysis year.

The PM-10 SIP allows trading from the motor vehicle emissions budget for the PM-10 precursor NOx to the motor vehicle emissions budget for primary PM-10 using a 1.5 to 1 ratio. The trading mechanism allows the agencies responsible for demonstrating transportation conformity in the San Joaquin Valley to supplement the 2005 budget for PM-10 with a portion of the 2005 budget for NOx, and use these adjusted motor vehicle emissions budgets for PM-10 and NOx to demonstrate transportation conformity with the PM-10 SIP for analysis years after 2005. As noted above, EPA approved the 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan (with minor technical corrections to the conformity budgets) on July 8, 2016, which includes continued approval of the trading mechanism.

The trading mechanism will be used only for conformity analyses for analysis years after 2005. To ensure that the trading mechanism does not impact the ability to meet the NOx budget, the NOx emission reductions available to supplement the PM-10 budget shall only be those remaining after the NOx budget has been met.

**Table 1-3:  
 On-Road Motor Vehicle PM-10 Emissions Budgets**  
 (tons per average annual day)

County	2020	
	PM-10	NO <sub>x</sub>
Fresno	7.0	25.4
Kern <sup>(a)</sup>	7.4	23.3
Kings	1.8	4.8
Madera	2.5	4.7
Merced	3.8	8.9
San Joaquin	4.6	11.9
Stanislaus	3.7	9.6
Tulare	3.4	8.4

- (a) Kern County subarea includes only the portion of Kern County within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin  
 (b) Note that EPA did not take action on the 2005 budgets of the 2007 PM10 Maintenance Plan (as revised in 2015). These budgets are not in the timeframe of this conformity analysis.

## PM2.5

EPA and FHWA have indicated that areas violating both the annual and 24-hour standards for PM2.5 must address all standards in the conformity determination. The San Joaquin Valley currently violates both the 1997 annual and 24-hour and 2012 annual PM2.5 standards and the 2006 24-hour PM2.5 standards; thus the conformity determination includes all corresponding analyses (see discussion under Air Quality Designations Applicable to the San Joaquin Valley above).

The 2017 PM2.5 Plan addressing 1997, 2006 and 2012 PM2.5 standards is anticipated to be submitted to EPA in the summer of 2018. Since no new PM2.5 budgets are available at this time, existing budgets in the approved PM2.5 plans will continue to be used as described below.

### *1997 (24-hour and annual) and 2012 (annual) PM2.5 Standards*

The 2008 PM2.5 Plan for the 1997 PM2.5 standard (as revised in 2011) was approved by EPA on November 9, 2011, which contains motor vehicle emission budgets for PM2.5 and NO<sub>x</sub> established based on average annual daily emissions, as well as a trading mechanism. The motor vehicle emissions budget for PM2.5 includes directly emitted PM2.5 motor vehicle emissions from tailpipe, brake wear and tire wear. VOC, SO<sub>x</sub>, ammonia, and dust (from paved roads, unpaved roads, and road construction) were found to be insignificant and not included in the motor vehicle emission budgets for conformity purposes. The conformity budgets from Table 5 of the November 9, 2011 Federal Register are provided in Table 1-4 below and will be used to compare emissions resulting from the 2019 FTIP and the 2018 RTP.

In accordance with Section 93.109(i)(3) of the conformity rule, if a 2012 PM2.5 nonattainment area has adequate or approved SIP budgets that address the annual 1997 PM2.5 standards, it must

use the budget test until new 2012 PM2.5 standard budgets are found adequate or approved. The attainment year of 2021 will be modeled. For this Conformity Analysis, the SJV will conduct determinations for subarea emission budgets as established in the 2008 PM2.5 (1997 Standard) Plan.

In addition, the final PM2.5 Implementation Rule requires areas designated as nonattainment for the 1997 PM2.5 standards to continue demonstrate conformity to these standards until attainment. In the San Joaquin Valley, the 1997 standards (both 24-hour and annual) continue to apply.

**Table 1-4:  
 On-Road Motor Vehicle 1997 (24-hour and annual) and  
 2012 (annual) PM2.5 Standard Emissions Budgets**  
 (tons per average annual day)

County	2012		2014	
	PM2.5	NOx	PM2.5	NOx
Fresno	1.5	35.7	1.1	31.4
Kern (SJV)	1.9	48.9	1.2	43.8
Kings	0.4	10.5	0.3	9.3
Madera	0.4	9.2	0.3	8.1
Merced	0.8	19.7	0.6	17.4
San Joaquin	1.1	24.5	0.9	21.6
Stanislaus	0.7	16.7	0.6	14.6
Tulare	0.7	15.7	0.5	13.8

The 2008 PM2.5 SIP includes a trading mechanism that allows trading from the motor vehicle emissions budget for the PM-2.5 precursor NOx to the motor vehicle emissions budget for primary PM-2.5 using a 9 to 1 ratio. The trading mechanism allows the agencies responsible for demonstrating transportation conformity in the San Joaquin Valley to supplement the applicable budget for PM-2.5 with a portion of the applicable corresponding budget for NOx, and use these adjusted motor vehicle emissions budgets for PM-2.5 and NOx to demonstrate transportation conformity with the PM-2.5 SIP for analysis years after 2014. As noted above, EPA approved the 2008 PM2.5 Plan (as revised in 2011) on November 9, 2011, which includes approval of the trading mechanism.

The trading mechanism will be used only for conformity analyses for analysis years after 2014. To ensure that the trading mechanism does not impact the ability to meet the NOx budget, the NOx emission reductions available to supplement the PM-2.5 budget shall only be those remaining after the NOx budget has been met.

As noted above, in accordance with the EPA Transportation Conformity Rule Restructuring Amendments Nonattainment areas allows 2012 PM2.5 areas with adequate or approved 1997 PM2.5 budgets to determine conformity for both NAAQS at the same time, using the budget test.

*2006 24-Hour PM2.5 Standard*

The 2012 (2006 Standard) PM2.5 Plan was first approved by ARB on January 24, 2013 and the Plan Supplement requesting reclassification to Serious and including revised budgets was approved by ARB on October 24, 2014. EPA proposed approval of the plan on January 13, 2015.

On January 20, 2016, EPA finalized reclassification of the San Joaquin Valley to Serious nonattainment for the 2006 24-hour PM2.5 Standard. On May 18, 2016 EPA published proposed approval of the revised 2012 Plan PM2.5 budgets. Then on August 16, 2016, the 2012 PM2.5 Plan was approved by EPA including the revised conformity budgets and a trading mechanism (effective September 30, 2016).

The 2012 PM2.5 Plan for the 2006 PM2.5 standard (as revised in 2015) contains motor vehicle emission budgets for PM2.5 and NOx established based on average winter daily emissions, as well as a trading mechanism. The motor vehicle emissions budget for PM2.5 includes directly emitted PM2.5 motor vehicle emissions from tailpipe, brake wear and tire wear. VOC, SOx, ammonia, and dust (from paved roads, unpaved roads, and road construction) were found to be insignificant and not included in the motor vehicle emission budgets for conformity purposes. The conformity budgets from the 2012 PM2.5 Plan (as revised in 2015) are provided in Table 1-5 below and will be used to compare emissions resulting from the 2019 FTIP and the 2018 RTP.

**Table 1-5:  
 On-Road Motor Vehicle 2006 24-Hour PM2.5 Standard Emissions Budgets**  
 (tons per average winter day)

County	2017	
	PM2.5	NOx
Fresno	1.0	32.1
Kern (SJV)	0.8	28.8
Kings	0.2	5.9
Madera	0.2	6.0
Merced	0.3	11.0
San Joaquin	0.6	15.5
Stanislaus	0.4	12.3
Tulare	0.4	11.2

<sup>(a)</sup> Note that EPA did not take action on the 2014 budgets of the 2012 PM2.5 Plan (as revised in 2015). These budgets are not in the timeframe of this conformity analysis.

The 2012 PM2.5 SIP includes a trading mechanism that allows trading from the motor vehicle emissions budget for the PM2.5 precursor NOx to the motor vehicle emissions budget for primary PM-2.5 using an 8 to 1 ratio. The trading mechanism allows the agencies responsible for demonstrating transportation conformity in the San Joaquin Valley to supplement the applicable budget for PM-2.5 with a portion of the applicable corresponding budget for NOx, and use these adjusted motor vehicle emissions budgets for PM2.5 and NOx to demonstrate transportation

conformity with the PM2.5 SIP for analysis years after 2014. As noted above, EPA approved the 2012 PM2.5 Plan budgets (as revised in 2015) on August 16, 2016 (effective September 30, 2016) and the trading mechanism.

## **E. ANALYSIS YEARS**

The conformity regulation (Section 93.118[b] and [d]) requires documentation of the years for which consistency with motor vehicle emission budgets must be shown. In addition, any interpolation performed to meet tests for years in which specific analysis is not required need to be documented.

For the selection of the horizon years, the conformity regulation requires: (1) that if the attainment year is in the time span of the transportation plan, it must be modeled; (2) the last year forecast in the transportation plan must be a horizon year; and (3) horizon years may not be more than ten years apart. In addition, the conformity regulation requires that conformity must be demonstrated for each year for which the applicable implementation plan specifically establishes motor vehicle emission budgets.

Section 93.118(b)(2) clarifies that when a maintenance plan has been submitted, conformity must be demonstrated for the last year of the maintenance plan and any other years for which the maintenance plan establishes budgets in the time frame of the transportation plan. Section 93.118(d)(2) indicates that a regional emissions analysis may be performed for any years, the attainment year, and the last year of the plan's forecast. Other years may be determined by interpolating between the years for which the regional emissions analysis is performed.

Section 93.118(d)(2) indicates that the regional emissions analysis may be performed for any years in the time frame of the transportation plan provided they are not more than ten years apart and provided the analysis is performed for the attainment year (if it is in the time frame of the transportation plan) and the last year of the plan's forecast period. Emissions in years for which consistency with motor vehicle emissions budgets must be demonstrated, as required in paragraph (b) of this section (i.e., each budget year), may be determined by interpolating between the years for which the regional emissions analysis is performed. Table 1-6 below provides a summary of conformity analysis years that apply to the 2018 RTP/2019 FTIP conformity analysis.

**Table 1-6:  
San Joaquin Valley Conformity Analysis Years**

<b>Pollutant</b>	<b>Budget Years<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Attainment/ Maintenance Year</b>	<b>Intermediate Years</b>	<b>RTP Horizon Year</b>
1997 Ozone	2011, 2014, 2017, 2020	2023	2031/2037	2042
2008 Ozone	2018/2021/2024/2027/2030	2031	2037	2042
PM-10	NA	2020	2027/2035	2042
1997 and 2012 PM2.5	NA	2014/2021 <sup>2</sup>	2027/2035	2042
2006 24-hour PM2.5	2014/2017	2019 <sup>3</sup>	2027/2035	2042

<sup>1</sup>Budget years that are not in the time frame of the transportation plan/conformity analysis are not included as analysis years (e.g., 2011, 2014, 2017), although they may be used to demonstrate conformity.

<sup>2</sup>. Note: 2014 is the attainment year for the 1997 PM2.5 standards. 2021 is the attainment year for the 2012 PM2.5 standards.

<sup>3</sup>Note: The 2006 standard must be met as expeditiously as practicable, but no later than December 31, 2019.

For the 1997 ozone standard<sup>3</sup>, the San Joaquin Valley has been classified as an Extreme nonattainment area with an attainment date of June 15, 2024. In accordance with the March 2015 *Implementation of the 2008 National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone: State Implementation Plan Requirements* final rule, the attainment year of 2023 must be modeled. When using the budget test, the attainment year of the 1997 Ozone standard must be analyzed (e.g. 2023).

For the 2008 ozone standard, the San Joaquin Valley has been classified as an Extreme nonattainment area with an attainment date of July 20, 2032. In accordance with the March 2015 *Implementation of the 2008 National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone: State Implementation Plan Requirements* final rule, the attainment year of 2031 must be modeled. When using the budget test, the attainment year of the 2008 Ozone standard must be analyzed (e.g. 2031).

The Clean Air Act requires all states to attain the 1997 PM2.5 standards as expeditiously as practicable beginning in 2010, but by no later than April 5, 2010 unless EPA approves an attainment date extension. States must identify their attainment dates based on the rate of reductions from their control strategies and the severity of the PM2.5 problem. On February 9, 2016 EPA released its proposed *Approval and Disapproval of California Air Plan; San Joaquin Valley Serious Area Plan and Attainment Date Extension for the 1997 PM2.5 NAAQS*. No final EPA action has been taken on the plan. As a result, the proposed SIP budgets are assumed to be unavailable for use and the 2008 PM2.5 Plan conformity budgets are the only budgets applicable at this time for the 1997 PM2.5 standard.

<sup>3</sup> Note that FHWA/FTA *Interim Guidance on Conformity Requirements for the 1997 Ozone NAAQS* issued on April 23 does not require that areas in non-attainment of the 2008 Ozone Standard address 1997 ozone in their regional conformity analyses at this time. However, the SJV MPOs have voluntarily included 1997 ozone conformity demonstration for the 2018 RTP/2019 TIP to minimize project delivery risk

On January 20, 2016, EPA finalized reclassification of the San Joaquin Valley to Serious nonattainment for the 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> Standard. On May 18, 2016 EPA published proposed approval of the revised 2012 Plan PM<sub>2.5</sub> budgets. Then on August 16, 2016, the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan was approved by EPA, effective September 30, 2016, inclusive of the revised conformity budgets and trading mechanism for the 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard. The attainment year of 2019 must be modeled.

On April 15, 2015, EPA classified the San Joaquin Valley as Moderate nonattainment for the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Standards. In accordance with Section 93.109(i)(3) of the conformity rule, if a 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment area has adequate or approved SIP budgets that address the annual 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards, it must use the budget test until new 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard budgets are found adequate or approved. When using the budget test, the attainment year must be analyzed (e.g. 2021). In addition, in areas that have approved or adequate budgets for the 1997 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards, consistency with those budgets must also be determined. The attainment year of 2021 must be modeled.



## **CHAPTER 2: LATEST PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS AND TRANSPORTATION MODELING**

The Clean Air Act states that “the determination of conformity shall be based on the most recent estimates of emissions, and such estimates shall be determined from the most recent population, employment, travel, and congestion estimates as determined by the MPO or other agency authorized to make such estimates.” On January 18, 2001, the USDOT issued guidance developed jointly with EPA to provide additional clarification concerning the use of latest planning assumptions in conformity determinations (USDOT, 2001).

According to the conformity regulation, the time the conformity analysis begins is “the point at which the MPO or other designated agency begins to model the impact of the proposed transportation plan or TIP on travel and/or emissions.” The conformity analysis and initial modeling began in May 2016.

Key elements of the latest planning assumption guidance include:

- Areas are strongly encouraged to review and strive towards regular five-year updates of planning assumptions, especially population, employment and vehicle registration assumptions.
- The latest planning assumptions must be derived from the population, employment, travel and congestion estimates that have been most recently developed by the MPO (or other agency authorized to make such estimates) and approved by the MPO.
- Conformity determinations that are based on information that is older than five years should include written justification for not using more recent information. For areas where updates are appropriate, the conformity determination should include an anticipated schedule for updating assumptions.
- The conformity determination must use the latest existing information regarding the effectiveness of the transportation control measures (TCMs) and other implementation plan measures that have already been implemented.

TCAG uses the CUBE/VOYAGER (VMIP2) transportation model. The model was validated in 2017 for the 2015 base year. The latest planning assumptions used in the transportation model validation and Conformity Analysis is summarized in Table 2-1.

**Table 2-1:  
 Summary of Latest Planning Assumptions for the TCAG Conformity Analysis**

<b>Assumption</b>	<b>Year and Source of Data (MPO action)</b>	<b>Modeling</b>	<b>Next Scheduled Update</b>
Population	Base Year: Department of Finance (2015)  Projections: Department of Finance (2017)  Approved by TCAG Governing Board in August 2018 (anticipated).	This data is disaggregated to the TAZ level for input into CUBE/Voyager (VMIP2) for the base year validation.	New data from the Department of Finance is expected to be adopted by TCAG in 2022.
Employment	Base Year: Employment Development Department (2015), InfoUSA (2015), and Woods and Poole (2017)  Projections:  Employment Development Department (2015) and Woods and Poole (2017)	This data is disaggregated to the TAZ level for input into CUBE/Voyager (VMIP2) for the base year validation.	New data from the Employment Development Department, InfoUSA, and Woods and Poole is anticipated to be included in the next transportation model update in 2022.
Traffic Counts	Approximately 150 traffic counts were collected annually.	CUBE/Voyager (VMIP2) was validated using these traffic counts.	Traffic counts are updated continuously, if funds are available.
Vehicle Miles of Travel	The 2017 transportation model validation for the 2015 base year was approved by the TCAG Board in August 2018 (anticipated).	Cube/Voyager (VMIP2) is the transportation model used to estimate VMT in Tulare County.	VMT is an output of the transportation model. VMT is affected by the TIP/RTP project updates and is included in each new conformity analysis.

Assumption	Year and Source of Data (MPO action)	Modeling	Next Scheduled Update
Speeds	<p>The 2017 transportation model validation was based on Caltrans Performance Measurement System (PeMS), in addition to TCAG survey data of peak and off-peak speeds, and a TCAG Travel Time Study for SR 198 &amp; 190.</p> <p>Speed distributions were updated in EMFAC2014, using methodology approved by ARB and with information from the transportation model.</p>	<p>Cube/Voyager (VMIP2) includes a feedback loop that assures congested speeds are consistent with travel speeds.</p> <p>EMFAC2014</p>	<p>A speed study will be conducted every five years, if adequate funds are available.</p>

## A. SOCIOECONOMIC DATA

### POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT AND LAND USE

The conformity regulation requires documentation of base case and projected population, employment, and land use used in the transportation modeling. USDOT/EPA guidance indicates that if the data is more than five years old, written justification for the use of older data must be provided. In addition, documentation is required for how land use development scenarios are consistent with future transportation system alternatives, and the reasonable distribution of employment and residences for each alternative.

#### *Supporting Documentation:*

MPO	Transportation Model	Base Year Validation	Year Completed	Population	Employment	Traffic Counts	Speeds	Periods	Feedback Loop
TCAG	CUBE (VMIP2)	2015 Projections →	2017	DOF 2015 DOF 2017	EDD 2015 / InfoUSA 2015 DOF 2017	2015-2016	Caltrans PeMS/TCAG 2014-2016	AM/MD/PM/OP	Yes

**Population:** TCAG utilized the California Department of Finance (DOF) as the primary county-level forecasting reference for a base population and future projections, to be within 3% of the latest DOF projections required by SB375. A linear growth rate with the population interpolated for each year was applied using the DOF forecasts through the planning horizon year of 2042.

**Employment:** Employment estimates and projections used included the California Employment Development Department (EDD), InfoUSA, and Woods & Poole. Control

totals were derived from these projections and used in the development of Envision Tomorrow scenarios and travel demand model socio-economic detail inputs.

The EDD data established control totals for the base and future years of employment and employment categories. Next, the InfoUSA data provided geocoded information to distribute the information graphically. InfoUSA data was adjusted to EDD's control totals and reclassified to fit the categories of the model. This allowed for the distribution of employees to the Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ). To test proportions and make adjustments where needed between EDD and InfoUSA, Woods & Poole was used, which provides historical employment data. Woods & Poole also helped complete the InfoUSA dataset, as InfoUSA has some gaps in its data in regards to employers not required to pay taxes (schools, fire stations, post offices, etc.)

**Land Use:** Land use and socioeconomic data was derived from the above sources and joined to the TAZ level for determining trip generation, vehicle availability, and mode choice. The housing forecasts are based on DOF data for the base year, and projected using a Planning Center Study from 2012 conducted for the San Joaquin Valley, which included population, birth rates, net migration, housing, construction, and school enrollment. A linear growth rate for households was then determined by adjusting to a persons per household ratio that was reasonable based on Planning Center study projections.

Future land use patterns were created using a GIS plugin called Envision Tomorrow, a suite of scenario planning tools that tests different land use and transportation options. Utilizing input and coordination with local agencies, parcel data information, city and county general plans, zoning maps, projected outputs in housing and population from the DOF and the Planning Center, and projected employment from the EDD, InfoUSA, and Woods & Poole, scenarios were built to graphically represent the world that would look like. This allowed for a deeper analysis into the study area, allowing the user to measure the scenario's influence on density, land use, housing, sustainability, transportation, and economic conditions. Although Envision tomorrow was not yet used to measure VMT, it was consistent with population and employment projections, and produced richer metrics for comparison amongst scenarios.

## **B. TRANSPORTATION MODELING**

*Specific transportation modeling requirements in the conformity regulation are summarized below, followed by a description of how TCAG transportation modeling methodology meets those requirements.*

The San Joaquin Valley Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) utilize the TP+/CUBE traffic modeling software. The Valley MPO regional traffic models consist of traditional four-step traffic forecasting models. They use land use, socioeconomic, and road network data to estimate facility-specific roadway traffic volumes. Each MPO model covers the appropriate county area, which is then divided into hundreds or thousands of individual traffic analysis zones (TAZs). In

addition the model roadway networks include thousands of nodes and links. Link types include freeway, freeway ramp, other State route, expressway, arterial, collector, and local collector. Current and future-year road networks were developed considering local agency circulation elements of their general plans, traffic impact studies, capital improvement programs, and the State Transportation Improvement Program. The models use equilibrium, a capacity sensitive assignment methodology, and the data from the model for the emission estimates differentiates between peak and off-peak volumes and speeds. In addition, the model is reasonably sensitive to changes in time and other factors affecting travel choices. The results from model validation/calibration were analyzed for reasonableness and compared to historical trends.

Specific transportation modeling requirements in the conformity regulation are summarized below, followed by a description of how TCAG transportation modeling methodology meets those requirements.

**Trip Generation:** this first step calculates person or truck trip ends using trip generation rates established during model calibration. This step also uses demographics to determine household passenger vehicle availability.

**Trip Distribution:** this step estimates how many trips travel from one zone to any other zone. The distribution is based on the number of trip ends generated in each of the two zones, and on factors that relate the likelihood of travel between any two zones to the impedance between the two zones such as distance, cost, time, and varies by accessibility to passenger vehicles, transit, and non-vehicular modes.

**Mode Choice:** this step uses demographics and the comparison of distance, time, cost, and access to between modes to estimate the proportions of the total person trips using drive-alone or shared-ride passenger auto, transit, walk, or bike for travel between zones.

**Trip Assignment:** in the final step, vehicle trips or transit trips from one zone to another zone are assigned to specific travel routes between the zones on the network.

## TRAFFIC COUNTS

*The conformity regulation requires documentation that a network-based travel model is in use that is validated against observed counts for a base year no more than 10 years before the date of the conformity determination. Document that the model results have been analyzed for reasonableness and compared to historical trends and explain any significant differences between past trends and forecasts (for per capita vehicle-trips, VMT, trip lengths mode shares, time of day, etc.).*

*Supporting Documentation:* The model was estimated and calibrated to reflect the base year travel conditions of 2015 and validated to the year of 2017, with 232 directional counts collected regionally between 2014 and 2016. Weekday traffic counts were compared to the model assigned volume for total vehicle trips. The overall Daily model/count ratio landed at .99, 8% closer to counts than the previous model.

Daily Model/Count by Functional Class		
Functional Class	M/C	# Locations
Freeway	1.01	4
Highway/Expressway	0.99	3
Arterial	0.77	224
Collector	NA	0

RMSE by Daily Volume Groups		
Count Volume	Guideline	Model
> 50,000	< 21%	14%
25,000 - 49,999	< 22%	27%
10,000 - 24,999	< 25%	31%
5,000 - 9,999	< 29%	46%
2,500 - 4,999	< 36%	55%
1,000 - 2,499	< 47%	72%
< 1,000	< 60%	182%

Daily Model/Count by Functional Class		
Functional Class	M/C	# Locations
Freeway	1.01	4
Highway/Expressway	0.99	3
Arterial	0.77	224
Collector	NA	0

RMSE by Daily Volume Groups		
Count Volume	Guideline	Model
> 50,000	< 21%	14%
25,000 - 49,999	< 22%	27%
10,000 - 24,999	< 25%	31%
5,000 - 9,999	< 29%	46%
2,500 - 4,999	< 36%	55%
1,000 - 2,499	< 47%	72%
< 1,000	< 60%	182%

**Trip Making and Travel Patterns:** Available 2010 Census Journey-to-Work data, 2010-2012 California Household Travel Survey (CHTS) data, and National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) recommended trip rates were used to verify, and as needed, modify the TCAG model trip generation rates. The table below shows the resultant trips by purpose compared with the Caltrans survey data:

Purpose	Total (All Modes)	
	CHTS	Model
HBW	16%	14%
HBO	59%	61%
NHB	26%	24%
Total (All Purposes)	100%	100%

## SPEEDS

*The conformity regulation requires documentation of the use of capacity sensitive assignment methodology and emissions estimates based on a methodology that differentiates between peak and off-peak volumes and speeds, and bases speeds on final assigned volumes. In addition, documentation of the use of zone-to-zone travel impedances to distribute trips in reasonable agreement with the travel times estimated from final assigned traffic volumes. Where transit is a significant factor, document that zone-to-zone travel impedances used to distribute trips are used to model mode split. Finally, document that reasonable methods were used to estimate traffic speeds and delays in a manner sensitive to the estimated volume of travel on each roadway segment represented in the travel model.*

*Supporting Documentation:*

The 2017 transportation model validation was based on Caltrans Performance Measurement System (PeMS), in addition to TCAG survey data of peak and off-peak speeds, and a TCAG Travel Time Study for SR 198 & 190.

The valley traffic models include a feedback loop that uses congested travel times as an input to the trip distribution step. The feedback loop ensures that the congested travel speeds used as input to the air pollution emission models are consistent with the travel speeds used throughout the traffic model process. The travel model is validated to counts using input average free flow speeds and common practice speed flow curves which are used to estimate congested speeds and travel times. Then, a feedback loop is implemented with the intent to ensure that the congested travel impedances (times) used for final traffic assignment and as input to the air quality analysis are consistent with the travel impedances used throughout the model process. The feedback loop is considered to converge when the travel times that result from the congested travel speeds after traffic assignment compare closely with the travel times used as input to the trip distribution process. Travel impedances from zone to zone are used to distribute trips to model mode split.

Speed limits, free flow speed, historical average speeds, and percentage of free flow, along with a time series report and confidence rate score on selected corridors through Iteris’ iPems web based software using “Big Data” from Here, are recently available to TCAG which may be used to determine free flow speeds and common practice speed flow curves in the future.

**TRANSIT**

*The conformity regulation requires documentation of any changes in transit operating policies and assumed ridership levels since the previous conformity determination. Document the use of the latest transit fares and road and bridge tolls.*

*Supporting Documentation:*

As part of VMIP 2, the highway network was based on a true shape centerline file in a geodatabase and updated variables to reflect the master network from the RTP/SCS. The transit lines were also updated to match the more detailed highway network and are contained in the geodatabase. The benefits of this are more accurate mapping and distances, easy linkage and comparisons to speed data, and inclusion of local streets for sub-TAZ level analysis. In addition, the GIS network contains many variables to complement those already part of the travel model network, including auto, HOV, transit, truck, bike, and walk accessibility designations. The transit assignment includes the following variables: transit networks, transit attributes (mode, operator, vehicle type), transit access links, fares, user classes, and transfer and wait rules. Higher frequency transit and infill developments lead to increased transit ridership in the future. The mode choice model reflects the household travel survey, as shown in the table below.

Drove Alone		Shared Ride 2		Shared Ride 3+		Transit		Walk		Bike		Other	
CHTS	Model	CHTS	Model	CHTS	Model	CHTS	Model	CHTS	Model	CHTS	Model	CHTS	Model
80%	81%	9%	8%	5%	7%	0.3%	0.8%	5%	3%	1%	1%	0%	0%
24%	25%	28%	30%	31%	30%	0.5%	1.5%	13%	8%	1%	1%	3%	4%
42%	40%	27%	26%	18%	17%	0.3%	0.9%	12%	13%	0%	2%	1%	0%
37%	37%	25%	26%	24%	23%	0.4%	1.2%	11%	9%	1%	2%	2%	2%

**VALIDATION/CALIBRATION**

*The conformity regulation requires documentation that the model results have been analyzed for reasonableness and compared to historical trends and explain any significant differences between past trends and forecasts (for per capita vehicle-trips, VMT, trip lengths mode shares, time of day, etc.). In addition, documentation of how travel models are reasonably sensitive to changes in time, cost, and other factors affecting travel choices is required. The use of HPMS, or a locally developed count-based program or procedures that have been chosen to reconcile and calibrate the network-based travel model estimates of VMT must be documented.*

*Supporting Documentation:*

The models were validated by comparing its estimates of base year traffic conditions with base year traffic counts. The base year validations meet standard criteria for replicating total traffic volumes on various road types and for percent error on links. The base year validation also meets standard criteria for percent error relative to traffic counts on groups of roads (screen-lines) throughout each county.

For Serious and above nonattainment areas, transportation conformity guidance, Section 93.122(b)(3) of the conformity regulation states:

*Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) estimates of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) shall be considered the primary measure of VMT within the portion of the nonattainment or maintenance area and for the functional classes of roadways included in HPMS, for urban areas which are sampled on a separate urban area basis. For areas with network-based travel models, a factor (or factors) may be developed to reconcile and calibrate the network-based travel model estimates of VMT in the base year of its validation to the HPMS estimates for the same period. These factors may then be applied to model estimates of future VMT. In this factoring process, consideration will be given to differences between HPMS and network-based travel models, such as differences in the facility coverage of the HPMS and the modeling network description. Locally developed count-based programs and other departures from these procedures are permitted subject to the interagency consultation procedures.*

As shown in the table below, the TCAG regional model forecasts of VMT for the 2015 base year validation were within 3% of the relevant year of Caltrans Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) data as tabulated in the Assembly of Statistical Reports for the selected base year.

<b>Evaluation Criterion</b>	<b>HPMS</b>	<b>Model</b>	<b>% Deviation</b>
+/-3%	10,062,200	10,336,790	2.7%



## **FUTURE NETWORKS**

*The conformity regulation requires that a listing of regionally significant projects and federally-funded non-regionally significant projects assumed in the regional emissions analysis be provided in the conformity documentation. In addition, all projects that are exempt must also be documented.*

*§93.106(a)(2)ii and §93.122(a)(1) requires that regionally significant additions or modifications to the existing transportation network that are expected to be open to traffic in each analysis year be documented for both Federally funded and non-federally funded projects (see Appendix B).*

*§93.122(a)(1) requires that VMT for non-regionally significant Federal projects is accounted for in the regional emissions analysis. It is assumed that all SJV MPOs include these projects in the transportation network (see Appendix B).*

*§93.126, §93.127, §93.128 require that all projects in the TIP/RTP that are exempt from conformity requirements or exempt from the regional emissions analysis be documented. In addition, the reason for the exemption (Table 2, Table 3, traffic signal synchronization) must also be documented (see Appendix B). It is important to note that the CTIPs exemption code is provided in response to FHWA direction.*

### *Supporting Documentation:*

The build highway networks include qualifying projects based on the 2019 FTIP and the 2018 RTP. Not all of the street and freeway projects included in the TIP/RTP qualify for inclusion in the highway network. Projects that call for study, design, or non-capacity improvements are not included in the networks. When these projects result in actual facility construction projects, the associated capacity changes are coded into the network as appropriate. Since the networks define capacity in terms of number of through traffic lanes, only construction projects that increase the lane-miles of through traffic are included.

Generally, Valley MPO highway networks include all roadways included in the county or cities classified system. These links typically include all freeways plus expressways, arterials, collectors and local collectors. Highway networks also include regionally significant planned local improvements from Transportation Impact Fee Programs and developer funded improvements required to mitigate the impact of a new development.

Small-scale local street improvements contained in the TIP/RTP are not coded on the highway network. Although not explicitly coded, traffic on collector and local streets is simulated in the models by use of abstract links called “centroid connectors”. These represent local streets and driveways which connect a neighborhood to a regionally-significant roadway. Model estimates of centroid connector travel are reconciled against HPMS estimates of collector and local street travel.

**C. TRAFFIC ESTIMATES**

A summary of the population, employment, and travel characteristics for the TCAG transportation modeling area for each scenario in the Conformity Analysis is presented in Table 2-2.

**Table 2-2:  
 Traffic Network Comparison for Horizon Years Evaluated in Conformity Analysis**

<b>Horizon Year</b>	<b>Total Population</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Average Weekday VMT</b>	<b>Total Lane Miles</b>
2018	478,292	178,046	10,575,671	N/A
2019	483,293	179,803	10,660,825	N/A
2020	488,293	181,560	10,716,374	4,192
2021	493,455	183,317	10,806,930	N/A
2023	504,072	186,830	10,995,728	N/A
2024	508,939	188,587	11,086,016	N/A
2027	524,916	193,858	11,406,584	4,288
2030	541,140	199,128	11,650,102	N/A
2031	546,549	200,885	11,756,385	N/A
2035	568,186	207,912	12,085,473	4,391
2037	578,651	211,426	12,253,801	NA
2042	603,775	220,210	12,699,425	4,461

**D. VEHICLE REGISTRATIONS**

TCAG does not estimate vehicle registrations, age distributions or fleet mix. Rather, current forecasted estimates for these data are developed by CARB and included in the EMFAC2014 model ([http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/onroad/latest\\_version.htm](http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/onroad/latest_version.htm)). EMFAC2014 is the most recent model for use in California conformity analyses. Vehicle registrations, age distribution and fleet mix are developed and included in the model by CARB and cannot be updated by the user. EPA issued a federal register notice on December 14, 2015 formally approving EMFAC2014 for conformity.

**E. STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN MEASURES**

The air quality modeling procedures and associated spreadsheets contained in Chapter 3 Air Quality Modeling assume emission reductions consistent with the applicable air quality plans. The emission reductions assumed for these committed measures reflect the latest implementation status of these measures. Committed control measures in the applicable air quality plans that reduce mobile source emissions and are used in conformity, are summarized below.

**OZONE**

Committed control measures in the 2007 8-hour Ozone Plan (as revised in 2015) for the 1997 Ozone standard that reduce mobile source emissions are shown in Table 2-3. However, reductions from these control measures were not applied to this conformity analysis because they were not needed to demonstrate conformity.

**Table 2-3:  
 2007 Ozone Plan Measures Assumed in the Conformity Analysis**

Measure Description	Pollutants
Existing Local Reductions: District Rule 9310 (School Bus Fleets)	Summer NOx
Existing State Reductions: Carl Moyer Program & AB 1493 GHG Standards	Summer ROG Summer NOx
New/Proposed Local Reductions: District Rule 9410 (Employer Based Trip Reduction)	Summer ROG Summer NOx
New/Proposed State Reductions: Smog Check & Reformulated Gas (RFG)	Summer ROG Summer NOx

NOTE: This table is consistent with the 2007 Ozone Plan (as revised in 2015) which was approved by EPA on July 8, 2016 (effective September 30, 2016). State reductions from the Carl Moyer, AB1493, Smog Check and RFG have been included in EMFAC2014.

No committed control measures are included in the 2008 ozone standard conformity demonstration.

**PM-10**

Committed control measures in the EPA approved 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan that reduce mobile source emissions and are included in the conformity demonstration are shown in Table 2-4. However, reductions from these control measures were not applied to this conformity analysis because they were not needed to demonstrate conformity.

**Table 2-4:  
 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan Measures Assumed in the Conformity Analysis**

Measure Description	Pollutants
ARB existing Reflash, Idling, and Moyer	PM-10 annual exhaust NOx annual exhaust
District Rule 8061: Paved and Unpaved Roads	PM-10 paved road dust PM-10 unpaved road dust
District Rule 8021 Controls: Construction, Demolition, Excavation, Extraction, and Other Earthmoving Activities	PM-10 road construction dust

NOTE: State reductions from the Carl Moyer, Reflash and Idling have been included in EMFAC2014.

**PM2.5**

Committed control measures in the 2008 PM2.5 Plan (as revised) and 2012 PM2.5 Plan (as revised in 2015) that reduce mobile source emissions and are included in the conformity demonstration are shown in Table 2-5 and 2-6, respectively. However, reductions from these control measures were not applied to this conformity analysis because they were not needed to demonstrate conformity.

**Table 2-5:  
 2008 PM2.5 (1997 Standard) Plan Measures Assumed in the Conformity Analysis**

Measure Description	Pollutants
Existing Local Reductions: District Rule 9310 (School Bus Fleets)	Annual PM2.5 Annual NOx
Existing State Reductions: Carl Moyer Program & AB 1493 GHG Standards	Annual PM2.5 Annual NOx
New/Proposed Local Reductions: District Rule 9410 (Employer Based Trip Reduction)	Annual PM2.5 Annual NOx
New/Proposed State Reductions: Smog Check	Annual PM2.5 Annual NOx

NOTE: This table is consistent with the 2008 PM2.5 Plan (as revised in 2011) as approved by EPA on November 9, 2011 (effective January 9, 2012). State reductions from the Carl Moyer, AB1493, and Smog Check have been included in EMFAC2014.

**Table 2-6:  
 2012 PM2.5 (2006 Standard) Plan Measures Assumed in the Conformity Analysis**

Measure Description	Pollutants
Existing Local Reductions: District Rule 9310 (School Bus Fleets)	Annual PM2.5 Annual NOx
Existing State Reductions: Carl Moyer Program & AB 1493 GHG Standards	Annual PM2.5 Annual NOx
New/Proposed Local Reductions: District Rule 9410 (Employer Based Trip Reduction)	Annual PM2.5 Annual NOx
New/Proposed State Reductions: Smog Check	Annual PM2.5 Annual NOx

NOTE: This table is consistent with the 2012 PM2.5 Plan (as revised in 2015) approved by EPA on August 16, 2016 (effective September 30, 2016). State reductions from the Carl Moyer, AB1493 and Smog Check have been included in EMFAC2014.

## **CHAPTER 3: AIR QUALITY MODELING**

The model used to estimate vehicle exhaust emissions for ozone precursors and particulate matter is EMFAC2014. CARB emission factors for PM10 have been used to calculate re-entrained paved and unpaved road dust, and fugitive dust associated with road construction. For this conformity analysis, model inputs not dependent on the TIP or RTP are consistent with the applicable SIPs, which include:

- The 2007 Ozone Plan (1997 Standard), as revised in 2015, was approved by EPA on July 8, 2016 (effective September 30, 2016).
- The 2016 Ozone Plan (2008 standard) was adopted by the Air District on June 16, 2016 and subsequently adopted by the ARB on July 21, 2016. EPA found the new ozone budgets adequate on June 29, 2017 (effective July 14, 2017).
- The 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan (as revised in 2015) was approved by EPA on July 8, 2016 (effective September 30, 2016).
- The 2008 PM2.5 Plan (1997 Standards), as revised in 2011, was approved by EPA on November 9, 2011 (effective January 9, 2012).
- The 2012 PM2.5 Plan was approved by EPA on August 16, 2016 (effective September 30, 2016) inclusive of the revised conformity budgets and PM2.5 trading mechanism.

The conformity regulation requirements for the selection of the horizon years are summarized in Chapter 1; regional emissions have been estimated for the horizon years summarized in Table 1-7.

### **A. EMFAC2014**

The EMFAC model (short for EMISSION FACTOR) is a computer emissions modeling software that estimates emission rates for motor vehicles for calendar years from 2000 to 2050 operating in California. Pollutant emissions for hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, particulate matter, lead, sulfur oxides, and carbon dioxide are output from the model. Emissions are calculated for passenger cars, light, heavy, and medium-duty trucks, motorcycles, buses and motor homes.

EMFAC is used to calculate current and future inventories of motor vehicle emissions at the state, county, air district, air basin, or MPO level. EMFAC contains default vehicle activity data that can be used to estimate a motor vehicle emissions inventory in tons/day for a specific year and

season, and as a function of ambient temperature, relative humidity, vehicle population, mileage accrual, miles of travel, and vehicle speeds.

Section 93.111 of the conformity regulation requires the use of the latest emission estimation model in the development of conformity determinations. On December 30, 2014, ARB released EMFAC2014, which is the latest update to the EMFAC model for use by California State and local governments to meet Clean Air Act (CAA, 1990) requirements. Nearly a year later, on December 14, 2015, EPA announced the availability of this latest version of the California EMFAC model for use in SIP development in California. EMFAC2014 will be required for conformity analysis on or after December 14, 2017, or when conformity budgets modeled with EMFAC2014 are found adequate or approved by EPA.

A transportation data template has been prepared to summarize the transportation model output for use in EMFAC 2014. The template includes allocating VMT by speed bin by hour of the day. EMFAC2014 was used to estimate exhaust emissions for CO, ozone, PM-10, and PM2.5 conformity demonstrations consistent with the applicable air quality plan. Note that the statewide SIP measures documented in Chapter 2 are already incorporated in the EMFAC2014 model.

## **B. ADDITIONAL PM-10 ESTIMATES**

PM-10 emissions for re-entrained dust from travel on paved and unpaved roads will be calculated separately from roadway construction emissions. It is important to note that with the final approval of the 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan, EPA approved a methodology to calculate PM-10 emissions from paved and unpaved roads in future San Joaquin Valley conformity determinations. The Conformity Analysis uses these methodologies and estimates construction-related PM-10 emissions consistent with the 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan. The National Ambient Air Quality Standards for PM-10 consists of a 24-hour standard, which is represented by the motor vehicle emissions budgets established in the 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan. It is important to note that EPA revoked the annual PM-10 Standard on October 17, 2006. The PM-10 emissions calculated for the conformity analysis represent emissions on an annual average day and are used to satisfy the budget test.

### **CALCULATION OF REENTRAINED DUST FROM PAVED ROAD TRAVEL**

On January 13, 2011 EPA released a new method for estimating re-entrained road dust emissions from cars, trucks, buses, and motorcycles on paved roads. On February 4, 2011, EPA published the *Official Release of the January 2011 AP-42 Method for Estimating Re-Entrained Road Dust from Paved Roads* approving the January 2011 method for use in regional emissions analysis and beginning a two year conformity grace period, after which use of the January 2011 AP-42 method is required (e.g. February 4, 2013) in regional conformity analyses.

The road dust calculations have been updated to reflect this new methodology. More specifically, the emission factor equation and k value (particle size multiplier) have been updated accordingly. CARB default assumptions for roadway silt loading by roadway class, average vehicle weight, and rainfall correction factor remain unchanged. Emissions are estimated for five roadway

classes including freeways, arterials, collectors, local roads, and rural roads. Countywide VMT information is used for each road class to prepare the emission estimates.

### **CALCULATION OF REENTRAINED DUST FROM UNPAVED ROAD TRAVEL**

The base methodology for estimating unpaved road dust emissions is based on a CARB methodology in which the miles of unpaved road are multiplied by the assumed VMT and an emission factor. In the 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan, it is assumed that all non-agricultural unpaved roads within the San Joaquin Valley receive 10 vehicle passes per day. An emission factor of 2.0 lbs PM-10/VMT is used for the unpaved road dust emission estimates. Emissions are estimated for city/county maintained roads.

### **CALCULATION OF PM-10 FROM ROADWAY CONSTRUCTION**

Section 93.122(e) of the Transportation Conformity regulation requires that PM-10 from construction-related fugitive dust be included in the regional PM-10 emissions analysis, if it is identified as a contributor to the nonattainment problem in the PM-10 implementation plan. The emission estimates are based on a CARB methodology in which the miles of new road built are converted to acres disturbed, which is then multiplied by a generic project duration (i.e., 18 months) and an emission rate. Emission factors are unchanged from the previous estimates at 0.11 tons PM-10/acre-month of activity. The emission factor includes the effects of typical control measures, such as watering, which is assumed to reduce emissions by about 50%. Updated activity data (i.e., new lane miles of roadway built) is estimated based on the highway and transit construction projects in the TIP/RTP.

### **PM-10 TRADING MECHANISM**

The PM-10 SIP allows trading from the motor vehicle emissions budget for the PM-10 precursor NOx to the motor vehicle emissions budget for primary PM-10 using a 1.5 to 1 ratio. The trading mechanism will be used only for conformity analyses for analysis years after 2005.

## **C. PM2.5 APPROACH**

EPA and FHWA have indicated that areas violating both the annual and 24-hour standards for PM2.5 must address all standards in the conformity determination. The San Joaquin Valley currently violates both the 1997 and 2012 annual PM2.5 standards, and the 1997 and 2006 24-hour PM2.5 standards; thus the conformity determination includes analyses to all PM2.5 standards.

The following PM2.5 approach addresses the 1997 (annual and 24-hour), the 2012 (annual), and the 2006 24-hour standards:

EMFAC2014 incorporates data for temperature and relative humidity that vary by geographic area, calendar year and season. The annual average represents an average of all the monthly inventories. A winter average represents an average of the California winter season (October

through February). EMFAC will be run to estimate direct PM<sub>2.5</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions from motor vehicles for an annual or winter average day as described below.

EPA guidance indicates that State and local agencies need to consider whether VMT varies during the year enough to affect PM<sub>2.5</sub> annual emission estimates. The availability of seasonal or monthly VMT data and the corresponding variability of that data need to be evaluated.

PM<sub>2.5</sub> areas that are currently using network based travel models must continue to use them when calculating annual emission inventories. The guidance indicates that the interagency consultation process should be used to determine the appropriate approach to produce accurate annual inventories for a given nonattainment area. Whichever approach is chosen, that approach should be used consistently throughout the analysis for a given pollutant or precursor. The interagency consultation process should also be used to determine whether significant seasonal variations in the output of network based travel models are expected and whether these variations would have a significant impact on PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission estimates.

The SJV MPOs all use network based travel models. However, the models only estimate average weekday VMT. The SJV MPOs do not have the data or ability to estimate seasonal variation at this time. Data collection and analysis for some studies are in the preliminary phases and cannot be relied upon for other analyses. Some statewide data for the seasonal variation of VMT on freeways does exist. However, traffic patterns on freeways do not necessarily represent the typical traffic pattern for local streets and arterials.

In many cases, traffic counts are sponsored by the MPOs and conducted by local jurisdictions. While some local jurisdictions may collect weekend or seasonal data, typical urban traffic counts occur on weekdays (Tuesday through Thursday). Data collection must be more consistent in order to begin estimation of daily or seasonal variation.

The SJV MPOs believe that the average annual day calculated from the current traffic models and EMFAC2014 represent the most accurate VMT data available. The MPOs will continue to discuss and research options that look at how VMT varies by month and season according to the local traffic models.

It is important to note that the guidance indicates that EPA expects the most thorough analysis for developing annual inventories will occur during the development of the SIP, taking into account the needs and capabilities of air quality modeling tools and the limitations of available data. Prior to the development of the SIP, State and local air quality and transportation agencies may decide to use simplified methods for regional conformity analyses.

The regional emissions analyses in PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment areas must consider directly emitted PM<sub>2.5</sub> motor vehicle emissions from tailpipe, brake wear, and tire wear. In California, areas will use EMFAC2014. As indicated under the Conformity Test Requirements, re-entrained road dust and construction-related fugitive dust from highway or transit projects is not included at this time. In addition, NO<sub>x</sub> emissions are included; however, VOC, SO<sub>x</sub>, and ammonia emissions are not.

*1997 Standard* – Since EPA did not take action on the 2017 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan, the 2008 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan budgets will continue to be used in this conformity analysis. The 2008 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan (as revised in 2011) was approved by EPA on November 9, 2011 (effective January 9, 2012) and contains motor vehicle emission budgets for PM<sub>2.5</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> established based on average annual daily



emissions. The annual inventory methodology contained in the 2008 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan (as revised in 2011) and used to establish emissions budgets is consistent with the methodology used herein. The motor vehicle emissions budget for PM<sub>2.5</sub> includes directly emitted PM<sub>2.5</sub> motor vehicle emissions from tailpipe, brake wear and tire wear. VOC, SO<sub>x</sub>, ammonia, and dust (from paved roads, unpaved roads, and road construction) were found to be insignificant and not included in the motor vehicle emission budgets for conformity purposes.

*2006 Standard* – Since EPA did not take action on the 2017 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan, the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan (as revised in 2015) budgets will continue to be used in this conformity analysis. On January 20, 2016, EPA finalized reclassification of the San Joaquin Valley to Serious nonattainment for the 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> Standard. On August 16, 2016, the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan was approved by EPA including the revised conformity budgets and a trading mechanism (effective September 30, 2016). The 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan (as revised in 2015) contains motor vehicle emission budgets for PM<sub>2.5</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> established based on average winter daily emissions. The winter inventory methodology contained in the 2012 Plan and used to establish emissions budgets is consistent with the methodology used herein. The motor vehicle emissions budget for PM<sub>2.5</sub> include directly emitted PM<sub>2.5</sub> motor vehicle emissions from tailpipe, brake wear and tire wear. VOC, SO<sub>x</sub>, ammonia, and dust (from paved roads, unpaved roads, and road construction) were found to be insignificant and not included in the motor vehicle emission budgets for conformity purposes. It is important to note that the 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment area boundary for the San Joaquin Valley is exactly the same as the nonattainment area boundary for the 1997 PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards.

*2012 Standard* – EPA’s nonattainment area designations for the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard became effective on April 15, 2015. Conformity applies one year after the effective date (April 15, 2016). In accordance with Section 93.109(i)(3) of the federal transportation conformity rule, if a 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> area has adequate or approved SIP budgets that address the annual 1997 standards, it must use the budget test until new 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard budgets are found adequate or approved. It is important to note that the 2012 annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment area boundary for the San Joaquin Valley is exactly the same as the nonattainment area boundary for the 1997 and 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards. Since EPA has not did not take action on the 2017 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan, the 2008 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan (as revised in 2011) budgets will continue to be used in this conformity analysis.

### **1997 and 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> TRADING MECHANISM**

Since EPA did not take action on the 2017 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan, consistent with the PM<sub>2.5</sub> implementation rule, the 2008 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan budgets and trading mechanism will continue to be used in this conformity analysis.

The 2008 PM<sub>2.5</sub> SIP (as revised in 2011) allows trading from the motor vehicle emissions budget for the PM<sub>2.5</sub> precursor NO<sub>x</sub> to the motor vehicle emissions budget for primary PM<sub>2.5</sub> using a 1 to 9 ratio. This trading mechanism will be used for the 1997 annual and 24-hour hour and 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard conformity analyses for analysis years after 2014.

## **2006 PM2.5 TRADING MECHANISM**

Since EPA did not take action on the 2017 PM2.5 Plan, consistent with the PM2.5 implementation rule, the 2012 PM2.5 Plan budgets and trading mechanism will continue to be used in this conformity analysis.

On August 16, 2016 EPA approved the 2012 PM2.5 SIP including the PM2.5 trading mechanism that allows trading from the motor vehicle emissions budget for the PM2.5 precursor NOx to the motor vehicle emissions budget for primary PM-2.5 using an 8 to 1 ratio. This trading mechanism will be used for the 2006 24-hour PM2.5 standard conformity analysis for analysis years after 2014.

## **D. SUMMARY OF PROCEDURES FOR REGIONAL EMISSIONS ESTIMATES**

New step-by-step air quality modeling instructions were developed for SJV MPO use with EMFAC2014. These instructions were originally provided for interagency consultation in May 2016. EPA, FHWA, and ARB concurred. The EMFAC instructions were subsequently updated to include appropriate conformity analysis years for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP; IAC concurrence was received in January 2018.

Documentation of the conformity analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP is provided in Appendix C, including:

- 2018 RTP Conformity EMFAC Spreadsheet
- 2018 RTP Conformity Paved Road Spreadsheet
- 2018 RTP Conformity Unpaved Road Dust Spreadsheet
- 2018 RTP Conformity Construction Spreadsheet
- 2018 RTP Conformity Totals Spreadsheet
- 2018 RTP PM10 Trading Spreadsheet

## **CHAPTER 4: TRANSPORTATION CONTROL MEASURES**

This chapter provides an update of the current status of transportation control measures identified in applicable implementation plans. Requirements of the Transportation Conformity regulation relating to transportation control measures (TCMs) are presented first, followed by a review of the applicable air quality implementation plans and TCM findings for the TIP/RTP.

### **A. TRANSPORTATION CONFORMITY REGULATION REQUIREMENTS FOR TCMS**

The Transportation Conformity regulation requires that the TIP/RTP “must provide for the timely implementation of TCMs in the applicable implementation plan.” The Federal definition for the term “transportation control measure” is provided in 40 CFR 93.101:

“any measure that is specifically identified and committed to in the applicable implementation plan that is either one of the types listed in Section 108 of the CAA [Clean Air Act], or any other measure for the purpose of reducing emissions or concentrations of air pollutants from transportation sources by reducing vehicle use or changing traffic flow or congestion conditions. Notwithstanding the first sentence of this definition, vehicle technology based, fuel-based, and maintenance-based measures which control the emissions from vehicles under fixed traffic conditions are not TCMs for the purposes of this subpart.”

In the Transportation Conformity regulation, the definition provided for the term “applicable implementation plan” is:

“Applicable implementation plan is defined in section 302(q) of the CAA and means the portion (or portions) of the implementation plan, or most recent revision thereof, which has been approved under section 110, or promulgated under section 110(c), or promulgated or approved pursuant to regulations promulgated under section 301(d) and which implements the relevant requirements of the CAA.”

Section 108(f)(1) of the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 lists the following transportation control measures and technology-based measures:

- (i) programs for improved public transit;
- (ii) restriction of certain roads or lanes to, or construction of such roads or lanes for use by, passenger buses or high occupancy vehicles;
- (iii) employer-based transportation management plans, including incentives;
- (iv) trip-reduction ordinances;
- (v) traffic flow improvement programs that achieve emission reductions;

- (vi) fringe and transportation corridor parking facilities serving multiple occupancy vehicle programs or transit service;
- (vii) programs to limit or restrict vehicle use in downtown areas or other areas of emission concentration particularly during periods of peak use;
- (viii) programs for the provision of all forms of high-occupancy, shared-ride services;
- (ix) programs to limit portions of road surfaces or certain sections of the metropolitan area to the use of non-motorized vehicles or pedestrian use, both as to time and place;
- (x) programs for secure bicycle storage facilities and other facilities, including bicycle lanes, for the convenience and protection of bicyclists, in both public and private areas;
- (xi) programs to control extended idling of vehicles;
- (xii) programs to reduce motor vehicle emissions, consistent with title II, which are caused by extreme cold start conditions;
- (xiii) employer-sponsored programs to permit flexible work schedules;
- (xiv) programs and ordinances to facilitate non-automobile travel, provision and utilization of mass transit, and to generally reduce the need for single occupant vehicle travel, as part of transportation planning and development efforts of a locality, including programs and ordinances applicable to new shopping centers, special events, and other centers of vehicle activity;
- (xv) programs for new construction and major reconstructions of paths, tracks or areas solely for the use by pedestrian or other non-motorized means of transportation when economically feasible and in the public interest. For purposes of this clause, the Administrator shall also consult with the Secretary of the Interior; and
- (xvi) program to encourage the voluntary removal from use and the marketplace of pre-1980 model year light duty vehicles and pre-1980 model light duty trucks.

### **TCM REQUIREMENTS FOR A TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

The EPA regulations in 40 CFR 93.113(b) indicate that transportation control measure requirements for transportation plans are satisfied if two criteria are met:

“(1) The transportation plan, in describing the envisioned future transportation system, provides for the timely completion or implementation of all TCMs in the applicable implementation plan which are eligible for funding under Title 23 U.S.C. or the Federal Transit Laws, consistent with schedules included in the applicable implementation plan.

(2) Nothing in the transportation plan interferes with the implementation of any TCM in the applicable implementation plan.”

### **TCM REQUIREMENTS FOR A TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

Similarly, in 40 CFR Section 93.113(c), EPA specifies three TCM criteria applicable to a transportation improvement program:

“(1) An examination of the specific steps and funding source(s) needed to fully implement each TCM indicates that TCMs which are eligible for funding under title 23 U.S.C. or the Federal Transit Laws are on or ahead of the schedule established in the applicable implementation plan, or, if such TCMs are behind the schedule established in the applicable implementation plan, the MPO and DOT have determined that past obstacles to implementation of the TCMs have been identified and have been or are being overcome, and that all State and local agencies with influence over approvals or funding for TCMs are giving maximum priority to approval or funding of TCMs over other projects within their control, including projects in locations outside the nonattainment or maintenance area;

(2) If TCMs in the applicable implementation plan have previously been programmed for Federal funding but the funds have not been obligated and the TCMs are behind the schedule in the implementation plan, then the TIP cannot be found to conform:

- if the funds intended for those TCMs are reallocated to projects in the TIP other than TCMs, or
- if there are no other TCMs in the TIP, if the funds are reallocated to projects in the TIP other than projects which are eligible for Federal funding intended for air quality improvement projects, e.g., the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program;

(3) Nothing in the TIP may interfere with the implementation of any TCM in the applicable implementation plan.”

## **B. APPLICABLE AIR QUALITY IMPLEMENTATION PLANS**

Only transportation control measures from applicable implementation plans for the San Joaquin Valley region are required to be updated for this analysis. For this conformity analysis, the applicable implementation plans, according to the definition provided at the start of this chapter, are summarized below.

### **APPLICABLE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR OZONE**

The 2007 Ozone Plan (as revised in 2015) was approved by EPA on July 8, 2016 (effective September 30, 2016). The 2016 Ozone Plan is currently under EPA review. However, both Plans do not include new TCMs for the San Joaquin Valley.

### **APPLICABLE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR PM-10**

The 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan (as revised in 2015) was approved by EPA on July 8, 2016 (effective September 30, 2016). No new local agency control measures were included in the Plan.

The Amended 2003 PM-10 Plan was approved by EPA on May 26, 2004 (effective June 25, 2004). A local government control measure assessment was completed for this plan. The analysis focused on transportation-related fugitive dust emissions, which are not TCMs by definition. The local government commitments are included in the *Regional Transportation Planning Agency Commitments for Implementation Document, April 2003*.

However, the *Amended 2002 and 2005 Ozone Rate of Progress Plan* contains commitments that reduce ozone related emissions; these measures are documented in the *Regional Transportation Planning Agency Commitments for Implementation Document, April 2002*. These commitments are included by reference in the Amended 2003 PM-10 Plan to provide emission reductions for precursor gases and help to address the secondary particulate problem. Since these commitments are included in the Plan by reference, the commitments were approved by EPA as TCMs.

### **APPLICABLE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR PM2.5**

The 2012 PM2.5 Plan was approved by EPA on August 16, 2016 (effective September 30, 2016). The 2008 PM2.5 Plan (as revised in 2011) was approved by EPA on November 9, 2011 (effective January 9, 2012). However, the Plans do not include any additional TCMs for the San Joaquin Valley.

### **C. IDENTIFICATION OF 2002 RACM THAT REQUIRE TIMELY IMPLEMENTATION DOCUMENTATION**

As part of the 2004 Conformity Determination, FHWA requested that each SIP (Reasonably Available Control Measure - RACM) commitment containing federal transportation funding and a transportation project and schedule be addressed more specifically. FHWA verbally requested documentation that the funds were obligated and the project was implemented as committed to in the SIP.

The RTPA Commitment Documents, Volumes One and Two, dated April 2002 (Ozone RACM) were reviewed, using a “Summary of Commitments” table. Commitments that contain specific Federal funding/transportation projects/schedules were identified for further documentation. In some cases, local jurisdictions used the same Federal funding/transportation projects/schedules for various measures; these were identified as combined with (“comb w/”) reference as appropriate. A not applicable (“NA”) was noted where federally-funded project is vehicle technology based, fuel based, and maintenance based measures (e.g., LEV program, retrofit programs, clean fuels - CNG buses, etc.).

In addition, the RTPA Commitment Document, Volume Three, dated April 2003 (PM-10 BACM) was reviewed, using the Summary of Commitments table. Commitments that contain specific Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding for the purchase and/or operation of street sweeping equipment have been identified. Only one commitment (Fresno - City of Reedley) was identified.

The Project TID Table was developed to provide implementation documentation necessary for the measures identified. Detailed information is summarized in the first five columns, including the commitment number, agency, description, funding and schedule (if applicable).

For each project listed, the TIP in which the project was programmed, as well as the project ID and description have been provided. In addition, the current implementation status of the project has been included (e.g., complete, under construction, etc). MPO staff determined this information in consultation with the appropriate local jurisdiction. Any projects not implemented according to schedule or project changes are explained in the project status column. These explanations are consistent with the guidance and regulations provided in the Transportation Conformity regulation.

Supplemental documentation was provided to FHWA in August and September 2004 in response to requests for information on timely implementation of TCMs in the San Joaquin Valley. The supplemental documentation included the approach, summary of interagency consultation correspondence, and three tables completed by each of the eight MPOs. The Supplemental Documentation was subsequently approved by FHWA as part of the 2004 Conformity Determination.

The Project TID table that was prepared at the request of FHWA for the 2004 Conformity Analysis, has been updated in each subsequent conformity analysis. This documentation has been updated as part of this Conformity Analysis. A summary of this information is provided in Appendix D.

In March 2005, the SJV MPOs began interagency consultation with FHWA and EPA to address outstanding RACM/TCM issues. In general, criteria were developed to identify commitments that require timely implementation documentation. The criteria were applied to the 2002 RACM Commitments approved by reference as part of the Amended 2003 PM-10 Plan. In April 2006, EPA transmitted final tables that identified the approved RACM commitments that require timely implementation documentation for the Conformity Analysis. Subsequently, an approach to provide timely implementation documentation was developed in consultation with FHWA.

A new 2002 RACM TID Table was prepared in 2006 to address the more general RACM commitments that require additional timely implementation documentation per EPA. A brief summary of the commitment, including finite end dates if applicable, is included for each measure. The MPOs provided a status update regarding implementation in consultation with their member jurisdictions. If a specific project has been implemented, it is included in the Project TID Table under "Additional Projects Identified". This documentation was included in the Conformity Analysis for the 2007 TIP and 2004 RTP (as amended) that was approved by FHWA in October 2006, as well as the 2015 TIP and 2014 RTP as amended. The 2002 RACM TID Table has been updated as part of this Conformity Analysis. A summary of this information is provided in Appendix D.

#### **D. TCM FINDINGS FOR THE TIP AND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

Based on a review of the transportation control measures contained in the applicable air quality plans, as documented in the two tables contained in Appendix D, the required TCM conformity findings are made below:

The TIP/RTP provide for the timely completion or implementation of the TCMs in the applicable air quality plans. In addition, nothing in the TIP or RTP interferes with the implementation of any TCM in the applicable implementation plan, and priority is given to TCMs.

#### **E. RTP CONTROL MEASURE ANALYSIS IN SUPPORT OF 2003 PM-10 PLAN**

In May 2003, the San Joaquin Valley MPO Executive Directors committed to conduct feasibility analyses as part of each new RTP in support of the 2003 PM-10 Plan. This commitment was retained in the 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan. In accordance with this commitment, TCAG undertook a process to identify and evaluate potential control measures that could be included in the 2018 RTP. The analysis of additional measures included verification of the feasibility of the measures in the PM-10 Plan BACM analysis, as well as an analysis of new PM-10 commitments from other PM-10 nonattainment areas.

A summary of the process to identify potential long-range control measures analysis and results to be evaluated as part of the RTP development was transmitted to the Interagency Consultation (IAC) partners for review. FHWA and EPA concurred with the summary of the long-range control measure approach in September 2009.

The Local Government Control Measures considered in the PM-10 Plan BACM analysis that were considered for inclusion in the 2018 RTP included:

- Paving or Stabilizing Unpaved Roads and Alleys
- Curbing, Paving, or Stabilizing Shoulders on Paved Roads
- Frequent Routine Sweeping or Cleaning of Paved Roads (i.e., funding allocation for the purchase of PM-10 efficient street sweepers for member jurisdictions)
- Repave or Overlay Paved Roads with Rubberized Asphalt

It is important to note that the first three measures considered in the PM-10 Plan BACM analysis (i.e., access points, street cleaning requirements, and erosion clean up) are not applicable for inclusion in the RTP.

With the adoption of each new RTP, the MPOs will consider the feasibility of these measures, as well as identify any other new PM-10 measures that would be relevant to the San Joaquin Valley. TCAG also considered PM-10 commitments from other PM-10 nonattainment areas that had been developed since the previous RTP was approved. Federal websites were reviewed for any PM-10 plans that have been approved since 2012. New PM-10 plans that have been reviewed include:



- A. West Pinal County, AZ Moderate PM-10 Nonattainment Area SIP, submitted December 21, 2015 (EPA approval effective May 31, 2017). Contingency measures include paving or chemically stabilizing unpaved roads.
- B. Owens Valley, CA Serious PM-10 Nonattainment Area SIP, submitted June 9, 2016 (EPA approval effective April 12, 2017). Road dust was determined to be below de minimis thresholds and no mobile source control measures were adopted.
- C. Mammoth Lake, CA PM-10 Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan, submitted October 21, 2014 (EPA approval effective November 4, 2015). The Mammoth Lake general plan places a cap on the growth of VMT. Contingency measures include improved street sweeping procedures and reduced use of volcanic cinders on roadways.
- D. Las Vegas, NV Serious PM-10 Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan, submitted September 7, 2012 (EPA approval effective November 5, 2014). Most stringent measures were introduced in 2001. Stabilization of unpaved roads including paving roads with volumes over 150 vehicles per day. Paved road sweeping and mitigation measures.
- E. Payson, AZ PM-10 Limited Maintenance Plan submitted January 23, 2012 (EPA approval effective May 19, 2014). Contingency measures include paving or chemically stabilizing unpaved roads.
- F. South Coast, CA PM-10 Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan submitted April 28, 2010 (EPA approval effective July 26, 2013). No PM-10 specific dust control measures cited for mobile sources.
- G. Juneau's Mendenhall Valley, AK PM-10 Limited Maintenance Plan submitted February 20, 2009 (EPA approval effective July 8, 2013). The attainment plan control measures included optimizing sanding and de-icing materials to minimize entrainment, spring street sweeping, and paving of dirt roads. No additional measures were identified for the LMP to continue attainment of the NAAQS. Contingency measures include paving of dirt roads and stabilization of unpaved shoulders.
- H. Eugene-Springfield, OR PM-10 Redesignation Request and Limited Maintenance Plan submitted January 13, 2012 (EPA approval effective June 10, 2013). Motor vehicles were not identified as a significant source and no control measures were included for onroad mobile sources.
- I. Sandpoint, ID PM-10 Limited Maintenance Plan submitted December 12, 2011 (EPA approval effective May 23, 2013). Ordinances require the application of certain types of sand in the winter along with increased street sweeping.

Based on review of commitments from other PM-10 nonattainment areas that have been developed since the previous RTP, no additional on-road fugitive dust controls measures are available for consideration.

Based on consultation with CARB and the Air District, TCAG considered priority funding allocations in the 2018 RTP for PM-10 and NOx emission reduction projects in the post-

attainment year timeframe that go beyond the emission reduction commitments made for the attainment year 2010 for the following four measures:

- (1) Paving or Stabilizing Unpaved Roads and Alleys
- (2) Curbing, Paving, or Stabilizing Shoulders on Paved Roads
- (3) Frequent Routine Sweeping or Cleaning of Paved Roads (i.e., funding allocation for the purchase of PM-10 efficient street sweepers for member jurisdictions); and
- (4) Repave or Overlay Paved Roads with Rubberized Asphalt

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding has been utilized by TCAG to fund numerous projects for implementation of Measures 1 through 3 above. The use of rubberized asphalt is at the discretion of the agencies responsible for specific overlay projects; various funding sources, including state, federal, and local measure money, have been and will continue to be utilized for implementation of Measure 4 so long as those funds are available. Requests for funding Measure 1 types of projects have not been brought to TCAG and presumably most, if not all, unpaved road needs have been met. On new or relatively small projects, agencies will likely use local and/or measure funds for these projects.

## **CHAPTER 5: INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION**

The requirements for consultation procedures are listed in the Transportation Conformity Regulations under section 93.105. Consultation is necessary to ensure communication and coordination among air and transportation agencies at the local, State and Federal levels on issues that would affect the conformity analysis such as the underlying assumptions and methodologies used to prepare the analysis. Section 93.105 of the conformity regulation notes that there is a requirement to develop a conformity SIP that includes procedures for interagency consultation, resolution of conflicts, and public consultation as described in paragraphs (a) through (e). Section 93.105(a)(2) states that prior to EPA approval of the conformity SIP, “MPOs and State departments of transportation must provide reasonable opportunity for consultation with State air agencies, local air quality and transportation agencies, DOT and EPA, including consultation on the issues described in paragraph (c)(1) of this section, before making conformity determinations.” The Air District adopted Rule 9120 Transportation Conformity on January 19, 1995 in response to requirements in Section 176(c)(4)(c) of the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990. Since EPA has not approved Rule 9120 (the conformity SIP), the conformity regulation requires compliance with 40 CFR 93.105 (a)(2) and (e) and 23 CFR 450.

Section 93.112 of the conformity regulation requires documentation of the interagency and public consultation requirements according to Section 93.105. A summary of the interagency consultation and public consultation conducted to comply with these requirements is provided below. Appendix E includes the public meeting process documentation. The responses to comments received as part of the public comment process are included in Appendix F.

### **A. INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION**

Consultation is generally conducted through the San Joaquin Valley Interagency Consultation Group (combination of previous Model Coordinating Committee and Programming Coordinating Group). The San Joaquin Valley Interagency Consultation (IAC) Group has been established by the Valley Transportation Planning Agency's Director's Association to provide a coordinated approach to valley transportation planning and programming (Transportation Improvement Program, Regional Transportation Plan, and Amendments), transportation conformity, climate change, and air quality (State Implementation Plan and Rules). The purpose of the group is to ensure Valley wide coordination, communication and compliance with Federal and California Transportation Planning and Clean Air Act requirements. Each of the eight Valley MPOs and the Air District are represented. In addition, the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, the California Air Resources Board and Caltrans (Headquarters, District 6, and District 10) are all represented. The IAC Group meets approximately quarterly.

The draft boilerplate conformity document was distributed for interagency consultation on January 9, 2018. Comments received have been addressed and incorporated into this version of the analysis.

In addition, the CMAQ Policy Threshold Evaluation was transmitted for interagency consultation on January 25, 2018. No changes to the CMAQ Policy were recommended. The San Joaquin Valley MPO CMAQ policy contains language that says the cost-effectiveness threshold will be evaluated with every FTIP; whereas, the policy itself is to be reviewed with every RTP. As part of the 2019 FTIP development, the threshold was reviewed. The review indicated that a threshold should be retained at the current \$45/lb level. No adverse comments were received

The Draft 2018 RTP was released on May 3, 2018 for a 55-day public comment period. The 2019 FTIP and the corresponding Conformity Analysis were released for a 30-day public comment period on May 28, 2018, followed by Board adoption on August 20, 2018. Federal approval is anticipated on or before December 31, 2018.

The conformity analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP was developed in consultation with TCAG local partner agencies, including member jurisdictions, Caltrans, and local transit agencies.

## **B. PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

In general, agencies making conformity determinations shall establish a proactive public involvement process that provides opportunity for public review and comment on a conformity determination for FTIPs/RTPs. In addition, all public comments must be addressed in writing.

All MPOs in the San Joaquin Valley have standard public involvement procedures. TCAG has an adopted consultation process and policy for conformity analysis which includes a 30-day public notice and comment period followed by a public hearing. Public hearing notices are posted in English and Spanish. Translation services are also available for other languages. Draft documents are provided to the Interagency Consultation (IAC) Group, the TCAG Board and various committees, and all member agencies and transit providers for review. A public meeting is also conducted prior to adoption and all public comments are responded to in writing. The Appendices contain corresponding documentation supporting the public involvement procedures.

---

## **CHAPTER 6: TIP AND RTP CONFORMITY**

The principal requirements of the transportation conformity regulation for TIP/RTP assessments are: (1) the TIP and RTP must pass an emissions budget test with a budget that has been found to be adequate by EPA for transportation conformity purposes, or an interim emission test; (2) the latest planning assumptions and emission models must be employed; (3) the TIP and RTP must provide for the timely implementation of transportation control measures (TCMs) specified in the applicable air quality implementation plans; and (4) consultation. The final determination of conformity for the TIP/RTP is the responsibility of the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration.

The previous chapters and the appendices present the documentation for all of the requirements listed above for conformity determinations except for the conformity test results. Prior chapters have also addressed the updated documentation required under the transportation conformity regulation for the latest planning assumptions and the implementation of transportation control measures specified in the applicable air quality implementation plans.

This chapter presents the results of the conformity tests, satisfying the remaining requirement of the transportation conformity regulation. Separate tests were conducted for ozone, PM-10 and PM2.5 (1997 and 2012 PM2.5 standards, and 2006 24-hour PM2.5 standards). The applicable conformity tests were reviewed in Chapter 1. For each test, the required emissions estimates were developed using the transportation and emission modeling approaches required under the transportation conformity regulation and summarized in Chapters 2 and 3. The results are summarized below, followed by a more detailed discussion of the findings for each pollutant. Table 6-1 presents results for ozone (ROG/NO<sub>x</sub>), PM-10 (PM-10/NO<sub>x</sub>), and PM2.5 (PM2.5/NO<sub>x</sub>) respectively, in tons per day for each of the horizon years tested.

### 1997 Ozone:

For 1997 8-hour ozone<sup>4</sup>, the applicable conformity test is the emissions budget test, using the 2007 Ozone Plan (as revised in 2015) budgets established for ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> for an average summer (ozone) season day. EPA approved the Plan and conformity budgets (as revised in 2015) on July 8, 2016 (effective September 30, 2016). The modeling results for all analysis years indicate that the on-road vehicle ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions predicted for each of the “Build” scenarios are less than the emissions budgets. The TIP/RTP therefore satisfy the conformity emissions test for volatile organic compounds and nitrogen oxides.

---

<sup>4</sup> Note that FHWA/FTA *Interim Guidance on Conformity Requirements for the 1997 Ozone NAAQS* issued on April 23 does not require that areas in non-attainment of the 2008 Ozone Standard address 1997 ozone in their regional conformity analyses at this time. However, the SJV MPOs have voluntarily included 1997 ozone conformity demonstration for the 2018 RTP/2019 TIP to minimize project delivery risk.

2008 Ozone:

For 2008 8-hour ozone, the applicable conformity test is the emissions budget test, using the 2016 Ozone Plan budgets established for ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> for an average summer (ozone) season day. EPA found 2016 Ozone Plan conformity budgets adequate on June 29, 2017 (effective July 14, 2017). The modeling results for all analysis years indicate that the on-road vehicle ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions predicted for each of the “Build” scenarios are less than the emissions budgets. The TIP/RTP therefore satisfy the conformity emissions test for volatile organic compounds and nitrogen oxides.

PM-10:

For PM-10, the applicable conformity test is the emissions budget test, using the 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan budgets for PM-10 and NO<sub>x</sub>. This Plan revisions including conformity budgets was approved by EPA on July 8, 2016 (effective September 30, 2016). The modeling results for all analysis years indicate that the PM-10 emissions predicted for the “Build” scenarios are less than the emissions budget for 2020. The TIP/RTP therefore satisfy the conformity emissions tests for PM-10.

1997 PM2.5 Standards:

Since EPA did not take action on the 2017 PM2.5 Plan, the 2008 PM2.5 Plan budgets will continue to be used in this conformity analysis. For 1997 PM2.5 Standards, the applicable conformity test is the emission budget test, using budgets established in the 2008 PM2.5 Plan. EPA approved the 2008 PM2.5 Plan (as revised in 2011) November 9, 2011 (effective January 9, 2012). The modeling results for all analysis years indicate that the on-road vehicle PM2.5 and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions predicted for the “Build” scenarios are less than the emissions budget. The TIP/RTP therefore satisfy the conformity emissions test for PM2.5 and nitrogen oxides.

2006 PM2.5 Standard:

Since EPA did not take action on the 2017 PM2.5 Plan, the 2012 PM2.5 Plan (as revised in 2015) budgets will continue to be used in this conformity analysis. For the 2006 PM2.5 standard, the applicable conformity test is the emission budget test, using adequate budgets established in the 2012 PM2.5 Plan (as revised in 2015). The modeling results for all analysis years indicate that the on-road vehicle PM2.5 and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions predicted for the “Build” scenarios are less than the emissions budget. The TIP/RTP therefore satisfy the conformity emissions test for PM2.5 and nitrogen oxides.

2012 PM2.5 Standard:

In accordance with Section 93.109(c)(2), areas designated nonattainment for the 2012 PM2.5 standards are required to use existing adequate or approved SIP motor vehicle emissions budgets for a prior annual PM2.5 standard until budgets for the 2012 PM2.5 standards are either found adequate or approved. Since EPA has not did not take action on the 2017 PM2.5 Plan, the 2008 PM2.5 Plan (as revised in 2011) budgets will continue to be used in this conformity analysis. For the 2012 PM2.5 standards, the applicable conformity test is the emissions budget test, using

the 2008 PM2.5 Plan (1997 standard) budgets. EPA approved the 2008 PM2.5 Plan (as revised in 2011) November 9, 2011, effective January 9, 2012. The modeling results for all analysis years indicate that the on-road vehicle PM2.5 and NOx emissions predicted for the “Build” scenarios are less than the emissions budget. The TIP/RTP therefore satisfy the conformity emissions test for PM2.5 and nitrogen oxides.

As all requirements of the Transportation Conformity Regulation have been satisfied, a finding of conformity for the Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and the 2018 RTP is supported.

**Table 6-1:  
Conformity Results Summary**

2018 RTP Conformity Results Summary -- TULARE

Standard	Analysis Year	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?	
		ROG (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	ROG	NOx
1997 Ozone*	2020 Budget	3.1	8.1		
	2020	2.9	7.6	YES	YES
	2023 Budget	2.5	4.9		
	2023	2.3	4.6	YES	YES
	2031	1.6	3.3	YES	YES
	2037	1.3	2.9	YES	YES
	2042	1.2	2.8	YES	YES

\*1997 Ozone conformity is included due to uncertainty associated with an ongoing litigation related to EPA's revocation of the 1997 ozone standard.

Pollutant	Scerio	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?	
		ROG (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	ROG	NOx
2008 Ozone	2018 Budget	3.7	9.5		
	2018	3.5	9.0	YES	YES
	2021 Budget	2.9	7.2		
	2021	2.7	6.8	YES	YES
	2024 Budget	2.4	4.7		
	2024	2.2	4.4	YES	YES
	2027 Budget	2.2	4.1		
	2027	2.0	3.8	YES	YES
	2030 Budget	1.9	3.8		
	2030	1.8	3.4	YES	YES
	2031 Budget	1.9	3.7		
	2031	1.7	3.3	YES	YES
	2037	1.4	2.9	YES	YES
2042	1.2	2.8	YES	YES	

Pollutant	Scerio	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?	
		PM-10 (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	PM-10	NOx
PM-10	Adjusted 2020 Budget	3.5	8.3		
	2020	3.5	7.9	YES	YES
	Adjusted 2020 Budget	3.6	8.1		
	2027	3.6	3.9	YES	YES
	Adjusted 2020 Budget	3.7	8.0		
	2035	3.7	3.1	YES	YES
	Adjusted 2020 Budget	3.8	7.8		
2042	3.8	2.9	YES	YES	

Standard	Analysis Year	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?	
		PM2.5 (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	PM2.5	NOx
1997 24-Hour and 1997 & 2012 Annual PM2.5 Standards	2014 Budget	0.5	13.8		
	2021	0.3	7.1	YES	YES
	2014 Budget	0.5	13.8		
	2027	0.3	3.9	YES	YES
	2014 Budget	0.5	13.8		
	2035	0.3	3.1	YES	YES
	2014 Budget	0.5	13.8		
2042	0.3	2.9	YES	YES	

Standard	Analysis Year	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?	
		PM2.5 (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	PM2.5	NOx
2006 PM2.5 Winter 24-Hour Standard	2017 Budget	0.4	11.2		
	2019	0.3	9.1	YES	YES
	2017 Budget	0.4	11.2		
	2027	0.3	4.1	YES	YES
	2017 Budget	0.4	11.2		
	2035	0.3	3.2	YES	YES
	2017 Budget	0.4	11.2		
2042	0.3	2.9	YES	YES	



**Conformity Results Summary Continued**

<b>PM-10</b>	Total On-Road Exhaust		Paved Road Dust		Unpaved Road Dust		Road Construction Dust		<b>Total</b>	
	PM-10	Nox	PM-10	Nox	PM-10	Nox	PM-10	Nox	<b>PM-10</b>	<b>Nox</b>
2020	0.703	7.946	1.796		0.757		0.205		<b>3.5</b>	<b>7.9</b>
2027	0.697	3.943	1.903		0.757		0.205		<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.9</b>
2035	0.719	3.107	2.013		0.757		0.192		<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.1</b>
2042	0.746	2.892	2.108		0.757		0.149		<b>3.8</b>	<b>2.9</b>

## REFERENCES

CAA, 1990. *Clean Air Act*, as amended November 15, 1990. (42 U. S. C. Section 7401et seq.) November 15, 1990.

EPA, 1993. 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93. *Criteria and Procedures for Determining Conformity to State or Federal Implementation Plans of Transportation Plans, Programs and Projects Funded or Approved Under Title 23 U.S.C. or the Federal Transit Act*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Federal Register, November 24, 1993, Vol. 58, No. 225, p. 62188.

EPA, 2004a. *Companion Guidance for the July 1, 2004, Final Transportation Conformity Rule: Conformity Implementation in Multi-jurisdictional Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas for Existing and New Air Quality Standards*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. July 21, 2004.

EPA, 2010a. 40 CFR Part 93. *Transportation Conformity Rule PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> Amendments; Final Rule*. Federal Register, March 24, 2010, Vol. 75, No. 56, p. 14260.

EPA, 2010b. *Transportation Conformity Regulations EPA-420-B-10-006*. March.

EPA, 2012a. 40 CFR Part 93. *Transportation Conformity Rule Restructuring Amendments; Final Rule*. Federal Register, March 14, 2012, Vol. 77, No. 50, p. 14979.

EPA, 2012b. *Transportation Conformity Guidance for 2008 Ozone Nonattainment Areas*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. EPA-420-B-12-045. July 2012.

EPA, 2012c. *Guidance for Transportation Conformity Implementation in Multi-Jurisdictional Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. EPA-420-B-12-046. July 2012.

EPA, 2015. *Implementation of the 2009 National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone: State Implementation Plan Requirements. Final Rule*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Vol. 80. No. 44. March 6, 2015.

EPA, 2016. *Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards: State Implementation Plan Requirements. Final Rule*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. PA-HQ-OAR-2013-0691. July 29, 2016.

USDOT. 2001. *Use of Latest Planning Assumptions in Conformity Determinations*. Memorandum from U.S. Department of Transportation. January 18, 2001.

USDOT. 2001. *Federal Highway Administration. Planning Assistance and Standards*. 23 CFR 450. October 16.

---

**APPENDIX A**  
**CONFORMITY CHECKLIST**

## CONFORMITY ANALYSIS DOCUMENTATION

### Checklist for MPO TIPs/RTPs January 2018

40 CFR	Criteria	Page	Comments
§93.102	Document the applicable pollutants and precursors for which EPA designates the area as nonattainment or maintenance. Describe the nonattainment or maintenance area and its boundaries.	8-10	
§93.102 (b)(2)(iii)	PM10 areas: document whether EPA or state has found VOC and/or NOx to be a significant contributor or if the SIP establishes a budget	12	
§93.102 (b)(2)(iv)	PM2.5 areas: document if both EPA and the state have found that NOx is <b>not</b> a significant contributor or that the SIP does <b>not</b> establish a budget (otherwise, conformity applies for NOx)	N/A	“Significant contributor” language not used in document...
§93.102 (b)(2)(v)	PM2.5 areas: document whether EPA or state has found VOC, SO2, and/or NH3 to be a significant contributor or if the SIP establishes a budget	34-36	
§93.104 (b, c)	Document the date that the MPO officially adopted, accepted or approved the TIP/RTP and made a conformity determination. Include a copy of the MPO resolution. Include the date of the last prior conformity finding made by DOT.	1, 47,	
§93.104 (e)	If the conformity determination is being made to meet the timelines included in this section, document when the new motor vehicle emissions budget was approved or found adequate.	N/A	
§93.106	Document that horizon years are no more than 10 years apart ((a)(1)(i)). Document that the first horizon year is no more than 10 years from the based year used to validate the transportation demand planning model ((a)(1)(ii)). Document that the attainment year is a horizon year, if in the timeframe of the plan ((a)(1)(iii)). Describe the regionally significant additions or modifications to the existing transportation network that are expected to be open to traffic in each analysis year ((a)(2)(ii)). Document that the design concept and scope of projects allows adequate model representation to determine intersections with regionally significant facilities, route options, travel times, transit ridership and land use.	17-18, 27, 61-69	
§93.108	Document that the TIP/RTP is fiscally constrained (23 CFR 450).	1	
§93.109 (a, b)	Document that the TIP/RTP complies with any applicable conformity requirements of air quality	9-15, 23-30, 33-36, 39, 41	

<b>40 CFR</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Comments</b>
	implementation plans (SIPs) and court orders.		
§93.109 (c.)	Provide either a table or text description that details, for each pollutant, precursor and applicable standard, whether the interim emissions test(s) and/or the budget test apply for conformity. Indicate which emissions budgets have been found adequate by EPA, and which budgets are currently applicable for what analysis years.	10-15, 47-49	
§93.109(e)	CO or PM10: Document if the area has a limited maintenance plan and from where that information comes	12	
§93.109(f)	Document if motor vehicle emissions are an insignificant contributor and in what SIP that determination is found	N/A	
§93.110 (a, b)	Document the use of latest planning assumptions (source and year) at the “time the conformity analysis begins,” including current and future population, employment, travel and congestion. Document the use of the most recent available vehicle registration data. Document the date upon which the conformity analysis was begun.	19-28	
EPA-DOT guidance	Document the use of planning assumptions less than five years old. If unable, include written justification for the use of older data. (December 2008 guidance.)	19-21	
§93.110 (c,d,e,f)	Document any changes in transit operating policies and assumed ridership levels since the previous conformity determination (c). Document the assumptions about transit service, use of the latest transit fares, and road and bridge tolls (d). Document the use of the latest information on the effectiveness of TCMs and other SIP measures that have been implemented (e). Document the key assumptions and show that they were agreed to through Interagency and public consultation (f).	25, 37-44	
§93.111	Document the use of the latest emissions model approved by EPA. If the previous model was used and the grace period has ended, document that the analysis began before the end of the grace period.	20-21, 31	
§93.112	Document fulfillment of the interagency and public consultation requirements outlined in a specific implementation plan according to §51.390 or, if a SIP revision has not been completed, according to §93.105 and 23 CFR 450. Include documentation of consultation on conformity tests and methodologies as well as responses to written comments.	45-46, Appendix F	
§93.113	Document timely implementation of all TCMs in approved SIPs. Document that implementation is consistent with schedules in the applicable SIP and document whether anything interferes with timely	37-44	

40 CFR	Criteria	Page	Comments
	implementation. Document any delayed TCMs in the applicable SIP and describe the measures being taken to overcome obstacles to implementation.		
§93.114	Document that the conformity analyses performed for the TIP is consistent with the analysis performed for the Plan, in accordance with 23 CFR 450.324(f)(2).	Analysis addresses both documents	
For Areas with SIP Budgets:			
§93.118, §93.124	Document what the applicable budgets are, and for what years. Document if there are subarea budgets established, and for which areas (93.124(c)). Document if there is a safety margin established, and what are the budgets with the safety margin included. (93.124(a)). Document if there has been any trading among budgets, and if so, which SIP establishes the trading mechanism, and how it is used in the conformity analysis (93.124(b)). If there is more than one MPO in the area, document whether separate budgets are established for each MPO (93.124(d)).	10-15, Appendix C	
§93.118 (a, c, e)	Document that emissions from the transportation network for each applicable pollutant and precursor, including projects in any associated donut area that are in the TIP and regionally significant non-Federal projects, are consistent with any adequate or approved motor vehicle emissions budget for all pollutants and precursors in applicable SIPs.	47-51	
§93.118 (b)	Document for which years consistency with motor vehicle emissions budgets must be shown.	17	
§93.118 (d)	Document the use of the appropriate analysis years in the regional emissions analysis for areas with SIP budgets, and the analysis results for these years. Document any interpolation performed to meet tests for years in which specific analysis is not required.	17-18, 50-51, Appendix C	
For Areas without Applicable SIP Budgets:			
§93.119	<u>Document whether the area must meet just one or both interim emissions tests. If both, document that it is the “less than” form of these tests (i.e., §93.119(b)(1) and (c)(1) vs. (b)(2), (c)(2), and (d)).</u>	N/A	
§93.119 <sup>9</sup> (a, b, c, d)	Document that emissions from the transportation network for each applicable pollutant and precursor, including projects in any associated donut area that are in the TIP and regionally significant non-Federal projects, are consistent with the requirements of the “Action/Baseline” or “Action/Baseline Year” emissions tests as applicable.	N/A	

<b>40 CFR</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Comments</b>
§93.119 (e)	Document the appropriate baseline year.	N/A	
§93.119 (f)	Document the use of appropriate pollutants and if EPA or the state has made a finding that a particular precursor or component of PM10 is significant or insignificant.	N/A	
§93.119 (g)	Document the use of the appropriate analysis years in the regional emissions analysis for areas without applicable SIP budgets.	N/A	
§93.119 (h, i)	Document how the baseline and action scenarios are defined for each analysis year.	N/A	
<b>For All Areas Where a Regional Emissions Analysis Is Needed</b>			
§93.122 (a)(1)	Document that all regionally significant federal and non-Federal projects in the nonattainment/maintenance area are explicitly modeled in the regional emissions analysis. For each project, identify by which analysis year it will be open to traffic. Document that VMT for non-regionally significant Federal projects is accounted for in the regional emissions analysis	27, Appendix B	
§93.122 (a)(2, 3)	Document that only emission reduction credits from TCMs on schedule have been included, or that partial credit has been taken for partially implemented TCMs (a)(2). Document that the regional emissions analysis only includes emissions credit for projects, programs, or activities that require regulatory action if: the regulatory action has been adopted; the project, program, activity or a written commitment is included in the SIP; EPA has approved an opt-in to the program, EPA has promulgated the program, or the Clean Air Act requires the program (indicate applicable date). Discuss the implementation status of these programs and the associated emissions credit for each analysis year (a)(3).	37-44, Appendix D	
§93.122 (a)(4,5,6,7)	For nonregulatory measures that are not included in the transportation plan and TIP, include written commitments from appropriate agencies (a)(4). Document that assumptions for measures outside the transportation system (e.g. fuels measures) are the same for baseline and action scenarios (a)(5). Document that factors such as ambient temperature are consistent with those used in the SIP unless modified through interagency consultation (a)(6). Document the method(s) used to estimate VMT on off-network roadways in the analysis (a)(7).	31-32, Appendix D	
§93.122 (b)(1)(i) <sup>ii</sup>	Document that a network-based travel model is in use that is validated against observed counts for a base year no more than 10 years before the date of the conformity determination. Document that the	23-24	

40 CFR	Criteria	Page	Comments
	model results have been analyzed for reasonableness and compared to historical trends and explain any significant differences between past trends and forecasts (for per capita vehicle-trips, VMT, trip lengths mode shares, time of day, etc.).		
§93.122 (b)(1)(ii) <sup>ii</sup>	Document the land use, population, employment, and other network-based travel model assumptions.	21-22	
§93.122 (b)(1)(iii) <sup>ii</sup>	Document how land use development scenarios are consistent with future transportation system alternatives, and the reasonable distribution of employment and residences for each alternative.	21-22	
§93.122 (b)(1)(iv) <sup>ii</sup>	Document use of capacity sensitive assignment methodology and emissions estimates based on a methodology that differentiates between peak and off-peak volumes and speeds, and bases speeds on final assigned volumes.	24-25	
§93.122 (b)(1)(v) <sup>ii</sup>	Document the use of zone-to-zone travel impedances to distribute trips in reasonable agreement with the travel times estimated from final assigned traffic volumes. Where transit is a significant factor, document that zone-to-zone travel impedances used to distribute trips are used to model mode split.	22-25	
§93.122 (b)(1)(vi) <sup>ii</sup>	Document how travel models are reasonably sensitive to changes in time, cost, and other factors affecting travel choices.	22-25	
§93.122 (b)(2) <sup>ii</sup>	Document that reasonable methods were used to estimate traffic speeds and delays in a manner sensitive to the estimated volume of travel on each roadway segment represented in the travel model.	24-25	
§93.122 (b)(3) <sup>ii</sup>	Document the use of HPMS, or a locally developed count-based program or procedures that have been chosen through the consultation process, to reconcile and calibrate the network-based travel model estimates of VMT.	20, 23-24	
§93.122 (d)	In areas not subject to §93.122(b), document the continued use of modeling techniques or the use of appropriate alternative techniques to estimate vehicle miles traveled	20-28	
§93.122 (e, f)	Document, in areas where a SIP identifies construction-related PM10 or PM2.5 as significant pollutants, the inclusion of PM10 and/or PM2.5 construction emissions in the conformity analysis.	31-35, Appendix C	
§93.122 (g)	If appropriate, document that the conformity determination relies on a previous regional emissions analysis and is consistent with that analysis, i.e. that:	N/A	
	(g)(1)(i): the new plan and TIP contain all the projects that must be started to achieve the highway and transit system envisioned by the plan	N/A	
	(g)(1)(ii): all plan and TIP projects are included in the transportation plan with design concept and scope adequate to determine their contribution to emissions	N/A	



40 CFR	Criteria	Page	Comments
	in the previous determination;		
	(g)(1)(iii): the design concept and scope of each regionally significant project in the new plan/TIP are not significantly different from that described in the previous;	N/A	
	(g)(1)(iv): the previous regional emissions analysis meets 93.118 or 93.119 as applicable	N/A	
§93.126, §93.127, §93.128	Document all projects in the TIP/RTP that are exempt from conformity requirements or exempt from the regional emissions analysis. Indicate the reason for the exemption (Table 2, Table 3, traffic signal synchronization) and that the interagency consultation process found these projects to have no potentially adverse emissions impacts.	27, 66-69	

<sup>i</sup> Note that some areas are required to complete both Interim emissions tests.

<sup>ii</sup> 40 CFR 93.122(b) refers only to serious, severe and extreme ozone areas and serious CO areas above 200,000 population. Also note these procedures apply in any areas where the use of these procedures has been the previous practice of the MPO (40 CFR 93.122(d)).

Disclaimers

This checklist is intended solely as an informational guideline to be used in reviewing Transportation Plans and Transportation Improvement Programs for adequacy of their conformity documentation. It is in no way intended to replace or supersede the Transportation Conformity regulations of 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93, the Statewide and Metropolitan Planning Regulations of 23 CFR Part 450 or any other EPA, FHWA or FTA guidance pertaining to transportation conformity or statewide and metropolitan planning. This checklist is not intended for use in documenting transportation conformity for individual transportation projects in nonattainment or maintenance areas. 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93 contain additional criteria for project-level conformity determinations.

---

**APPENDIX B**  
**TRANSPORTATION PROJECT LISTING**

### Regionally Significant Project Listing

RTP Project ID	Jurisdiction/ Agency	Facility Name/Rte	Project Limits	Type of Improvement	Open to Traffic	Year(s) Modeled											Estimated Cost (\$1,000's)	
						2018	2019	2020	2021	2023	2024	2027	2030	2031	2035	2042		
TUL12-111	Caltrans	SR 99	30.6/35.2 Tulare/Tagus - Prosperity Ave to 1.2m S of Ave 280	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	2022						x	x	x	x	x	x	x	\$95,863
CT-RTP07-004	Caltrans	SR 99	25.5/30.6 Tulare - Avenue 200 to Prosperity Ave	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	2029									x	x	x	x	\$263,420
CT-RTP07-005	Caltrans	SR 99	16.0/25.5 South of Tipton to Avenue 200	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	2038												x	\$192,623
TUL12-122	Caltrans	SR 65	10.9/15.6 Terra Bella - Ave 88 to Ave 124	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	2029									x	x	x	x	\$52,318
TUL12-123	Caltrans	SR 65	6.1/11.4 Ducor - Orris UP to Ave 92	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	2034											x	x	\$75,680
TUL12-124	Caltrans	SR 65	0.0/6.6 County Line to Ave 56	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	2040												x	\$108,309
CT-RTP11-001	Caltrans	SR 65	29.5/32.3 Near Lindsay-from Hermosa Rd to Ave 244	Realignment and widen from 2 to 4 lanes	2030									x	x	x	x	\$39,978
CT-RTP07-008	Caltrans	SR 190	8.5/15.0 Poplar/Porterville - Rte 65 to Road 184	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	2042												x	\$133,532

### Regionally Significant Project Listing

RTP Project ID	Jurisdiction/ Agency	Facility Name/Rte	Project Limits	Type of Improvement	Open to Traffic	Year(s) Modeled											Estimated Cost (\$1,000's)	
						2018	2019	2020	2021	2023	2024	2027	2030	2031	2035	2042		
CT-RTP11-002	Caltrans	SR 216 (Houston)	Rd 144 to Rd 148; 0.5 mi.	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	2030									x	x	x	x	\$7,103
CT-RTP11-003	Caltrans	SR 216 (Houston)	Rd 148 to Rd 152; 0.5 mi.	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	2035											x	x	\$8,234
CT-RTP07-011	Caltrans	SR 99	SR-99 at Caldwell Avenue	Widen on/off ramps and bridge structure	2026								x	x	x	x	x	\$56,721
CT-RTP07-013	Caltrans	SR 99	SR-99 at AgriCenter (Commercial)	Construct new Interchange	2030									x	x	x	x	\$73,250
CT-RTP07-014	Caltrans	SR 99	SR-99 at Paige Ave.	Widen on/off ramps and bridge structure	2030									x	x	x	x	\$83,360
CT-RTP07-021	Caltrans	SR 198	SR-198 at Road 148	Construct new interchange	2032											x	x	\$75,439
CT-RTP07-022	Caltrans	SR 190	SR-190 at Main Street	Widen bridge structure, new ramps	2040												x	\$80,056
DI-RTP07-015	Dinuba	Alta Avenue	Sequoia to Avenue 432	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	2031										x	x	x	\$8,416

### Regionally Significant Project Listing

RTP Project ID	Jurisdiction/ Agency	Facility Name/Rte	Project Limits	Type of Improvement	Open to Traffic	Year(s) Modeled											Estimated Cost (\$1,000's)		
						2018	2019	2020	2021	2023	2024	2027	2030	2031	2035	2042			
TUL00-106	Dinuba	Ave 416 (El Monte)	Road 80 to Road 92	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	2042												x	\$30,114	
FA-RTP07-001	Farmersville	Farmersville Blvd.	Walnut Ave to Noble Ave. - 1 mi	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	2022					x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	\$22,195	
PO-RTP14-001	Porterville	Westwood St	South of Orange Ave to South of Tule River	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	2040												x	\$11,220	
PO-RTP18-002	Porterville	Newcomb St	North of Tule River to south of Poplar Ditch	New 4 lane overcrossing	2035												x	x	\$68,982
VI-RTP07-029	Visalia	Riggin Avenue	Road 80 to SR-63 (various sections)	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	2024							x	x	x	x	x	x	#REF!	
TUL00-010a	Tulare Co.	Avenue 280	Santa Fe (Visalia) to Lovers Ln (Visalia)	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	2022					x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	\$26,304	
TUL00-010b	Tulare Co.	Avenue 280	Lovers Ln (Visalia) to Virginia (Farmersville)	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	2024							x	x	x	x	x	x	\$31,167	
TUL00-010c	Tulare Co.	Avenue 280	Brundage (Farmersville) to Elberta (Exeter)	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	2024							x	x	x	x	x	x	\$24,501	

### Regionally Significant Project Listing

RTP Project ID	Jurisdiction/ Agency	Facility Name/Rte	Project Limits	Type of Improvement	Open to Traffic	Year(s) Modeled										Estimated Cost (\$1,000's)	
						2018	2019	2020	2021	2023	2024	2027	2030	2031	2035		2042
CT-RTP-07-018	Visalia	SR 198	SR-198 at Akers Street	Minor widening & Safety Improvements	2020			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	\$5,240
LI-RTP18-001	Lindsay	SR 65	SR-65 at Tulare Avenue	Roundabout and local street improvements	2024						x	x	x	x	x	x	\$38,750

**Federally-Funded Non-Regionally Significant Project Listing**

RTP Project ID	Jurisdiction/ Agency	Facility Name/Rte	Project Limits	Type of Improvement	Open to Traffic	Year(s) Modeled										Estimated Cost (\$1,000's)
						2018	2019	2020	2021	2023	2024	2027	2030	2031	2035	
None																

### Exempt Project Listing

Agency	MPO ID	CTIPS ID	Project Title	Project Description	Total Project Cost (in \$1,000's)	Exemption Code
Caltrans	TUL12-170	21500000381	Grouped Projects for Safety Improvements-SHOPP Collision Reduction Program	In Tulare County: Grouped Projects for Safety Improvements-SHOPP Collision Reduction Program .	\$17,356	1.06
Caltrans	TUL12-172	21500000383	Grouped Projects for Bridge Rehabilitation and Reconstruction-SHOPP Bridge Preservation Program	In Tulare County: Grouped Projects for Bridge Rehabilitation and Reconstruction-SHOPP Bridge Preservation Program .	\$48,543	1.06
Caltrans	TUL12-175	21500000501	Grouped Projects for Pavement Resurfacing and/or Rehabilitation-SHOPP Roadway Preservation	In Tulare County: Grouped Projects for Pavement Resurfacing and/or Rehabilitation-SHOPP Roadway Preservation	\$100,337	1.10
Caltrans	TUL13-125	21500000619	Caltrans. Bridge No. 46C0208, Ave 364 Over Cottonwood Creek	In Tulare County: Bridge No. 46C0208, Ave. 364 Over Cottonwood Creek, 0.2 miles west of SR-245; Replace 1 Lane Bridge with 2 Lane Bridge.	\$3,970	1.19
Central Federal Lands Highway Division	TUL16-701	21500000721	CA FTNP SEKI 10 (12) General's Highway	In Tulare County (Sequoia National Park): Between Little Baldy and Pythian Camp Road; Rehabilitate and resurface 8.7 miles of the Generals Highway	\$8,200	1.10
Dinuba, City of	TUL10-010	21500000513	Alta Avenue and El Monte Way Signal Synchronization	In Dinuba: along Alta Ave (Road 80) from Kamm Avenue (Avenue 408) to Nebraska Avenue (Avenue 424) and along El Monte Way (Avenue 416) from Englehart Avenue (Road 72) to Alta Avenue (Road 80); Signal Synchronization.	\$452	5.07
Dinuba, City of	TUL17-001	21500000750	City of Dinuba Alta and Nebraska Roundabout	In Dinuba: At intersection of Alta and Nebraska Avenues; construction of roundabout.	\$2,077	5.01
Porterville, City of	TUL14-200	21500000671	Porterville City Transit ITS Improvements	In Porterville: Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Improvements for Porterville City Transit	\$736	2.04



### Exempt Project Listing

Agency	MPO ID	CTIPS ID	Project Title	Project Description	Total Project Cost (in \$1,000's)	Exemption Code
Porterville, City of	TUL16-006	21500000734	City of Porterville Solid Waste Truck Purchases (2)	In Porterville: Purchase of two (2) CNG-powered municipal solid waste trucks	\$553	4.01
Porterville, City of	TUL16-206	21500000742	Porterville City Transit Preventative Maintenance	In Porterville: Porterville City Transit preventative maintenance activities using FTA 5307 funds.	\$3,240	2.01
Porterville, City of	TUL17-000	21500000748	City of Porterville Solid Waste Truck Purchases (3)	In Porterville: Purchase of three (3) CNG-powered municipal solid waste trucks	\$906	4.01
Tulare County	TUL12-130	21500000595	County of Tulare. Bridge No. 46C0300-Ave 108	In Tulare County: Bridge No. 46C0300, Ave. 108, Over Lakeland Canal, 0.5 miles east of SR-43; Replace 1 Lane Bridge with 2 Lane Bridge	\$1,690	1.19
Tulare, City of	TUL16-003	21500000731	City of Tulare Solid Waste Truck Purchases	In Tulare: Purchase of six (6) diesel-powered municipal solid waste trucks	\$1,820	4.01
Tulare, City of	TUL16-200	21500000722	Tulare City Transit Preventative Maintenance	In Tulare: Tulare City Transit preventative maintenance activities using FTA 5307 funds.	\$4,288	2.01
Various Agencies	TUL11-120	21500000549	Grouped Projects for Bridge Rehabilitation and Reconstruction-HBP Program	In Tulare County: Grouped Projects for Bridge Rehabilitation and Reconstruction-HBP Program	\$82,323	1.10
Various Agencies	TUL12-144	21500000615	Grouped Proejcts for Safety Improvements - HSIP Program	Grouped Projects for Safety Improvements - HSIP Program. Throughout Tulare County.	\$4,323	1.06
Various Agencies	TUL13-700	21500000624	Grouped Projects for Pavement Resurfacing and/or Rehabilitaition (STBGP)	In Tulare County Urbanized Area (UZA): Grouped Projects for Pavement Resurfacing and/or Rehabilitation - Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP) .	\$13,588	1.10
Various Agencies	TUL16-001	21500000728	Grouped Projects for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities funded with CMAQ	In Tulare County: Grouped Projects for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities funded with CMAQ funds.	\$5,360	3.02

### Exempt Project Listing

Agency	MPO ID	CTIPS ID	Project Title	Project Description	Total Project Cost (in \$1,000's)	Exemption Code
Various Agencies	TUL16-204	21500000727	Grouped Projects for Operating Assistance to Transit Agencies	In Tulare County: Grouped Projects for Operating Assistance to Transit Agencies.	\$50,876	2.01
Various Agencies	TUL16-205	21500000741	Grouped Projects for Purchase of New Buses and Rail Cars to Replace Existing Vehicles or for Minor Expansions to the Fleet	In Tulare County: Grouped Projects for Purchase of New Buses and Rail Cars to Replace Existing Vehicle or for Minor Expansions of the Fleet.	\$3,436	2.10
Various Agencies	TUL16-500	21500000726	Grouped Projects for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities funded with ATP	In Tulare County: Grouped Projects for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities funded with Active Transportation Program (ATP) funds.	\$9,282	3.02
Visalia, City of	TUL15-209	21500000701	Visalia City Transit Preventative Maintenance	In Visalia: Visalia City Transit preventative maintenance activities using FTA 5307 funds.	\$7,440	2.01
Visalia, City of	TUL16-002	21500000730	Northwest Downtown Traffic Signal Interconnections	In Visalia: At various locations in northwest portion of downtown area; replace existing copper wire traffic signal interconnects with fiber optic cable interconnects.	\$790	5.02
Visalia, City of	TUL16-004	21500000732	City of Visalia School Bus Purchase for Central Valley Christian School	In Visalia: Purchase of one (1) propane-powered school bus. Bus being purchased by City of Visalia on behalf of Central Valley Christian School	\$140	4.01
Visalia, City of	TUL16-008	21500000736	Visalia City Transit Bus Purchases	In Visalia: Purchase of 17 transit buses for Visalia City Transit.	\$10,880	2.10
Visalia, City of	TUL16-009	21500000737	City of Visalia Solid Waste Truck Purchases (13)	In Visalia: Purchase of 13 CNG-powered municipal solid waste trucks	\$4,610	4.01
Visalia, City of	TUL16-011	21500000740	City of Visalia Tulare & Santa Fe Roundabout	In Visalia: at intersection of Tulare Avenue and Santa Fe Street; design and right-of-way acquisition for a roundabout with a Class I multi-use trail along the perimeter.	\$2,725	5.01

### Exempt Project Listing

Agency	MPO ID	CTIPS ID	Project Title	Project Description	Total Project Cost (in \$1,000's)	Exemption Code
Visalia, City of	TUL17-200	21500000747	City of Visalia Mobility Management	In City of Visalia; FTA 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program - Mobility Management	\$452	4.01

## APPENDIX C CONFORMITY ANALYSIS DOCUMENTATION

### 2018 RTP Conformity EMFAC Spreadsheet

**EMFAC Emissions (tons/day)**

**TULARE**

Pollutant	Source	Description	2020	2023	2031	2037	2042
1997 Ozone	EMFAC 2014 (Summer Run)	ROG Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)	2.91	2.32	1.64	1.31	1.17
		<b>Conformity Total</b>	<b>2.90</b>	<b>2.30</b>	<b>1.60</b>	<b>1.30</b>	<b>1.20</b>
1997 Ozone	EMFAC 2014 (Summer Run)	NOx Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)	7.57	4.56	3.28	2.90	2.79
		<b>Conformity Total</b>	<b>7.60</b>	<b>4.60</b>	<b>3.30</b>	<b>2.90</b>	<b>2.80</b>
<i>Note: State control measures (RFG, Moyer, AB1493 and Smog Check) have been incorporated in EMFAC2014. Rule 9310 and 9410 are not included in this conformity analysis.</i>							
2008 Ozone	EMFAC 2014 (Summer Run)	ROG Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)	3.50	2.69	2.20	1.94	1.71
		<b>Conformity Total</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>2.70</b>	<b>2.20</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>1.80</b>
2008 Ozone	EMFAC 2014 (Summer Run)	NOx Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)	8.99	6.79	4.33	3.78	3.38
		<b>Conformity Total</b>	<b>9.00</b>	<b>6.80</b>	<b>4.40</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>3.40</b>
PM-10	EMFAC 2014 (Annual Run)	PM-10 Total (All Vehicles Total) * includes tire & brake wear	0.70		0.70	0.72	0.75
		<b>Conformity Total</b>	<b>0.70</b>		<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.72</b>	<b>0.75</b>
PM-10	EMFAC 2007 (Annual Run)	NOx Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)	7.95		3.94	3.11	2.89
		<b>Conformity Total</b>	<b>7.95</b>		<b>3.94</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>2.89</b>
PM2.5 Annual (1997 and 2012 standards)	EMFAC 2014 (Annual Run)	PM2.5 Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total) * includes tire & brake wear	0.30		0.29	0.29	0.30
		<b>Conformity Total</b>	<b>0.30</b>		<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.30</b>
PM2.5 Annual (1997 and 2012 standards)	EMFAC 2014 (Annual Run)	NOx Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)	7.12		3.94	3.11	2.89
		<b>Conformity Total</b>	<b>7.10</b>		<b>3.90</b>	<b>3.10</b>	<b>2.90</b>
PM2.5 24-hour (2006 standard)	EMFAC 2014 (Winter Run)	PM2.5 Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total) * includes tire & brake wear	0.33		0.29	0.29	0.30
		<b>Conformity Total</b>	<b>0.30</b>		<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.30</b>
PM2.5 24-hour (2006 standard)	EMFAC 2014 (Winter Run)	NOx Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)	9.06		4.05	3.18	2.95
		<b>Conformity Total</b>	<b>9.10</b>		<b>4.10</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>2.90</b>

## 2018 RTP Conformity Paved Road Spreadsheet

### Paved Road Dust Emissions (tons/day)

#### TULARE 2020

	Enter Freeway VMT ==>	Enter Arterial VMT ==>	Enter Collector VMT ==>	Enter Total of Urban and Rural Local VMT Here =>	VTM Daily	VMT (million/year)	Base Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tons/day)	District Rule 8061/ISR Control Rates	Control-Adjusted Emissions
Freeway					3,253,968	1,188	90.751	88.076	0.241	0.075	0.223
Arterial					6,263,530	2,286	290.685	282.116	0.773	0.282	0.555
Collector					517,806	189	24.031	23.323	0.064	0.407	0.038
Urban					497,181	181	172.863	167.768	0.480	0.324	0.311
Rural					183,889	67	276.571	268.418	0.735	0.090	0.669
<b>Totals</b>					<b>10,716,374</b>	<b>3,911</b>	<b>854.900</b>	<b>829.701</b>	<b>2.273</b>		<b>1.796</b>

#### TULARE 2027

	Enter Freeway VMT ==>	Enter Arterial VMT ==>	Enter Collector VMT ==>	Enter Total of Urban and Rural Local VMT Here =>	VTM Daily	VMT (million/year)	Base Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tons/day)	District Rule 8061/ISR Control Rates	Control-Adjusted Emissions
Freeway					3,475,566	1,289	98.931	94.074	0.258	0.075	0.238
Arterial					6,825,537	2,418	307.485	298.422	0.818	0.282	0.587
Collector					586,109	214	27.201	26.399	0.072	0.407	0.043
Urban					525,142	192	182.585	177.203	0.485	0.324	0.328
Rural					194,231	71	292.125	283.514	0.777	0.090	0.707
<b>Totals</b>					<b>11,406,584</b>	<b>4,163</b>	<b>906.326</b>	<b>879.612</b>	<b>2.410</b>		<b>1.903</b>

#### TULARE 2035

	Enter Freeway VMT ==>	Enter Arterial VMT ==>	Enter Collector VMT ==>	Enter Total of Urban and Rural Local VMT Here =>	VTM Daily	VMT (million/year)	Base Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tons/day)	District Rule 8061/ISR Control Rates	Control-Adjusted Emissions
Freeway					3,646,871	1,331	101.709	98.711	0.270	0.075	0.250
Arterial					7,025,944	2,564	326.068	316.456	0.887	0.282	0.623
Collector					653,455	239	30.326	29.432	0.081	0.407	0.048
Urban					554,218	202	192.694	187.014	0.512	0.324	0.346
Rural					204,985	75	308.299	299.211	0.820	0.090	0.746
<b>Totals</b>					<b>12,085,473</b>	<b>4,411</b>	<b>959.095</b>	<b>930.825</b>	<b>2.560</b>		<b>2.013</b>

#### TULARE 2042

	Enter Freeway VMT ==>	Enter Arterial VMT ==>	Enter Collector VMT ==>	Enter Total of Urban and Rural Local VMT Here =>	VTM Daily	VMT (million/year)	Base Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tons/day)	District Rule 8061/ISR Control Rates	Control-Adjusted Emissions
Freeway					3,850,632	1,405	107.392	104.226	0.286	0.075	0.264
Arterial					7,363,655	2,688	341.740	331.667	0.909	0.282	0.652
Collector					692,103	253	32.120	31.173	0.085	0.407	0.051
Urban					578,915	211	201.281	195.348	0.535	0.324	0.362
Rural					214,119	78	322.037	312.545	0.856	0.090	0.779
<b>Totals</b>					<b>12,699,425</b>	<b>4,635</b>	<b>1004.570</b>	<b>974.959</b>	<b>2.671</b>		<b>2.108</b>

DO NOT CHANGE ANY ITEMS BELOW THIS LINE

#### TULARE

HPMS Local Urban/Rural Percent From 1998 Assembly of Statistical Reports - Caltrans 73.0% Urban 27.0% Rural 100.0% Total
--

Road Type	Base EF (lb PM10/ VMT)
Freeway	0.000152818
Arterial	0.000254296
Collector	0.000254296
Local	0.00190513
Rural	0.008241141

#### TULARE

	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total/Average
Rain Days	8.0	7.3	6.8	4.0	2.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	1.0	2.0	4.8	6.8	42.8
Total Days	31	28	31	30	31	30	31	31	30	31	30	31	365
Rain Reduction Factor	0.94	0.94	0.95	0.97	0.98	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.98	0.96	0.95	0.97

## 2018 RTP Conformity Unpaved Road Dust Spreadsheet

### Unpaved Road Dust Emissions (tons/day)

#### TULARE 2020

	Miles	Vehicle Passes per Day	VMT (1000/year)	Base Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tons/day)	District Rule 8061/ISR Control Rates	Control-Adjusted Emissions
City/County	128.6	10	469.4	469.390	414.047	1.134	0.333	0.757

#### TULARE 2027

	Miles	Vehicle Passes per Day	VMT (1000/year)	Base Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tons/day)	District Rule 8061/ISR Control Rates	Control-Adjusted Emissions
City/County	128.6	10	469.4	469.390	414.047	1.134	0.333	0.757

#### TULARE 2035

	Miles	Vehicle Passes per Day	VMT (1000/year)	Base Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tons/day)	District Rule 8061/ISR Control Rates	Control-Adjusted Emissions
City/County	128.6	10	469.4	469.390	414.047	1.134	0.333	0.757

#### TULARE 2042

	Miles	Vehicle Passes per Day	VMT (1000/year)	Base Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tons/day)	District Rule 8061/ISR Control Rates	Control-Adjusted Emissions
City/County	128.6	10	469.4	469.390	414.047	1.134	0.333	0.757

DO NOT CHANGE ANY ITEMS BELOW THIS LINE

TULARE													
	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total/Average
Rain Days	8.0	7.3	6.8	4.0	2.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	1.0	2.0	4.8	6.8	42.8
Total Days	31	28	31	30	31	30	31	31	30	31	30	31	365
Rain Reduction Factor	0.74	0.74	0.78	0.87	0.94	0.99	1.00	1.00	0.97	0.94	0.84	0.78	0.88

**2018 RTP Conformity Construction Spreadsheet**

**Road Construction Dust**

**TULARE**

Description	2020		2027		2035		2042	
	Year	Lane Miles	Year	Lane Miles	Year	Lane Miles	Year	Lane Miles
	Baseline	2005	3986	2020	4192	2027	4288	2035
Horizon	2020	4,192	2027	4,288	2035	4,391	2042	4,461
Difference	15	206	7	96	8	103	7	70
Lane Miles per Year		14		14		13		10
Acres Disturbed		53		53		50		39
Acre-Months		959		958		899		698
Emissions (tons/year)		105.472		105.326		98.880		76.800
Annual Average Day Emissions (tons)		0.289		0.289		0.271		0.210
District Rule 8021 Control Rates		0.290		0.290		0.290		0.290
<b>Total Emissions (tons per day)</b>		<b>0.205</b>		<b>0.205</b>		<b>0.192</b>		<b>0.149</b>

# 2018 RTP Conformity Totals Spreadsheet

## 2018 RTP Conformity Results Summary -- TULARE

Standard	Analysis Year	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?	
		ROG (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	ROG	NOx
1997 Ozone*	2020 Budget	3.1	8.1		
	2020	2.9	7.6	YES	YES
	2023 Budget	2.5	4.9		
	2023	2.3	4.6	YES	YES
	2031	1.6	3.3	YES	YES
	2037	1.3	2.9	YES	YES
	2042	1.2	2.8	YES	YES

\*1997 Ozone conformity is included due to uncertainty associated with an ongoing litigation related to EPA's revocation of the 1997 ozone standard.

Pollutant	Scerio	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?	
		ROG (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	ROG	NOx
2008 Ozone	2018 Budget	3.7	9.5		
	2018	3.5	9.0	YES	YES
	2021 Budget	2.9	7.2		
	2021	2.7	6.8	YES	YES
	2024 Budget	2.4	4.7		
	2024	2.2	4.4	YES	YES
	2027 Budget	2.2	4.1		
	2027	2.0	3.8	YES	YES
	2030 Budget	1.9	3.8		
	2030	1.8	3.4	YES	YES
	2031 Budget	1.9	3.7		
	2031	1.7	3.3	YES	YES
	2037	1.4	2.9	YES	YES
	2042	1.2	2.8	YES	YES

Pollutant	Scerio	PM-10 (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	PM-10	NOx
		Adjusted 2020 Budget	3.5	8.3	
2020	3.5	7.9	YES	YES	
Adjusted 2020 Budget	3.6	8.1			
2027	3.6	3.9	YES	YES	
Adjusted 2020 Budget	3.7	8.0			
2035	3.7	3.1	YES	YES	
Adjusted 2020 Budget	3.8	7.8			
2042	3.8	2.9	YES	YES	

Pollutant	Scerio	PM2.5 (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	PM2.5	NOx
		2014 Budget	0.5	13.8	
2021	0.3	7.1	YES	YES	
2014 Budget	0.5	13.8			
2027	0.3	3.9	YES	YES	
2014 Budget	0.5	13.8			
2035	0.3	3.1	YES	YES	
2014 Budget	0.5	13.8			
2042	0.3	2.9	YES	YES	

Pollutant	Scerio	PM2.5 (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	PM2.5	NOx
		2017 Budget	0.4	11.2	
2019	0.3	9.1	YES	YES	
2017 Budget	0.4	11.2			
2027	0.3	4.1	YES	YES	
2017 Budget	0.4	11.2			
2035	0.3	3.2	YES	YES	
2017 Budget	0.4	11.2			
2042	0.3	2.9	YES	YES	



PM-10	Total On-Road Exhaust		Paved Road Dust		Unpaved Road Dust		Road Construction Dust		Total	
	PM-10	Nox	PM-10	Nox	PM-10	Nox	PM-10	Nox	PM-10	Nox
2020	0.703	7.946	1.796		0.757		0.205		3.5	7.9
2027	0.697	3.943	1.903		0.757		0.205		3.6	3.9
2035	0.719	3.107	2.013		0.757		0.192		3.7	3.1
2042	0.746	2.892	2.108		0.757		0.149		3.8	2.9

## 2018 RTP PM10 Trading Spreadsheet

### PM10 Emission Trading Worksheet

#### TULARE CONFORMITY ESTIMATES (tons/day)

	2020		2027		2035		2042	
	PM10	NOx	PM10	NOx	PM10	NOx	PM10	NOx
Total On-Road Exhaust	0.700	7.900	0.700	3.900	0.700	3.100	0.700	2.900
Paved Road Dust	1.796		1.903		2.013		2.108	
Unpaved Road Dust	0.757		0.757		0.757		0.757	
Road Construction Dust	0.205		0.205		0.192		0.149	
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.458</b>	<b>7.900</b>	<b>3.565</b>	<b>3.900</b>	<b>3.662</b>	<b>3.100</b>	<b>3.714</b>	<b>2.900</b>

#### Difference (2020 Budget - 2020)

	PM10	NOx
2020 Budgets	3.4	8.4
2020	3.5	7.9

<b>Difference</b>	<b>-0.1</b>	<b>0.5</b>
* 1.5 (Adjustment to NOx Budget)		0.2

NOTE: ONLY IMPLEMENT TRADING IF NECESSARY (I.E., CONFORMITY FAILURE IN TOTALS WORKSHEET)

#### Difference (2020 Budget - 2027)

	PM10	NOx
2020 Budgets	3.4	8.4
2027	3.6	3.9

<b>Difference</b>	<b>-0.2</b>	<b>4.5</b>
* 1.5 (Adjustment to NOx Budget)		0.3

NOTE: ONLY IMPLEMENT TRADING IF NECESSARY (I.E., CONFORMITY FAILURE IN TOTALS WORKSHEET)

#### Difference (2020 Budget - 2035)

	PM10	NOx
2020 Budgets	3.4	8.4
2035	3.7	3.1

<b>Difference</b>	<b>-0.3</b>	<b>5.3</b>
* 1.5 (Adjustment to NOx Budget)		0.5

NOTE: ONLY IMPLEMENT TRADING IF NECESSARY (I.E., CONFORMITY FAILURE IN TOTALS WORKSHEET)

#### Difference (2020 Budget - 2042)

	PM10	NOx
2020 Budgets	3.4	8.4
2042	3.7	2.9

<b>Difference</b>	<b>-0.3</b>	<b>5.5</b>
* 1.5 (Adjustment to NOx Budget)		0.5

NOTE: ONLY IMPLEMENT TRADING IF NECESSARY (I.E., CONFORMITY FAILURE IN TOTALS WORKSHEET)

### 1:1.5 PM10 to NOx Trading

<b>Adjusted 2020 Budget</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>8.3</b>
<b>2020 Conformity Total</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>7.9</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.4</b>

NOTE: FINAL DIFFERENCE MUST BE POSITIVE

<b>Adjusted 2020 Budget</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>8.1</b>
<b>2027 Conformity Total</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.9</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>4.2</b>

NOTE: FINAL DIFFERENCE MUST BE POSITIVE

<b>Adjusted 2020 Budget</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>8.0</b>
<b>2035 Conformity Total</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.1</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>4.9</b>

NOTE: FINAL DIFFERENCE MUST BE POSITIVE

<b>Adjusted 2020 Budget</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>8.0</b>
<b>2042 Conformity Total</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>2.9</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>5.1</b>

NOTE: FINAL DIFFERENCE MUST BE POSITIVE

**APPENDIX D**

**TIMELY IMPLEMENTATION DOCUMENTATION FOR  
TRANSPORTATION CONTROL MEASURES**

**Tulare County Association of Governments  
RACM Timely Implementation Documentation**

Agency	RACM Commitment	Measure Title	Measure Description (not verbatim)	Implementation Status (as of 7/16)	Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP (as of 3/18)
TCAG	TU3.3	Employer Rideshare Program Incentives	TCAG Outreach program through 2006	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
Exeter	TU9.5	Encouragement of Bicycle Travel	Implement projects that fund, construct, or promote pedestrian and bicycle facilities.	The City has completed all bike lanes planned with BTA money received. 13,300 feet of Class II lanes along F St., Palm St., and Filbert Rd. and 15,200 feet along Visalia Rd., Firebaugh Ave., and Rocky Hill Road. (See Project TID Table) In addition, the City has been awarded a CMAQ grant for a Class I bicycle path on Belmont Avenue. The project is programmed, design and right of way complete, and is estimated to start construction in 16/17.	The Belmont Avenue bike path construction phase has been obligated. Construction will be underway in 2018/19.
Farmersville	TU1.5	Expansion of Public Transportation Systems	Seek opportunities to ensure more frequent stops of Orange Line in City and encourage ridership by making bus schedules available at City Hall and reminders on utility bills in 2002	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
Farmersville	TU5.5	Removal of On-Street Parking	Consider removing on-street parking on Visalia Road and some in downtown during FY 2002/03	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.

**Tulare County Association of Governments  
RACM Timely Implementation Documentation**

Agency	RACM Commitment	Measure Title	Measure Description (not verbatim)	Implementation Status (as of 7/16)	Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP (as of 3/18)
Farmersville	TU5.9	Bus Pullouts in Curbs for Passenger Loading	Consider bus pull out on Visalia Road and Downtown during FY 2002/03	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
Farmersville	TU5.16	Adaptive traffic signals and signal timing	New traffic signals will have adaptive traffic signals and signal timing as they are installed	Roundabouts are still under construction at the intersections of Noble Ave and Farmersville Blvd, and at Noble Ave and SR 198 eastbound ramps and are 90% complete. Construction completion is still anticipated in the fall of 2016. A traffic signal is proposed at Road 168 and Avenue 288 (Walnut) once a junior high school is constructed. School construction continues to be delayed due to funding. The existing traffic signal at Farmersville Blvd and Avenue 288 (Walnut) will be modified in the future with the Farmersville Blvd widening project. This project is fully funded and currently in design.	The roundabouts at Noble Ave & Farmersville Boulevard and Noble Ave & SR 198 are complete and open to traffic. The traffic signal proposed at Road 168 and Avenue 288 (Walnut) is proposed once a junior high is constructed. The existing traffic signal at Farmersville Boulevard and Avenue 288 (Walnut) is still to be modified. The project is currently in design. The design consultant has updated the project schedule and has indicated the project should be ready to bid (design and right of way completed) in January 2019.
Lindsay	TU1.7	Free transit during special events	Trolley rides will be given during the annual Chili Cook-off celebration through October 2005	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.

**Tulare County Association of Governments  
RACM Timely Implementation Documentation**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>RACM Commitment</b>	<b>Measure Title</b>	<b>Measure Description (not verbatim)</b>	<b>Implementation Status (as of 7/16)</b>	<b>Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP (as of 3/18)</b>
Lindsay	TU5.3	Reduce Traffic Congestion at Major Intersections	Five pedestrian corridor projects by Fall 2003	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
Lindsay	TU5.4	Site-Specific Transportation Control Measures	Five pedestrian corridor projects by Fall 2003	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
Lindsay	TU6.1	Park and Ride Lots	Continue to use and maintain two park and ride lots from 2002 - 2005	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
Lindsay	TU7.3	Involve school districts to encourage walking to school	Five pedestrian corridor projects by Fall 2003	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
Lindsay	TU9.2	Encouragement of Pedestrian Travel	Five pedestrian corridor projects by Fall 2003	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
Lindsay	TU9.3	Bicycle/Pedestrian Program	Five pedestrian corridor projects by Fall 2003	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
Lindsay	TU9.5	Encouragement of Bicycle Travel	Five pedestrian corridor projects by Fall 2003	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
Lindsay	TCM4	Bicycle Programs	Five pedestrian corridor projects by Fall 2003	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
Porterville	TU1.2	Transit Access to Airports	Provide demand response transit to and from the airport through at least 2007.	Porterville COLT continues to provide this service.	Porterville COLT continues to provide this service.
Porterville	TU1.6	Transit Service Improvements in Combination with Park-and-Ride Lots and Parking Management	Create a bus stop adjacent to a proposed new Park-and-Ride lot prior to end of 2003.	Commitment Complete	Commitment complete.

**Tulare County Association of Governments  
RACM Timely Implementation Documentation**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>RACM Commitment</b>	<b>Measure Title</b>	<b>Measure Description (not verbatim)</b>	<b>Implementation Status (as of 7/16)</b>	<b>Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP (as of 3/18)</b>
Porterville	TU1.7	Free transit during special events	Provide free shuttle bus service during the Sutton Iris Farm Festival through at least 2006.	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
Porterville	TU5.4	Site-Specific Transportation Control Measures	Construct left turn lanes at designated intersections by 2003.	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
Porterville	TU5.9	Bus Pullouts in Curbs for Passenger Loading	Construct one bus pull-out on Olive Avenue at Westwood; construct others as needed.	The City of Porterville routinely evaluates its transit service and has added other needed items to the transit system. The city will continue to evaluate bus pullout locations for feasibility and warrant.	The City of Porterville routinely evaluates its transit service and has added other needed items to the transit system. The city will continue to evaluate bus pullout locations for feasibility and warrant.
Porterville	TU5.16	Adaptive traffic signals and signal timing	Adaptive traffic signals will be installed on designated corridors in the City by 2003.	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
Porterville	TU9.5	Encouragement of Bicycle Travel	Hold dedication ceremonies for future phases of Tule River Parkway that encourage public use of bikeways through 2003.	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
Porterville	TU10.2	Bike Racks on Buses	Equip new buses with bike racks through at least 2006.	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
Porterville	TCM3	Rideshare Programs	Publish an article in "The Pen" that encourages rideshare within the City. Implementation by FY 2002/03.	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.

**Tulare County Association of Governments  
RACM Timely Implementation Documentation**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>RACM Commitment</b>	<b>Measure Title</b>	<b>Measure Description (not verbatim)</b>	<b>Implementation Status (as of 7/16)</b>	<b>Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP (as of 3/18)</b>
Tulare	TU1.1	Regional Express Bus Program	Provide regional express bus service to connect with other transit services through at least 2007.	The Tulare InterModal Express (TIME) fixed route service continues to provide connections to VCC (Visalia Transit) and TCAT.	The Tulare InterModal Express (TIME) fixed route service continues to provide connections to Visalia Transit and TCaT.
Tulare	TU1.2	Transit Access to Airports	Provide transit access to local airports through connection with other transit lines through at least 2007.	The TIME fixed route service continues to provide connections to VCC (Visalia Transit) which provides service to the Visalia Municipal Airport and the Fresno Airport (via the V-Line).	The TIME fixed route service continues to provide connections to Visalia Transit which provides service to the Visalia Municipal Airport and the Fresno Airport (via the V-Line).
Tulare	TU1.5	Expansion of Public Transportation Systems	Provide for the expansion and enhancement of existing transit services within the City through Unmet Needs and updating the City's Transit Development Plan.	The City continues to participate in the Unmet Needs Process. The City continues to implement the 2007 Transit Development Plan and 2014 Short Range Transit Plan.	The City continues to participate in the Unmet Needs Process. The City continues to implement the 2014 Short Range Transit Plan.
Tulare	TU1.6	Transit Service Improvements in Combination with Park-and-Ride Lots and Parking Management	The City will provide of adequate parking at transit facilities as park-and-ride lots. Implementation from 1999 through FY 2002/03.	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
Tulare	TU1.7	Free transit during special events	Provide free transit service during special events through at least 2007.	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
Tulare	TU1.9	Increase parking at transit centers or stops	Encourage transit convenience by providing additional parking at transit centers. Implementation from 1999 through FY 2002/03.	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.

**Tulare County Association of Governments  
RACM Timely Implementation Documentation**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>RACM Commitment</b>	<b>Measure Title</b>	<b>Measure Description (not verbatim)</b>	<b>Implementation Status (as of 7/16)</b>	<b>Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP (as of 3/18)</b>
Tulare	TU5.4	Site-Specific Transportation Control Measures	Install additional traffic signals as warranted.	See Project TID Table	See Project TID Table
Tulare	TU5.9	Bus Pullouts in Curbs for Passenger Loading	Provide bus pull-outs for passenger loading and unloading.	See Project TID Table	See Project TID Table
Tulare	TU5.16	Adaptive traffic signals and signal timing	Install adaptive and emergency vehicle pre-emptive traffic signals.	Commitment Complete.	Commitment complete.
Tulare	TU10.2	Bike Racks on Buses	Encourage pedestrian and bicycle travel as an alternative to automobile travel.	The city continues to evaluate potential for additional pedestrian and bicycle projects.	The city continues to evaluate potential for additional pedestrian and bicycle projects.
Tulare	TU15.2	Pedestrian and Bicycle Overpasses Where Safety Dictates	Install pedestrian and bicycle over crosses where safety concerns dictate through at least 2007.	Commitment Complete.	Commitment complete.
Tulare	TU5.6	Reversible Lanes	Implement reversible parking on arterial streets to improve traffic flow.	The City continues to implement reversible parking on arterial streets during the annual World Ag Expos.	The City continues to implement reversible parking on arterial streets during the annual World Ag Expos.
Visalia	TU1.2	Transit Access to Airports	Provide a fixed route transit service to the local airport.	Route 10 continues to provide transportation to the Visalia Airport upon request. The V-Line connects riders to the Fresno Airport.	Route 10 continues to provide transportation to the Visalia Airport upon request. The V-Line connects riders to the Fresno Airport.
Visalia	TU1.5	Expansion of Public Transportation Systems	Expand / enhance transit services through the Short Range Transit Plan.	Visalia Transit continues to implement the approved Short Range Transit Plan.	Visalia Transit continues to implement the approved Short Range Transit Plan.



**Tulare County Association of Governments  
RACM Timely Implementation Documentation**

Agency	RACM Commitment	Measure Title	Measure Description (not verbatim)	Implementation Status (as of 7/16)	Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP (as of 3/18)
Visalia	TU1.7	Free transit during special events	Provide free trolley service during special events.	The Visalia Trolley continues to provide free service during special events.	The Visalia Trolley continues to provide free service during special events.
Visalia	TU3.3	Employer Rideshare Program Incentives	Provide employee incentives for carpooling, walking, biking to work.	The City of Visalia continues to provide incentives to all employees who carpool, bike, or walk to work.	The City of Visalia continues to provide incentives to all employees who carpool, bike, or walk to work.
Visalia	TU5.2	Coordinate Traffic Signal Systems	Continue to expand the City's coordinated traffic signal system.	<p>The City of Visalia is finalizing an Intelligent Transportation System Strategic Plan for implementation. The construction and installation of the interconnect equipment along the corridors of Walnut Avenue, Conyer Street, and Acequia Avenue has been completed. The installation of the interconnection equipment along the Santa Fe corridor is currently under construction.</p> <p>The City continues to evaluate the transportation system for the implementation of intelligent transportation systems and the coordination of traffic signals.</p>	<p>The City of Visalia has completed the Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Strategic Plan and has implemented the installation of interconnect equipment along Walnut Avenue, Conyer Street, Acequia Avenue, Santa Fe Street, and School Avenue. The Traffic Management Center (TMC) is currently under construction that will allow all current and future deployed ITS devices to be maintained and operated in real time. Within the next few months, the City will begin construction on interconnect equipment along Center Avenue, Giddings Street and Murray Avenue.</p>

**Tulare County Association of Governments  
RACM Timely Implementation Documentation**

Agency	RACM Commitment	Measure Title	Measure Description (not verbatim)	Implementation Status (as of 7/16)	Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP (as of 3/18)
Visalia	TU5.3	Reduce Traffic Congestion at Major Intersections	Continue to make use of turn lanes, signalization, and median dividers for traffic control.	The City of Visalia continually evaluates and prioritizes high volume intersections to determine the appropriate traffic control measures to be implemented. The project to install left turn phases at five existing signalized intersections HSIP-5044(096) is currently under construction.	The City of Visalia continually evaluates and prioritizes high volume intersections to determine the appropriate traffic control measures to be implemented. A project at the intersection of Goshen and Demaree will modernize the existing traffic signal, add right turn lanes for all approaches, and provide dual left turn lanes from Goshen to Demaree. In addition, it will reconfigure the 4 lanes currently marked between SR 198 and Goshen along Demaree to a five lane roadway providing a continuous left turn lane. Furthermore, the City will begin construction of three traffic signals at the following intersections; Houston & County Center, Riggin & Mooney, County Center Street & Riggin Avenue and add protected left turns for north and south bound traffic at the existing signalized intersection of Chinowth Street & Whitendale Avenue. The project to install left turn phases at five existing signalized intersections HSIP-5044(096) is currently under construction.

**Tulare County Association of Governments  
RACM Timely Implementation Documentation**

Agency	RACM Commitment	Measure Title	Measure Description (not verbatim)	Implementation Status (as of 7/16)	Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP (as of 3/18)
Visalia	TU5.4	Site-Specific Transportation Control Measures	Implement geometric traffic control procedures	The City of Visalia continues to implement various geometric traffic control measures based on the City's evaluation of intersections within the City of Visalia. The project to signalize the intersection of Ben Maddox Way at Douglas Avenue [HSIPL-5044(095)] is under construction.	The City of Visalia continues to implement various geometric traffic control measures based on the City's evaluation of intersections within the City of Visalia. The City is currently in design to install median along Caldwell Avenue between Akers Street and Shady Street. Construction will occur in 2019. The project to signalize the intersection of Ben Maddox Way at Douglas Avenue [HSIPL-5044(095)] is under construction.

**Tulare County Association of Governments  
RACM Timely Implementation Documentation**

Agency	RACM Commitment	Measure Title	Measure Description (not verbatim)	Implementation Status (as of 7/16)	Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP (as of 3/18)
Visalia	TU9.5	Encouragement of Bicycle Travel	Expand the City's existing bicycle system; work with TCAG on outreach for bicycle programs	Existing bike lanes are being restriped and signing upgrades occur throughout the year. City staff works with the Waterways & Trails Committee to identify areas needing bike lanes or bike route signage. The Waterways & Trails Committee members actively outreach to educate bicyclists by having manned booths at special events and publishing and distributing a Bike Trail Map with the rules of the road. The City is preparing an Active Transportation Plan for funding eligibility. In new roadway design, roadways are being evaluated for the addition of bike routes or bike lanes as designated in the City's Bikeway Master Plan.	As the City performs pavement preservation, existing bike lanes are being restriped and signing upgrades occur throughout the year. City staff works with the Waterways & Trails Committee to identify areas needing bike lanes or bike route signage. The Waterways & Trails Committee members actively outreach to educate bicyclists by having manned booths at special events and publishing and distributing a Bike Trail Map with the rules of the road. The City has completed an Active Transportation Plan for project identification and possible funding eligibility. This past year about 3.2 miles of Class I multi-use paths were constructed. About 2 miles are anticipated to be constructed within the next year. In new roadway design, roadways are being evaluated for the addition of bike routes or bike lanes as designated in the City's Bikeway Master Plan.
Visalia	TU10.2	Bike Racks on Buses	Continue to provide bike racks on transit buses.	Numerous buses have been purchased for transit services in the City of Visalia. All buses come equipped with bike racks.	Numerous buses have been purchased for transit services in the City of Visalia. All buses come equipped with bike racks.

**Tulare County Association of Governments  
RACM Timely Implementation Documentation**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>RACM Commitment</b>	<b>Measure Title</b>	<b>Measure Description (not verbatim)</b>	<b>Implementation Status (as of 7/16)</b>	<b>Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP (as of 3/18)</b>
Visalia	TCM1	Traffic Flow Improvements	Continue to identify projects that improve traffic flow through the City's 5-Year Capitol Improvement Program	This measure has been implemented through the City's Circulation Element.	This measure has been implemented through the City's Circulation Element.
Visalia	TCM2	Public Transit	Implement Short Range Transit Plan to enhance and expand transit services.	Implementation continues as warranted.	Implementation continues as warranted.
Visalia	TCM4	Bicycle Programs	Continue to seek funding for, and implement bicycle improvements and programs.	The City continues to seek funding for and evaluate bike plan implementation. Implementation is ongoing.	The City continues to seek funding for and evaluate bike plan implementation. Implementation is ongoing.
Woodlake	TU1.5	Expansion of Public Transportation Systems	Expansion and enhancement of existing public transit through at least 2007.	Commitment Complete. Implementation continues.	Commitment Complete. Implementation continues.
Woodlake	TU3.5	Preferential Parking for Carpools and Vanpools	The City of Woodlake will designate preferential parking for carpools and vanpools at City locations through at least 2007.	Commitment Complete. Implementation continues.	Commitment Complete. Implementation continues.
Woodlake	TU5.8	On-Street Parking Restrictions	Restrict parking where it impacts traffic safety through at least 2007.	Commitment Complete. No additional parking restrictions have been identified.	Commitment Complete. No additional parking restrictions have been identified.
Woodlake	TU5.19	Internet provided road and route information	Post scheduled road construction on City website through at least 2007.	Commitment Complete. Implementation continues.	Commitment Complete. Implementation continues.

**Tulare County Association of Governments  
RACM Timely Implementation Documentation**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>RACM Commitment</b>	<b>Measure Title</b>	<b>Measure Description (not verbatim)</b>	<b>Implementation Status (as of 7/16)</b>	<b>Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP (as of 3/18)</b>
Woodlake	TU7.13	Land use/air quality guidelines	Encourage high density development around transportation centers and the downtown through at least 2007.	Commitment Complete. Implementation ongoing.	Commitment Complete. Implementation continues.
Woodlake	TU7.14	Incentives for cities with good development practices	Require new development and major reconstruction to provide energy efficient lighting through at least 2007.	Commitment Complete. Implementation ongoing.	Commitment Complete. Implementation continues.
Woodlake	TU14.2	Special Event Controls	Reduce mobile source emissions from special event centers through at least 2007.	Commitment Complete.	Commitment complete.
Woodlake	TU14.3	Land Use/Development Alternatives	Promote high-density residential and commercial development in downtown area through at least 2007.	See Measure 7.13	See Measure 7.13
Woodlake	TU14.5	Evaluation of the Air Quality Impacts of New development and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts	Evaluate air quality impacts from new development using CEQA/NEPA process through at least 2007.	Commitment complete. Implementation ongoing.	Commitment complete. Implementation ongoing.
Woodlake	TCM1	Traffic Flow Improvements	Investigate the feasibility of regional cross valley rail and a number of signal and corridor improvements.	Signal improvements continue to be unwarranted.	Signal improvements continue to be unwarranted.

**Tulare County Association of Governments  
Project Timely Implementation Documentation**

<b>RACM Commitment</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Commitment Description</b>	<b>Commitment Schedule</b>	<b>Commitment Funding</b>	<b>TIP</b>	<b>TIP Project ID</b>	<b>TIP Project Description</b>	<b>Implementation Status (as of 7/16)</b>	<b>Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP (as of 3/18)</b>
TU1.1/1.5	County of Tulare	Programs for improved public transit/regional express bus program	FY2002-2003 - operating new service	Local and State transit funding	N.A.	N.A.	Service between Woodville/Poplar/Cotton Center and Lindsay and Porterville	Complete	Complete
TU10.2	County of Tulare	Bike Rack On Buses	2002/2003 - implementation	Local and State transit funding	N.A.	N.A.	Install nine bile racks	Complete	Complete
TU18/TCM2/1.1/1.5/15.2	County of Tulare	Local Government Control Measures/Improved Public Transit	varies	FTA Section 5311/TDA/CMAQ	2000, 2002	TUL00-056, TUL00-021	3-30 Passenger Buses	Complete	Complete
TU1.5/TCM 2	Dinuba	Expansion of Public Transit	2003	FTA 5311	2000	TUL01-011, TUL01-010	Two new buses operating by Jan 2003	Complete	Complete
TU1.5/TCM 2	Exeter	Expansion of Public Transportation System	2003	FTA 5311	2000	TUL01-009	New bus operating by Jan 2003	Complete	Complete

**Tulare County Association of Governments  
Project Timely Implementation Documentation**

<b>RACM Commitment</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Commitment Description</b>	<b>Commitment Schedule</b>	<b>Commitment Funding</b>	<b>TIP</b>	<b>TIP Project ID</b>	<b>TIP Project Description</b>	<b>Implementation Status (as of 7/16)</b>	<b>Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP (as of 3/18)</b>
TU5.4	Exeter	Site-Specific Transportation Control Measures		Local	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Complete	Complete
TU9.5	Exeter	Encouragement of Bicycle Travel		BTA	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Complete	Complete
TU 5.4	Farmersville	Turn pocket at Farmersville Boulevard and Visalia Road	2003	\$2 M STIP	2000, 2002, 2004	TUL00-107	Construct turn lanes & operational improvements	Complete	Complete
TU5.16	Farmersville	Adaptive traffic signals and signal timing		STP, State Cash	2006	TUL00-107	Ave 280-Visalia Road Operational Improvements	Complete	Complete



**Tulare County Association of Governments  
Project Timely Implementation Documentation**

<b>RACM Commitment</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Commitment Description</b>	<b>Commitment Schedule</b>	<b>Commitment Funding</b>	<b>TIP</b>	<b>TIP Project ID</b>	<b>TIP Project Description</b>	<b>Implementation Status (as of 7/16)</b>	<b>Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP (as of 3/18)</b>
TU1.6	Lindsay	Transit Improvements in Combination with Park and Ride Lots	2003 - construction complete	Local and State transit funding	N.A.	N.A.	New bus stops along Hermosa Street. Note: this is not an expansion of service but adding stops along an existing route	Complete	Complete
TU 5.1	Lindsay	Five pedestrian corridor projects	2003	\$3.5 M Federal grants	2000, 2002	TUL00-016, TUL00-023, TUL00-067, TUL01-001, TUL02-018	Construct five pedestrian corridor improvements	Complete	Complete
TU5.5	Lindsay	Removal of On-Street Parking	2003 - construction complete	Non-FHWA/FTA funding	N.A.	N.A.	Sweet Brier Plaza	Complete	Complete
TU 1.9	Porterville	Multi-modal transit center	2004	\$1,359,000 STIP (includes local)	2000	8614 (PPNO)	Construct transit station	Complete	Complete
TU 5.1 & 5.2	Porterville	Traffic Signal Coordination & Preemption	2005	\$240,000 includes partial CMAQ funding.	2000, 2002	TUL00-003, TUL00-004, TUL00-005	Implement revised coordination at six locations	Complete	Complete

**Tulare County Association of Governments  
Project Timely Implementation Documentation**

<b>RACM Commitment</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Commitment Description</b>	<b>Commitment Schedule</b>	<b>Commitment Funding</b>	<b>TIP</b>	<b>TIP Project ID</b>	<b>TIP Project Description</b>	<b>Implementation Status (as of 7/16)</b>	<b>Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP (as of 3/18)</b>
TU 5.3	Porterville	Reduce traffic congestion at 13 locations	2003	Includes partial CMAQ funding	2000, 2002	TUL00-006, TUL00-007	Thirteen signals or signal modifications	Complete	Complete
TU 6.1	Porterville	Park and Ride lot	2002	\$70,000 CMAQ	2000	TUL00-072	Construct Park and Ride lot	Complete	Complete
TU 9.2	Porterville	Missing sidewalks in core area	2004	\$1.9 M CMAQ	2000, 2002, 2004	TUL00-009	Construct bike path	Complete	Complete
TU 9.3	Porterville	Tule River Parkway (from Indiana St. to Jaye St.) and Rails to Trails Project	2002 & 2003	\$591,000 includes CMAQ	2000, 2002, 2004	TUL00-009	Construct bike path	Complete	Complete
TU14.7 & 7.12	Porterville	Incentives to increase density around transit centers	2003 construction	STIP and local funds	2000	8614(PPN O)	Transit Center	Complete	Complete

**Tulare County Association of Governments  
Project Timely Implementation Documentation**

<b>RACM Commitment</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Commitment Description</b>	<b>Commitment Schedule</b>	<b>Commitment Funding</b>	<b>TIP</b>	<b>TIP Project ID</b>	<b>TIP Project Description</b>	<b>Implementation Status (as of 7/16)</b>	<b>Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP (as of 3/18)</b>
TCM2	Porterville	Public Transit	FY2003/2004 - bus operations	FTA 5311/CMAQ and City	2000, 2002	TUL 00-008, TUL00-008	Four Buses to expand service	Complete	Complete
TU5.4	Porterville	Site-Specific Transportation Control Measures	2003	Local	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Complete	Complete
TU5.9	Porterville	Bus Pullouts in Curbs for Passenger Loading	2001	LTF	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Complete	Complete
TU1.6	Tulare	Transit Service Improvements in Combination with Park-and-Ride Lots and Management	2002/2003 - construction	STIP, State Rural transit grant, and local funds	2000, 2002, 2004	8631(PPN O)	Parking at Intermodal Transit Facility	Complete	Complete
TU1.8	Tulare	Encourage Use of Transit By City Employee	FY 2002/2003	Local funding	N.A.	N.A.	Bus for free commute trips for city employees	Complete	Complete

**Tulare County Association of Governments  
Project Timely Implementation Documentation**

<b>RACM Commitment</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Commitment Description</b>	<b>Commitment Schedule</b>	<b>Commitment Funding</b>	<b>TIP</b>	<b>TIP Project ID</b>	<b>TIP Project Description</b>	<b>Implementation Status (as of 7/16)</b>	<b>Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP (as of 3/18)</b>
TU 5.3	Tulare	Design improvements to Prosperity Avenue interchange on SR 99	No schedule has been specified	No funds specified	1998, 2000, 2002, 2004	6405 (PPNO)	Construct interchange improvements	Complete	Complete
TU 9.1/9.2/9.3/9.4/9.5/TCM 4/9.9	Tulare	Santa Fe Trail	2002	includes CMAQ	2000, 2002	TUL00-014, TUL00-015, TUL00-026	Construct 4.5 mile pedestrian/bicycle path	Complete	Complete
TU5.4	Tulare	Site-Specific Transportation Control Measures		SR2S, Local	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Complete	Complete
	Tulare	Bus Pullouts in Curbs for Passenger Loading		LTF	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Complete	Complete
TU5.16	Tulare	Install adaptive and emergency vehicle pre-emptive traffic signals.		Local	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Complete	Complete

**Tulare County Association of Governments  
Project Timely Implementation Documentation**

<b>RACM Commitment</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Commitment Description</b>	<b>Commitment Schedule</b>	<b>Commitment Funding</b>	<b>TIP</b>	<b>TIP Project ID</b>	<b>TIP Project Description</b>	<b>Implementation Status (as of 7/16)</b>	<b>Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP (as of 3/18)</b>
TU5.1	Visalia	Develop Intelligent Transportation System	2005	STIP and local funding	2002, 2004	8688 (PPNO)	ITS System	Complete	Complete
TU5.9	Visalia	Bus Pullouts in Curbs for Passenger Loading	Within ten years	STIP	2000, 2002	6220 (PPNO)	Mooney Blvd. Widening Project/Bus Pullouts	Complete	Complete
TU9.3	Visalia	Bicycle/Pedestrian Program	Not Noted	Used local funding for the extension of the St. John's River bike path	N.A.	N.A.	St Johns River Bike path	Complete	Complete
TU 15.1	Visalia	Pedestrian pathway (from transit center to downtown) & convert Garden Street between Main Street and parking structure to pedestrian plaza	2004 & 2002	TEA grants	2000, 2002	TUL00-027, TUL02-076	Construct two pedestrian corridor improvements	Complete	Complete

**Tulare County Association of Governments  
Project Timely Implementation Documentation**

<b>RACM Commitment</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Commitment Description</b>	<b>Commitment Schedule</b>	<b>Commitment Funding</b>	<b>TIP</b>	<b>TIP Project ID</b>	<b>TIP Project Description</b>	<b>Implementation Status (as of 7/16)</b>	<b>Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP (as of 3/18)</b>
TU5.3	Visalia	Reduce Traffic Congestion at Major Intersections		Local	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Complete	Complete
TU5.4	Visalia	Site-Specific Transportation Control Measures		Local	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Complete	Complete
TU9.5	Visalia	Encouragement of Bicycle Travel		Local	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Complete	Complete
TU10.2	Visalia	Bike Racks on Buses		CMAQ, Energy Commission, Local	2006	TUL06-014	Purchase six (6) transit replacement vehicles with CNG buses.	Complete	Complete
TU10.2	Woodlake	Bike Rack On Buses	2002/2003 - implementation	Local Funding	N.A.	N.A.	Equip two buses with bike racks	Complete	Complete
TCM 4	Woodlake	Bravo Lake bicycle path	2007	\$264,000 TEA	2000, 2002	TUL00-028, TUL02-021	Construct bike path	Complete	Complete

---

**APPENDIX E**

**PUBLIC MEETING PROCESS DOCUMENTATION**

---

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON THE  
DRAFT 2019 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM,  
THE DRAFT 2018 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN/SUSTAINABLE  
COMMUNITY STRATEGY, CORRESPONDING DRAFT CONFORMITY  
ANALYSIS,  
AND DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Tulare County Association of Governments will hold a public hearing on June 18, 2018 at 1:00 pm at the Dinuba Community Center located at 1390 E. Elizabeth Way, Dinuba, CA 93618 regarding the Draft 2018 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2018 RTP/SCS), the 2018 RTP/SCS Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR), Draft 2019 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (2019 FTIP), and the corresponding Draft Air Quality Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP/SCS. The purpose of the public hearing is to receive public comments on these documents.

- The 2019 FTIP is a near-term listing of capital improvement and operational expenditures utilizing federal and state monies for transportation projects in Tulare County during the next four years.
- This public notice also satisfies the program of projects (POP) requirements of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Urbanized Area Formula Program, Section 5307. If no comments are received on the proposed POP, the proposed transit program (funded with FTA 5307 dollars) will be the final program.
- The 2018 RTP/SCS is a long-term coordinated transportation/land use strategy to meet Tulare County transportation needs out to the year 2042.
- The Draft EIR document provides an analysis of potential environmental impacts related to the implementation of the 2018 RTP/SCS as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
- The corresponding Conformity Analysis contains the documentation to support a finding that the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP/SCS meet the air quality conformity requirements for ozone and particulate matter.

Individuals with disabilities may call Amie Kane or Wendy Gutierrez (559-623-0450) of TCAG (with 3-working-day advance notice) to request auxiliary aids necessary to participate in the public hearing. Translation services are available (with 3-working-day advance notice) to participants speaking any language with available professional translation services.

A 55-day public review and comment period will commence on May 3, 2018 and conclude on June 26, 2018 for the 2018 RTP/SCS.

A 45-day public review and comment period will commence on May 11, 2018 and conclude on June 26, 2018 for the Draft EIR.



A concurrent 30-day comment period for the 2019 FTIP and corresponding Draft Air Quality Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP/SCS will commence on May 28, 2018 and conclude on June, 26, 2018.

The draft documents are available for review at the TCAG office, located at 210 N. Church Street, Suite B, Visalia, CA 93291 and on the TCAG website at [www.tularecog.org/rtp2018](http://www.tularecog.org/rtp2018).

Public comments are welcomed at the hearings, or may be submitted in writing to Benjamin Kimball, TCAG Deputy Executive Officer at the address below by 5 pm on June 26, 2018.

After considering the comments, the documents will be considered for adoption, by resolution, by the Tulare County Association of Governments at a regularly scheduled meeting to be held on August 20, 2018. The documents will then be submitted to state and federal agencies for approval.

Contact Person: Benjamin Kimball, Deputy Executive Officer  
210 N. Church Street, Suite B  
Visalia, CA 93291  
559-623-0450  
Contact Email: [bkimball@tularecog.org](mailto:bkimball@tularecog.org)

**APPENDIX F**

**RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS**

No comments received on the Draft Conformity Analysis for the 2019 FTIP and 2018 RTP.