

**FINAL CONFORMITY ANALYSIS FOR  
THE 2011 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION  
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM  
AND  
2011 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

July 19, 2010

Prepared by the:



5955 South Mooney Boulevard  
Visalia, CA 93277  
Phone: (559) 624-7274  
Fax: (559) 733-6720

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
CONFORMITY REQUIREMENTS	1
CONFORMITY TESTS	2
RESULTS OF THE CONFORMITY ANALYSIS	2
REPORT ORGANIZATION	3
CHAPTER 1: FEDERAL AND STATE REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS	4
A.    FEDERAL AND STATE CONFORMITY REGULATIONS	4
B.    CONFORMITY REGULATION REQUIREMENTS	6
C.    AIR QUALITY DESIGNATIONS APPLICABLE TO THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY	7
D.    CONFORMITY TEST REQUIREMENTS	8
E.    ANALYSIS YEARS	12
CHAPTER 2: LATEST PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS AND TRANSPORTATION MODELING 15	
A.    LATEST PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS	15
B.    SOCIOECONOMIC DATA	17
C.    TRANSPORTATION MODELING	19
D.    TRAFFIC ESTIMATES	25
E.    VEHICLE REGISTRATIONS	25
F.    STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN MEASURES	26
CHAPTER 3: AIR QUALITY MODELING	28
A.    EMFAC2007 28	
B.    ADDITIONAL PM-10 ESTIMATES	29
C.    PM2.5 APPROACH	30
D.    SUMMARY OF PROCEDURES FOR REGIONAL EMISSIONS ESTIMATES 32	
CHAPTER 4: TRANSPORTATION CONTROL MEASURES	33
A.    TRANSPORTATION CONFORMITY REGULATION REQUIREMENTS FOR TCMS	33
B.    APPLICABLE AIR QUALITY IMPLEMENTATION PLANS	35
C.    IDENTIFICATION OF 2002 RACM THAT REQUIRE TIMELY IMPLEMENTATION DOCUMENTATION	36
D.    TCM FINDINGS FOR THE TIP AND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN	38
E.    RTP CONTROL MEASURE ANALYSIS IN SUPPORT OF 2003 PM-10 PLAN	38
CHAPTER 5: INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION	40
A.    INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION	40
B.    PUBLIC CONSULTATION	42

CHAPTER 6: TIP AND RTP CONFORMITY

43

REFERENCES 46

## **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 Meeting Process Documentation

Appendix F: Response to Public Comments

## TABLES

Table 1-1:	On-Road Motor Vehicle CO Emissions Budgets .....	9
Table 1-2:	Adequate Budgets from the 2007 Ozone Plan.....	10
Table 1-3:	On-Road Motor Vehicle PM-10 Emissions Budgets.....	10
Table 1-4:	On-Road Motor Vehicle PM2.5 Emissions Budgets.....	12
Table 1-5:	San Joaquin Valley Conformity Analysis Years .....	13
Table 6-1:	Conformity Results Summary .....	45

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report presents the Conformity Analysis for the 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and the 2011 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The Tulare County Association of Governments 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 2011 FTIP and 2011 RTP; a finding of conformity is therefore supported. The 2011 FTIP and 2011 RTP and corresponding Conformity Analysis were approved by the Tulare County Association of Governments Policy Board on July 19, 2010. FHWA/FTA last issued a finding of conformity for the 2009 TIP and 2007 RTP, including amendments, on February 27, 2009.

The 2011 TIP and 2011 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), as well as a maintenance plan for carbon monoxide (CO) for the urbanized/metropolitan areas of Kern, Fresno, Stanislaus and San Joaquin Counties. Therefore, transportation plans and programs for the nonattainment areas for

the Tulare County area must satisfy the requirements of the Federal transportation conformity regulation.

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 carbon monoxide, ozone, PM-10, and PM2.5.

## **RESULTS OF THE CONFORMITY ANALYSIS**

A regional emissions analysis was conducted for the years 2011, 2012, 2014, 2017, 2018 (via interpolation), 2020, 2023, 2025 and 2035 for each applicable pollutant. All analyses were conducted using the latest planning assumptions and emissions models. The major conclusions of the Tulare County Association of Governments Conformity Analysis are:

- For ozone, the total regional on-road vehicle-related emissions (ROG and NO<sub>x</sub>) associated with implementation of the 2011 FTIP and the 2011 RTP for all years tested are projected to be less than the adequate emissions budgets specified in the *2007 Ozone Plan*. The conformity tests for ozone are therefore satisfied.
- For PM-10, the total regional vehicle-related emissions (PM-10 and NO<sub>x</sub>) associated with implementation of the 2011 FTIP and the 2011 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 NO<sub>x</sub> trading mechanism for transportation conformity purposes from the *2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan*. The conformity tests for PM-10 are therefore satisfied.
- For PM<sub>2.5</sub>, the total regional on-road vehicle-related emissions associated with implementation of the 2011 FTIP and the 2011 RTP for the analysis years are projected to be less than the adequate emission budgets specified in the *2008 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan*. The conformity tests for PM<sub>2.5</sub> for both the 1997 and 2006 standards are therefore satisfied.
- The 2011 FTIP and the 2011 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 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 meeting documentation conducted on the 2011 FTIP and 2011 RTP and corresponding Conformity Analysis on May 17, 2010. 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 Analysis for the Draft 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Draft 2011 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) was 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.

The Tulare County Association of Governments is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for Tulare County in the San Joaquin Valley. As a result of this designation, Tulare County Association of Governments prepares the TIP, RTP, and associated conformity analyses. The TIP serves as a detailed four-year programming document for the preservation, expansion, and management of the transportation system. The 2011 RTP has a 2035 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 2002. These amendments have addressed a number of items related to conformity lapses, grace periods, and other related issues to streamline the conformity process.

On July 1, 2004 EPA published the final rule, Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments for the New 8-hour Ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standards and Miscellaneous Revisions for Existing Areas; Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments – Response to Court Decision and Additional Rule Changes (EPA, 2004a).

EPA issued a final rule on May 6, 2005 to add the following particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) precursors to the transportation conformity rule: nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), sulfur oxides (SO<sub>x</sub>), and ammonia (NH<sub>3</sub>) (EPA, 2005). The rule specifies when each of these precursors must be considered in PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment areas, before and after PM<sub>2.5</sub> SIPs are submitted.

In late March 2006, EPA and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) published “Transportation Conformity Guidance for Qualitative Hot-Spot Analyses in PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas”. This guidance affects Federal project-level approvals for “projects of air quality concern” in PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> nonattainment areas on or after April 5, 2006.

EPA issued a final rule on January 24, 2008 regarding changes to make the rule consistent with the Clean Air Act as amended by the most recent transportation funding legislation, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU).

EPA published the Transportation Conformity Rule PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> 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 PM<sub>2.5</sub> national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS). The final PM amendments rule also addresses hot-spot analyses in PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> and carbon monoxide nonattainment and maintenance areas.

## MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL GUIDANCE

EPA issued “multi-jurisdictional” guidance on July 21, 2004 to clarify how nonattainment areas with multiple agencies should conduct conformity determinations based on the changes to the Conformity Rule (EPA, 2004b). 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 carbon monoxide, ozone and PM<sub>10</sub>. 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. EPA published a budget adequacy determination for the 2012 conformity budget contained in the 2008 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan May 12, 2010, effective May 27, 2010. 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. Rule 9120 contains the Transportation Conformity Rule promulgated November 24, 1993 verbatim. The Rule provides guidance for the development of consultation procedures and processes at the local level. As required by the Transportation Conformity Rule, Rule 9120 was submitted to EPA on January 24, 1995 as a revision to the State SIP. The rule becomes effective on the date EPA promulgates interim, partial, or final approval in the Federal Register.

To date, the Rule has not received approval by EPA. Section 51.390(b) of the Transportation Conformity Rule states: “Following EPA approval of the State conformity provisions (or a portion thereof) in a revision to the applicable implementation plan, conformity determinations would be governed by the approved (or approved portion of the) State criteria and procedures.” 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 has not been approved for the SJV, the Federal transportation conformity rule still 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 inter agency 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 February 2010 (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. EMFAC2007 was used in the Conformity Analysis and is documented in Chapter 3.

- 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. The consultation process for the conformity analysis includes a 30-day comment period followed by a public meeting. However, the comment period for this conformity analysis was 45 days concurrent with the Draft 2011 TIP and RTP, and associated California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents.

## **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.

The Tulare County Association of Governments 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. Conformity for the 2011 FTIP and RTP includes analysis of existing and future air quality impacts for each applicable pollutant.

The San Joaquin Valley is currently designated as nonattainment for the NAAQS for 8-hour ozone, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>; and has a maintenance plan for PM-10, as well as a maintenance plan for carbon monoxide (CO) for the urbanized/metropolitan areas of Kern, Fresno, Stanislaus and San Joaquin Counties. State Implementation Plans have been prepared to address carbon monoxide, ozone, PM-10 and PM<sub>2.5</sub>:

- The 2004 Revision to the California State Implementation Plan for Carbon Monoxide was approved by EPA on November 30, 2005 (effective January 30, 2006).
- EPA published a budget adequacy determination for the 2011, 2014, and 2017 conformity budgets contained in the 2007 Ozone Plan on January 22, 2009, effective February 6, 2009.
- The 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan, which included revisions to the attainment plan, was approved (with minor technical corrections to the conformity budgets) by EPA on November 12, 2008.
- EPA published a budget adequacy determination for the 2012 conformity budget contained in the 2008 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan on May 12, 2010, effective May 27, 2010.

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 applies by December 14, 2010. In the San Joaquin Valley, the 1997 standards (both 24-hour and annual) will continue to apply. 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 standard.

#### **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 carbon monoxide, ozone, and particulate matter are summarized below.

Section 93.124(d) of the 1997 Final Transportation Conformity regulation allows for conformity determinations for subregional emission budgets by MPOs if the applicable implementation plans (or implementation plan submission) explicitly indicates an intent to create such subregional 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.

**CARBON MONOXIDE**

The urbanized/metropolitan areas of Kern, Fresno, Stanislaus and San Joaquin Counties are classified maintenance for carbon monoxide. The motor vehicle emission budgets for carbon monoxide are specified in the 2004 Revision to the California State Implementation Plan for Carbon Monoxide in tons per average winter day. EPA published a direct final rulemaking approving the plan on November 30, 2005, effective January 30, 2006.

For carbon monoxide, the Federal transportation conformity regulation requires that the TIP and RTP must pass an emissions budget test with a budget that has been approved by EPA for transportation conformity purposes. New conformity budgets have been approved for 2003, 2010 and 2018 for portions of the San Joaquin Valley as provided in the following table.

**Table 1-1:  
 On-Road Motor Vehicle CO Emissions Budgets**

<b>County</b>	<b>2003 Emissions (winter tons/day)</b>	<b>2010 Emissions (winter tons/day)</b>	<b>2018 Emissions (winter tons/day)</b>
Fresno	240 240 240		
Kern	180 180 180		
San Joaquin	170 170 170		
Stanislaus	130 130 130		

**OZONE**

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). The motor vehicle emission budgets for ozone are specified in the 2007 Ozone Plan in tons per average summer day. EPA published the notice of adequacy determination for the 2011, 2014, and 2017 budgets in the Federal Register on January 22, 2009, effective February 6, 2009.

The SJV was reclassified from a Serious nonattainment area for the 8-hour ozone standard to Extreme effective June 4, 2010. The 2007 Ozone Plan requested an Extreme nonattainment classification and attainment date of 2023, and includes the corresponding additional RFP years. The SIP has identified subarea budgets for each MPO in the nonattainment area. For this Conformity Analysis, the SJV will continue to conduct determinations for subarea emission budgets as established in the applicable implementation plan.

The adequate conformity budgets from Table 9.3 of the Plan are provided in the table below. These budgets will be used to compare to emissions resulting from the 2011 FTIP and RTP.

CARB subsequently updated Madera County and San Joaquin County budgets; these updates are reflected in the table below.

**Table 1-2:  
 Adequate Budgets from the 2007 Ozone Plan**  
 (summer tons/day)

County	2011		2014		2017	
	ROG	NOx	ROG	NOx	ROG	NOx
Fresno	15.5	47.9 12.9	37.2 11.1			29.1
Kern (SJV)	15.7	79.4 13.5	64.1 11.6			49.5
Kings	3.4	15.9 2.8		12.3 2.3		9.4
Madera	3.7	12.2 3.1	9.7 2.6			7.7
Merced	6.2	28.8 5.1		22.3 4.2		17.1
San Joaquin	12.1	34.7 10.1	27.8		8.6	21.3
Stanislaus	9.0	22.3 7.5		17.2 6.5		13.4
Tulare	9.2	20.9 7.7		16.6 6.7		13.1

**PM-10**

The 2007 P M-10 Maintenance Plan was approved (with minor technical corrections to the conformity budgets) by EPA on November 12, 2008, 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 reentrained dust from travel on paved roads, vehicular exhaust, travel on unpaved roads, and road construction.

The conformity budgets from Tables 6 and 7 of the Plan are provided below (including the minor technical corrections) and will be used to compare emissions for each analysis year. CARB subsequently updated the 2005 attainment budgets; these updates are reflected in the table below.

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

County	2005		2020	
	PM-10	NOx	PM-10	NOx
Fresno	13.5 59.2		16.1 23.2	
Kern <sup>(a)</sup>	12.1 88.3		14.7 39.5	
Kings 3.1		16.7	3.6	6.8
Madera 3.6		13.9	4.7	6.5
Merced	6.2 39.4		6.4 12.9	
San Joaquin	9.1 42.6		10.6 17.0	
Stanislaus	5.6 29.7		6.7 10.8	
Tulare	7.3 25.1		9.4 10.9	

<sup>(a)</sup> Kern County subarea includes only the portion of Kern County within the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin

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 November 12, 2008, 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.

### **PM2.5**

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

The 2008 PM2.5 Plan contains motor vehicle emission budgets for PM2.5 and NOx established based on average annual daily emissions. 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 Table 7-2 of the Plan are provided below and will be used to compare emissions resulting from the 2011 FTIP and RTP.

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, 2015. States must identify their attainment dates based on the rate of reductions from their control strategies and the severity of the PM2.5 problem. Modeling must be used to verify that the control strategy is as expeditious as practicable. The 2008 PM2.5 Plan shows that the San Joaquin Valley PM2.5 nonattainment area can attain the annual PM2.5 NAAQS in 2014. The SIP has identified subarea budgets for each MPO in the nonattainment area. For this Conformity Analysis, the SJV will continue to conduct determinations for subarea emission budgets as established in the applicable implementation plan.

**Table 1-4:  
 On-Road Motor Vehicle PM2.5 Emissions Budgets**  
 (tons per average annual day)

County	2009		2012		2014	
	PM2.5	NOx	PM2.5	NOx	PM2.5	NOx
Fresno	2.2	56.5	1.9	44.2	1.1	26.0
Kern (SJV)	3.4	87.7	3.0	74.2	1.4	41.6
Kings	0.7	17.9	0.6	14.6	0.3	8.1
Madera	0.6	14.1	0.5	11.4	0.3	6.7
Merced	1.5	33.6	1.2	26.7	0.6	14.8
San Joaquin	1.6	39.1	1.4	32.8	0.9	20.3
Stanislaus	1.0	25.8	0.9	20.8	0.5	12.4
Tulare	0.9	23.3	0.8	19.5	0.5	12.2

As noted above, the Transportation Conformity Rule PM2.5 and PM10 Amendments published on March 24, 2010 (effective April 23, 2010) allows 2006 PM2.5 areas with adequate or approved 1997 PM2.5 budgets to determine conformity for both of the NAAQS at the same time, using the budget test.

**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.

**Table 1-5:  
 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>
CO NA		2018	2017/2025	2035
Ozone	2011/2014/2017	2023 2025 2035		
PM-10	NA	2020 2025 2035		
PM2.5 2012		2014	2017/2025	2035

<sup>1</sup> Budget years that are not in the time frame of the transportation plan are not included as analysis years (e.g., CO 2003 and 2010, Ozone 2008, PM-10 2005, PM2.5 2009), although they may be used to demonstrate conformity.

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. For CO, the analysis year 2018 will be interpolated from 2017 and 2025.

For PM<sub>2.5</sub>, the attainment year is 2014 for both the 1997 and 2006 Standards. On March 8, 2005, EPA issued Guidance for Determining the "Attainment Year" for Transportation Conformity in new 8-hour ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> Nonattainment Areas (EPA, 2005b). Per CAA section 172(a)(2), all PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment areas will have an initial maximum statutory attainment date of April 5, 2010. However, the submitted 2008 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan shows that the San Joaquin Valley PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment area can attain the annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS in 2014. In addition, the attainment year for the 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> areas will be 2014. Since this is the same attainment year as the 1997 standards noted above, no changes to the conformity analysis years are required.

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

### **A. LATEST PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS**

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 February 2010. On January 21, 2010, a summary of transportation model updates and latest planning assumptions was transmitted to the San Joaquin Valley Interagency Consultation Group (IAC) for review and comment or concurrence. Both EPA and FHWA subsequently indicated that there were no comments or concerns regarding the summary and provided concurrence.

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.

The Tulare County Association of Governments uses the TP+/Cube transportation model. The model was validated in 2010 for the 2007 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 Tulare County Association of Governments  
 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: Census 2000  Projections: DOF 2007  Adopted by Tulare COG policy board in May 2007	This data is disaggregated to the TAZ level for input into the TP+/Cube for the base year validation.	New data from the Central California Futures Institute projections is expected to be adopted by Tulare COG in 2008.
Employment	Base Year: InfoUSA 2007  Projections: Woods and Poole 2007 and Uplan software.	This data is disaggregated to the TAZ level for input into the TP+/Cube for the base year validation.	New data from InfoUSA is anticipated to be included in the next transportation model update in 2012.
Traffic Counts	Approximately 75 0 traffic counts were collected in 2007 through 2009.	TP+/Cube was validated using these traffic counts.	Traffic counts are updated every five years, if funds are available.
Vehicle Miles of Travel	The Tulare COG policy Board accepted the transportation model validation for the 2007 base year in May 2010.	TP+/Cube is the transportation model used to estimate VMT in Tulare County.	The transportation model is expected to be validated for the 2010 base year in 2012.
Speeds	The 2007 transportation model validation was based on survey data on peak and off-peak highway speeds and common practice speed flow charts. Speed distributions were updated in EMFAC2007, using methodology approved by ARB and with information from the transportation model.	TP+/Cube. The transportation model includes a feedback loop that assures congested speeds are consistent with travel speeds.  EMFAC2007	A speed study will be conducted every five years, if adequate funds are available.
Vehicle Registrations	EMFAC2007 is the most recent model for use in California conformity analyses. Vehicle registration data is included by ARB in the model and cannot be updated by the user.	EMFAC2007	ARB has committed to update the fleet information in EMFAC on a 3-year cycle (see 1/31/06 letter to EPA and FHWA). The next update is scheduled to occur in 2010.
State Implementation Plan Measures	Latest implementation status of commitments in prior SIPs.	Emission reduction credits consistent with the SIPs are post-processed via spreadsheets as documented in Ch. 4.	Updated for every conformity analysis.

## B. 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:*

**Population:** Tulare County Association of Governments uses the 2000 U.S. Census files, permit activity and Department of Finance (DOF) projections. Because former DOF population projection numbers were inaccurate, staff used only the base year number as an actual population. The future population numbers for Tulare County were factored using the actual population numbers from previous years for the county and trending them out to 2050. Updates are consistent with the DOF trends, although they may not match exactly, since DOF can change significantly from year to year. The official population assumptions were accepted on May 21, 2007.

**Employment:** The employment information came primarily in census block format. In this case, a business database service, InfoUSA, was utilized. This data was later verified, cross-referenced and updated with information from other sources. Listed below are the exact resources utilized.

InfoUSA provided the base information to the block level on employers and the number of employees at each location. The data was reclassified by employment type into one of eight categories utilized in the model. The employment categories included Education, Government, Agriculture, Industrial, Office, Service, and Retail. The individual data was also verified by staff for accuracy. All employers with more than 100 employees were contacted to ensure the correct block placement. Any business not correctly assigned was reassigned. Government, Education and Agricultural employment categories were pulled out and evaluated separately.

School Districts provided staff with the locations of all their facilities and the number of people employed at each location. Local, State and Federal agencies were contacted for the locations of their respective facilities and employment levels. Employment data from the California Employment Development Department and the US Census Bureau (Economic Census) provided a county overview of public sector jobs and private sector jobs. The US Department of Agriculture also provided county level statistics on farm labor figures, a number historically difficult to establish.

Tulare County Association of Governments utilized information from the projection firm Woods and Poole (W&P), which provided additional data on employment levels. All of the sources listed provided TCAG with the information to construct the employment element of the land use model. Reviewing all the data together revealed that the InfoUSA numbers were understating

employment in Tulare County. Private sector numbers were adjusted based on correction factors developed from the other data sources.

The InfoUSA data provided approximately 11,000 data records of businesses in Tulare County, including their name, address, 4-digit standard industry classification (SIC) code, employees (total and “employees here”), and geocoding at the Census 2000 block level. This allows for distribution of employees by Census block, and ultimately, by TAZ. The Woods & Poole data provided historical, current, and projected estimates of county-wide employment by 5 year increments from 1970 to 2025. Estimates include county totals of population, employment (jobs) by SIC code and major category (e.g., farm, agricultural, construction, manufacturing, wholesale trade, retail trade, service, government, etc.), households, etc.

**Land Use:** Land use provides the foundation for the operation and accuracy of the Tulare County Association of Governments transportation model. Information on the current land use conditions for the county was entered into the model to approximate the current conditions of Tulare County. This process draws upon a number of resources ranging from federal government agencies to local cities and school districts. Once the TAZs were numbered, the TAZ layer was assigned to the Census block layer to give each census block a TAZ assignment. This allowed data released in block format to be aggregated together to form the TAZ layer. Once the block assignment was complete, the assignment process was repeated for Tracts. Since Tracts are the higher level geography (one to several TAZs nest within each Tract) each TAZ received a tract number, to which data would be later assigned. Unlike blocks, no TAZ crossed tract boundaries; as a result, there were no split tract assignments.

TCAG’s 2007 travel demand model land use database was developed based on census data, housing start information, State of California’s Department of Finance (DOF) data, and a commercially purchased InfoUSA employment database. Year 2000 census data was used for population and household estimates by TAZ and housing start information since 2000 was used to update the increment of growth between 2000 and 2007. Census auto ownership data at the census block level was used to distribute households by percentages of 0, 1 and 2+ auto ownership for single-family and multi-family housing units to improve trip generation estimates (households with zero autos, with one auto, and with two or more autos). An InfoUSA commercial employment database which covers approximately 95% of the employment in the county, provided the basis for the 2007 employment estimates. TCAG staff then ensured that all large employers were appropriately coded (headquarters vs. other sites), and that those uses not normally included in the InfoUSA database (e.g. those not required to pay taxes such as schools, fire stations, post offices, etc.) were included. The resultant employment totals were then compared with EDD estimates to determine reasonableness of totals.

Future forecasts of population and housing were based on DOF estimates. Year 2007 DOF annual growth rates were used for near term (2010) forecasts. However, since the DOF estimates fluctuate annually and the Year 2007 DOF forecasts project annual growth rates significantly higher than historic rates (average of 2.6% per year vs. 1.9%) resulting in more than 20% more population, housing and employment in 2035 than was previously forecast, TCAG staff determined that the year 2003 DOF and historic annual growth rates were more reasonable for their longer term forecasts (2035). Trend lines with historic data were used to estimate future population and housing levels using the updated 2007 estimates as a base. On the employment

side, employment trend lines, estimates of employees per household by jurisdiction, and overall employment distribution were used to forecast future employment.

### **C. TRANSPORTATION MODELING**

The San Joaquin Valley Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) utilize the TP+/Cube traffic modeling software. The Valley TPA 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 TPA 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, express way, 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 the Tulare County Association of Governments transportation modeling methodology meets those requirements.

The TCAG regional travel model is a conventional travel model demand forecasting model that is similar in structure to most other current area-wide models used for traffic forecasting. It uses land use, socioeconomic, and road network data to estimate facility-specific transit and roadway traffic volumes.

The TCAG model was converted to TP+ in 1999 and in 2010 remains in that modeling domain. The major land use update effort of 2007/early 2008 increased the number of traffic analysis zones (TAZs) from 1,251 “active” zones to 1,380 “active” zones.

#### 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 validated to the end of 2007 conditions using about 38 directional 2007 and 2008 counts from Caltrans and about 130 directional traffic counts collected locally in 2007 and late 2009. Traffic counts included daily, AM 3 hour, PM 3 hour, AM 1 hour and PM 1-hour observations.

Forecasted traffic volumes on the simulated network were compared with actual traffic counts on selected streets and on established screenlines and for the recommended Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) target variations by facility type. In general, the model meets all of the FHWA validation targets for percent differences by facility type.

*Count vs. Volume Comparisons by Facility Type*

Facility Type	Model Estimate	Traffic Count	Percent	Target Percent
Freeways	305,388	328,444	7.5%	+/- 7%
Highways	59,655	44,290	-25.8%	+/- 10%
Arterials	195,535	178,987	-8.5%	+/- 15%
Collectors	20,551	15,125	-26.4%	+/- 25%
Rural Roads	195,259	189,016	-3.2%	+/- 15%
Overall	776,388	755,862	-2.6%	

*Trip-Making and Travel Patterns*

Available 2000 Census Journey-to-Work data, Caltrans 2001 Travel Survey 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.

*TCAG Model Trips by Trip Purpose*

	HBW Home Based Work	HBS Home Based Shopping	HBO Home Based Other	WO Work Other	OO Other Other	TOT Total
Caltrans Survey	14.9%	10.9%	44.0%	8.3%	21.9%	100.0%
TCAG Model	14.6%	12.0%	40.3%	8.3%	24.8%	100.0%

The Census Journey-to-Work and Caltrans 2001 Travel Survey data was used in conjunction with the Caltrans Statewide Model to incorporate new estimates of the internal-external, external-internal, and external-external county trip percents, average trip lengths by trip purpose, home-based work (HBW) trip distribution, and average vehicle occupancy rates and transit percentage assumptions.

*Statistical Fit and RMSE Estimates*

The model's coefficient of determination (R-squared value) of 0.969 for counts vs. model volumes meets the FHWA target of >0.88, indicating an acceptable fit of the observed counts to the modeled traffic volumes for the base year. Additionally, the model meets all of the FHWA % RMSE targets by facility type and by volume range, except for the lowest volume facilities.

*Count / Model Volume Comparison by Facility Type*

Facility	%RMSE	FHWA % RMSE Target
Freeways	21.3%	20%
Highways	33.3%	30%
Arterials	19.5%	35%
Collectors	35.6%	50%
Rural Roads	26.3%	50%
<b>Sum</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>30%</b>

*Count / Model Volume Comparison by Volume Range*

Volume Range	%RMSE	FHWA % RMSE Target
1-4,999	22.5%	<70%
5,000-9,999	20.3%	52%
10,000-14,999	20.1%	34%
15,000-19,999	27.2%	27%
20,000-24,999	20.0%	25%
25,000-44,999	21.5%	22%
<b>Sum</b>	<b>34%</b>	

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:*

TCAG does not currently collect peak period congested travel speeds. 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.

Future data will be obtained with survey data on free flow speeds and common practice speed flow curves.

The TCAG peak period model has been set up to estimate travel demand during three periods: AM peak 3 hours, PM peak 3 hours, and Off-Peak 18 hours. The time-of-day factors are based on information from the 2001 Caltrans travel survey and are shown below.

Trip Purpose	Percent of Daily Trips		
	Productions to Attractions	Attractions to Productions	Total
AM Peak 3-Hour Period (6:00 AM to 9:00 AM)			
Home-Work	19.4	1.9	21.3
Home-Shop	7.8	4.4	12.2
Home-Other	16.0	4.8	20.8
Work-Other	16.3	5.7	22.0
Other-Other	5.0	5.0	10.0
Through Trips	16.5	0.0	16.5
PM Peak 3-Hour Period (3:00 PM to 6:00 PM)			
Home-Work	2.1	22.0	24.1
Home-Shop	11.0	21.0	32.0
Home-Other	10.0	13.6	23.6
Work-Other	20.0	1.0	21.0
Other-Other	9.0	9.0	18.0
Through Trips	0.0	21.0	21.0
Off-Peak 18-Hour Period			
Home-Work	31.5	23.1	54.6
Home-Shop	23.5	32.3	55.8
Home-Other	24.9	30.7	55.6
Work-Other	37.1	19.9	57.0

Trip Purpose	Percent of Daily Trips		
	Productions to Attractions	Attractions to Productions	Total
Other-Other	36.0	36.0	72.0
Through Trips	31.25	31.2	62.5

Tulare County Association of Governments offered review of the model update to Caltrans, the San Joaquin Valley COG Directors Association Model Coordinating Committee, and presented several staff reports to the TCAG Board.

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:*

The percent of transit trips is small in Tulare County; however, in 2010 a mode split element was added to the model (post trip generation) to account for the percent of trips using transit, as well as walk and bike. Transit trips currently account for about 0.4 percent of all trips in Tulare County, and no major transit investments are planned that would significantly increase transit usage. The peak period model does include a separate sub-model for estimating vehicle occupancy. It also includes provisions for varying the transit usage assumptions to help evaluate the traffic effects of higher transit use.

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 (screenlines) 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.*

The TCAG regional model forecasts of VMT for the 2007 base year validation were within 5% 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. Even with the model update, the regional model is still providing consistent estimates of VMT to previous versions and the estimated VMT increased between 1998 and 2003 at the pace of population, employment, and traffic growth (~ 6%). It appears that the Caltrans estimate has grown significantly faster than population, employment, and traffic (~ 15%). This results in the current model estimate of VMT about 5.7% lower than the 2003 Caltrans estimate. Horizon year model estimates of VMT are consistent with previous versions of the model.

### 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 DRAFT 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (2011 FTIP) and the 2011 Regional Transportation Plan

(2011 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, right-of-way acquisition, 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 TPA 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 H PMS estimates of collector and local street travel.

#### D. TRAFFIC ESTIMATES

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

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

<b>Horizon Year</b>	<b>Total Population (in thousands)</b>	<b>Employment (in thousands)</b>	<b>Average Weekday VMT (millions)</b>	<b>Total Lane Miles</b>
<b>2011</b>	<b>472.54</b>	<b>193.35</b>	<b>10.40</b>	<b>NA</b>
<b>2012</b>	<b>479.06</b>	<b>196.39</b>	<b>10.53</b>	<b>NA</b>
<b>2014</b>	<b>492.12</b>	<b>202.48</b>	<b>10.83</b>	<b>NA</b>
<b>2017</b>	<b>518.15</b>	<b>212.62</b>	<b>11.79</b>	<b>NA</b>
<b>2020</b>	<b>547.42</b>	<b>223.27</b>	<b>13.02</b>	<b>5,244</b>
<b>2023</b>	<b>574.55</b>	<b>231.56</b>	<b>13.41</b>	<b>NA</b>
<b>2025</b>	<b>592.64</b>	<b>237.10</b>	<b>14.26</b>	<b>5,383</b>
<b>2035</b>	<b>700.84</b>	<b>277.87</b>	<b>17.69</b>	<b>5,663</b>

#### E. VEHICLE REGISTRATIONS

The Tulare County Association of Governments 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 EMFAC 2007 model found at [http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/onroad/latest\\_version.htm](http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/onroad/latest_version.htm). EMFAC 2007 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.

**F. 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 Ozone Plan that reduce mobile source emissions and are included in the conformity demonstration are shown in Table 2-3.

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

<b>Measure Description</b>	<b>Pollutants</b>
District Existing Indirect Source Mitigation and School Bus Fleets rules	Summer NOx
ARB existing Reflash, Idling, and Moyer	Summer ROG Summer NOx
District Proposed Employee Trip Reduction	Summer ROG Summer NOx

NOTE: While the ARB Proposed passenger and truck measures included in the Draft State Strategy were included in the 2007 Ozone Plan and conformity budgets, they are not included in the conformity analysis. EPA has indicated that these measures cannot be included, since there is no written commitment to the specific control measures contained in the SIP.

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.

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

<b>Measure Description</b>	<b>Pollutants</b>
ARB existing Reflash, Idling, and Moyer	PM-10 annual exhaust NOx annual exhaust
District Rule 8061	PM-10 paved road dust PM-10 unpaved road dust
District Rule 8021 Controls	PM-10 road construction dust

PM2.5

Committed control measures in the 2008 PM2.5 Plan that reduce mobile source emissions and are included in the conformity demonstration are shown in Table 2-5.

**Table 2-5  
 2008 PM2.5 Plan Measures Assumed in the Conformity Analysis**

Measure Description	Pollutants
ARB Adopted State and Local Measures not included in EMFAC 2007	Annual PM2.5 Annual NOx

NOTE: While the ARB 2007 State Strategy included in the Draft State Strategy was included in the 2008 PM2.5 Plan and conformity budgets, it is not included in the conformity analysis. EPA has indicated that these measures cannot be included, since there is no written commitment to the specific control measures contained in the SIP.

The PM-10 diesel exhaust emission reductions are reduced by the ARB size fraction for diesel vehicle exhaust to yield a PM2.5 diesel exhaust emission reduction. The ARB size fraction data can be accessed at <http://www.arb.ca.gov/ei/speciate/speciate.htm>. The PMSIZE link (under speciation profiles) opens a spreadsheet that contains size fractions. Row 75 of the spreadsheet specifies that the diesel exhaust fraction of PM-10 that represents PM2.5 or smaller is 0.92. This fraction was used because the approved ARB control measure in the EPA approved 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan only affects diesel vehicle exhaust. This is documented in the spreadsheet EMFAC explanation tab. The PM2.5 fraction is calculated by multiplying the PM-10 diesel exhaust fraction by the ARB size fraction 0.92.

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

The model used to estimate vehicle exhaust emissions for carbon monoxide, ozone precursors, and particulate matter is EMFAC2007. CARB emission factors for PM-10 have been used to calculate reentrained paved and unpaved road dust, and fugitive dust associated with road construction. For the Conformity Analysis, model inputs not dependent on the TIP or RTP are consistent with the applicable SIP, which include:

- The 2004 Revision to the California State Implementation Plan for Carbon Monoxide was approved by EPA on November 30, 2005 (effective January 30, 2006).
- EPA published a budget adequacy determination for the 2011, 2014, and 2017 conformity budgets contained in the 2007 Ozone Plan on January 22, 2009, effective February 6, 2009.
- The 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan, which included revisions to the attainment plan, was approved (with minor technical corrections to the conformity budgets) by EPA on November 12, 2008.
- EPA published a budget adequacy determination for the 2012 conformity budgets contained in the 2008 PM2.5 Plan on May 12, 2010, effective May 27, 2010.

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 1-5.

### **A. EMFAC2007**

The EMFAC model (short for EMISSION FACTOR) is a computer model that can estimate emission rates for motor vehicles for calendar years from 1970 to 2040 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, eight different classes of trucks, motorcycles, urban and school 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 county within air basin level. EMFAC contains default vehicle activity data that can be used to estimate a motor vehicle emission inventory in tons/day for a specific day, month, or season, and as a function of ambient temperature, relative humidity, vehicle population, mileage accrual, miles of travel and speeds.

Section 93.111 of the conformity regulation requires the use of the latest emission estimation model in the development of conformity determinations. EMFAC2007 is the latest update to the EMFAC model for use by California State and local governments to meet Clean Air Act (CAA, 1990) requirements. On January 18, 2008 EPA announced the availability of this latest version of the California EMFAC model for use in SIP development in California.

Since the transportation conformity regulation (40 CFR 93.110) requires areas to use the latest information for estimating vehicle activity, EPA approved the CARB methodology for updating the default vehicle activity data in EMFAC2002 in April 2003. CARB's methodology, "Recommended Methods for Use of EMFAC2002 to Develop Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets and Assess Conformity," explains how vehicle activity data should be updated. This methodology has not been updated for EMFAC2007, but remains applicable. The methodology explains how each parameter associated with vehicle activity was originally developed in EMFAC, how each parameter is related, and how each can be updated when new data becomes available. These relationships are important when adjusting vehicle trips or VMT (vehicle miles traveled). For example, VMT in EMFAC2007 is directly related to vehicle population and mileage accrual rate. Similarly, start and evaporative vehicle emissions are also related to vehicle population levels. If new VMT data is available, CARB suggests modifying the input vehicle population levels, instead of directly inputting new VMT data, so that start and evaporative emissions are revised appropriately. Updated vehicle activity data can also be input to EMFAC using the WIS interface.

A transportation data template has been prepared to summarize the transportation model output for use in EMFAC 2007. The template includes allocating VMT by speed bin by modeling period, as well as creating a 24-hour VMT percentage by speed bin array for input into EMFAC 2007.

EMFAC was used to estimate exhaust emissions for CO, ozone, PM-10, and PM2.5 conformity demonstrations consistent with the applicable air quality plan. These estimates are further reduced by SIP measures as documented in Chapter 2.

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

PM-10 emissions for reentrained 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**

The core methodology for estimating paved road dust emissions is based on the algorithm published in the 5th Edition of AP-42 (U.S. EPA) (<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ap42/ch13/>). CARB default assumptions for roadway silt loading by roadway class, rainfall correction factor average vehicle weight 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 NO<sub>x</sub> 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. PM<sub>2.5</sub> APPROACH**

1997 Standard - EPA and FHWA have indicated that areas violating both the annual and 24-hour standards for PM<sub>2.5</sub> must address both standards in the conformity determination. The San Joaquin Valley currently violates both standards, and the conformity determination includes both analyses.

EPA issued guidance for creating annual on-road mobile source emission inventories for PM<sub>2.5</sub> in August 2005 (EPA, 2005b). The guidance indicates that all areas currently designated nonattainment for PM<sub>2.5</sub> are violating the annual standard for the pollutant. Therefore, in order to be consistent with the standard, PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment areas must develop annual emission inventories for the purpose of developing SIP budgets and demonstrating transportation conformity.

2006 Standard – EPA published 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard Nonattainment area designations on November 13, 2009 with an effective date of December 14, 2009. Conformity to the 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard will apply December 14, 2010. The 1997 standards will continue to apply as they were not revoked. 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 standard.

The following PM<sub>2.5</sub> approach addresses both the 1997 standards and the 2006 24-hour standard

EMFAC2007 includes data for temperature, relative humidity, and characteristics for gasoline fuel sold that vary by geographic area, calendar year, and month and season. The annual average represents an average of all the monthly inventories. As a result, EMFAC will be run to estimate direct PM<sub>2.5</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub> from motor vehicles for an annual average day that will provide the information for both the annual and 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> standards.

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 the same 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 EMFAC2007 represent the most accurate 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.

It is important to note that the San Joaquin Valley 2008 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan has been developed and submitted to EPA. The annual inventory methodology contained in the plan and used to establish emissions budgets is consistent with the methodology used herein. 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 EMFAC2007.

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, NOx emissions are included; however, VOC, SOx, and ammonia emissions are not.

1997 Standard – The 2008 PM2.5 Plan contains motor vehicle emission budgets for PM2.5 and NOx established based on average annual daily emissions. 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.

2006 Standard – In accordance with Transportation Conformity Rule PM2.5 and PM10 Amendments published on March 24, 2010 (effective April 23, 2010) for 2006 PM2.5 NAAQS Nonattainment areas, if a 2006 PM2.5 area has adequate or approved SIP budgets that address the 1997 standards, it must use the budget test to determine conformity for both of the NAAQS at the same time.

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

Step-by-step air quality modeling procedures, including instructions, references and controls, for the Conformity Analysis were provided for Interagency Consultation and reviewed at an Interagency Consultation Workshop; no comments were received and concurrence was received from EPA, CARB, and the Air District. In addition, documentation of the conformity analysis is provided in Appendix C, including:

- 2011 adjust\_vmt Spreadsheet
- 2011 Conformity EMFAC Spreadsheet
- 2011 Conformity Paved Road Spreadsheet
- 2011 Conformity Unpaved Road Dust Spreadsheet
- 2011 Conformity Construction Spreadsheet
- 2011 Conformity Trading Spreadsheet
- 2011 Conformity Totals 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 of 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 the 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 only applicable ozone plan is the *1994 Ozone Attainment Demonstration Plan* and the *Revised 1996 Rate of Progress Plan*.

The transportation control measures contained in the *1994 Ozone Attainment Demonstration* are not clearly delineated. Both transportation control measures and mobile source measures are discussed under the heading of transportation control measures. The Attainment Demonstration specifically includes Rule 9001 – Commute Based Trip Reduction; however, this rule was never approved by EPA as part of the SIP. In addition, the Revised 1996 Rate of Progress Plan specifically identifies TCMs committed for implementation from 1990 through 1996. The commitments are listed within the following TCM categories:

- TCM1 – Traffic Flow Improvements
- TCM2 – Public Transit
- TCM3 – Rideshare Programs (Rule 9001)
- TCM4 – Bicycle Programs
- TCM5 – Alternative Fuels Program

Most of the TCMs in the plans were implemented in the short term, and have been fully implemented. As a result, any resulting credible emission reduction benefits have been

incorporated into the traffic forecasts for the region. However, the TIP/RTP provides continued funding for transportation projects that support TCM programs (e.g., traffic flow improvements, public transit, rideshare programs, and bicycle programs). In addition, voluntary implementation of Rule 9001 (Employee Commute Options) is ongoing even though the Rule was not approved by EPA and cannot be implemented as a mandatory program under SB437.

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

The 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan was approved by EPA on November 12, 2008. No new local agency control measures were included in the Plan.

The Amended 2003 PM-10 Plan was approved by EPA on April 28, 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. Accordingly, they will be tracked for timely implementation through 2010.

### **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 ("combined") 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 (e.g., 8-hour, PM2.5, 2007 and 2009 TIP). 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. The 2002 RACM TID Table has been updated 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, the Tulare County Association of Governments undertook a process to identify and evaluate potential control measures that could be included in the 2011 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 2011 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).

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. Tulare County Association of Governments 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 adopted since 2007. New PM-10

plans were developed for Imperial County and Owens Valley (California), Maricopa County and Miami (Arizona), and the Municipality of Guaynabo (Puerto Rico).

Only the Maricopa County PM-10 plan contained any new measures for possible inclusion in the 2011 RTP. In December 2007, the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) developed the "Five Percent Plan for PM-10 for the Maricopa County Nonattainment Area," which contained commitments to reduce PM-10 emissions. The MAG PM-10 Plan contains one new commitment applicable to the San Joaquin Valley, which indicates that the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) would commit to repaving or overlaying paved roads with rubberized asphalt that reduces PM-10 emissions by reducing vehicle tire wear. Overlaying freeways with rubberized asphalt is part of ADOT's "Quiet Pavement" program to mitigate highway noise. Rubberized asphalt also affects PM-10 emissions, as PM-10 emissions rates from tire wear on rubberized asphalt are 30 to 50 percent lower than on Portland Cement Concrete. Therefore, the ADOT program continues with multiple purposes, which are to reduce PM-10 emissions and to mitigate noise. Therefore, as part of the 2011 RTP, Tulare County Association of Governments will also consider a commitment to "Repave or overlay paved roads with rubberized asphalt".

Based on consultation with CARB and the Air District, Tulare County Association of Governments considered priority funding allocations in the 2011 RTPs 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 is utilized by TCAG to fund projects for implementation of measures 1-3 above. The use of rubberized asphalt is at the discretion of the agencies responsible for specific overlay projects; various funding sources, including local measure money, have been and may continue to be utilized for implementation of measure four.

## **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 interagency consultation process for the 2011 TIP, RTP, CEQA document, and corresponding Conformity Analysis began on the May 28, 2009 IAC conference call with a discussion of the timeline and approach. CEQA status reports were discussed, as well as the

requirements and outline of approach to address AB 32 and SB 375. In September 2009, it was reported that the Director recommended approach to address AB 32 / SB 375 was distributed for IAC and then presented to Policy Council in June; no questions or comments were received). In December 2009, it was reported that the PM Control Measure task and CMAQ tasks were completed. The former involved, identifying potential long-term PM-10 Control Measures that must be evaluated as part of the RTP. A summary was provided for IAC prior to application by the MPOs; no substantive comments were received. The latter involved a review of the CMAQ policy and cost-effectiveness threshold. No updates to the policy were recommended and the existing threshold was maintained. A summary was provided for IAC prior to application by the MPOs; concurrence was received from the Air District, EPA, and FHWA.

In March 2010, it was reported that the Draft Transportation Model Summary & Latest Planning Assumptions were transmitted for IAC and concurrence was received from FHWA & EPA. In addition, the Draft Conformity Analysis Years were transmitted for IAC and concurrence was received from FHWA & EPA. The Draft Conformity Procedures were also transmitted for IAC and concurrence from EPA, CARB & Air District was received.

The SJV MPOs committed to a more coordinated approach and improved documentation valley-wide for the development of the 2011 TIP/RTP in response to meetings with Caltrans and FHWA. Conducting workshops to review the status of document development, including best practices and discussion of issues that need to be addressed was part of that commitment. The first workshop was conducted in August 2009. Topics generally included: schedule, CEQA document development, RTP Performance Evaluation, RTP Revenue & Cost Analysis, and Congestion Management Process (CMP) Updates. A second workshop was conducted in February 2010. At this workshop, roundtable discussions were conducted with Caltrans and FHWA to review the individual MPO Draft TIP and RTP project lists. Transportation conformity was reviewed, including latest planning assumptions, procedures, and analysis years. Individual MPO public outreach efforts were also discussed.

The Draft 2011 TIP, RTP, CEQA document, and corresponding Conformity Analysis were released on April 30, 2010 for a 45-day public comment period, followed by Board adoption in July 2010. Federal approval of the 2011 TIP and Conformity Analysis is anticipated by December 14, 2010.

Interagency consultation also includes the distribution of materials to local agencies and transit providers. Local agencies include the Cities of Dinuba, Exeter, Farmersville, Lindsay, Porterville, Tulare, Visalia and Woodlake, Tulare County and the Tule River Indian Tribe. The Tulare County Association of Governments Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the TCAG Board meet monthly to discuss transportation issues. The TAC includes representatives from all local agencies, including transit providers. The Draft 2011 RTP has been regularly discussed at monthly TAC and Board meetings since the fall of 2009. The Draft 2011 TIP, RTP, CEQA document, and corresponding Conformity Analysis will be included as part of the agenda for the May 2010 TAC and TCAG Board meetings.

## **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 TIPs/RTPs. In addition, all public comments must be addressed in writing.

All MPOs in the San Joaquin Valley have standard public involvement procedures. In general, the TIP/RTP and corresponding conformity analysis are the subject of a public notice and 30 day review period prior to adoption. However, the comment period for this conformity analysis was 45 days concurrent with the public review of the Draft 2011 TIP and RTP, and associated CEQA documents. 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 8-hour ozone (ROG and NO<sub>x</sub>), PM-10 and PM2.5. 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.

For ozone, the applicable conformity test is the emissions budget test, using the 2007 Ozone Plan budgets established for ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> for an average summer (ozone) season day. EPA published a budget adequacy determination for the 2011, 2014, and 2017 conformity budgets in the Federal Register on January 22, 2009, effective February 6, 2009. 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.

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 was approved (with minor technical corrections to the conformity budgets) by EPA on November 12, 2008. 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 Standards: For PM2.5, the applicable conformity test is the emission budget test, using budgets established in the 2008 PM2.5 Plan. EPA published a budget adequacy determination for

the 2012 conformity budget contained in the 2008 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan May 12, 2010, effective May 27, 2010. The modeling results for all analysis years indicate that the on-road vehicle PM<sub>2.5</sub> 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 PM<sub>2.5</sub> and nitrogen oxides.

**2006 Standard:** In accordance with Transportation Conformity Rule PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> Amendments published on March 24, 2010 (effective April 23, 2010) for 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS Nonattainment areas, if a 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> area has adequate or approved SIP budgets that address the 1997 standards, it must use the budget test. For PM<sub>2.5</sub>, the applicable conformity test is the emission budget test, using budgets established in the 2008 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan. EPA published a budget adequacy determination for the 2012 conformity budget contained in the 2008 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Plan May 12, 2010, effective May 27, 2010. The modeling results for all analysis years indicate that the on-road vehicle PM<sub>2.5</sub> 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 PM<sub>2.5</sub> and nitrogen oxides.

As all requirements of the Transportation Conformity regulation have been satisfied, a finding of conformity for the Draft 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program and the 2011 Regional Transportation Plan is supported.

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

**2011 Conformity Results Summary -- TULARE**

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?	
		ROG (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	ROG	NOx
Ozone	2011 Budget	9.2	20.9		
	2011	8.0	17.9	YES	YES
	2014 Budget	7.7	16.6		
	2014	6.4	13.6	YES	YES
	2017 Budget	6.7	13.1		
	2017	5.6	10.9	YES	YES
	2023	4.5	7.5	YES	YES
	2025	4.4	7.0	YES	YES
	2035	3.7	6.4	YES	YES

Pollutant	Scenario	PM-10 (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	PM-10	NOx
PM-10	2020 Budget	9.4	10.9		
	2020	8.6	9.4	YES	YES
	2020 Budget	9.4	10.9		
	2025	9.3	7.2	YES	YES
	Adjusted 2020 Budget	10.8	8.8		
	2035	10.8	6.5	YES	YES

Pollutant	Scenario	PM2.5 (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	PM2.5	NOx
1997 PM2.5 24-Hour & Annual Standards and 2006 24-Hour Standard	2012 Budget	0.8	19.5		
	2012	0.6	16.4	YES	YES
	2014	0.6	13.6	YES	YES
	2017	0.5	10.9	YES	YES
	2025	0.5	6.9	YES	YES
	2035	0.6	6.2	YES	YES

## 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. 40 CFR Part 93. *Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments for the New 8-hour Ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standards and Miscellaneous Revisions for Existing Areas; Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments – Response to Court Decision and Additional Rule Changes*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Federal Register, July 1, 2004, Vol. 69, No. 126, p. 40004.
- EPA. 2004b. *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. 2005a. *Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments for the New PM<sub>2.5</sub> National Ambient Air Quality Standards: PM<sub>2.5</sub> Precursors; Final Rule*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Federal Register, May 6, 2005, Vol. 70, No. 87, p. 24280.
- EPA. 2005b. *Guidance for Creating Annual On-Road Mobile Source Emission Inventories for PM<sub>2.5</sub> Nonattainment Areas for Use in SIPs and Conformity*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. EPA420-B-05-008. August 2005
- EPA, 2008. 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93. *Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments To Implement Provisions Contained in the 2005 Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU); Final Rule*. Federal Register, January 24, 2008, Vol. 73, No. 16, p. 4420.
- 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.
- 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

## FHWA Checklist for MPO TIPs/RTPs

June 27, 2005

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.	Ch. 1 Pg. 9	
§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.	E.S. Pg. 1	
§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 (a)(2)ii	Describe the regionally significant additions or modifications to the existing transportation network that are expected to be open to traffic in each analysis year. 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.	Ch. 2, App. B Pgs. 21-22	
§93.108	Document that the TIP/RTP is financially constrained (23 CFR 450).	E.S. Pg. 1	
§93.109 (a, b)	Document that the TIP/RTP complies with any applicable conformity requirements of air quality implementation plans (SIPs) and court orders.	Ch. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	
§93.109 (c-k)	Provide either a table or text description that details, for each pollutant and precursor, whether the interim emissions tests 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.	Ch. 1 Pgs. 16-18	
§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.	Ch. 2	
USDOT/EP A guidance	Document the use of planning assumptions less than five years old. If unable, include written justification for the use of older data. (1/18/02)	Ch. 2 Pg. 20	
§93.110 (c,d,e,f)	Document 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. Document the use of the latest information on the	Ch. 2 Pg. 26	

40 CFR	Criteria	Page	Comments
	effectiveness of TCMs and other SIP measures that have been implemented. Document the key assumptions and show that they were agreed to through Interagency and public consultation.		
§93.111	Document the use of the latest emissions model approved by EPA.	Ch. 3 Pgs. 32-33	
§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.	Ch. 5 Pgs. 46-47	
§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 implementation. Document any delayed TCMs in the applicable SIP and describe the measures being taken to overcome obstacles to implementation.	Ch. 4, App. E Pgs. 38-40	
§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	
§93.118 (a, c, e) <sup>i</sup>	<u>For areas with SIP budgets:</u> Document that emissions from the transportation network for each applicable pollutant and precursor, including projects in any associated donut area that are in the Statewide 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.	Ch. 6 Pgs. 48-50	
§93.118 (b)	Document for which years consistency with motor vehicle emissions budgets must be shown.	Ch. 1 Pg. 18	
§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.	Ch. 6 Pg. 50	
§93.119 <sup>1</sup>	<u>For areas without applicable SIP budgets:</u> Document that emissions from the transportation network for each applicable pollutant and precursor, including projects in any associated donut area that are in the Statewide TIP and regionally significant non-Federal projects, are consistent with the requirements of the “Action/Baseline”, “Action/1990” and/or “Action/2002” interim emissions tests as applicable.	Ch. 6 Pgs. 48-50	
§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	
§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	N/A	

40 CFR	Criteria	Page	Comments
	project, identify by which analysis it will be open to traffic. Document that VMT for non-regionally significant Federal projects is accounted for in the regional emissions analysis		
§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. 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.	Ch. 2 Pg. 29-31	
§93.122 (a)(4,5,6)	For nonregulatory measures that are not included in the STIP, include written commitments from appropriate agencies. Document that assumptions for measures outside the transportation system (e.g. fuels measures) are the same for baseline and action scenarios. Document that factors such as ambient temperature are consistent with those used in the SIP unless modified through interagency consultation.	N/A	
§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 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.).	Ch. 2 Pgs. 19-29	
§93.122 (b)(1)(ii) <sup>2</sup>	Document the land use, population, employment, and other network-based travel model assumptions.	Ch. 2 Pgs. 21-22	
§93.122 (b)(1)(iii) <sup>2</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.	Ch. 2 Pg. 22	
§93.122 (b)(1)(iv) <sup>2</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.	Ch. 2 Pgs. 25-26	
§93.122 (b)(1)(v) <sup>2</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.	Ch. 2 Pgs. 21-22	
§93.122 (b)(1)(vi) <sup>2</sup>	Document how travel models are reasonably sensitive to changes in time, cost, and other factors affecting travel choices.	Ch. 2 Pg. 25	
§93.122 (b)(2) <sup>2</sup>	Document that reasonable methods were used to estimate traffic speeds and delays in a manner	Ch. 2 Pg. 27	

40 CFR	Criteria	Page	Comments
	sensitive to the estimated volume of travel on each roadway segment represented in the travel model.		
§93.122 (b)(3) <sup>2</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.	Ch. 2 Pg. 27	
§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	Ch. 2	
§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.	Ch. 3	
§93.122 (g)	If appropriate, document that the conformity determination relies on a previous regional emissions analysis and is consistent with that analysis.	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.	Ch. 2, App B	

<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

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. **Document #46711**

**APPENDIX B**

**TRANSPORTATION PROJECT LISTING**

## Regionally Significant Projects

Jurisdiction/Agency	TIP/RTP Project ID	CTIPs Project ID (if available)	Description			Estimated Cost	Conformity Analysis Year (project open to traffic)							
			Facility		Project Limits		2011	2012	2014	2017	2020	2023	2025	2035
			Type of Improvement	Name/Route										
Caltrans	TUL00-104	1150000073	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	SR 65	15.1/18.0 Porterville - Ave 120 to Rte 190	\$29,730				X	X	X	X	X
Caltrans	TUL00-104	1150000073	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	SR 65	10.9/15.6 Terra Bella - Ave 80 to Ave 124	\$58,558							X	X
Caltrans	TUL00-104	1150000073	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	SR 65	6.1/11.4 Ducor - Orris UP to Ave 95	\$63,658								X
Caltrans	CT-RTP07-001	NA	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	SR 65	0.0/6.6 County Line to Ave 56	\$111,170								X
Caltrans C	T-RTP11-005	1150000075	Construct 2 ln exwy on 4 ln alignment	SR 65	36.8/39.3 Near Exeter-Spruce from Rocky Hill Dr to Ave 300	\$50,219								X
Caltrans C	T-RTP11-004	1150000075	Construct 2 ln exwy on 4 ln alignment	SR 65	35.3/36.8 Near Exter-Spruce from ave 268 to Rocky Hill Dr	\$28,711								X
Caltrans C	T-RTP07-002	1150000075	Construct 2 ln exwy on 4 ln alignment	SR 65	32.3/35.3 Near Exeter-Spruce from Ave 244 to Ave 268	\$53,790								X
Caltrans C	T-RTP11-001	1150000075	Construct 2 ln exwy on 4 ln alignment	SR 65	29.5/32.3 Near Lindsay-Spruce from Hermosa Rd to Ave 244	\$35,401				X	X	X	X	X
Caltrans	TUL02-121	1150000083	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	SR 99	41.3/53.9 0.0/1.6 Tul Co - Goshen OH to Fre Co - Rte 201	\$172,824			X	X	X	X	X	X
Caltrans	TUL08-107	1150000151	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	SR 99	37.3/41.3 Visalia - .9m S of W Visalia OH to Goshen Overhead	\$59,899				X	X	X	X	X
Caltrans	TUL08-107	1150000151	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	SR 99	30.6/37.3 Tulare/Tagus - Prosperity Ave to .9m S of W Visalia OH	\$224,960						X	X	X
Caltrans	CT-RTP07-004	NA	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	SR 99	25.5/30.6 Tulare - Avenue 200 to Prosperity Ave	\$238,867								X
Caltrans	CT-RTP07-005	NA	Widen from 4 to 6 lanes	SR 99	16.0/25.5 South of Tipton to Avenue 200	\$161,057								X
Caltrans	CT-RTP07-008	NA	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	SR 190	0.2/15.0 Tipton/Porterville - Rte 65 to Rte 99	\$120,566								X
Caltrans	TUL00-120	1150000028	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes*	SR 198	21.5/28.3 0.0/3.3 Kings Co - Rte 43 to Tulare Co - Rte 99	\$120,007	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Caltrans	TUL08-111	1150000077	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	SR 216 (Houston)	1.9/2.9 Visalia - Lovers Ln to McAuliff St	\$11,000			X	X	X	X	X	X
Caltrans	CT-RTP11-002	NA	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	SR 216 (Houston)	Rd 144 to Rd 148; 0.5 mi.	\$7,275				X	X	X	X	X
Caltrans	CT-RTP11-003	NA	Widen from 2 to 4 lanes	SR 216 (Houston)	Rd 148 to Rd 152; 0.5 mi.	\$5,931								X
Caltrans T	UL08-100	2150000425	Widen on/off ramps and bridge structure	SR 99	SR-99 at Betty Drive	\$58,265				X	X	X	X	X
Caltrans C	T-RTP07-011	NA	Widen on/off ramps and bridge structure	SR 99	SR-99 at Caldwell Avenue	\$85,880								X
Caltrans T	UL08-402	2150000429	Widen on/off ramps and bridge structure	SR 99	SR-99 at Cartmill Avenue	\$68,650			X	X	X	X	X	X





Federally Funded Non-Regionally Significant Projects

No projects.

Exempt Projects

Jurisdiction/ Agency	TIP/RTP Project ID	CTIPs Project ID (if available)	Description	Estimated Cost	Exemption Code (per CTIPs)
City of Porterville	TUL06-250	21500000323	4 30-passenger CNG buses	\$1,898,000	2.05
City of Porterville	TUL06-251	21500000324	2 5-passenger vans	\$95,000	2.05
City of Porterville	TUL06-252	21500000325	Purchase/install bus stop signs and poles	\$12,000	2.04
City of Porterville	TUL06-254	21500000327	Install bus turn-outs	\$451,000	2.08
City of Porterville	TUL06-259	21500000347	Transit operation for Porterville COLT	\$2,400,000	2.01
City of Porterville	TUL09-250	21500000457	Signal Preemption Devices	\$83,000	2.04
City of Porterville	TUL06-253	21500000362	Purchase shelters and benches for bus stops	\$47,000	2.04
City of Dinuba	TUL08-015	21500000408	Expansion of Existing CNG fueling station	\$345,000	4.12
City of Farmersville	TUL08-016	21500000409	Purchase of PM10 street sweeper	\$299,000	4.01
City of Lindsay	TUL08-010	21500000403	Shoulder stabilization	\$403,000	1.04
City of Lindsay	TUL08-018	21500000411	Purchase of 3 T3 vehicles	\$27,000	4.01
City of Lindsay	TUL08-019	21500000412	Purchase 4 electric passenger cars	\$36,000	4.01
City of Lindsay	TUL08-028	21500000421	Shoulder stabilization	\$551,000	1.04
Tulare County	TUL08-013	21500000406	Purchase Diesel Retrofit Traps	\$286,000	4.01
Tulare County	TUL08-027	21500000420	Signal Construction	\$425,000	5.02
Tulare County Redevelopment	TUL08-017	21500000410	Purchase Street Sweeper	\$170,000	4.01
City of Tulare	TUL08-011	21500000404	Shoulder stabilization	\$125,000	1.04
City of Tulare	TUL08-012	21500000405	Shoulder stabilization	\$166,000	1.04
City of Tulare	TUL08-029	21500000422	Shoulder stabilization	\$85,000	1.04
City of Tulare	TUL08-030	21500000423	Shoulder stabilization	\$125,000	1.04
City of Visalia	TUL08-022	21500000415	Construct Bike Path	\$400,000	3.02
City of Porterville	TUL06-045	21500000298	Purchase 4 CNG on-road trash trucks	\$1,060,000	4.01
City of Visalia	TUL08-023	21500000416	Construct Bike Path	\$600,000	3.02
City of Visalia	TUL08-024	21500000417	Construct Bike Path	\$700,000	3.02
City of Visalia	TUL08-025	21500000418	Signal Construction	\$300,000	5.02
City of Visalia	TUL08-026	21500000419	Signal Construction	\$300,000	5.02
City of Visalia	TUL08-031	21500000424	Purchase 5 CNG refuse trucks	\$1,858,000	4.01
City of Visalia	TUL06-032	21500000286	Purchase 2 gas/electric hybrids	\$56,000	4.01
City of Woodlake	TUL08-021	21500000414	Shoulder stabilization	\$175,000	4.01
Visalia City Coach	TUL08-020	21500000413	Purchase 6 CNG buses	\$720,000	2.10

Exempt Projects

Jurisdiction/ Agency	TIP/RTP Project ID	CTIPs Project ID (if available)	Description	Estimated Cost	Exemption Code (per CTIPs)
City of Visalia	TUL08-014	21500000407	New bus service	\$1,020,000	2.01
FHWA	TUL08-300	21500000401	Rehabilitation on Generals Highway	\$13,150,000	1.10
FHWA	TUL09-302	21500000449	Sequoia Kings Canyon Natl. Park- Generals Highway-Halstead Meadow Bridge	\$5,034,000	1.19
FHWA	TUL09-304	21500000451	Sequoia Kings Canyon Natl. Park- General Highway- 4R	\$6,261,000	1.10
FHWA	TUL09-303	21500000450	Sequoia Kings Canyon Natl. Park- Kings River Bridge	\$150,000	1.19
City of Lindsay	TUL06-103	21500000352	Pedestrian plaza	\$224,000	3.02
City of Visalia	TUL06-100	21500000349	Construct bicycle path	\$357,000	3.02
City of Visalia	TUL06-102	21500000351	Pedestrian corridor enhancements	\$197,000	3.02
Tulare County	TUL08-502	21500000439	Install 2 Flashing Solar Beacons in Strathmore	\$309,000	1.06
City of Visalia	TUL08-503	21500000440	SRTS Along North side of Tulare Ave.	\$319,000	1.06
City of Tulare	TUL08-500	21500000437	Install in-pavement crosswalk lights	\$78,000	1.06
City of Dinuba	TUL06-215	21500000333	Operating assistance	\$240,000	2.01
City of Tulare	TUL06-217	21500000335	Operating assistance	\$136,000	2.01
City of Tulare	TUL06-218	21500000336	Operating assistance	\$620,000	2.01
Caltrans	TUL07-170	21500000381	SHOPP- Collision Reduction	\$2,667,000	1.06
Caltrans	TUL07-171	21500000382	SHOPP- Roadside Preservation	\$12,395,000	1.06
Caltrans	TUL07-172	21500000383	SHOPP- Roadway Preservation	\$14,059,000	1.06
Visalia	TUL10-003	21500000506	Purchase Six (6) Dial-a-Ride Buses	\$614,000	2.10
Visalia	TUL10-004	21500000507	Signal Synchronization on Whitendale from Akers to Cnty Cntr	\$47,000	5.07
Visalia	TUL10-005	21500000508	Signal Synchronization on Mineral King from West to Giddings	\$35,000	5.07
Visalia	TUL10-006	21500000509	Signal Synchronization on Akers from Tulare to Whitendale	\$71,000	5.07
Tulare	TUL10-007	21500000510	Signal Optimization along Bardsley, Cross, and Blackston/Hillman	\$98,000	5.07
Tulare	TUL10-008	21500000511	Downtown Tulare Traffic Signal Coordination	\$200,000	5.07
Woodlake	TUL10-009	21500000512	Shoulder Stabilization on Ave. 204 (Blair Rd.)	\$150,000	1.04
Dinuba	TUL10-010	21500000513	Signal Synchronization along Alta Avenue (Rd. 80)	\$430,000	5.07
Exeter	TUL10-011	21500000514	Purchase One (1) PM10 Street Sweeper	\$312,000	4.01
Lindsay	TUL10-012	21500000515	Roundabout at Hermosa and Westwood	\$732,000	1.07
Kings River UESD	TUL10-020	21500000523	Purchase One (1) Cleaner Burning Diesel School Bus	\$144,000	2.10

Exempt Projects

Jurisdiction/ Agency	TIP/RTP Project ID	CTIPs Project ID (if available)	Description	Estimated Cost	Exemption Code (per CTIPs)
VUSD	TUL10-021	21500000524	Equip Four (4) Heavy Duty Trucks with PM Filters	\$77,000	4.01
Tulare County	TUL10-013	21500000516	Repower Three (3) Off-Road Construction Engines (Dozers)	\$318,000	4.01
Porterville	TUL10-029	21500000532	Newcomb St. Shoulder Stabilization between Roby and Olive Aves.	\$710,000	1.04
Porterville	TUL10-015	21500000518	Morton Ave. Shoulder Stabilization	\$292,000	1.04
Porterville	TUL10-016	21500000519	Matthew Street shoulder Stabilization	\$130,000	1.04
Porterville	TUL10-017	21500000520	Purchase PM10 Street Sweeper	\$265,000	4.01
Porterville	TUL10-018	21500000521	Indiana St Stabilization (Tule River to midway between Devon and Roby)	\$224,000	1.04
Porterville	TUL10-002	21500000505	Construct Class 1 Bike Trail from Olive Ave to Heritage Center	\$105,000	3.02
Porterville	TUL10-019	21500000522	Purchase One (1) CNG Dump Truck	\$135,000	4.01
Visalia	TUL10-022	21500000525	Signal Synchronization on Demaree from Mill Creek to Riggins	\$635,000	5.07
Visalia	TUL10-023	21500000526	Modoc Ditch Bike Path from Giddings to Dinuba Blvd.	\$100,000	3.02
Farmersville	TUL10-024	21500000527	Roundabout at Noble Ave. and N. Farmersville Blvd.	\$800,000	1.07
Tulare County	TUL10-025	21500000528	Shoulder Stabilization- Poplar	\$1,466,000	1.04
Porterville	TUL10-026	21500000529	Purchase Four (4) CNG Refuse Trucks	\$1,080,000	4.01
Tulare County	TUL10-027	21500000530	Repower Five (5) Off-Road Construction Engines (Mixers and Water Tanker)	\$531,000	4.01
Tulare County	TUL10-028	21500000531	Repower Two (2) Off-Road Construction Engines (Graders)	\$89,000	4.01
Porterville	TUL10-014	21500000517	Newcomb Street Shoulder Stabilization Between Roby and Ropes Aves.	\$710,000	1.04
Visalia	TUL10-001	21500000502	Shannon Parkway Bike Path	\$187,000	3.02
Porterville	TUL10-251	21500000490	Transit Center Expansion	\$485,000	2.08
Porterville	TUL10-252	21500000491	Bus Maintenance Facility Expansion	\$811,000	2.08
Visalia	TUL10-277	21500000346	Operating assistance	\$5,538,000	2.01
Visalia	TUL10-278	21500000348	Purchase 15 Bus Shelters	\$68,000	2.07

Exempt Projects

Jurisdiction/ Agency	TIP/RTP Project ID	CTIPs Project ID (if available)	Description	Estimated Cost	Exemption Code (per CTIPs)
Porterville Sheltered Workshop	TUL10-210	21500000465	Four Type III Transit Buses	\$260,000	2.05
Porterville Sheltered Workshop	TUL10-211	21500000466	Two Type VII Transit Buses	\$190,000	2.05
Porterville Sheltered Workshop	TUL10-212	21500000467	Scheduling Software	\$40,000	2.04
Dinuba	TUL08-202	21500000443	One 24 Passenger CNG Bus	\$141,000	2.05
Dinuba	TUL09-225	21500000468	Transit Center	\$1,055,000	2.11
Dinuba	TUL09-215	21500000471	Operations	\$350,000	2.01
Dinuba	TUL10-201	21500000493	Purchase One CNG Trolley	\$250,000	2.05
Tulare County	TUL06-200	21500000307	Purchase One 22 Passenger CNG Bus	\$180,000	2.10
Tulare County	TUL09-217	21500000473	Operations	\$290,000	2.01
Tulare County	TUL10-202	21500000494	Purchase 2 CNG or gas 30 Passenger Buses	\$360,000	2.05
Tulare	TUL09-216	21500000472	Operations	\$1,152,000	2.01
Tulare	TUL10-020	21500000492	Purchase Two 33 Passenger buses	\$830,000	2.05
TCRA	TUL08-900	21500000434	Betty Drive Grade Separation	\$24,425,000	1.01
Tulare	TUL08-901	21500000435	Cartmill Ave. Overcrossing	\$22,949,000	1.01
Tulare	TUL08-902	21500000441	Bardsley Ave. Overcrossing	\$12,248,000	1.01
Woodlake	TUL06-212	21500000316	Operating assistance	\$55,000	2.01
Woodlake	TUL09-218	21500000474	Purchase One 16 passenger bus	\$100,000	2.01
FHWA	TUL02-022	21500000087	Cow Mountain Road	\$6,000	1.02
FHWA	TUL02-023	21500000088	Water Tank and Casino Road	\$10,000	1.02
VCC	TUL08-201	21500000400	Regional Transit Information Call Center	\$406,000	4.01
VCC	TUL10-250	21500000486	Construction of Shuttle Visitors Center	\$3,500,000	2.05
Porterville	TUL10-903	21500000499	Roundabout at Jaye and Montgomery	\$1,260,000	5.01
Various	TUL10-900	21500000496	Road Rehabilitation	\$6,548,000	1.10
Visalia	TUL10-901	21500000497	Walnut/Mooney Intersection Improvements	\$1,200,000	5.02
Visalia	TUL10-902	21500000498	Whitendale/Mooney Intersection Improvements	\$1,300,000	5.02
Tulare County	TUL08-203	21500000444	Install Signal at Rd. 156 and Ave. 295	\$337,000	1.06
Tulare County	TUL10-140	21500000481	Install Signal and upgrade intersection at Ave. 256	\$2,069,000	5.02
Tulare County	TUL10-141	21500000482	Install Signal at Ave. 148 and Rd. 256	\$484,000	5.02
Tulare County	TUL10-142	21500000484	Install Signal at SR 190 and Road 284	\$1,864,000	5.02
Visalia	TUL10-143	21500000485	Install Signal at Mooney Blvd/Goshen Ave.	\$347,000	5.02
Caltrans	TUL10-175	21500000501	SHOPP Lump Sum	\$25,462,000	1.10
TCAG	TUL10-152	21500000533	Santa Fe Trail Connection	\$1,900,000	3.02
Tulare	TUL10-150	21500000495	Santa Fe Trail Lighting	\$448,000	1.18
Tulare	TUL10-151	21500000500	Install in-pavement crosswalk lights	\$118,000	1.08
Visalia	TUL04-154	21500000227	Construct Trail along South Side of Packwood Creek	\$1,000	3.02
Visalia	TUL04-160	21500000240	Santa Fe Bike Path	\$1,000	3.02

**APPENDIX C**  
**CONFORMITY ANALYSIS DOCUMENTATION**

- 2011 adjust\_vmt Spreadsheet

Tulare

Variable	Source	Analysis Year							
		2011	2012	2014	2017	2020	2023	2025	2035
EDP	EMFAC 2007	334,674	341,195	354,620	375,757	398,155	423,251	440,854	539,465
EVMT	EMFAC 2007	11,577,100	11,818,260	12,318,438	13,069,687	13,827,414	14,682,876	15,279,495	18,701,054
MVMT	TPA Model	10,397,666	10,529,667	10,817,463	11,810,924	12,998,737	13,383,856	14,229,035	17,663,718
N	Calculated	300,579	303,993	311,410	339,567	374,294	385,805	410,545	509,541

N = New Population  
 EDP = EMFAC Default Population  
 MVMT = Modeled VMT  
 EVMT = EMFAC Default VMT

- 2011 Conformity EMFAC Spreadsheet

**EMFAC Emissions (tons/day)**

**TULARE**

<u>Pollutant</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u>Description</u>						
Ozone	EMFAC 2007 (Summer Run)	ROG Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)	8.03	6.48	5.68	4.61	4.47	
	District Existing Local Reductions	Indirect Source Mitigation and School Bus Fleet rules	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	ARB Existing Local Reductions	Relfash, Idling, and Moyer	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	
	District New/Proposed Local Reductions	Employee Trip Reduction	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.08	
	ARB New/Proposed State Reductions	Passenger and Truck Measures included in the Draft State Strategy	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	<b>Conformity Total</b>			<b>7.95</b>	<b>6.40</b>	<b>5.60</b>	<b>4.53</b>	<b>4.39</b>
Ozone	EMFAC 2007 (Summer Run)	NOx Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)	19.42	14.88	12.15	8.66	8.23	
	District Existing Local Reductions	Indirect Source Mitigation and School Bus Fleet rules	0.19	0.11	0.17	0.15	0.15	
	ARB Existing Local Reductions	Relfash, Idling, and Moyer	1.32	1.18	1.08	1.01	1.01	
	District New/Proposed Local Reductions	Employee Trip Reduction	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	
	ARB New/Proposed State Reductions	Passenger and Truck Measures included in the Draft State Strategy	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	<b>Conformity Total</b>			<b>17.88</b>	<b>13.56</b>	<b>10.87</b>	<b>7.47</b>	<b>7.04</b>
PM-10	EMFAC 2007 (Annual Run)	PM-10 Total (All Vehicles Total) * includes tire & brake wear				2020 0.77	2025 0.77	
	ARB	Existing Reflash, Idling, and Moyer (HDI, PFR, Moyer, AB1493, Relfash)				0.01	0.01	
	<b>Conformity Total</b>						<b>0.76</b>	<b>0.76</b>
PM-10	EMFAC 2007 (Annual Run)	NOx Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)				10.36	8.22	
	ARB	Existing Reflash, Idling, and Moyer (HDI, PFR, Moyer, AB1493, Relfash)				1.00	1.00	
	<b>Conformity Total</b>						<b>9.36</b>	<b>7.22</b>
PM2.5	EMFAC 2007 (Annual Run)	PM2.5 Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total) * includes tire & brake wear		2012 0.64	2014 0.57	2017 0.53		2025 0.50
	ARB	Adopted State and Local Measures not included in EMFAC 2007		0.01	0.01	0.01		0.01
	ARB	2007 State Strategy		0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00
	<b>Conformity Total</b>				<b>0.60</b>	<b>0.60</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.50</b>
PM2.5	EMFAC 2007 (Annual Run)	NOx Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)		17.84	14.91	12.17		8.22
	ARB	Adopted State and Local Measure not included in EMFAC 2007		1.42	1.31	1.31		1.31
	ARB	2007 State Strategy		0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00
	<b>Conformity Total</b>				<b>16.40</b>	<b>13.60</b>	<b>10.90</b>	<b>6.90</b>

- 2011 Conformity Paved Road Spreadsheet

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

**TULARE 2020**

	VMT 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	
Enter Freeway VMT ==>	Freeway	4,768,947	1,741	499.391	484.671	1.328	0.075	1.228
Enter Arterial VMT ==>	Arterial	5,850,085	2,135	881.363	855.384	2.344	0.282	1.683
Enter Collector VMT ==>	Collector	564,745	206	85.083	82.576	0.226	0.407	0.134
	Urban	1,324,920	484	841.173	816.379	2.237	0.324	1.512
Enter Total of Urban and Rural Local VMT Here =>	Rural	490,039	179	885.639	859.534	2.355	0.090	2.143
	Totals	12,998,737	4,745	3192.649	3098.543	8.489		6.700

**TULARE 2025**

	VMT 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	
Enter Freeway VMT ==>	Freeway	5,250,660	1,916	549.834	533.627	1.462	0.075	1.352
Enter Arterial VMT ==>	Arterial	6,348,349	2,317	956.430	928.239	2.543	0.282	1.826
Enter Collector VMT ==>	Collector	621,390	227	93.618	90.858	0.249	0.407	0.148
	Urban	1,466,304	535	930.936	903.496	2.475	0.324	1.673
Enter Total of Urban and Rural Local VMT Here =>	Rural	542,332	198	980.147	951.256	2.606	0.090	2.372
	Totals	14,229,035	5,194	3510.965	3407.476	9.336		7.371

**TULARE 2035**

	VMT 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	
Enter Freeway VMT ==>	Freeway	6,452,555	2,355	675.693	655.777	1.797	0.075	1.662
Enter Arterial VMT ==>	Arterial	8,184,694	2,987	1233.091	1196.744	3.279	0.282	2.354
Enter Collector VMT ==>	Collector	763,425	279	115.016	111.626	0.306	0.407	0.181
	Urban	1,652,023	603	1048.846	1017.931	2.789	0.324	1.885
Enter Total of Urban and Rural Local VMT Here =>	Rural	611,022	223	1104.290	1071.740	2.936	0.090	2.672
	Totals	17,663,718	6,447	4176.936	4053.818	11.106		8.755

- 2011 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 2025

	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

- 2011 Conformity Construction Spreadsheet

## Road Construction Dust

### TULARE

Description	2020		2025		2035	
	Year	Lane Miles	Year	Lane Miles	Year	Lane Miles
Baseline	2005	4884	2020	5243.5	2025	5383.25
Horizon	2020	5,244	2025	5,383	2035	5,663
Difference	15	360	5	140	10	280
Lane Miles per Year		24		28		28
Acres Disturbed		93		108		108
Acre-Months		1673		1951		1951
Emissions (tons/year)		184.064		214.656		214.656
Annual Average Day Emissions (tons)		0.504		0.588		0.588
District Rule 8021 Control Rates		0.290		0.290		0.290
<b>Total Emissions (tons per day)</b>		<b>0.358</b>		<b>0.418</b>		<b>0.418</b>

- 2011 Conformity Trading Spreadsheet

## PM10 Emission Trading Worksheet

### TULARE CONFORMITY ESTIMATES (tons/day)

	2020		2025		2035	
	PM10	NOx	PM10	NOx	PM10	NOx
Total On-Road Exhaust	0.760	9.360	0.760	7.220	0.890	6.540
Paved Road Dust	6.700		7.371		8.755	
Unpaved Road Dust	0.757		0.757		0.757	
Road Construction Dust	0.358		0.418		0.418	
<b>Total</b>	<b>8.575</b>	<b>9.360</b>	<b>9.306</b>	<b>7.220</b>	<b>10.820</b>	<b>6.540</b>

### Difference (2020 Budget - 2020)

	PM10	NOx
2020 Budgets	9.4	10.9
2020	8.6	9.4
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>1.5</b>
* 1.5 (Adjustment to NOx Budget)	-1.2	

NOTE: IF PM10 DIFFERENCE IS NEGATIVE, IMPLEMENT TRADING BELOW; IF NOT, INSERT RESULTS DIRECTLY INTO TOTALS SHEET

### Difference (2020 Budget - 2025)

	PM10	NOx
2020 Budgets	9.4	10.9
2025	9.3	7.2
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>3.7</b>
* 1.5 (Adjustment to NOx Budget)	-0.1	

NOTE: IF PM10 DIFFERENCE IS NEGATIVE, IMPLEMENT TRADING BELOW; IF NOT, INSERT RESULTS DIRECTLY INTO TOTALS SHEET

### Difference (2020 Budget - 2035)

	PM10	NOx
2020 Budgets	9.4	10.9
2035	10.8	6.5
<b>Difference</b>	<b>-1.4</b>	<b>4.4</b>
* 1.5 (Adjustment to NOx Budget)	2.1	

NOTE: IF PM10 DIFFERENCE IS NEGATIVE, IMPLEMENT TRADING BELOW; IF NOT, INSERT RESULTS DIRECTLY INTO TOTALS SHEET

- 2011 Conformity Trading Spreadsheet (continued)

**PM10 Emission Trading Worksheet**

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

**1:1.5 PM10 to NOx Trading**

	PM10	NOx
2020 Budget	9.4	10.9

Adjusted 2020 Budget	N/A	N/A
2020 Conformity Total	8.6	9.4
Difference	N/A	N/A

NOTE: TRADING NOT NECESSARY

Adjusted 2020 Budget	N/A	N/A
2025 Conformity Total	9.3	7.2
Difference	N/A	N/A

NOTE: TRADING NOT NECESSARY

Adjusted 2020 Budget	10.8	8.8
2035 Conformity Total	10.8	6.5
Difference	0.0	2.3

NOTE: FINAL DIFFERENCE MUST BE POSITIVE

- 2011 Conformity Totals Spreadsheet

**2011 Conformity Results Summary -- TULARE**

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?	
		ROG (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	ROG	NOx
Ozone	2011 Budget	9.2	20.9		
	2011	8.0	17.9	YES	YES
	2014 Budget	7.7	16.6		
	2014	6.4	13.6	YES	YES
	2017 Budget	6.7	13.1		
	2017	5.6	10.9	YES	YES
	2023	4.5	7.5	YES	YES
	2025	4.4	7.0	YES	YES
	2035	3.7	6.4	YES	YES

Pollutant	Scenario	PM-10 (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	PM-10	NOx
PM-10	2020 Budget	9.4	10.9		
	2020	8.6	9.4	YES	YES
	2020 Budget	9.4	10.9		
	2025	9.3	7.2	YES	YES
	Adjusted 2020 Budget	10.8	8.8		
	2035	10.8	6.5	YES	YES

Pollutant	Scenario	PM2.5 (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	PM2.5	NOx
1997 PM2.5 24-Hour & Annual Standards and 2006 24-Hour Standard	2012 Budget	0.8	19.5		
	2012	0.6	16.4	YES	YES
	2014	0.6	13.6	YES	YES
	2017	0.5	10.9	YES	YES
	2025	0.5	6.9	YES	YES
	2035	0.6	6.2	YES	YES

**APPENDIX D**

**TIMELY IMPLEMENTATION DOCUMENTATION FOR  
TRANSPORTATION CONTROL MEASURES**

## 2002 RACM Timely Implementation Documentation

<u>RACM Commitment</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Measure Title</u>	<u>Measure Description</u> <u>(not verbatim)</u>	<u>Implementation Status</u> <u>(as of 10/08)</u>	<u>2011 Conformity Update</u> <u>(as of 03/10)</u>
TU3.3	TCAG	Employer Rideshare Program Incentives	TCAG Outreach program through 2006	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
TU5.4	Exeter	Site-Specific Transportation Control Measures	Conduct signal coordination studies on a regular basis to identify congestion issues. Also consider amending development impact fee schedule	The City has completed the left turn pocket on Belmont Road with signal modifications. There have been no new studies to date, as there has been no identified need.	There have been no new studies to date, as there has been no identified need in the City of Exeter.
TU9.5	Exeter	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)	Since completing the bike lanes described in Column E, the city has not implemented a new pedestrian or bicycle project.
TU1.5	Farmersville	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.
TU5.5	Farmersville	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.
TU5.9	Farmersville	Bus Pullouts in Curbs for Passenger Loading	Consider bus pull out on Visalia Road and Downtown during FY 2002/03	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
TU5.16	Farmersville	Adaptive traffic signals and signal timing	New traffic signals will have adaptive traffic signals and signal timing as they are installed	Signal construction is complete at Visalia Rd. and Farmersville Blvd. A signal is planned for Road 168 and Avenue 288 (Walnut), awaiting state approval on school plans for access roads. The city is also evaluating the need for a signal at Noble Ave. and Farmersville Blvd.	Signal at Rd. 168 and Ave. 288 (Walnut) has not moved forward due to issues with school plans for access roads. An accident study was prepared for Noble Ave. and Farmersville Blvd. No further action has been taken on that potential project.
TU1.7	Lindsay	Free transit during special events	Trolley rides will be given during the annual Chili Cook-off celebration through October 2005	Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
TU5.3	Lindsay	Reduce Traffic Congestion at Major Intersections	Five pedestrian corridor projects by Fall 2003	See Project TID Table (Measure TU 5.1.). Commitment complete. Co	mmitment complete.
TU5.4	Lindsay	Site-Specific Transportation Control Measures	Five pedestrian corridor projects by Fall 2003	See Project TID Table (Measure TU 5.1.). Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
TU6.1	Lindsay	Park and Ride Lots	Continue to use and maintain two park and ride lots from 2002 - 2005	Commitment complete. Park-and-Ride lots used from 2002 through 2005.	Commitment complete.
TU7.3	Lindsay	Involve school districts to encourage walking to school	Five pedestrian corridor projects by Fall 2003	See Project TID Table (Measure TU 5.1.). Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
TU9.2	Lindsay	Encouragement of Pedestrian Travel	Five pedestrian corridor projects by Fall 2003	See Project TID Table (Measure TU 5.1.). Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
TU9.3	Lindsay	Bicycle/Pedestrian Program	Five pedestrian corridor projects by Fall 2003	See Project TID Table (Measure TU 5.1.). Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.

## 2002 RACM Timely Implementation Documentation

<u>RACM Commitment</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Measure Title</u>	<u>Measure Description (not verbatim)</u>	<u>Implementation Status (as of 10/08)</u>	<u>2011 Conformity Update (as of 03/10)</u>
TU9.5	Lindsay	Encouragement of Bicycle Travel	Five pedestrian corridor projects by Fall 2003	See Project TID Table (Measure TU 5.1.). Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
TCM4	Lindsay	Bicycle Programs	Five pedestrian corridor projects by Fall 2003	See Project TID Table (Measure TU 5.1.). Commitment complete.	Commitment complete.
TU1.2	Porterville	Transit Access to Airports	Provide demand response transit to and from the airport through at least 2007.	Porterville COLT provides this service on a regular basis.	Porterville COLT continues to provide this service.
TU1.6	Porterville	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. New bus stops were created for Porterville COLT Route No. 6 which serves the park and ride lot on Jaye Street, just south of Orange Avenue, and other locations.	Commitment Complete
TU1.7	Porterville	Free transit during special events	Provide free shuttle bus service during the Sutton Iris Farm Festival through at least 2006.	Commitment complete. Free shuttle service was provided for the Iris Festival and the Literacy Fair.	Commitment complete.
TU5.4	Porterville	Site-Specific Transportation Control Measures	Construct left turn lanes at designated intersections by 2003.	Commitment complete. See Project TID Table	Commitment complete.
TU5.9	Porterville	Bus Pullouts in Curbs for Passenger Loading	Construct one bus pull-out on Olive Avenue at Westwood; construct others as needed.	One pullout has been constructed on the East side of town, near Granite Hills HS, and another has been completed on J street near SR190.	Two pullouts have been constructed along Morton Ave., located near the intersections at Prospect and Newcomb.
TU5.16	Porterville	Adaptive traffic signals and signal timing	Adaptive traffic signals will be installed on designated corridors in the City by 2003.	Commitment complete. Traffic signal coordination was completed along three designated corridors within the city.	Commitment complete.
TU9.5	Porterville	Encouragement of Bicycle Travel	Hold dedication ceremonies for future phases of Tule River Parkway that encourage public use of bikeways through 2003.	Commitment complete. The Tule River Parkway, Phase II, was completed February 2005. The City held a dedication ceremony for the completion of Phase II of the Parkway. City representatives highlighted the opportunities the Parkway will provide for walking and biking.	Commitment complete.
TU10.2	Porterville	Bike Racks on Buses	Equip new buses with bike racks through at least 2006.	Commitment complete. All new transit buses are equipped with bike racks.	Commitment complete.
TCM3	Porterville	Rideshare Programs	Publish an article in "The Pen" that encourages rideshare within the City. Implementation by FY 2002/03.	Commitment complete. An article has appeared two times in the City's newsletter.	Commitment complete.

## 2002 RACM Timely Implementation Documentation

<u>RACM Commitment</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Measure Title</u>	<u>Measure Description (not verbatim)</u>	<u>Implementation Status (as of 10/08)</u>	<u>2011 Conformity Update (as of 03/10)</u>
TU1.1	Tulare	Regional Express Bus Program	Provide regional express bus service to connect with other transit services through at least 2007.	Tulare Transit Express Route No. 6 connects with TCAT and VCC to provide service to Visalia and surrounding areas. The Tulare InterModal Express (TIME) fixed route service continues to provide connections to VCC and TCAT.	The Tulare InterModal Express (TIME) fixed route service continues to provide connections to VCC and TCAT.
TU1.2	Tulare	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 which provides service to the Visalia Municipal Airport.	The TIME fixed route service continues to provide connections to VCC which provides service to the Visalia Municipal Airport.
TU1.5	Tulare	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 current TIME Transit Development Plan was adopted by the City in June of 2007.	The City continues to participate in the Unmet Needs Process. The City continues to implement the 2007 Transit Development Plan.
TU1.6	Tulare	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. Transit parking is provided for the World Ag Expo, and annual event in Tulare. Transit stops also provided at public parking lots at the Horizon Outlets.	Commitment complete.
TU1.7	Tulare	Free transit during special events	Provide free transit service during special events through at least 2007.	The City continued to offer a day of free fares on fixed routes in 2008. The free fare day in 2008 took place on Earth Day and was called a Spare the Air Day in coordination with Visalia City Coach (VCC).	The City offered a day of free fares on fixed routes on Earth Day, April 22nd, 2009, coordinated with the City of Visalia's free fare day.
TU1.9	Tulare	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. The City provided additional parking in the vicinity of the Transit Center and Multi-Modal Center.	Commitment complete.
TU5.4	Tulare	Site-Specific Transportation Control Measures	Install additional traffic signals as warranted.	See Project TID Table	See Project TID Table
TU5.9	Tulare	Bus Pullouts in Curbs for Passenger Loading	Provide bus pull-outs for passenger loading and unloading.	See Project TID Table	See Project TID Table
TU5.16	Tulare	Adaptive traffic signals and signal timing	Install adaptive and emergency vehicle pre-emptive traffic signals.	All signals that have been installed since 2002 are adaptive and are emergency pre-emptive. The City continues to monitor signals and signal timing. The City purchased equipment and installed emergency vehicle pre-emptive signals.	Commitment Complete.
TU10.2	Tulare	Bike Racks on Buses	Encourage pedestrian and bicycle travel as an alternative to automobile travel.	The City has installed bike racks on all fixed-route buses, including new fleet and additional implementation needs have not been identified.	Additional implementation needs have not been identified.
TU15.2	Tulare	Pedestrian and Bicycle Overpasses Where Safety Dictates	Install pedestrian and bicycle over crosses where safety concerns dictate through at least 2007.	The City of Tulare has not identified any locations where crossings are required to mitigate safety concerns.	Commitment Complete. Additional locations have not been identified.
TU5.6	Tulare	Reversible Lanes	Implement reversible parking on arterial streets to improve traffic flow.	The City continued implementation of reversible parking on arterial streets during the annual World Ag Expo in 2008. Reversible Lanes have been integrated into the traffic management plan.	The City implemented reversible parking on arterial streets during the 2009 World Ag Expo.
TU1.5	Woodlake	Expansion of Public Transportation Systems	Expansion and enhancement of existing public transit through at least 2007.	City participated in the 2008 Unmet Needs process. The City continues to operate a Dial-a-Ride system.	Commitment Complete. Implementation continues.
TU3.5	Woodlake	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.	Preferential parking for employees that carpool at City Hall continues to be in place.	Commitment Complete. Implementation continues.

## 2002 RACM Timely Implementation Documentation

<u>RACM Commitment</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Measure Title</u>	<u>Measure Description (not verbatim)</u>	<u>Implementation Status (as of 10/08)</u>	<u>2011 Conformity Update (as of 03/10)</u>
TU5.8	Woodlake	On-Street Parking Restrictions	Restrict parking where it impacts traffic safety through at least 2007.	Two locations have been identified near schools, and on-street parking restrictions have been implemented.	Commitment Complete. No additional parking restrictions have been identified.
TU5.19	Woodlake	Internet provided road and route information	Post scheduled road construction on City website through at least 2007.	Notices continue to be posted on the City of Woodlake's website.	Commitment Complete. Implementation continues.
TU7.13	Woodlake	Land use/air quality guidelines	Encourage high density development around transportation centers and the downtown through at least 2007.	Implementation ongoing. City zoning continues to encourage infill and high density development in the downtown area. The City of Woodlake continues to operate an on-demand transit service (Dial-a-Ride) and does not have a city transit center.	Commitment Complete. Implementation ongoing.
TU7.14	Woodlake	Incentives for cities with good development practices	Require new development and major reconstruction to provide energy efficient lighting through at least 2007.	Implementation ongoing. The city continues to adhere to the energy efficient standards established in the California Energy Code, Title 24, Part 6 for all major reconstruction projects.	Commitment Complete. Implementation ongoing.
TU14.2	Woodlake	Special Event Controls	Reduce mobile source emissions from special event centers through at least 2007.	This measure has been implemented through City Administrative Policy.	Commitment Complete.
TU14.3	Woodlake	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
TU14.5	Woodlake	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.	Implementation ongoing. The City continues to prepare environmental analysis for public works and development projects.	Commitment complete. Implementation ongoing.
TCM1	Woodlake	Traffic Flow Improvements	Investigate the feasibility of regional cross valley rail and a number of signal and corridor improvements.	There are no traffic signals in Woodlake, and no signals are warranted. Corridor coordination is not feasible without signals.	Signal improvements continue to be unwarranted.
TU1.2	Visalia	Transit Access to Airports	Provide a fixed route transit service to the local airport.	Route 10 provides transportation to the Visalia Airport upon request.	Route 10 continues to provide transportation to the Visalia Airport upon request.
TU1.5	Visalia	Expansion of Public Transportation Systems	Expand / enhance transit services through the Short Range Transit Plan.	The Short Range Transit Plan has been updated. The Visalia City Coach added additional transit routes and expanded hours.	Visalia City Coach continues to implement the approved Short Range Transit Plan.
TU1.7	Visalia	Free transit during special events	Provide free trolley service during special events.	The VCC Trolley is a free service. The trolley serves Downtown Visalia, the Downtown Farmers Market, Visalia Rawhide Baseball games, the annual Downtown Christmas Parade, and other city events.	The VCC Trolley continues to provide free service during special events.
TU3.3	Visalia	Employer Rideshare Program Incentives	Provide employee incentives for carpooling, walking, biking to work.	The City of Visalia provides a \$1/day incentive to all employees who carpool, bike, or walk to work. This practice has been ongoing for years.	The City of Visalia continues to provide incentives to all employees who carpool, bike, or walk to work.
TU5.2	Visalia	Coordinate Traffic Signal Systems	Continue to expand the City's coordinated traffic signal system.	The City of Visalia and consultant have adjusted existing coordination timing on several streets for improved travel time and will continue to do so as necessary. The City is currently evaluating the need to initiate signal synchronization along Caldwell Avenue and Woodland Street.	The City of Visalia is working with a consultant to evaluate the entire City traffic control system to determine recommended areas of synchronization and the necessary equipment for implementation to improve travel time and air quality. The City expects to begin implementation of some recommended improvements in 2010.

## 2002 RACM Timely Implementation Documentation

<u>RACM Commitment</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Measure Title</u>	<u>Measure Description (not verbatim)</u>	<u>Implementation Status (as of 10/08)</u>	<u>2011 Conformity Update (as of 03/10)</u>
TU5.3	Visalia	Reduce Traffic Congestion at Major Intersections	Continue to make use of turn lanes, signalization, and median dividers for traffic control.	The City is presently in various stages of installing traffic signals at heavily congested all-way stop intersections: Santa Fe St at Walnut Ave and Tulare Ave (design), Pinkham St at Walnut Ave (complete), Demaree St at Mill Creek Dr and Ferguson Ave (design), Plaza Dr at Riggin Ave (under construction), Skirt St at Hurley Ave (planned), Goshen Ave at Mooney Blvd (design), Caldwell Ave and County Center (signal modification), Demaree and Whitendale (design), Linwood and Walnut (design), Court and Whitendale (design), Demaree and Goshen (design), and Demaree and Ferguson (design). The City has completed installing medians, with left and right intersection pockets to Riggin Ave, St. Johns Parkway, and Caldwell Ave. The City is near completion of design and plans to build a roundabout at the intersections of Houston Ave, N.E., 3rd Ave., and Santa Fe St in the next 2-3 years. Roundabouts have been installed at various locations within the city in lieu of 4-way stops. The city will continue to install or expand turn and/or through lanes to channelize and improve traffic flow where possible.	The City is presently in various stages of installing traffic signals at heavily congested all-way stop intersections: Santa Fe St at Walnut Ave and Tulare Ave, Demaree St at Mill Creek Dr and Ferguson Ave, and Shirk St at Hurley Ave. The City is under construction to build a roundabout at the intersections of Houston Ave, N.E., 3rd Ave., and Santa Fe St in the next 2-3 years. Roundabouts have been installed at various locations within the city in lieu of 4-way stops. The city will continue to install or expand turn and/or through lanes to channelize and improve traffic flow where possible.
TU5.4	Visalia	Site-Specific Transportation Control Measures	Implement geometric traffic control procedures	The city is planning to install protected left turn indications at the following signalized intersections: Caldwell Ave at County Center Dr, Demaree St at Whitendale Ave, Linwood St at Walnut Ave, and Lovers Lane at Walnut Ave.	The city is planning to install protected left turn indications at the following signalized intersections: Caldwell Ave at County Center Dr, Demaree St at Whitendale Ave, and Linwood St at Walnut Ave.
TU9.5	Visalia	Encouragement of Bicycle Travel	Expand the City's existing bicycle system; work with TCAG on outreach for bicycle programs	The City has recently striped and installed signage for new bicycle lanes on several streets within the city and is currently at or ahead of schedule for construction and improvement of bike/pedestrian paths along Packwood Creek, Cameron Creek, Mill Creek, St. Johns River Parkway, Riggin Ave, and Santa Fe Street. Existing bicycle lanes are being restriped and signing upgraded throughout the year. With assistance from the Bike, Pedestrian, and Waterway Committee, new bike lanes and bike paths along many streets and pathways are being evaluated.	The City has recently striped and installed signage for new bicycle lanes on several streets within the city and is currently at or planning for construction of bike/pedestrian paths along Packwood Creek, Cameron Creek, Mill Creek and Santa Fe Street. Existing bicycle lanes are being restriped and signing upgraded this year. With assistance from the Bike, Pedestrian, and Waterway Committee, new bike lanes and bike paths along many streets and pathways are being evaluated.
TU10.2	Visalia	Bike Racks on Buses	Continue to provide bike racks on transit buses.	The entire VCC fleet have bike racks on them, including the 6 recently purchased 35-foot CNG buses. The City plans to purchase 10 more 35-foot CNG buses with bike racks by summer 2009.	The buses with bike racks have been ordered. Delivery is expected by summer 2010.
TCM1	Visalia	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, which identifies transportation needs over the next 20 years.	This measure has been implemented through the City's Circulation Element.
TCM2	Visalia	Public Transit	Implement Short Range Transit Plan to enhance and expand transit services.	The City of Visalia has added routes to their Short Range Transit Plan. A full update to the Short Range Transit Plan, which identifies the City's transit needs and goals over a 5-year period, is expected to be completed by the end of 2008.	The Short Range Transit Plan was completed and approved in December 2008. Various routes have already been added to the City's transit system.
TCM4	Visalia	Bicycle Programs	Continue to seek funding for, and implement bicycle improvements and programs.	The Visalia City Council authorized funding to implement the City's adopted and updated bicycle plan. The City will continue to evaluate bike plan implementation. Implementation is ongoing.	The City continues to seek funding for and evaluate bike plan implementation. Implementation is ongoing.

## 2002 RACM Timely Implementation Documentation

<u>RACM Commitment</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Commitment Description</u>	<u>Commitment Schedule</u>	<u>Commitment Funding</u>	<u>TIP</u>	<u>TIP Project ID</u>	<u>TIP Project Description</u>	<u>Implementation Status</u>	<u>2011 Conformity Update</u>
								(as of 10/08)	(as of 03/10)
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
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
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
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	Area 1 & 3 complete. Construction on areas 2 and 4 are scheduled for completion in first quarter 2009.	Complete

## 2002 RACM Timely Implementation Documentation

RACM Commitment	Agency	Commitment Description	Commitment Schedule	Commitment Funding	TIP	TIP Project ID	TIP Project Description	Implementation Status	2011 Conformity Update
								(as of 10/08)	(as of 03/10)
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(PPNO)	transit center	Complete	Complete
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
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(PPNO)	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
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
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
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	Construction is underway. Construction is expected to be completed in summer 2009.	Complete

## 2002 RACM Timely Implementation Documentation

<u>RACM Commitment</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Commitment Description</u>	<u>Commitment Schedule</u>	<u>Commitment Funding</u>	<u>TIP</u>	<u>TIP Project ID</u>	<u>TIP Project Description</u>	<u>Implementation Status</u>	<u>2011 Conformity Update</u>
								(as of 10/08)	(as of 03/10)
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
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
<b>ADDITIONAL PROJECTS IDENTIFIED</b>									
TU5.4	Exeter	Site-Specific Transportation Control Measures	L	ocal	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Complete	Complete
TU9.5	Exeter	Encouragement of Bicycle Travel	B	TA	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	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
TU5.4	Tulare	Site-Specific Transportation Control Measures	S	R2S, Local	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Complete	Complete
				Local	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Complete	Complete
TU5.9	Tulare	Bus Pullouts in Curbs for Passenger Loading	LT	F	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Complete	Complete

## 2002 RACM Timely Implementation Documentation

<u>RACM Commitment</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Commitment Description</u>	<u>Commitment Schedule</u>	<u>Commitment Funding</u>	<u>TIP</u>	<u>TIP Project ID</u>	<u>TIP Project Description</u>	<u>Implementation Status</u> (as of 10/08)	<u>2011 Conformity Update</u> (as of 03/10)
TU5.16	Tulare	Install adaptive and emergency vehicle pre-emptive traffic signals.		Local	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Complete	Complete
TU5.3	Visalia	Reduce Traffic Congestion at Major Intersections	L	Local	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Complete	Complete
TU5.4	Visalia	Site-Specific Transportation Control Measures	L	Local	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Complete	Complete
					N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Complete	Complete
TU9.5	Visalia	Encouragement of Bicycle Travel		Local	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Complete	Complete
			2009 (obligation)	TEA/Local	2008	TUL04-158	Mill Creek Arboretum Trail	Project is scheduled to be obligated in 2009.	TEA funding lapsed due to ROW issues with the school district. Local funds have been approved for this project. Construction is expected to begin Fall 2010.
			2009 (obligation)	CMAQ, Local	2008	TUL06-017	City of Visalia-Riggin Ave. Bicycle Path	Project is scheduled to be obligated in 2009.	Project delayed due to necessity of changing routing. Estimate obligation in FY 11/12.
			2010 (obligation)	TEA/Local	2008	TUL06-100	St. John's River Bike Path Rd 148 to Cutler Park	Project is scheduled to be obligated in 2010.	Project is scheduled to be obligated in FY 2010/11.
			2009 (obligation)	Recreational Trails Program	2008	TUL06-002	City of Visalia-East Mill Creek	Project is scheduled to be obligated in 2009.	Construction to start in 2010.
			2009 (obligation)	Recreational Trails Program	2008	TUL06-001	City of Visalia-Bike Trails Project (St. John's River Parkway Trail)	Project is scheduled to be obligated in 2009.	Complete
			2010 (obligation)	TEA/Local	2008	TUL04-160	City of Visalia-Santa Fe Bike Path	Project is scheduled to be obligated in 2010.	Project is scheduled to be obligated in 2010.
			2009 (obligation)	TEA/Local	2008	TUL04-154	Packwood Creek Bike Path	Project is scheduled to be obligated in 2009.	Project received CTC allocation in 2009, contract is scheduled for award in April 2010.
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
TU5.16	Farmersville	Adaptive traffic signals and signal timing		STP, State Cash	2006	TUL00-107	Ave 280-Visalia Road Operational Improvements	Signal construction is complete at Visalia Rd. and Farmersville Blvd.	Complete

## APPENDIX E

### PUBLIC MEETING PROCESS DOCUMENTATION

#### NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON THE DRAFT 2011 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, THE DRAFT 2011 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN, THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND CORRESPONDING DRAFT CONFORMITY ANALYSIS

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG) will hold a public hearing May 17, 2010 at 1:00 p.m. at the Tulare County Ag Center Auditorium, 4437 S. Laspina St., Tulare, 93274 regarding the Draft 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (2011 FTIP), the Draft 2011 Regional Transportation Plan (2011 RTP), the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and corresponding Draft Air Quality Conformity Analysis for the 2011 FTIP and 2011 RTP. The purpose of this combined public hearing is to receive public comments on these documents.

- The 2011 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.
- The 2011 RTP is a long-term strategy to meet Tulare County transportation needs out to the year 2035.
- The Program EIR provides an analysis of potential environmental impacts related to the implementation of the RTP as required by the California Environmental Quality Act.
- The Conformity Analysis contains the documentation to support a finding that the 2011 FTIP and 2011 RTP meet the air quality conformity requirements for ozone and particulate matter.

Individuals with disabilities may call TCAG at 559-624-7274 (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 concurrent 45-day public review and comment period will commence on April 30, 2010 and conclude on June 14, 2010. The draft documents are available for review at the Tulare County Association of Governments, office, located at 5955 S. Mooney Blvd. Visalia, California, 93277 and on TCAG's website at [www.tularecog.org](http://www.tularecog.org).

Public comments are welcomed at the hearing, or may be submitted in writing by 5 p.m. on June 14, 2010 to TCAG at the address below.

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 July 19, 2010. The documents will then be submitted to state and federal agencies for approval.

Contact Person:

559-6

Tulare County Association of Governments  
Attn: Eddie Wendt, Associate Regional Planner  
5955 S. Mooney Blvd, Visalia, CA 93277  
24-7265  
[ewendt@co.tulare.ca.us](mailto:ewendt@co.tulare.ca.us)

BEFORE THE  
TULARE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
COUNTY OF TULARE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the matter of:

RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE TULARE	)	
COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS	)	
2011 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN	)	
2011 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION	)	Resolution No. [ ]
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND	)	
CORRESPONDING AIR QUALITY	)	
CONFORMITY ANALYSIS	)	

WHEREAS, the Tulare County Association of Governments (TCAG) is a Regional Transportation Planning Agency and a Metropolitan Planning Organization, pursuant to State and Federal designation; and

WHEREAS, federal planning regulations require Metropolitan Planning Organizations to prepare and adopt a long range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for their region; and

WHEREAS, federal planning regulations require that Metropolitan Planning Organizations prepare and adopt a Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) for their region; and

WHEREAS, Section 65080 of the California Government Code requires each regional transportation planning agency to prepare a regional transportation plan and update it for submission to the governing Policy Board for adoption; and

WHEREAS, Section 65080 of the California Government Code requires each regional transportation planning agency to prepare a regional transportation plan and update it for submission to the governing Policy Board for adoption; and

WHEREAS, a 2011 Regional Transportation Plan has been prepared in full compliance with federal guidance; and

WHEREAS, a 2011 Regional Transportation Plan has been prepared in accordance with state guidelines adopted by the California Transportation Commission; and

WHEREAS, federal planning regulations require that Metropolitan Planning Organizations prepare and adopt a short range Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) for their region; and

WHEREAS, the 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (2011 FTIP) has been prepared to comply with Federal and State requirements for local projects and through a cooperative process between the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the State Department of Transportation (Caltrans), principal elected officials of general purpose local governments and their staffs, and public owner operators of mass transportation services acting through the Tulare County Association of Governments forum and general public involvement; and

WHEREAS, the 2011 FTIP program listing is consistent with : 1) the 2011 Regional Transportation Plan ; 2) the 2010 State Transportation Improvement Program; and 3 ) the Corresponding Conformity Analysis; and

WHEREAS, the 2011 FTIP contains the MPO's certification of the transportation planning process assuring that all federal requirements have been fulfilled; and

WHEREAS, the 2001 FTIP meets all applicable transportation planning requirements per 23 CFR Part 450; and

WHEREAS, projects submitted in the 2011 FTIP must be financially constrained and the financial plan affirms that funding is available; and

WHEREAS, the 2011 RTP and 2011 FTIP includes a new Conformity Analysis; and

WHEREAS, the MPO must demonstrate conformity per 40 CFR Part 93 for the RTP and FTIP; and

WHEREAS, the 2011 RTP and 2011 FTIP do not interfere with the timely implementation of the Transportation Control Measures; and

WHEREAS, the 2011 RTP and 2011 FTIP conforms to the applicable SIPs; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with EPA Companion Guidance for the Conformity Rule for multi-jurisdictional areas, Tulare County Association of Governments has developed their portion of the PM2.5 regional emissions analysis separately and provided the entire PM2.5 nonattainment area conformity demonstration; and

WHEREAS, the PM2.5 nonattainment area conformity demonstration is contingent upon adoption by all MPOs in the PM2.5 nonattainment area; and

WHEREAS, the documents have been widely circulated and reviewed by Tulare County Association of Governments advisory committees representing the technical and management staffs of the member agencies; representatives of other governmental agencies, including State and Federal; representatives of special interest groups; representatives of the private business sector; and residents of Tulare County consistent with public participation process adopted by Tulare County Association of Governments; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted on May 17, 2010 to hear and consider comments on the 2011 RTP, 2011 FTIP, and Corresponding Conformity Analysis; and the remainder of the MPOs in the PM2.5 nonattainment area have conducted public hearings as well.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, th at Tulare County Association of Governments adopts the 2011 RTP, 2011 FTIP, and Corresponding Conformity Analysis.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Tulare County Association of Governments finds that the 2011 RTP and 2011 FTIP are in conformity with the requirements of the Federal Clean Air Act Amendments and applicable State Implementation Plans for air quality.

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION was passed and adopted by Tulare County Association of Governments this 19<sup>th</sup> day of July 2010.

AYES:  
NOES:  
ABSENT:  
ABSTAIN:

TULARE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF  
GOVERNMENTS

---

Pete Vander Poel  
Chair, TCAG

---

Ted Smalley  
Executive Director, TCAG  
I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a  
resolution of the Tulare County Association of Governments  
duly adopted at a regular meeting thereof held on the 19<sup>th</sup> day  
of July, 2010.

## **APPENDIX F**

### **RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS**

NOTE: No public comments were received with respect to the Draft Conformity Analysis for the 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program and 2011 Regional Transportation Plan. However, in consultation with EPA, the document has been updated to reflect EPA publication of a budget adequacy determination for the 2010 conformity budget contained in the 2008 PM2.5 Plan May 12, 2010, effective May 27, 2010.

In addition, minor modifications have been made to reflect the final EPA rule reclassifying the San Joaquin Valley 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Area from Serious to Extreme effective June 4, 2010.