CONFORMITY ANALYSIS FOR THE 2013 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND 2011 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AMENDMENT #3

REGIONAL ADOPTION
JULY 19, 2012

Kern Council of Governments
1401 19th Street, Suite 300
Bakersfield, California 93301
www.kerncog.org
661-861-2191
Facsimile 661-324-8215
TTY 661-832-7433

U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration

Federal Highway Administration
California Division

650 Capitol Mall, Suite 4-100
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 498-5001
(916) 498-5008 (fax)

December 13, 2012

In Reply Refer To:
HDA-CA

Mr. Ahron Hakimi, Executive Director
Kern Council of Governments
1401 19th Street, Suite 300
Bakersfield, CA 93301

Dear Mr. Hakimi:

SUBJECT: Conformity Determination for the Kern Council of Governments' (KCOG) 2013 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and Amendment No. 3 to the 2011 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) have completed our review of the conformity determination for the Kern Council of Governments' (KCOG) 2013 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and Amendment No. 3 to the 2011 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). A FTA/FHWA air quality conformity determination is required pursuant to the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) *Transportation Conformity Rule*, 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93, and the United States Department of Transportation's *Metropolitan Planning Rule*, 23 CFR Part 450.

On July 19, 2012, KCOG adopted the 2013 FTIP and Amendment No. 3 to the RTP and made the corresponding conformity determination. The conformity analysis submitted by KCOG indicates that all air quality conformity requirements have been met. Based on our review, we find that the 2013 FTIP and the 2011 RTP, as amended, conform to the applicable state implementation plan in accordance with the provisions of 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93. In accordance with the July 15, 2004, *Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Federal Highway Administration, California Division and the Federal Transit Administration, Region IX*, the FTA has concurred with this conformity determination. Additionally, this conformity determination was made after consultation with the EPA, Region 9 office.

If you have questions or need additional information concerning this approval, please contact Joseph Vaughn (Joseph.Vaughn@dot.gov) of the FHWA California Division office at (916) 498-5346.

Sincerely,

/s/ Leslie T. Rogers

Leslie T. Rogers
Regional Administrator
Federal Transit Administration

For
Vincent P. Mammano
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration

cc: (e-mail)
Ray Sukys, FTA
Paul Page, FTA
Muhaned Aljabiry, Caltrans
Mike Brady, Caltrans
Karina O'Connor, EPA
Raquel Pacheco, KCOG (RPacheco@kerncog.org)
Rob Ball, KCOG (RBall@kerncog.org)
Ahron Hakimi, KCOG (ahakimi@kerncog.org)
Joseph Vaughn, FHWA
Scott Carson, FHWA
Jermaine Hannon, FHWA
Jack Lord, FHWA

cc: (other)
KCOG TIP Binder

JLord/km

Kern Council of Governments
Board of Directors

The Kern Council of Governments is the regional planning agency as well as the technical and informational resource, and rideshare administrator for the area's 11 incorporated cities and the County of Kern. Following Board direction, staff coordinates between local, state, and federal agencies to avoid overlap or duplication of programs. This intergovernmental coordination enables staff to work with many public agencies to ensure that planning and implementation of programs proceed in a coordinated manner.

Chairman: Harold Hanson
Vice Chairman: Paul Linder
Secretary/ Executive Director: Ahron Hakimi

City of Arvin
Tim Tarver

City of Bakersfield
Harold Hanson

City of California City
Nicholas Lessenevitch

City of Delano
Joe Aguirre

City of Maricopa
Gary Mock

City of McFarland
Manuel Cantu

City of Ridgecrest
Steve Morgan

City of Shafter
Jon Johnston

City of Taft
Paul Linder

City of Tehachapi
Philip A. Smith

City of Wasco
Cheryl Wegman

County of Kern
Jon McQuiston

County of Kern
Ray Watson

Caltrans
Gail Miller

Golden Empire Transit District
Howard Silver

Military Joint Planning Policy Board
Scott Kiernan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1
CONFORMITY REQUIREMENTS 1
CONFORMITY TESTS 4
RESULTS OF THE CONFORMITY ANALYSIS 5
REPORT ORGANIZATION 6

CHAPTER 1: FEDERAL AND STATE REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS 7
A. FEDERAL AND STATE CONFORMITY REGULATIONS 7
B. CONFORMITY REGULATION REQUIREMENTS 9
C. AIR QUALITY DESIGNATIONS APPLICABLE TO THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY 10
D. CONFORMITY TEST REQUIREMENTS 11
E. ANALYSIS YEARS 16
F. AIR QUALITY DESIGNATIONS APPLICABLE TO THE OTHER AREAS OF KERN COUNTY 17
G. CONFORMITY TEST REQUIREMENTS 18
H. ANALYSIS YEARS 19

CHAPTER 2: LATEST PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS AND TRANSPORTATION MODELING 20

A. LATEST PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS 20

TRAFFIC COUNTS 24

SPEEDS 24

TRANSIT 25

VALIDATION/CALIBRATION 25

FUTURE NETWORKS 26

E. VEHICLE REGISTRATIONS 30

CHAPTER 3: AIR QUALITY MODELING 32
A. EMFAC2007 32
B. ADDITIONAL PM-10 ESTIMATES 33
C. PM2.5 APPROACH 34
D. AIR QUALITY MODELING APPLICABLE TO THE OTHER AREAS OF KERN COUNTY 36
E. SUMMARY OF PROCEDURES FOR REGIONAL EMISSIONS ESTIMATES 37

CHAPTER 4: TRANSPORTATION CONTROL MEASURES 38
A. TRANSPORTATION CONFORMITY REGULATION REQUIREMENTS FOR TCMS 38
B. APPLICABLE AIR QUALITY IMPLEMENTATION PLANS 40
C. IDENTIFICATION OF 2002 RACM THAT REQUIRE TIMELY IMPLEMENTATION DOCUMENTATION 41
D. TCM FINDINGS FOR THE TIP AND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN 43
E. RTP CONTROL MEASURE ANALYSIS IN SUPPORT OF 2003 PM-10 PLAN43

CHAPTER 5: INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION 45
A. INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION 45
B. PUBLIC CONSULTATION 46

CHAPTER 6: TIP AND RTP CONFORMITY 47

REFERENCES 53

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 12
Table 1-2: Approved Budgets from the 2007 Ozone Plan (as revised in 2011) 13
Table 1-3: On-Road Motor Vehicle PM-10 Emissions Budgets..... 14
Table 1-4: On-Road Motor Vehicle PM2.5 Emissions Budgets..... 15
Table 1-5: San Joaquin Valley Conformity Analysis Years 16
Table 1-6: Mojave Desert (Eastern Kern County) Ozone Emissions Budgets..... 18
Table 1-7: Kern County Indian Wells Valley Area PM-10 Emissions Budgets 18
Table 1-8: Other Portions of Kern County Conformity Analysis Years 19
Table 6-1: Conformity Results Summary 50

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the Conformity Analysis for the 2013 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and the 2011 Regional Transportation Plan Amendment #3 (RTP Amendment #3). The Kern Council of Governments is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in Kern 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 2013 FTIP and 2011 RTP; a finding of conformity is therefore supported. The 2013 FTIP and 2011 RTP and corresponding Conformity Analysis were approved by the Kern Council of Governments Policy Board on July 19, 2012. FHWA/FTA last issued a finding of conformity for the 2011 TIP and 2011 RTP, including amendments, on May 3, 2012 .

The 2013 TIP and 2011 RTP Amendment #3 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 (PM2.5); 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 Kern County area must satisfy the requirements of the Federal transportation conformity regulation.

Figure 1– Air Pollution Control Districts in the Kern Region



Kern COG is also located in the federally designated Mojave Desert, portions of the Indian Wells Valley Planning Area, and the portion of the San Joaquin Valley (SJV) PM-10 nonattainment area that lies within the Kern County Air Pollution Control District (this area is not included in the SJV 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan and has been labeled the East Kern PM-10 Area). The Mojave Desert area is currently designated as nonattainment for the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for 8-hour ozone; whereas the Indian Wells Valley Planning area is designated as a maintenance area for PM-10. The Kern COG transportation plans and programs also satisfy the requirements of the transportation conformity regulation for these nonattainment areas.

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.

Figure 2 – Ozone/Carbon Monoxide Planning Areas



Figure 3 – Particulate Matter Planning Areas



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 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 Kern Council of Governments Conformity Analysis are:

- For carbon monoxide, the total regional on-road vehicle-related emissions associated with implementation of the 2013 FTIP and the 2011 RTP Amendment #3 for the analysis years are projected to be less than the approved emissions budget established in the *2004 Revision to the California State Implementation Plan for Carbon Monoxide*. The applicable conformity test for carbon monoxide is therefore satisfied.
- For ozone, the total regional on-road vehicle-related emissions (ROG and NOx) associated with implementation of the 2013 FTIP and the 2011 RTP Amendment #3 for all years tested are projected to be less than the approved emissions budgets specified in the *2007 Ozone Plan (as revised in 2011)*. The conformity tests for ozone are therefore satisfied.
- For PM-10, the total regional vehicle-related emissions (PM-10 and NOx) associated with implementation of the 2013 FTIP and the 2011 RTP Amendment #3 for all years tested are either (1) projected to be less than the approved emissions budgets, or (2) less than the emission budgets using the approved PM-10 and NOx trading mechanism for transportation conformity purposes from the *2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan*. The conformity tests for PM-10 are therefore satisfied.
- For PM2.5, the total regional on-road vehicle-related emissions associated with implementation of the 2013 FTIP and the 2011 RTP Amendment #3 for the analysis years are either (1) projected to be less than the approved emission budgets, or (2) less than the emission budgets using the approved PM2.5 and NOx trading mechanism for transportation conformity purposes from the *2008 PM2.5 Plan (as revised in 2011)*. The conformity tests for PM2.5 for both the 1997 and 2006 standards are therefore satisfied.
- The 2013 FTIP and the 2011 RTP Amendment #3 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.

Regional emissions analyses were also conducted for 2013, 2015, 2025, and 2035 for the Eastern Kern ozone area and the Indian Wells Valley PM-10 area. No emissions analysis was completed for the portion of the SJV PM-10 nonattainment area that is under Kern County Air Pollution Control District jurisdiction (East Kern PM-10 Area).

- For Mojave Desert ozone, the total regional on-road vehicle-related emissions (ROG and NOx) associated with implementation of the 2013 FTIP and the 2011 RTP [INSERT Amendment # (if applicable)] for all years tested are projected to be less than the adequate emissions budgets specified in the 8-Hour Ozone Early Progress Plan. The conformity tests for ozone are therefore satisfied.
- For Indian Wells Valley PM-10, the total regional vehicle-related emissions associated with implementation of the 2013 FTIP and the 2011 RTP [INSERT Amendment # (if applicable)] for all years tested are projected to be less than the approved emissions budgets from the PM-10 Attainment Demonstration, Maintenance Plan, and Re-designation Request. The conformity tests for PM-10 are therefore satisfied.
- For the portion of the SJV PM-10 nonattainment area that is under the jurisdiction of the Kern County APCD (East Kern PM-10 Area), the interim emissions test is satisfied for all years since the transportation projects and planning assumptions in both the "action" and "baseline" scenarios are exactly the same. In accordance with Section 93.119(g)(2), the emissions predicted in the "action" scenario are not greater than the emissions predicted in the "Baseline" scenario for such analysis years. The conformity tests for PM-10 are therefore satisfied.

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, as amended, are provided in Chapter 6.

Appendix F includes public meeting documentation conducted on the 2013 FTIP and 2011 RTP Amendment #3 and corresponding Conformity Analysis on June 21, 2012. Comments received on the conformity analysis and responses made as part of the public involvement process are included in Appendix G.

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 2013 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the 2011 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Amendment #3 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.

Kern Council of Governments is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for Kern County in the San Joaquin Valley. As a result of this designation, Kern Council of Governments prepares the TIP, RTP, and associated conformity analyses. The TIP serves as a detailed four year (FFY 2012/13 – 2015/16 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 present. These amendments have addressed a number of items related to conformity lapses, grace periods, and other related issues to streamline the conformity process.

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

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

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, 2004a). 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-10. The guidance allows MPOs to make independent conformity determinations for their plans and TIPs as long as all of the other subareas in the nonattainment area have conforming transportation plans and TIPs in place at the time of each MPO and the Department of Transportation (DOT) conformity determination.

With respect to PM2.5, the Transportation Conformity Rule PM2.5 and PM10 Amendments published on March 24, 2010 effectively incorporates the “multi-jurisdictional” guidance directly into the rule. The Rule allows MPOs to make independent conformity determinations for their plans and TIPs as long as all of the other subareas in the nonattainment area have conforming transportation plans and TIPs in place at the time of each MPO and DOT conformity determination.

DISTRICT RULE

The San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (Air District) adopted Rule 9120 Transportation Conformity on January 19, 1995 in response to requirements in Section 176(c)(4)(c) of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments. 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 interagency consultation" (EPA, 2010b). All analyses for the Conformity Analysis were conducted using the latest planning assumptions and emissions models in force at the time the conformity analysis started in February 2012 (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. ARB has released EMFAC 11; however, it has not been approved by EPA for use in conformity analysis.

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 45-day comment period followed by a public meeting.

C. AIR QUALITY DESIGNATIONS APPLICABLE TO THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY

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

Kern Council 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 2013 FTIP and 2011 RTP Amendment #3 includes analysis of existing and future air quality impacts for each applicable pollutant.

The San Joaquin Valley is currently designated as nonattainment for the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for 8-hour ozone (1997 standard), and particulate matter under 2.5 microns in diameter (PM2.5) (1997 and 2006 standards); 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. State Implementation Plans have been prepared to address carbon monoxide, ozone, PM-10 and PM2.5:

- The 2004 Revision to the California State Implementation Plan for Carbon Monoxide was approved by EPA on November 30, 2005 (effective January 30, 2006).
- The 2007 Ozone Plan (as revised in 2011) was approved by EPA on March 1, 2012 (effective April 30, 2012).
- 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.
- The 2008 PM2.5 Plan (as revised in 2011) was approved by EPA on November 9, 2011 (effective January 9, 2012).

On November 13, 2009, EPA published Air Quality Designations for the 2006 24-hour PM2.5 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 PM2.5 nonattainment area boundary for the San Joaquin Valley is exactly the same as the nonattainment area boundary for the 1997 annual standard.

In accordance with the EPA Interim Transportation Conformity Guidance 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. The new attainment year of 2014 must be modeled.

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

County	2003 Emissions (winter tons/day)	2010 Emissions (winter tons/day)	2018 Emissions (winter tons/day)
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 approved the Plan and conformity budgets (as revised in 2011) on March 1, 2012, effective April 30, 2012.

The SJV was reclassified from a Serious nonattainment area for the 8-hour ozone standard to Extreme effective June 4, 2010. 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 approved conformity budgets from Table 5 of the EPA Federal Register notice are provided in the table below. These budgets will be used to compare to emissions resulting from the 2013 FTIP and 2011 RTP Amendment #3.

Table 1-2:
Approved Budgets from the 2007 Ozone Plan (as revised in 2011)
(summer tons/day)

	2011		2014		2017		2020		2023	
County	**ROG**	**NOx**	**ROG**	**NOx**	**ROG**	**NOx**	**ROG**	**NOx**	**ROG**	**NOx**
Fresno	14.3	36.2	10.7	30.0	9.3	22.6	8.3	17.7	8.0	13.5
Kern (SJV)	12.7	50.3	9.7	42.7	8.7	31.7	8.2	25.1	7.9	18.6
Kings	2.8	10.7	2.1	8.9	1.8	6.7	1.7	5.3	1.6	4.0
Madera	3.4	9.3	2.5	7.7	2.2	5.8	2.0	4.7	1.9	3.6
Merced	5.1	19.9	3.7	16.7	3.2	12.4	2.9	9.9	2.8	7.4
San Joaquin	11.1	24.6	8.4	20.5	7.2	15.6	6.4	12.4	6.3	10.0
Stanislaus	8.5	16.9	6.4	13.9	5.6	10.6	5.0	8.4	4.7	6.4
Tulare	8.8	16.0	6.7	13.2	5.8	10.1	5.3	8.1	4.9	6.2

PM-10

The 2007 PM-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)

	2005		2020	
County	**PM-10**	**NOx**	**PM-10**	**NOx**
Fresno	13.5	59.2	16.1	23.2
Kern[(a)]	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

[(a)] 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 (as revised in 2011) was approved by EPA on November 8, 2011, which contains motor vehicle emission budgets for PM2.5 and NOx established based on average annual daily emissions, as well as a trading mechanism. The motor vehicle emissions budget for PM2.5 includes directly emitted PM2.5 motor vehicle emissions from tailpipe, brake wear and tire wear. VOC, 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 5 of the November 9, 2011 Federal Register are

provided below and will be used to compare emissions resulting from the 2013 FTIP and 2011 RTP Amendment #3.

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)

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

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

The trading mechanism will be used only for conformity analyses for analysis years after 2014. To ensure that the trading mechanism does not impact the ability to meet the NOx budget, the NOx emission reductions available to supplement the PM2.5 budget shall only be those remaining after the NOx budget has been met.

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

Pollutant	Budget Years[1]	Attainment/Maintenance Year	Intermediate Years	RTP Horizon Year
CO	NA	2018	2017/2025	2035
Ozone	2014/2017/2020	2023	2025	2035
PM-10	NA	2020	2025	2035
PM2.5	NA	2014	2017/2025	2035

[1] 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 and 2011, PM-10 2005, PM2.5 2012), 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 PM2.5, 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 PM2.5 Nonattainment Areas (EPA, 2005a). Per CAA section 172(a)(2), all PM2.5 nonattainment areas will have an initial maximum statutory attainment date of April 5, 2010. However, the submitted 2008 PM2.5 Plan shows that the San Joaquin Valley PM2.5 nonattainment area can attain the annual PM2.5 NAAQS in 2014. In addition, the attainment year for the 2006 PM2.5 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.

F. AIR QUALITY DESIGNATIONS APPLICABLE TO THE OTHER AREAS OF KERN COUNTY

In addition to the San Joaquin Valley planning area, Kern County also includes the federally designated Mojave Desert, portions of the Indian Wells Valley Planning Area, and the portion of the San Joaquin Valley PM-10 nonattainment area that lies within the Kern County Air Pollution Control District (this area is not included in the SJV 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan) and has been labeled the East Kern PM-10 Area. Conformity for the 2013 FTIP and RTP Amendment #XX also includes analysis of existing and future air quality impacts for each applicable pollutant.

The Mojave Desert area is currently designated as nonattainment for the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for 8-hour ozone; whereas the Indian Wells Valley Planning area is designated as a maintenance area for PM-10; and there is an additional East Kern PM-10 Area. The Kern County Air Pollution Control District is responsible for air quality plan development for these areas. State Implementation Plans have been prepared to address 8-hour ozone in the Mojave Desert, and PM-10 in the Indian Wells:

- EPA published a Notice of Adequacy for the 8-hour ozone Early Progress Plans for Eastern Kern County on November 25, 2008 (effective December 10, 2008).
- The PM-10 Attainment demonstration, Maintenance Plan, and Redesignation Request was approved by EPA on May 7, 2003 (effective June 6, 2003).

While there is a 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan for the San Joaquin Valley, it does not address the portion of the nonattainment area under the jurisdiction of Kern County APCD (East Kern PM-10 Area). It is important to note that EPA has not designated any area beyond the San

Joaquin Valley portion of Kern County as nonattainment for the 1997 PM2.5 standards or the 2006 24-hour PM2.5 standard.

G. CONFORMITY TEST REQUIREMENTS

OZONE

Under the existing conformity regulation, regional emissions analyses for ozone areas must address nitrogen oxides (NOx) and volatile organic compounds (VOC) precursors. The motor vehicle emission budgets for ozone are specified in the Early Progress Plans for the California State Implementation Plan in tons per average summer day. EPA published the notice of adequacy determination in the Federal Register on November 25, 2008 (effective December 10, 2008). The 2008 motor vehicle emission budgets for ROG and NOx are provided in the table below.

Table 1-6: Mojave Desert (Eastern Kern County)
Ozone Emissions Budgets
(summer tons / day)

County	ROG	NOx
Kern – Eastern	5	18

PM-10

The Indian Wells Valley planning area, which includes a portion of Kern County, has an approved Maintenance Plan for PM-10 that includes conformity budgets. The motor vehicle emissions budget for PM-10 are specified in the September 5, 2003 PM-10 Attainment Demonstration, Maintenance Plan, and Redesignation Request. EPA finalized approval of this Plan on May 7, 2003, effective June 6, 2003. The budgets for 2001 and 2013 from Table 7-2 of the Plan provided below will be used to compare with each analysis year emissions. Emission budget includes dust from paved and unpaved roads, as well as dust from construction activities. Vehicle exhaust was determined not to be significant and was not included in the budget.

Table 1-7: Kern County Indian Wells Valley Area
PM-10 Emissions Budgets

County	2001 (tons/day)	2013 (tons/day)
Kern – Indian Wells Valley	1.6	1.7

In addition, the San Joaquin Valley PM-10 nonattainment area includes a portion of Kern County that is not addressed in the 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan. This area is now under the jurisdiction of the Kern County APCD and has been labeled the East Kern PM-10 Area. This area currently has no PM-10 air quality plan. Under this scenario, the conformity regulation requires that the PM-10 nonattainment area use the interim emissions tests, which include either the “Action” scenario less than the “Baseline” scenario (Build vs. No-Build) or the “Action”

scenario less than baseline emissions (Build vs. 1990). The regional emissions analysis must only address PM-10, since neither VOC nor NOx precursors have been found to be a significant contributor to the PM-10 nonattainment problem in this area. Analysis year requirements are addressed under Section 93.119(g)(1) of the conformity regulation, nonattainment areas using interim emission tests are required to perform a regional emissions analysis for the following years:

- A year no more than 5 years beyond the year in which the conformity determination is made (e.g., 2015);
- The last year of the transportation plan's forecast period (e.g., 2035); and
- Any additional years within the time frame of the transportation plan so that analysis years are no more than 10 years apart (e.g., 2025).

Section 93.119(g)(2) of the conformity regulation indicates that a regional emissions analysis would not be required for analysis years in which the transportation projects and planning assumptions in the "Action" and "Baseline" scenarios are exactly the same. In such case, the interim test can be satisfied by documenting that the transportation projects and planning assumptions in both scenarios are exactly the same, and consequently, the emission predicted in the "action" scenario are not greater than the emissions predicted in the "Baseline" scenario for such analysis years.

H. ANALYSIS YEARS

A summary of the analysis years resulting from the above described rules and guidance for the Conformity Analysis is provided below.

Table 1-8: Other Portions of Kern County Conformity Analysis Years

Pollutant	Budget Years	Attainment/ Maintenance Year	Intermediate Years	RTP Horizon Year
E. Kern Ozone	NA	[1]	2015/2025	2035
Indian Wells Valley PM-10	NA	2013	2015/2025	2035
East Kern PM-10	NA	NA	2015/2025	2035

[1] Since the attainment year is currently 2008 for ozone and 2010 for PM-10, which are NOT in the time span of the transportation plan, it is not included as an analysis year, although the ozone budget itself will be used to demonstrate conformity.

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 2012.

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.

Kern COG uses the TP+/CUBE transportation model. The model was validated in 2009 using a 2006 base year. The validation of the new model includes validation test of the existing model's

ability to forecast to the new 2006 traffic counts. The validated model, used for this conformity analysis, predicted 2006 traffic within 1 percent of HPMS VMT, well within the tolerance required by federal conformity guidelines. The latest planning assumptions used in the transportation model validation and Conformity Analysis is summarized in Table 2-1.

It is important to note that the San Joaquin Valley has recently completed an ambitious effort to update and improve each of the MPO traffic models. The San Joaquin Valley Model Improvement Plan (MIP) was funded by a grant of $2.5 million from Proposition 84 money. Although the MIP contract work is complete, the models continue to be refined. It is currently anticipated that the models and validation/calibration report will be officially adopted as part of the 2014 RTP.

Table 2-1
Summary of Latest Planning Assumptions for the Kern COG Conformity Analysis

Assumption	Year and Source of Data (MPO action)	Modeling	Next Scheduled Update
Population	Base Year: 2006 Projections: 2009 The 2006 base year population was based on the DOF estimates from 2006. In October 2009, the Kern COG policy board approved a regional growth forecast target of 1.8 percent countywide based on historic trend data and public input.	This data is disaggregated to the TAZ level for input into TP+/CUBE for the base year validation. The population data from the DOF and U.S. Census, combined with Kern County Assessor's year-structure-built data provided the 2006 base for future year projections.	The Kern COG Board has established a policy to revisit the regional growth forecast every 3-5 years. The most recent re-used DOF and Kern estimates from 2006. The next countywide target update will be 2013, and will include the 2010 census data. Disaggregation to the TAZs for use by the model normally takes 6 to 9 months to develop after approval of the new forecast by the Kern COG Board.
Employment	Base Year: 2006 Projections: 2006 The 2006 base year employment was based on EDD estimates from 2006. Projections are based on 2nd Quarter 2006 employer locations derived from California Employment Development Dept (EDD). The forecast is based on a jobs per household (JPH) ratio, and assumes a gradual decrease in the ratio from 1.27JPH in 2006 to 1.15JPH in 2030 as the population ages.	This data is disaggregated to the TAZ level for input into the TP+/CUBE. The employment data was geocoded by Kern COG and used to allocate the EDD estimates for the 2006 base year, and extrapolated using the JPH ratio for all forecast years.	The next countywide target update for employment may occur with the release of the next update to the DOF forecast sometime in 2013.

Assumption	Year and Source of Data (MPO action)	Modeling	Next Scheduled Update
Traffic Counts	2006 traffic counts collected by Kern COG, its member agencies and Caltrans. A test validation was performed using 2006 counts and found that the screenlines averaged within 10% of the observed counts.	TP+/CUBE was validated using these traffic counts.	Kern COG maintains a regional traffic count program that counts over 1000 locations per year. The next full re-validation will occur in 2013 as part of the Model Improvement Program (MIP).
Cont. next page Vehicle Mile of Travel	The transportation model was validated in 2009 to the 2006 base year. The validation came within 1 percent of Caltrans HPMS VMT estimate.	TP+/CUBE is the transportation model used to estimate VMT in KERN County.	VMT is an output of the transportation model. VMT is affected by the TIP/RTP project updates and is included in each new conformity analysis.
Speeds	The 2006 transportation model validation was based on survey data free flow speeds collected in 2006 by the cities, County, Caltrans, and Kern COG. Speed distributions were updated in EMFAC 2007, using methodology approved by ARB and with information from the transportation model.	TP+/CUBE transportation model includes a feedback loop that assures congested speeds are consistent with travel speeds. EMFAC 2007	Speed studies are conducted by the cities and the County on Caltrans functionally classified routes on an on-going basis for setting/enforcing speed limits. This information is gathered and incorporated into each new model validation. Updated speed data will be incorporated in the next model validation.
Vehicle Registrations	EMFAC 2007 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.	EMFAC 2007	ARB has released EMFAC 11; however, it has not been approved by EPA for use in conformity analysis.
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:

The Kern Regional Transportation Modeling Committee (KRTMC) provides oversight for the land use and socioeconomic data inputs into the model. The KRTMC is made up of local government planning and public works staff. The KRTMC is a subcommittee of the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee to the Kern COG Board. The KRTMC was established by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Kern COG (representing the outlying communities), the City of Bakersfield, the County of Kern and Caltrans District 6 to coordinate modeling in the region. The MOU affirms the Kern COG policy for its Board to revise and adopt the countywide forecast targets every 3-5 years.

Land use and socioeconomic data at the zonal level are used for determining trip generation. The KRTMC updates the distribution of zonal data as new information and planning assumptions are available. The housing forecasts are based on the US Census and State of California Department of Finance (DOF) projections, and locally adopted forecasts based on historic performance. The employment forecasts were developed primarily California Employment Development Department (EDD) data and distributed by geocoding using ArcGIG software and from general plan land use data applying estimates of market absorption rates, jobs housing balance ratios. Employment data is currently stratified into three broad sectors: Retail, Basic/Industrial, and Service/Other based on SIC/NIACs code listings provided by InfoUSA. Population and employment growth were distributed among the County jurisdictions based on local data and a consensus process through the KRTMC. Income stratification for zonal data is based on the 2000 Census and is used in place of vehicle availability to determine mode choice and trip generation rates. Validation in the region shows a strong correlation between vehicle availability and income. School enrollment forecasts and future school location are developed in consultation with local school districts.
The KRTMC representatives work daily with developers and the public on future growth applications. Recently, developers have begun using the Kern COG model to test infrastructure needs created by new developments. These land use and infrastructure changes are worked into the regional conformity model after the development is approved and reflected in the TIP, RTP or Local impact fee project lists as requested by local agencies.

C. TRANSPORTATION MODELING

The San Joaquin Valley Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) utilize the TP+/Viper (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, expressway, arterial, collector, and local collector. Current and future-year road networks were developed considering local agency circulation elements of their general plans, traffic impact studies, capital improvement programs, and the State Transportation Improvement Program. The models use equilibrium, a capacity sensitive assignment methodology, and the data from the model for the emission estimates differentiates between peak and off-peak volumes and speeds. In addition, the model is reasonably sensitive to changes in time and other factors affecting travel choices. The results from model validation/calibration were analyzed for reasonableness and compared to historical trends.

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

Supporting Documentation:

The Kern COG regional travel demand model contains a congestion feedback loop with a fully integrated transit mode choice module. The model uses socio-economic data for 1984 TAZs and is integrated with ArcGIS software to manage both network and land use inputs.

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 Kern COG regional travel demand model was validated in 2009 to 2006 observed counts at more than 2000 locations. The validation incorporated data for Kern County from the most recent available California household travel. 75 percent of freeways, expressways and principle arterials meet the maximum desirable deviation established by the 1992 Caltrans Travel Forecasting Guidelines and transit boardings were within 12 percent of observed counts in the 2006 base year. 67 percent of all the links greater than the daily count of 500 meet the maximum desirable deviation.

The 2006 validation model performed well and averaged within 10% of observed counts along screenlines. The percent difference of 3% is well within the allowable 5% difference for all links. The validation also meets the maximum allowable deviation criteria for the percent difference for all the different volume ranges.

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:

Kern COG's member agencies routinely perform speed surveys on functionally classified routes throughout the region. These observed speeds are inputted into the model as the freeflow speeds. The valley traffic models include a feedback loop that uses congested travel times as an input to the trip distribution step. The feedback loop ensures that the congested travel speeds used as input to the air pollution emission models are consistent with the travel speeds used throughout the traffic model process. The observed speeds were also compared to the speeds from the traffic assignment and are shown in the appendix table of the model documentation.

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 Golden Empire Transit (GET) District is a member of the KRTMC and provides updates to the fixed transit network upon request by Kern COG modeling staff. The transit network as modeled reflects the latest available changes from GET.

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. The modeled trip lengths were also reasonable compared to the observed trip lengths in minutes.

For Serious and above nonattainment areas, transportation conformity guidance, Section 93.122(b)(3) of the conformity rule 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 Caltrans HPMS 2006 estimate of VMT in Kern County was 22,400,280. The 2006 model base year estimated 22,652,969 VMT. The 2006 model estimate is 1 percent higher than the Caltrans 2006 HPMS VMT and within the validation of plus or minus 3 percent desirable target range.

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 2013 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (2013 FTIP) and 2011 Regional Transportation Plan Amendment #3 (2011 RTP Amendment #3). 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 HPMS estimates of collector and local street travel.

Kern COG surveys its member jurisdictions twice a year for updates to the transportation model network on regionally significant routes. The latest changes are reflected in Appendix B.

D. TRAFFIC ESTIMATES

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

Table 2-2
Traffic Network Comparison for Horizon Years Evaluated in Conformity Analysis (SJV)

Horizon Year	Total Population (thousands)	Employment (thousands)	Average Weekday VMT (millions)	Total Lane Miles
2014	768.7	277.6	21.2	N/A
2017	813.4	292.0	22.7	N/A
2020	858.3	306.7	24.3	5664
2023	906.4	321.7	25.8	N/A
2025	938.5	331.6	27.0	5752
2035	1127.8	382.2	32.9	6834

*Not applicable for years lane miles not used in analysis.

Traffic Network Comparison for Horizon Years Evaluated in Conformity Analysis for Mojave Desert (Eastern Kern)

Horizon Year	Total Population (thousands)	Employment (thousands)	Average Weekday VMT (millions)	Total Lane Miles
2015	103.9	38.4	4.6	N/A
2025	126.7	47.2	5.8	N/A
2035	151.0	55.8	7.6	N/A

*Not applicable for years lane miles not used in analysis.

Traffic Network Comparison for Horizon Years Evaluated in Conformity Analysis for Indian Wells Valley (Kern County Portion)

Horizon Year	Total Population (thousands)	Employment (thousands)	Average Weekday VMT (millions)	Total Lane Miles
2013	36.6	36.6	0.7	361
2015	36.7	15.2	0.7	361
2025	39.5	18.3	0.8	412
2035	41.8	22.6	1.2	439

Traffic Network Comparison for Horizon Years Evaluated in Conformity Analysis for San Joaquin Valley PM-10 (Kern APCD Portion)

Horizon Year	Total Population (thousands)		Employment (thousands)		Average Weekday VMT (millions)		Total Lane Miles	
	Build	NO-Build	Build	No-Build	Build	No-Build	Build	No-Build
2015	36.0	36.0	7.0	7.0	0.9	0.9	423	423
2025	40.6	40.6	8.3	8.3	1.1	1.1	423	423
2035	41.8	41.8	9.6	9.6	1.7	1.7	423	423

E. VEHICLE REGISTRATIONS

Kern Council 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 EMFAC2007 model. EMFAC2007 is the most recent model for use in California conformity analyses (http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/onroad/latest_version.htm). Vehicle registrations, age distribution and fleet mix are developed and included in the model by CARB and cannot be updated by the user. ARB has released EMFAC 11; however, it has not been approved by EPA for use in conformity analysis.

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.

CARBON MONOXIDE

No committed control measures are included in the conformity demonstration.

OZONE

Committed control measures in the 2007 8-Hour Ozone Plan (as revised in 2011) 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

Measure Description	Pollutants
Existing Local Reductions: Rule 9310 (School Buses)	Summer NOx
Existing State Reductions: Carl Moyer Program & AB 1493 GHG Standards	Summer ROG Summer NOx
New/Proposed Local Reductions: Rule 9410 (Employer Based Trip Reduction)	Summer ROG Summer NOx
New/Proposed State Reductions: Smog Check & Truck Model	Summer ROG Summer NOx

NOTE: This table is consistent with the 2007 8-Hour Ozone Plan (as revised in 2011) which was approved by EPA on March 1, 2012 (effective April 30, 2012).

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

Measure Description	Pollutants
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 (as revised in 2011) 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
Existing Local Reductions: Rule 9310 (School Buses)	Annual PM2.5 Annual NOx
Existing State Reductions: Carl Moyer Program & AB 1493 GHG Standards	Annual PM2.5 Annual NOx
New/Proposed State Reductions: Smog Check & Truck Model	Annual PM2.5 Annual NOx

NOTE: This table is consistent with the 2008 PM2.5 Plan (as revised in 2011) as approved by EPA on November 9, 2011 (effective January 9, 2012).

G. STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN MEASURES APPLICABLE TO THE OTHER AREAS OF KERN COUNTY

No committed control measures are included in the conformity demonstration for ozone or PM-10. As previously indicated, EPA has not designated any area beyond the San Joaquin Valley portion of Kern County as nonattainment for the 1997 or 2006 PM2.5 standards.

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 re-entrained 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).
- The 2007 Ozone Plan (as revised in 2011) was approved by EPA on March 1, 2012 (effective April 30, 2012) 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.
- The 2008 PM2.5 Plan (as revised in 2011) was approved by EPA on November 9, 2011 (effective January 9, 2012).

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. NOTE: ARB has released EMFAC 11; however, it has not been approved by EPA for use in conformity analysis.

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

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

The road dust calculations have been updated to reflect this new methodology. More specifically, the emission factor equation and k value (particle size multiplier) have been updated accordingly. CARB default assumptions for roadway silt loading by roadway class, average vehicle weight, and rainfall correction factor remain unchanged. Emissions are estimated for five roadway classes including freeways, arterials, collectors, local roads, and rural roads. Countywide VMT information is used for each road class to prepare the emission estimates.

CALCULATION OF REENTRAINED DUST FROM UNPAVED ROAD TRAVEL

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

CALCULATION OF PM-10 FROM ROADWAY CONSTRUCTION

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

PM-10 TRADING MECHANISM

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

C. PM2.5 APPROACH

1997 Standard - 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.

EPA issued guidance for creating annual on-road mobile source emission inventories for PM2.5 in August 2005 (EPA, 2005a). The guidance indicates that all areas currently designated nonattainment for PM2.5 are violating the annual standard for the pollutant. Therefore, in order to be consistent with the standard, PM2.5 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 PM2.5 standard Nonattainment area designations on November 13, 2009 with an effective date of December 14, 2009. Conformity to the 2006 24-hour PM2.5 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 PM2.5 nonattainment area boundary for the San Joaquin Valley is exactly the same as the nonattainment area boundary for the 1997 annual standard.

The following PM2.5 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 PM2.5 and NOx from motor vehicles for an annual average day that will provide the information for both the annual and 24-hour PM2.5 standards.

EPA guidance indicates that State and local agencies need to consider whether VMT varies during the year enough to affect PM2.5 annual emission estimates. The availability of seasonal or monthly VMT data and the corresponding variability of that data need to be evaluated.

PM2.5 areas that are currently using network based travel models must continue to use them when calculating annual emission inventories. The guidance indicates that the interagency consultation process should be used to determine the appropriate approach to produce accurate annual inventories for a given nonattainment area. Whichever approach is chosen, that approach should be used consistently throughout the analysis for a given pollutant or precursor. The interagency consultation process should also be used to determine whether significant seasonal variations in the output of network based travel models are expected and whether these variations would have a significant impact on PM2.5 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 PM2.5 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 PM2.5 nonattainment areas must consider directly emitted PM2.5 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.

PM2.5 TRADING MECHANISM

The PM2.5 SIP (as revised in 2011) allows trading from the motor vehicle emissions budget for the PM2.5 precursor NOx to the motor vehicle emissions budget for primary PM2.5 using a 9 to 1 ratio. The trading mechanism will be used only for conformity analyses for analysis years after 2014.

D. AIR QUALITY MODELING APPLICABLE TO THE OTHER AREAS OF KERN COUNTY

For Mojave Desert (Eastern Kern), the model used to estimate emissions for ozone precursors is EMFAC2007 using the methodology described above.

For Indian Wells Valley (Kern County Portion), PM-10 on-road exhaust is not significant and not included in the emissions budgets or the conformity estimates. Paved road dust, unpaved road dust, and fugitive dust associated with road construction have been estimated using the methodology described above. However, there is no PM-10 trading mechanism.

For the Conformity Analysis, model inputs not dependent on the TIP or RTP are consistent with the applicable SIPs, which include:

- EPA published a Notice of Adequacy for the 8-hour ozone Early Progress Plans for Eastern Kern County on November 25, 2008 (effective December 10, 2008).

- The PM-10 Attainment demonstration, Maintenance Plan, and Redesignation Request was approved by EPA on May 7, 2003 (effective June 6, 2003).

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 under "Other Portions of Kern County Conformity Analysis Years".

No air quality modeling is being conducted for the portion of the San Joaquin Valley PM-10 nonattainment area that lies within the Kern County APCD (East Kern PM-10 Area). As discussed in Section 1, this area currently has no PM-10 air quality plan and must use the interim emissions test for PM-10. However, as illustrated in Section 2 and Appendix B, the transportation projects and planning assumptions in the "Action" and "Baseline" scenarios are exactly the same.

E. SUMMARY OF PROCEDURES FOR REGIONAL EMISSIONS ESTIMATES

It is important to note that the 2013 FTIP conformity procedures and documentation is fundamentally based on the 2011 TIP/RTP Conformity analysis with various updates as appropriate (e.g., new conformity budgets). Because EMFAC 2007 will continue to be used, previous step-by-step air quality modeling procedures have not been updated; rather, the worksheets have been updated as noted below. These updates were provided for interagency consultation in February 2012. Interagency consultation partners were requested to provide comments or concurrence. EPA concurred with the updated procedures; minor data entry errors were corrected in response to comments received from ARB. Documentation of the conformity analysis is provided in Appendix C, including:

- 2013 adjust_vmt Spreadsheet (updated analysis years only)
- 2013 Conformity EMFAC Spreadsheet (updated analysis years and new line item emission reductions to be consistent with the 2007 8-Hour Ozone Plan as revised in 2011 and 2008 PM2.5 Plan as revised in 2011)
- 2013 Conformity Paved Road Spreadsheet (updated to include January 2011 EPA update to AP-42 methodology)
- 2013 Conformity Unpaved Road Dust Spreadsheet
- 2013 Conformity Construction Spreadsheet
- 2013 Conformity Trading Spreadsheets (PM-10 and PM2.5) (new PM2.5 sheet developed consistent with 2008 PM2.5 Plan as revised in 2011)
- 2013 Conformity Totals Spreadsheet (updated to include new conformity budgets consistent with the 2007 8-Hour Ozone Plan as revised in 2011 and 2008 PM2.5 Plan as revised in 2011 and corresponding EPA approvals)

CHAPTER 4:
TRANSPORTATION CONTROL MEASURES

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

A. TRANSPORTATION CONFORMITY REGULATION REQUIREMENTS FOR TCMS

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

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

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

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

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

(i) programs for improved public transit;

(ii) restriction of certain roads or lanes to, or construction of such roads or lanes for use by, passenger buses or high occupancy vehicles;

(iii) employer-based transportation management plans, including incentives;

(iv) trip-reduction ordinances;

(v) traffic flow improvement programs that achieve emission reductions;

(vi) fringe and transportation corridor parking facilities serving multiple occupancy vehicle programs or transit service;

(vii) programs to limit or restrict vehicle use in downtown areas or other areas of emission concentration particularly during periods of peak use;

(viii) programs for the provision of all forms of high-occupancy, shared-ride services;

(ix) programs to limit portions of road surfaces or certain sections of the metropolitan area to the use of non-motorized vehicles or pedestrian use, both as to time and place;

(x) programs for secure bicycle storage facilities and other facilities, including bicycle lanes, for the convenience and protection of bicyclists, in both public and private areas;

(xi) programs to control extended idling of vehicles;

(xii) programs to reduce motor vehicle emissions, consistent with title II, which are caused by extreme cold start conditions;

(xiii) employer-sponsored programs to permit flexible work schedules;

(xiv) programs and ordinances to facilitate non-automobile travel, provision and utilization of mass transit, and to generally reduce the need for single occupant vehicle travel, as part of transportation planning and development efforts of a locality, including programs and ordinances applicable to new shopping centers, special events, and other centers of vehicle activity;

(xv) programs for new construction and major reconstructions of paths, tracks or areas solely for the use by pedestrian or other non-motorized means of transportation when economically feasible and in the public interest. For purposes of this clause, the Administrator shall also consult with the Secretary of the Interior; and

(xvi) program to encourage the voluntary removal from use and the marketplace of pre-1980 model year light duty vehicles and pre-1980 model light duty trucks.

TCM REQUIREMENTS FOR A TRANSPORTATION PLAN

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

> "(1) The transportation plan, in describing the envisioned future transportation system, provides for the timely completion or implementation of all TCMs in the applicable implementation plan which are eligible for funding under Title 23 U.S.C. or the Federal Transit Laws, consistent with schedules included in the applicable implementation plan.
>
> (2) Nothing in the transportation plan interferes with the implementation of any TCM in the applicable implementation plan."

TCM REQUIREMENTS FOR A TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

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

> "(1) An examination of the specific steps and funding source(s) needed to fully implement each TCM indicates that TCMs which are eligible for funding under title 23 U.S.C. or the Federal Transit Laws are on or ahead of the schedule established in the applicable

implementation plan, or, if such TCMs are behind the schedule established in the applicable implementation plan, the MPO and DOT have determined that past obstacles to implementation of the TCMs have been identified and have been or are being overcome, and that all State and local agencies with influence over approvals or funding for TCMs are giving maximum priority to approval or funding of TCMs over other projects within their control, including projects in locations outside the nonattainment or maintenance area;

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

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

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

B. APPLICABLE AIR QUALITY IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

Only transportation control measures from applicable implementation plans for the San Joaquin Valley region are required to be updated for this analysis. For 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 CARBON MONOXIDE

The 2004 Revision to the California State Implementation Plan for Carbon Monoxide was approved by EPA on November 30, 2005 (effective January 30, 2006). However, the Plan does not include TCMs for the San Joaquin Valley.

APPLICABLE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR OZONE

The 2007 Ozone Plan (as revised in 2011) was approved by EPA on March 1, 2012 (effective April 30, 2012). However, the Plan does not include TCMs for the San Joaquin Valley.

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.

APPLICABLE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR PM2.5

The 2008 PM2.5 Plan (as revised in 2011) was approved by EPA on November 9, 2011 (effective January 9, 2012). However, the Plan does not include TCMs for the San Joaquin Valley.

Other Portions of Kern: No TCMs are included in the air quality plans for the Mojave Desert (Eastern Kern) or Indian Wells Valley (Kern County portion) and there is no air quality plan for the San Joaquin Valley PM-10 nonattainment area that lies within the jurisdiction of the Kern County APCD (East Kern PM-10 Area).

C. IDENTIFICATION OF 2002 RACM THAT REQUIRE TIMELY IMPLEMENTATION DOCUMENTATION

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

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

In addition, the RTPA Commitment Document, Volume Three, dated April 2003 (PM-10 BACM) was reviewed, using the Summary of Commitments table. Commitments that contain specific Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding for the purchase and/or

operation of street sweeping equipment have been identified. Only one commitment (Fresno - City of Reedley) was identified.

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

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

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

The Project TID table that was prepared at the request of FHWA for the 2004 Conformity Analysis has been updated in each subsequent conformity analysis (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 E.

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 E.

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 E, 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, Kern Council 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. Kern Council 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, Kern Council of Governments also considered a commitment to "Repave or overlay paved roads with rubberized asphalt".

Based on consultation with CARB and the Air District, Kern Council 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

There is no "new" RTP development with 2013 FTIP. As a result, there is no update to this section with respect to inclusion of additional long-range local government control measures.

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 F includes the public meeting process documentation. The responses to comments received as part of the public comment process are included in Appendix G.

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 2013 TIP, 2011 RTP Amendment #3, and corresponding Conformity Analysis began on the February 2012 IAC conference call. Discussion topics included the draft schedule, procedures and documentation, including analysis

years. In February 2012, the Draft Conformity Analysis Years and Draft Conformity Procedures were transmitted for IAC. EPA concurred with the former and ARB provided comments on the latter; EPA then concurred with the procedures.

In addition, the CMAQ Policy Threshold Evaluation was transmitted for interagency consultation in April 2012. The San Joaquin Valley MPO CMAQ policy contains language that says the cost-effectiveness threshold will be evaluated with every FTIP; whereas, the policy itself is to be reviewed with every RTP. As part of the 2013 FTIP development, the threshold was reviewed. While the review indicates justification for an increase to $33/lb., it was recommended that the current threshold of $30/lb. be retained at this time. No adverse comments were received.

The Draft 2013 TIP, 2011 RTP Amendment #3, and corresponding Conformity Analysis were released on May 14, 2012 for a 45-day public comment period , followed by Board adoption in July 2012. Federal approval of the 2013 TIP and Conformity Analysis is anticipated by December 17, 2012.

Interagency consultation also includes the local transportation providers in the MPO region (e.g., cities, transit districts). Kern Council of Governments worked with these providers through the Kern Regional Transportation Modeling Committee, Transportation Technical Advisory Committee, The Transportation Planning Policy Committee and the Kern COG Board to develop the TIP/RTP, approve the TIP/RTP and the corresponding conformity analysis. In addition to the eleven incorporated cities and the count, many of these committees included representatives from the Kern Air Pollution Control District, the Golden Empire Transit District, Military Joint Planning Policy Board District, and Caltrans District 6.

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 45-day review period prior to adoption. 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 carbon monoxide (CO), 8-hour ozone (ROG and NOx), 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 CO, ozone (ROG/NOx), PM-10 (PM-10/NOx), and PM2.5 (PM2.5/NOx) respectively, in tons per day for each of the horizon years tested.

For carbon monoxide, the applicable conformity test is the emissions budget test, using the budgets established in the 2004 Revision to the California State Implementation Plan for Carbon Monoxide. The carbon monoxide budgets were approved by EPA for conformity purposes, effective January 30, 2006. The modeling results indicated that the on-road vehicle CO emissions predicted for the “Build” scenario for 2017 are less than the 2010 emissions budgets and 2018, 2025, and 2035 are less than the 2018 emissions budget. The TIP/RTP therefore satisfy the conformity emissions test for carbon monoxide.

For ozone, the applicable conformity test is the emissions budget test, using the 2007 Ozone Plan (as revised in 2011) budgets established for ROG and NOx for an average summer (ozone) season day. EPA approved the Plan and conformity budgets (as revised in 2011) on March 1, 2012, effective April 30. The modeling results for all analysis years indicate that the on-road vehicle ROG and NOx 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 NOx. 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 approved the 2008 PM2.5 Plan (as revised in 2011) November 9, 2011 (effective January 9, 2012). The modeling results for all analysis years indicate that the on-road vehicle PM2.5 and NOx emissions predicted for the "Build" scenarios are less than the emissions budget. The TIP/RTP therefore satisfy the conformity emissions test for PM2.5 and nitrogen oxides.

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

In addition to the San Joaquin Valley planning area, Kern County also includes the federally designated Mojave Desert, portions of the Indian Wells Valley Planning Area, and the portion of the San Joaquin Valley PM-10 nonattainment area that lies within the Kern County Air Pollution Control District (East Kern PM-10 Area).

For Mojave Desert ozone area, the applicable conformity test is the emissions budget test, using the 8-hour ozone Early Progress Plans for the California State Implementation Plan budgets established for ROG and NOx for an average summer (ozone) season day. EPA published the notice of adequacy determination in the Federal Register on November 25, 2008, effective December 10, 2008. The modeling results for all analysis years indicate that the on-road vehicle ROG and NOx emissions predicted for each of the "Build" scenarios are less than the emissions budgets for 2008. The TIP/RTP therefore satisfy the conformity emissions test for volatile organic compounds and nitrogen oxides.

For Indian Wells Valley PM-10, the applicable conformity test is the emissions budget test, using the PM-10 Attainment demonstration, Maintenance Plan, and Redesignation Request budgets for PM-10 and NOx. This Plan was approved by EPA on May 7, 2003 (effective June 6, 2003). The modeling results for all analysis years indicate that the PM-10 emissions predicted for the "Build" scenarios are less than the emissions budgets for 2001 and 2013. The TIP/RTP therefore satisfy the conformity emissions tests for PM-10.

For the portion of the SJV PM-10 nonattainment area that is under the jurisdiction of the Kern County APCD, the interim emissions test is satisfied for all years since the transportation projects and planning assumptions in both the "action" and "baseline" scenarios are exactly the same. In accordance with Section 93.119(g)(2), the emission predicted in the "action" scenario are not greater than the emissions predicted in the "Baseline" scenario for such analysis years. The TIP/RTP therefore satisfy the conformity emissions tests for PM-10.

As all requirements of the Transportation Conformity regulation have been satisfied, a finding of conformity for the Draft 2013 Federal Transportation Improvement Program and the 2011 Regional Transportation Plan [as amended, if necessary] is supported.

Table 6-1:
Conformity Results Summary

2013 Conformity Results Summary -- KERN

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?
		CO (tons/day)		CO
Carbon Monoxide	2010 Budget	180		
	2017	69		YES
	2018 Budget	180		
	2018	67		YES
	2025	52		YES
	2035	51		YES

		ROG (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)		ROG	NOx
Ozone	2014 Budget	9.7	42.7			
	2014	8.2	35.7		YES	YES
	2017 Budget	8.7	31.7			
	2017	7.3	25.6		YES	YES
	2020 Budget	8.2	25.1			
	2020	6.9	19.7		YES	YES
	2023 Budget	7.9	18.6			
	2023	6.7	14.2		YES	YES
	2025	6.4	11.9		YES	YES
	2035	6.0	9.8		YES	YES

		PM-10 (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)		PM-10	NOx
PM-10	2020 Budget	14.7	39.5			
	2020	7.9	34.1		YES	YES
	2020 Budget	14.7	39.5			
	2025	7.6	25.6		YES	YES
	2020 Budget	14.7	39.5			
	2035	10.1	23.4		YES	YES

		PM2.5 (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)		PM2.5	NOx
1997 PM2.5 24 Hour & Annual Standards and 2006 24-Hour Standard	2014 Budget	1.2	43.8			
	2014	1.0	37.8		YES	YES
	2014 Budget	1.2	43.8			
	2017	0.6	22.1		YES	YES
	2014 Budget	1.2	43.8			
	2025	1.1	15.4		YES	YES
	Adjusted 2014 Budget	1.3	42.9			
	2035	1.3	18.5		YES	YES

2013 Conformity Results Summary -- KERN (Mojave Desert)

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total			DID YOU PASS?	
		ROG (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)		ROG	NOx
Ozone	2008 Budget	5	18			
	2015	3	9		YES	YES
	2025	2	5		YES	YES
	2035	2	5		YES	YES

2013 Conformity Results Summary -- KERN (Indian Wells Valley)

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?
		PM-10 (tons/day)		PM-10
PM-10	2013 Budget	1.7		
	2013	1.0		YES
	2015	0.8		YES
	2025	0.9		YES
	2035	1.0		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. *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. *Guidance for Creating Annual On-Road Mobile Source Emission Inventories for PM2.5 Nonattainment Areas for Use in SIPs and Conformity.* U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. EPA420-B-05-008. August 2005

EPA, 2010a. 40 CFR Part 93. *Transportation Conformity Rule PM2.5 and PM10 Amendments; Final Rule.* Federal Register, March 24, 2010, Vol. 75, No. 56, p. 14260.

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

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

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, p 13	
§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., p. 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, p. 58	
§93.108	Document that the TIP/RTP is financially constrained (23 CFR 450).	E.S., p. 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, p.7ff	
§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, p. 16	
§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, pp.18	
USDOT/EPA 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, p. 22	
§93.110 (c,d,e,f)	Document any changes in transit operating policies and assumed ridership levels since the previous	Ch. 2, p. 24	

40 CFR	Criteria	Page	Comments
	conformity determination. Document the use of the latest transit fares and road and bridge tolls. Document the use of the latest information on the 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, p. 30	
§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, p. 45	
§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, p. 55 App. D p. 101	
§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)[i]	For areas with SIP budgets: 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, pp. 66-68	
§93.118 (b)	Document for which years consistency with motor vehicle emissions budgets must be shown.	Ch. 1, p. 12	
§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, pp. 66-68	
§93.119[1]	For areas without applicable SIP budgets: 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, NA	
§93.119 (g)	Document the use of the appropriate analysis years in the regional emissions analysis for areas without applicable SIP budgets.	Ch. 1, NA	
§93.119 (h,i)	Document how the baseline and action scenarios are defined for each analysis year.	Ch. 3, NA	
§93.122	Document that all regionally significant federal and	Ch. 2, p. 35	

40 CFR	Criteria	Page	Comments
(a)(1)	non-Federal projects in the nonattainment/maintenance area are explicitly modeled in the regional emissions analysis. For each 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	App B p.58	
§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, p. 14	
§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)[ii]	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, p. 24	
§93.122 (b)(1)(ii) [2]	Document the land use, population, employment, and other network-based travel model assumptions.	Ch. 2, p. 21	
§93.122 (b)(1)(iii) [2]	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, p. 21	
§93.122 (b)(1)(iv) [2]	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, p. 22	
§93.122 (b)(1)(v) [2]	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, p. 23	
§93.122 (b)(1)(vi) [2]	Document how travel models are reasonably sensitive to changes in time, cost, and other factors	Ch. 2, p. 22	

40 CFR	Criteria	Page	Comments
	affecting travel choices.		
§93.122 (b)(2) [2]	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.	Ch. 2, p. 23	
§93.122 (b)(3) [2]	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, p. 24	
§93.122 (d)	In areas not subject to §93.122(b), document the continued use of modeling techniques or the use of appropriate alternative techniques to estimate vehicle miles traveled	Ch. 2, NA	
§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, p. 31	
§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, p. 25 App B p. 58	

[i] Note that some areas are required to complete both interim emissions tests.
[ii] 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

TRANPORTATION PROJECT LISTING

Notes on How to Read These Tables:

Project listings are by road segment represented in the regional transportation model. Kern COG surveys its members bi-annually to update this table. The table is used to ensure that the projects are accurately represented in the model. A project that spans multiple segments has separate, duplicative listings for each segment of the project. The segments listed are only for regionally significant routes. Kern COG defines regionally significant routes as state functionally classified urban arterials, expressways, state routes and freeways. The model contains other roadways and projects on those roads, but they are not included in this project listing because they are not regionally significant routes. Construction start dates for projects listed in the RTP or FTIP may not coincide with the year shown in this project listing. This project listing shows the year the facility is anticipated to be open to traffic.

The table indicates the number of through lanes modeled in each direction. A 3 indicates a roadway with 3 lanes in each direction or a 6 lane facility. A 3/2 indicates a roadway with three lanes in one direction and 2 in the other. The table only shows through lanes in the segment modeled. An auxiliary lane or other capacity increasing project improvement that does not span the entire segment may not show up in the lane count for that segment. To accurately model the capacity of a segment, the lanes coded must be based on the minimum number of lanes or bottleneck in that segment. For example, ramps with 2 lanes are often coded as one lane because the two lanes merge into one at the ramp exit or entrance.

Kern models multiple air quality planning areas each with different State Implementation Plans (SIP). The planning areas are indicated in the Air Basin column. The blacked out columns indicate a segment is in a planning area without a SIP attainment date in that year. The segment was included in that model for that year, however, the segment's lanes are not reported because it is not affecting that SIP attainment demonstration for that planning area.

A separate exempt project table listing is also included. These are projects that are not required to be modeled for air quality conformity because they do not negatively affect air quality.

Appendix B - Highway Project Listing on Regionally Significant Route Segments and Year Number of Lanes Modeled

										Year number of lanes modeled (each direction)						
SORT KEY	AGENCY	AIR BASIN	PM10 BASIN	STREET	BEGIN	END	Type of Imprvmnt.	RTP PROJECT ID/Other ID	COST (RTP, Other)	13	14	15	17	20	23	25	35
1	**Bakersfield**																
2	Bakersfield	SJV		7th STANDARD RD	SANTA FE	ZERKER RD	Add Lanes	KER08RTP005	$57,000,000		2		2	2	2	2	2
3	Bakersfield	SJV		7th STANDARD RD	JEWETTA	VERDUGO	Add Lanes	KER08RTP005	$57,000,000		2		2	2	2	2	2
4	Bakersfield	SJV		7th STANDARD RD	VERDUGO	CALLOWAY	Add Lanes	KER08RTP005	$57,000,000		2		2	2	2	2	2
5	Bakersfield	SJV		AIRPORT	STATE RD	SR99	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	3	3	3	3
6	Bakersfield	SJV		ALFRED HARRELL	MT VERNON	CHINA GRADE LOOP					2		2	2	2	2	2
7	Bakersfield	SJV		ALFRED HARRELL	CHINA GRADE LOOP	FAIRFAX					2		2	2	2	2	3
8	Bakersfield	SJV		ALFRED HARRELL	FAIRFAX	WEST END HARTPARK	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	2
9	Bakersfield	SJV		ALFRED HARRELL	WEST END HARTPARK	LAKE MING	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	1	1	1	2
10	Bakersfield	SJV		ALFRED HARRELL	LAKE MING	PALADINO	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	1	1	1	2
11	Bakersfield	SJV		ALFRED HARRELL	PALADINO	SR178	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	1	1	1	2
12	Bakersfield	SJV		ALLEN	SR58	BRIMHALL	Add Lanes	Local			2		3	3	3	3	3
13	Bakersfield	SJV		ALLEN	BRIMHALL	WESTSIDE PARKWAY	Add Lanes		$7,000,000		2		2	2	2	2	2
14	Bakersfield	SJV		ALLEN	WESTSIDE PARKWAY	STOCKDALE	Add Lanes		$7,000,000		2		2	2	2	2	2
15	Bakersfield	SJV		ALLEN	STOCKDALE	MING AVE			$124,972		1		1	1	1	1	1
16	Bakersfield	SJV		ALLEN	MING AVE	CAMPUS PARK					1		1	1	1	1	2
17	Bakersfield	SJV		ALLEN	CAMPUS PARK	PANAMA LN					0		0	0	1	1	2
18	Bakersfield	SJV		ALLEN	PANAMA LN	SR 119					0		0	0	1	1	1
19	Bakersfield	SJV		ASHE RD	PANAMA LN	SR 119					1		1	2	2	2	2
20	Bakersfield	SJV		BRIMHALL RD	Rudd Road	RENFRO RD					0		0	2	2	2	2
21	Bakersfield	SJV		BRIMHALL RD	RENFRO RD	ALLEN					1		1	2	2	2	2
22	Bakersfield	SJV		BUENA VISTA RD	WHITE LN	HARRIS RD					2		2	2	2	2	2
23	Bakersfield	SJV		BUENA VISTA RD	HARRIS RD	PANAMA LN					1		1	2	2	2	2
24	Bakersfield	SJV		BUENA VISTA RD	PANAMA LN	SR 119					1		1	2	2	2	2
25	Bakersfield	SJV		BUENA VISTA RD	SR 119	CURNOW RD					1		1	1	1	1	2
26	Bakersfield	SJV		CALLOWAY	ETCHART	SNOW	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	2
27	Bakersfield	SJV		CALLOWAY	SNOW	NORRIS					2		2	2	2	3	3
28	Bakersfield	SJV		CALLOWAY	NORRIS	OLIVE					3		3	3	3	3	3
29	Bakersfield	SJV		CALLOWAY	OLIVE	NORIEGA					3		3	3	3	3	3
30	Bakersfield	SJV		CALLOWAY	NORIEGA	HAGEMAN					3		3	3	3	3	3
31	Bakersfield	SJV		CALLOWAY	HAGEMAN	MEACHAM					3		3	3	3	3	3
32	Bakersfield	SJV		CALLOWAY	MEACHAM	SR58					3		3	3	3	3	3
33	Bakersfield	SJV		CALLOWAY	BRIMHALL	WESTSIDE PARKWAY	Add Lanes	Local			3		3	3	3	3	3
34	Bakersfield	SJV		CALLOWAY	WESTSIDE PARKWAY	STOCKDALE					3		3	3	3	3	3
35	Bakersfield	SJV		CALIFORNIA	STOCKDALE	MOHAWK					3		3	3	3	3	3
36	Bakersfield	SJV		CALIFORNIA	MOHAWK	REAL					3		3	3	3	3	3
37	Bakersfield	SJV		CALIFORNIA	REAL	SR99					3		3	3	3	3	3
38	Bakersfield	SJV		CALIFORNIA	SR99	OAK					3		3	3	3	3	3
39	Bakersfield	SJV		CALIFORNIA	OAK	A ST					3/2		3/2	3/2	3/2	3/2	3
40	Bakersfield	SJV		CALIFORNIA	A ST	H ST					3		3	3	3	3	3
41	Bakersfield	SJV		CALIFORNIA	H ST	CHESTER					3		3	3	3	3	3
42	Bakersfield	SJV		CALIFORNIA	CHESTER	L ST					3		3	3	3	3	3
43	Bakersfield	SJV		CALIFORNIA	L ST	N ST					3		3	3	3	3	3

Appendix B - Highway Project Listing on Regionally Significant Route Segments and Year Number of Lanes Modeled

										Year number of lanes modeled (each direction)							
SORT KEY	AGENCY	AIR BASIN	PM10 BASIN	STREET	BEGIN	END	Type of Imprvmnt.	RTP PROJECT ID/Other ID	COST (RTP, Other)	13	14	15	17	20	23	25	35
44	Bakersfield	SJV		CALIFORNIA	N ST	Q ST					3		3	3	3	3	3
45	Bakersfield	SJV		CALIFORNIA	Q ST	UNION					3		3	3	3	3	3
46	Bakersfield	SJV		CALIFORNIA	UNION	BAKER					3		3	3	3	3	3
47	Bakersfield	SJV		CALIFORNIA	BAKER	KING					3		3	3	3	3	3
48	Bakersfield	SJV		CALIFORNIA	KING	BEALE					3		3	3	3	3	3
49	Bakersfield	SJV		CALIFORNIA	BEALE	HALEY					3		3	3	3	3	3
50	Bakersfield	SJV		CALIFORNIA	HALEY	WASHINGTON					2		2	2	2	2	2
51	Bakersfield	SJV		CASA LOMA	UNION	MADISON					2		2	2	2	2	2
52	Bakersfield	SJV		CASA LOMA	MADISON	COTTONWOOD					2		2	2	2	2	2
53	Bakersfield	SJV		CASA LOMA	COTTONWOOD	WASHINGTON					1		1	1	2	2	2
54	Bakersfield	SJV		CASA LOMA	WASHINGTON	FAIRFAX					0		0	0	0	0	2
55	Bakersfield	SJV		CHESTER	34TH ST	COLUMBUS					2		2	2	2	2	2
56	Bakersfield	SJV		CHESTER	30TH ST	34TH ST					2		2	2	2	2	2
57	Bakersfield	SJV		CHESTER	SR178	30TH ST					2		2	2	2	2	2
58	Bakersfield	SJV		COFFEE	7TH STANDARD	ETCHART	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	2	2	2	3
59	Bakersfield	SJV		COFFEE	ETCHART	SNOW	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	2	2	2	3
60	Bakersfield	SJV		COFFEE	NORRIS	OLIVE	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	3
61	Bakersfield	SJV		COFFEE	OLIVE	HAGEMAN					3		3	3	3	3	3
62	Bakersfield	SJV		COFFEE	HAGEMAN	MEANY					3		3	3	3	3	3
63	Bakersfield	SJV		COFFEE	MEANY	DOWNING					3		3	3	3	3	3
64	Bakersfield	SJV		COFFEE	DOWNING	GRANITE FALLS					3		3	3	3	3	3
65	Bakersfield	SJV		COFFEE	GRANITE FALLS	SR58					3		3	3	3	3	3
66	Bakersfield	SJV		COFFEE	SR58	BRIMHALL					3		3	3	3	3	3
67	Bakersfield	SJV		COFFEE	BRIMHALL	WESTSIDE PARKWAY					3		3	3	3	3	3
68	Bakersfield	SJV		COFFEE	WESTSIDE PARKWAY	TRUXTUN					3		3	3	3	3	3
69	Bakersfield	SJV		COFFEE	TRUXTUN	STOCKDALE					3		3	3	3	3	3
70	Bakersfield	SJV		CENTENNIAL CORRIDOR	SR 58	WESTSIDE PARKWAY	New Freeway	KER08RTP020	$698,000		0		0	3	3	3	3
71	Bakersfield	SJV		COTTONWOOD	SR 58	PANAMA RD					1		1	1	1	1	2
72	Bakersfield	SJV		FAIRFAX RD	ALFRED HARRELL HIGH	PALADINO DR					1		1	1	1	2	2
73	Bakersfield	SJV		FAIRFAX RD	REDBANK RD	PANAMA LN					1		1	1	1	1	2
74	Bakersfield	SJV		FAIRVIEW RD	MONITOR ST	SOUTH UNION AVE					1		1	1	1	1	2
75	Bakersfield	SJV		GOSFORD	SR119	MC KEE	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	2	2	2	2
76	Bakersfield	SJV		GOSFORD	MC KEE	MC CUTCHEN	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	2	2	2	2
77	Bakersfield	SJV		GOSFORD	MC CUTCHEN	PANAMA LN	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	2	2	2	2
78	Bakersfield	SJV		GOSFORD	PANAMA LN	HARRIS					3		3	3	3	3	3
79	Bakersfield	SJV		GOSFORD	HARRIS	PACHECO					3		3	3	3	3	3
80	Bakersfield	SJV		GOSFORD	PACHECO	DISTRICT					3		3	3	3	3	3
81	Bakersfield	SJV		GOSFORD	DISTRICT	WHITE LN					3		3	3	3	3	3
82	Bakersfield	SJV		GOSFORD	WHITE LN	S LAURELGLEN					3		3	3	3	3	3
83	Bakersfield	SJV		GOSFORD	S LAURELGLEN	N LAURELGLEN					3		3	3	3	3	3
84	Bakersfield	SJV		GOSFORD	N LAURELGLEN	MING					3		3	3	3	3	3
85	Bakersfield	SJV		GOSFORD	MING	CAMINO MEDIA					3		3	3	3	3	3
86	Bakersfield	SJV		GOSFORD	CAMINO MEDIA	STOCKDALE					3		3	3	3	3	3

Appendix B - Highway Project Listing on Regionally Significant Route Segments and Year Number of Lanes Modeled

										Year number of lanes modeled (each direction)							
SORT KEY	AGENCY	AIR BASIN	PM10 BASIN	STREET	BEGIN	END	Type of Imprvmnt.	RTP PROJECT ID/Other ID	COST (RTP, Other)	13	14	15	17	20	23	25	35
87	Bakersfield	SJV		HAGEMAN	ALLEN	OLD FARM					3		3	3	3	3	3
88	Bakersfield	SJV		HAGEMAN	OLD FARM	JEWETTA					3		3	3	3	3	3
89	Bakersfield	SJV		HAGEMAN	JEWETTA	VERDUGO					3		3	3	3	3	3
90	Bakersfield	SJV		HAGEMAN	VERDUGO	CALLOWAY					3		3	3	3	3	3
91	Bakersfield	SJV		HAGEMAN	CALLOWAY	MAIN PLAZA					3		3	3	3	3	3
92	Bakersfield	SJV		HAGEMAN	MAIN PLAZA	RIVERLAKES					3		3	3	3	3	3
93	Bakersfield	SJV		HAGEMAN	RIVERLAKES	COFFEE					3		3	3	3	3	3
94	Bakersfield	SJV		HAGEMAN	COFFEE	PATTON					3		3	3	3	3	3
95	Bakersfield	SJV		HAGEMAN	PATTON	FRUITVALE					3		3	3	3	3	3
96	Bakersfield	SJV		HAGEMAN	FRUITVALE	MOHAWK					3		3	3	3	3	3
97	Bakersfield	SJV		HAGEMAN	MOHAWK	KNUDSEN DR					2		2	2	2	2	3
98	Bakersfield	SJV		HAGEMAN	KNUDSEN DR	SR 99	New Ramps	KER08RTP013	$68,900,000		0		0	2	2	2	3
99	Bakersfield	SJV		HOSKING	BUENA VISTA	GOSFORD					1		1	1	1	2	2
100	Bakersfield	SJV		HOSKING	GOSFORD	STINE					1		1	1	2	2	2
101	Bakersfield	SJV		HOSKING	STINE	AKERS RD					1		1	2	2	2	2
102	Bakersfield	SJV		HOSKING	AKERS RD	WIBLE RD					2		2	2	2	2	2
103	Bakersfield	SJV		HOSKING	WIBLE RD	SO. H ST					3		3	3	3	3	3
104	Bakersfield	SJV		HOSKING	SO. H ST	UNION					1		1	2	2	2	2
105	Bakersfield	SJV		JEWETTA AVE	SNOW	HAGEMAN					2		2	2	2	2	2
106	Bakersfield	SJV		JEWETTA AVE	HAGEMAN	MEACHAM					1		1	2	2	2	2
107	Bakersfield	SJV		MANOR	ROBERTS LN	UNION					2		2	2	2	2	2
108	Bakersfield	SJV		MASTERSON ST	ALFRED HARRELL HWY	PALADINO DR					0		0	2	2	2	2
109	Bakersfield	SJV		MASTERSON ST	PALADINO DR	SR 178					2		2	2	2	2	2
110	Bakersfield	SJV		MING AVE	WEST BELTWAY	S ALLEN					0		0	2	2	2	2
111	Bakersfield	SJV		MING AVE	S ALLEN	BUENA VISTA					2		2	2	2	2	2
112	Bakersfield	SJV		MING AVE	BUENA VISTA	GRAND LAKES					3		3	3	3	3	3
113	Bakersfield	SJV		MING AVE	GRAND LAKES	OLD RIVER RD					3		3	3	3	3	3
114	Bakersfield	SJV		MING AVE	OLD RIVER RD	HAGGIN OAKS					3		3	3	3	3	3
115	Bakersfield	SJV		MING AVE	HAGGIN OAKS	GOSFORD					3		3	3	3	3	3
116	Bakersfield	SJV		MING AVE	GOSFORD	EL PORTAL					3		3	3	3	3	3
117	Bakersfield	SJV		MING AVE	EL PORTAL	ASHE					3		3	3	3	3	3
118	Bakersfield	SJV		MING AVE	ASHE	NEW STINE					3		3	3	3	3	3
119	Bakersfield	SJV		MING AVE	NEW STINE	STINE RD					3		3	3	3	3	3
120	Bakersfield	SJV		MING AVE	STINE	AKERS					3		3	3	3	3	3
121	Bakersfield	SJV		MING AVE	AKERS	REAL					3		3	3	3	3	3
122	Bakersfield	SJV		MING AVE	REAL	WIBLE					3		3	3	3	3	3
123	Bakersfield	SJV		MING AVE	WIBLE	HUGHES LN					3		3	3	3	3	3
124	Bakersfield	SJV		MING AVE	HUGHES LN	H ST					2		2	2	2	2	2
125	Bakersfield	SJV		MING AVE	H ST	CHESTER					2		2	2	2	2	2
126	Bakersfield	SJV		MING AVE	CHESTER	P ST					2		2	2	2	2	2
127	Bakersfield	SJV		MING AVE	P ST	UNION					2		2	2	2	2	2
128	Bakersfield	SJV		MOHAWK	HAGEMAN	DOWNING					3		3	3	3	3	3
129	Bakersfield	SJV		MOHAWK	ROSEDALE	TRUXTUN	New Arterial	KER08RTP004	$377,000,000		3		3	3	3	3	3

Appendix B - Highway Project Listing on Regionally Significant Route Segments and Year Number of Lanes Modeled

										Year number of lanes modeled (each direction)							
SORT KEY	AGENCY	AIR BASIN	PM10 BASIN	STREET	BEGIN	END	Type of Imprvmnt.	RTP PROJECT ID/Other ID	COST (RTP, Other)	13	14	15	17	20	23	25	35
130	Bakersfield	SJV		MOHAWK	SR 58	SR 58/Rosedale Highway	0.5 mi s/o				3		3	3	3	3	3
131	Bakersfield	SJV		MONTEREY	UNION	ALTA VISTA					3		3	3	3	3	3
132	Bakersfield	SJV		MONTEREY	ALTA VISTA	BAKER					3		3	3	3	3	3
133	Bakersfield	SJV		MONTEREY	BAKER	BEALE					3		3	3	3	3	3
134	Bakersfield	SJV		MONTEREY	BEALE	HALEY					3		3	3	3	3	3
135	Bakersfield	SJV		MONTEREY	HALEY	NILES					3		3	3	3	3	3
136	Bakersfield	SJV		MORNING DR	ALFRED HARRELL HWY	PALADINO DR					0		0	0	0	1	1
137	Bakersfield	SJV		MORNING DR	PALADINO DR	SR 178					1		1	2	2	2	2
138	Bakersfield	SJV		MORNING DR	SR 178	COLLEGE					1		1	1	1	1	1
139	Bakersfield	SJV		MT VERNON	COLUMBUS	SR178					2		2	2	2	2	2
140	Bakersfield	SJV		MT VERNON	SR58	BELLE TERRACE					2		2	2	2	2	2
141	Bakersfield	SJV		MT VERNON	BELLE TERRACE	CASA LOMA DR					2		2	2	2	2	2
142	Bakersfield	SJV		MT VERNON	WHITE LN/MULLER RD	PANAMA LN					0		0	0	0	0	1
143	Bakersfield	SJV		N. CHESTER	COLUMBUS	BEARDSLEY					2		2	2	2	2	2
144	Bakersfield	SJV		NEW STINE RD	WILSON	MING					3		3	3	3	3	3
145	Bakersfield	SJV		NEW STINE RD	MING	SUNDALE					3		3	3	3	3	3
146	Bakersfield	SJV		NEW STINE RD	SUNDALE	BELLE TERRACE					3		3	3	3	3	3
147	Bakersfield	SJV		NEW STINE RD	BELLE TERRACE	STOCKDALE					3		3	3	3	3	3
148	Bakersfield	SJV		NILES	UNION	ALTA VISTA					3		3	3	3	3	3
149	Bakersfield	SJV		NILES	ALTA VISTA	BAKER					3		3	3	3	3	3
150	Bakersfield	SJV		NILES	BAKER	BEALE					3		3	3	3	3	3
151	Bakersfield	SJV		NILES	BEALE	HALEY					3		3	3	3	3	3
152	Bakersfield	SJV		NILES	HALEY	MONTEREY					3		3	3	3	3	3
153	Bakersfield	SJV		OAK ST	CALIFORNIA AVE	SR 178 / 24th ST					2		2	2	2	3	3
154	Bakersfield	SJV		OLD_RIVER	STOCKDALE	CAMINO MEDIA					3		3	3	3	3	3
155	Bakersfield	SJV		OLD_RIVER	CAMINO MEDIA	MING					3		3	3	3	3	3
156	Bakersfield	SJV		OLD_RIVER	MING	WHITE LN					3		3	3	3	3	3
157	Bakersfield	SJV		OLD_RIVER	WHITE LN	CAMPUS PARK	Add Lanes	Local			3		3	3	3	3	3
158	Bakersfield	SJV		OLD_RIVER	CAMPUS PARK	PACHECO	Add Lanes	Local			3		3	3	3	3	3
159	Bakersfield	SJV		OLD_RIVER	PACHECO	HARRIS	Add Lanes	Local			3		3	3	3	3	3
160	Bakersfield	SJV		OLD_RIVER	HARRIS	PANAMA LN	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	2
161	Bakersfield	SJV		OLD_RIVER	PANAMA LN	BERKSHIRE	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	1	1	2	2
162	Bakersfield	SJV		OLD_RIVER	BERKSHIRE	MCCUTCHEN(HOSKING)	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	1	1	2	2
163	Bakersfield	SJV		OLD STINE	MING AVE	BELLE TERRACE					1		1	1	1	2	2
164	Bakersfield	SJV		OLIVE DR	RUDD RD (WEST BELTW	ALLEN					1		1	1	2	2	2
165	Bakersfield	SJV		OLIVE DR	ALLEN	JEWETTA					2		2	2	2	2	2
166	Bakersfield	SJV		OSWELL	SR178	BERNARD	Add Lanes	Local			3		3	3	3	3	3
167	Bakersfield	SJV		OSWELL	BRUNDAGE	SR58					2		2	2	2	2	2
168	Bakersfield	SJV		PALADINO DR	FAIRFAX	MORNING DR					0		0	0	2	2	2
169	Bakersfield	SJV		PALADINO DR	MORNING DR	MASTERSON Street					1		1	1	1	1	2
170	Bakersfield	SJV		PALADINO DR	MASTERSON Street	ALFRED HARRELL HWY					0		0	0	0	0	1
171	Bakersfield	SJV		PANAMA_LN	ALLEN	BARLOW	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	3	3
172	Bakersfield	SJV		PANAMA_LN	BARLOW	BUENA VISTA BLVD	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	3	3

Appendix B - Highway Project Listing on Regionally Significant Route Segments and Year Number of Lanes Modeled

										Year number of lanes modeled (each direction)							
SORT KEY	AGENCY	AIR BASIN	PM10 BASIN	STREET	BEGIN	END	Type of Imprvmnt.	RTP PROJECT ID/Other ID	COST (RTP, Other)	13	14	15	17	20	23	25	35
173	Bakersfield	SJV		PANAMA_LN	BUENA VISTA	MOUNTAIN VISTA	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	3	3
174	Bakersfield	SJV		PANAMA_LN	MOUNTAIN VISTA	OLD RIVER RD	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	3	3
175	Bakersfield	SJV		PANAMA_LN	OLD RIVER RD	PROGRESS	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	3	3
176	Bakersfield	SJV		PANAMA_LN	PROGRESS	GOSFORD	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	3	3
177	Bakersfield	SJV		PANAMA_LN	GOSFORD	RELIANCE	Add Lanes	Local			1/2		1/2	1/2	2	3	3
178	Bakersfield	SJV		PANAMA_LN	RELIANCE	ASHE	Add Lanes	Local			1/2		1/2	1/2	2	3	3
179	Bakersfield	SJV		PANAMA_LN	ASHE	GOLDEN GATE	Add Lanes	Local			3/2		3/2	3/2	3/2	3	3
180	Bakersfield	SJV		PANAMA_LN	GOLDEN GATE	STINE RD	Add Lanes	Local			3/2		3/2	3/2	3/2	3	3
181	Bakersfield	SJV		PANAMA_LN	STINE RD	AKERS	Add Lanes	Local			3		3	3	3	3	3
182	Bakersfield	SJV		PANAMA_LN	AKERS	WIBLE	Add Lanes	Local			3		3	3	3	3	3
183	Bakersfield	SJV		PANAMA_LN	WIBLE	SR99					3		3	3	3	3	3
184	Bakersfield	SJV		PANAMA_LN	SR99	H ST					3		3	3	3	3	3
185	Bakersfield	SJV		PANAMA_LN	H ST	MONITOR	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	3
186	Bakersfield	SJV		PANAMA_LN	MONITOR	UNION	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	3
187	Bakersfield	SJV		PANAMA_LN	UNION	COTTONWOOD					1		1	2	2	2	2
188	Bakersfield	SJV		PANAMA LN	COTTONWOOD	SR184					1		1	1	1	1	2
189	Bakersfield	SJV		PANORAMA DR	1700 FEET N COLUMBUS	UNION					2		2	2	2	2	2
190	Bakersfield	SJV		QUAIL CREEK RD	SNOW	7th STANDARD RD					0		0	0	0	2	2
191	Bakersfield	SJV		REAL RD	STOCKDALE	SR58					2		2	2	2	2	2
192	Bakersfield	SJV		RENFRO RD	7th STANDARD RD	OLIVE DR					0		0	0	0	0	1
193	Bakersfield	SJV		RENFRO RD	OLIVE DR	REINA RD					1		0	0	0	1	1
194	Bakersfield	SJV		RENFRO RD	JOHNSON RD	STOCKDALE HWY					1		1	2	2	2	2
195	Bakersfield	SJV		SANTA FE WAY	RUDD RD (West Beltway)	HAGEMAN RD					1		1	1	1	1	2
196	Bakersfield	SJV		SNOW RD	JENKINS RD	ALLEN					1		1	1	1	1	2
197	Bakersfield	SJV		SNOW RD	JEWETTA AVE	CALLOWAY DR					1		1	1	1	2	2
198	Bakersfield	SJV		SNOW RD	COFFEE RD	FRUITVALE AVE					1		1	1	1	2	2
199	Bakersfield	SJV		SO.CHESTER	UNION	PLANZ RD					2		2	2	2	2	2
200	Bakersfield	SJV		SO.CHESTER	PLANZ RD	WILSON					2		2	2	2	2	2
201	Bakersfield	SJV		SO.CHESTER	MING	BELLE TERRACE					2		2	2	2	2	2
202	Bakersfield	SJV		SO.CHESTER	BELLE TERRACE	SR58					2		2	2	2	2	2
203	Bakersfield	SJV		SO.CHESTER	SR58	BRUNDAGE					2		2	2	2	2	2
204	Bakersfield	SJV		SO.CHESTER	BRUNDAGE	4TH ST					2		2	2	2	2	2
205	Bakersfield	SJV		SO.CHESTER	4TH ST	CALIFORNIA					2		2	2	2	2	2
206	Bakersfield	SJV		SO.CHESTER	CALIFORNIA	TRUXTUN					2		2	2	2	2	2
207	Bakersfield	SJV		SO.CHESTER	TRUXTUN	18TH ST					2		2	2	2	2	2
208	Bakersfield	SJV		SO.CHESTER	18TH ST	21ST ST					2		2	2	2	2	2
209	Bakersfield	SJV		SO.CHESTER	21ST ST	SR178					2		2	2	2	2	2
210	Bakersfield	SJV		SO. H ST	ARVIN-EDSION CANAL	HOSKING					1		2	2	2	2	2
211	Bakersfield	SJV		SO. H ST	HOSKING	SR119					1		1	1	1	1	2
212	Bakersfield	SJV		STINE RD	WILSON	PLANZ RD					3		3	3	3	3	3
213	Bakersfield	SJV		STINE RD	PLANZ RD	WHITE LN					3		3	3	3	3	3
214	Bakersfield	SJV		STINE RD	WHITE LN	DISTRICT					3		3	3	3	3	3
215	Bakersfield	SJV		STINE RD	DISTRICT	PACHECO					3		3	3	3	3	3

Appendix B - Highway Project Listing on Regionally Significant Route Segments and Year Number of Lanes Modeled

										Year number of lanes modeled (each direction)							
SORT KEY	AGENCY	AIR BASIN	PM10 BASIN	STREET	BEGIN	END	Type of Imprvmnt.	RTP PROJECT ID/Other ID	COST (RTP, Other)	13	14	15	17	20	23	25	35
216	Bakersfield	SJV		STINE RD	PACHECO	HARRIS					3		3	3	3	3	3
217	Bakersfield	SJV		STINE RD	HARRIS	PANAMA LN					3		3	3	3	3	3
218	Bakersfield	SJV		STINE RD	PANAMA LN	BERKSHIRE					1		2	2	2	2	2
219	Bakersfield	SJV		STINE RD	BERKSHIRE	HOSKING					1		2	2	2	2	2
220	Bakersfield	SJV		STINE RD	HOSKING	MC KEE					1		2	2	2	2	2
221	Bakersfield	SJV		STINE RD	MC KEE	SR119					1		2	2	2	2	2
222	Bakersfield	SJV		STOCKDALE	NORD	WEGIS	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	1	1	1	3
223	Bakersfield	SJV		STOCKDALE	WEGIS	HEATH	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	1	1	1	3
224	Bakersfield	SJV		STOCKDALE	HEATH	CLAUDIA AUTUMN DR	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	2	2	2	2
225	Bakersfield	SJV		STOCKDALE	CLAUDIA AUTUMN DR	RENFRO	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	2	2	2	2
226	Bakersfield	SJV		STOCKDALE	RENFRO	ALLEN					3		3	3	3	3	3
227	Bakersfield	SJV		STOCKDALE	ALLEN	JEWETTA					3		3	3	3	3	3
228	Bakersfield	SJV		STOCKDALE	JEWETTA	BUENA VISTA BLVD					3		3	3	3	3	3
229	Bakersfield	SJV		STOCKDALE	BUENA VISTA	CALLOWAY					3		3	3	3	3	3
230	Bakersfield	SJV		STOCKDALE	CALLOWAY	COFFEE					3		3	3	3	3	3
231	Bakersfield	SJV		STOCKDALE	COFFEE	ASHE					3		3	3	3	3	3
232	Bakersfield	SJV		STOCKDALE	ASHE	CALIFORNIA					3		3	3	3	3	3
233	Bakersfield	SJV		STOCKDALE	CALIFORNIA	MONTCLAIR					3		3	3	3	3	3
234	Bakersfield	SJV		STOCKDALE	MONTCLAIR	STINE RD					3		3	3	3	3	3
235	Bakersfield	SJV		STOCKDALE	STINE	REAL					3		3	3	3	3	3
236	Bakersfield	SJV		STOCKDALE	REAL	SR99					3		3	3	3	3	3
237	Bakersfield	SJV		STOCKDALE	SR99	OAK					3		3	3	3	3	3
238	Bakersfield	SJV		TRUXTUN AVE	OAK	BEECH					2		2	2	2	2	2
239	Bakersfield	SJV		TRUXTUN AVE	BEECH	PINE ST					2		2	2	2	2	2
240	Bakersfield	SJV		TRUXTUN AVE	PINE	B ST					2		2	2	2	2	2
241	Bakersfield	SJV		TRUXTUN AVE	B ST	F ST					2		2	2	2	2	2
242	Bakersfield	SJV		TRUXTUN AVE	F ST	H ST					2		2	2	2	2	2
243	Bakersfield	SJV		TRUXTUN AVE	H ST	CHESTER					2		2	2	2	2	2
244	Bakersfield	SJV		TRUXTUN AVE	CHESTER	M ST					3		3	3	3	3	3
245	Bakersfield	SJV		TRUXTUN AVE	M ST	N ST					3		3	3	3	3	3
246	Bakersfield	SJV		TRUXTUN AVE	N ST	Q ST					3		3	3	3	3	3
247	Bakersfield	SJV		TRUXTUN AVE	Q ST	UNION					3		3	3	3	3	3
248	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	MANOR	COLUMBUS	Add Lanes	Local			3		3	3	3	3	3
249	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	COLUMBUS	34TH ST					3		3	3	3	3	3
250	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	34TH ST	30TH ST					3		3	3	3	3	3
251	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	30TH ST	NILES					3		3	3	3	3	3
252	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	NILES	MONTEREY					3		3	3	3	3	3
253	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	MONTEREY	KENTUCKY					3		3	3	3	3	3
254	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	KENTUCKY	SR204					3		3	3	3	3	3
255	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	SR204	21ST ST					3		3	3	3	3	3
256	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	21ST ST	18TH ST					3		3	3	3	3	3
257	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	18TH ST	TRUXTUN					3		3	3	3	3	3
258	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	TRUXTUN	CALIFORNIA					3		3	3	3	3	3

Appendix B - Highway Project Listing on Regionally Significant Route Segments and Year Number of Lanes Modeled

										Year number of lanes modeled (each direction)							
SORT KEY	AGENCY	AIR BASIN	PM10 BASIN	STREET	BEGIN	END	Type of Imprvmnt.	RTP PROJECT ID/Other ID	COST (RTP, Other)	13	14	15	17	20	23	25	35
259	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	CALIFORNIA	4TH ST					3		3	3	3	3	3
260	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	4TH ST	BRUNDAGE					3		3	3	3	3	3
261	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	BRUNDAGE	SR58					3		3	3	3	3	3
262	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	SR58	BELLE TERRACE	Add Lanes	Local			3		3	3	3	3	3
263	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	MING	WILSON	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	3	3
264	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	WILSON	PLANZ	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	3	3
265	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	PLANZ	CHESTER	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	3	3
266	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	CHESTER	WHITE LN	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	3	3
267	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	PACHECO	FAIRVIEW RD	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	3
268	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	FAIRVIEW RD	PANAMA LN	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	3
269	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	PANAMA LN	BERKSHIRE	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	3
270	Bakersfield	SJV		UNION	BERKSHIRE	HOSKING	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	3
271	Bakersfield	SJV		VINELAND RD	PALADINO DR	SR 178					0		2	2	2	2	2
272	Bakersfield	SJV		VINELAND RD	SR 178	SR 184/Kern Canyon Road					0		2	2	2	2	2
273	Bakersfield	SJV		WHITE LN/Muller Road	COTTONWOOD RD	OSWELL					0		0	0	0	0	2
274	Bakersfield	SJV		WHITE LN	BUENA VISTA	MOUNTAIN VISTA					3		3	3	3	3	3
275	Bakersfield	SJV		WHITE LN	MOUNTAIN VISTA	OLD RIVER RD					3		3	3	3	3	3
276	Bakersfield	SJV		WHITE LN	OLD RIVER RD	PARK VIEW					3		3	3	3	3	3
277	Bakersfield	SJV		WHITE LN	PARK VIEW	PIN OAK PARK					3		3	3	3	3	3
278	Bakersfield	SJV		WHITE LN	PIN OAK PARK	GOSFORD					3		3	3	3	3	3
279	Bakersfield	SJV		WHITE LN	GOSFORD	LILY					3		3	3	3	3	3
280	Bakersfield	SJV		WHITE LN	LILY	ASHE					3		3	3	3	3	3
281	Bakersfield	SJV		WHITE LN	ASHE	WILSON					3		3	3	3	3	3
282	Bakersfield	SJV		WHITE LN	WILSON	CLOVE					3		3	3	3	3	3
283	Bakersfield	SJV		WHITE LN	CLOVE	STINE RD					3		3	3	3	3	3
284	Bakersfield	SJV		WHITE LN	STINE RD	AKERS					3		3	3	3	3	3
285	Bakersfield	SJV		WHITE LN	AKERS	WIBLE RD					3		3	3	3	3	3
286	Bakersfield	SJV		WHITE LN	WIBLE RD	SR99					3		3	3	3	3	3
287	Bakersfield	SJV		WHITE LN	SR99	HUGHES LN					3		3	3	3	3	3
288	Bakersfield	SJV		WHITE LN	HUGHES LN	H ST					3/2		3/2	3/2	3/2	3/2	3/2
289	Bakersfield	SJV		WHITE LN	H ST	MONITOR					2		2	2	2	2	2
290	Bakersfield	SJV		WHITE LN	MONITOR	UNION					2		2	2	2	2	2
291	Bakersfield	SJV		WIBLE	SR 119	CURNOW RD					1		1	1	1	1	2
292	Bakersfield	SJV		WESTSIDE PARKWAY	HEATH	WEST BELTEWAY	New Freeway	KER08RTP004	$377,000,000		2		2	2	2	2	2
293	Bakersfield	SJV		WESTSIDE PARKWAY	WEST BELTEWAY	ALLEN	New Freeway	KER08RTP005	$377,000,000		2		2	2	2	2	3
294	Bakersfield	SJV		WESTSIDE PARKWAY	ALLEN	JEWETTA	New Freeway	KER08RTP004	$377,000,000		3		3	3	3	3	3
295	Bakersfield	SJV		WESTSIDE PARKWAY	JEWETTA	CALLOWAY	New Freeway	KER08RTP004	$377,000,000		3		3	3	3	3	3
296	Bakersfield	SJV		WESTSIDE PARKWAY	CALLOWAY	COFFEE	New Freeway	KER08RTP004	$377,000,000		3		3	3	3	3	3
297	Bakersfield	SJV		WESTSIDE PARKWAY	COFFEE	MOHAWK	New Freeway/Arte	KER08RTP004	$377,000,000		3/4		3/4	4	4	4	4
298	Bakersfield	SJV		WESTSIDE PARKWAY	MOHAWK	TRUXTUN	New Freeway/Arte	KER08RTP004	$377,000,000		2		2	2	2	2	2
299	Bakersfield	SJV		WESTSIDE PARKWAY(P	MOHAWK	SR 99/SR 58					3		3	3	3	3	3
300	Bakersfield	SJV		WEST BELTWAY	7TH STANDARD	SR 58/Rosedale Highway		KER08RTP102			0		0	0	0	0	2
301	Bakersfield	SJV		WEST BELTWAY	SR58	WESTSIDE PARKWAY	New Freeway	KER08RTP016	$170,000,000		0		0	0	0	0	3

Appendix B - Highway Project Listing on Regionally Significant Route Segments and Year Number of Lanes Modeled

										Year number of lanes modeled (each direction)							
SORT KEY	AGENCY	AIR BASIN	PM10 BASIN	STREET	BEGIN	END	Type of Imprvmnt.	RTP PROJECT ID/Other ID	COST (RTP, Other)	13	14	15	17	20	23	25	35
302	Bakersfield	SJV		WEST BELTWAY	WESTSIDE PARKWAY	PACHECO		KER08RTP016			0		0	0	0	0	2
303	Bakersfield	SJV		WEST BELTWAY	PACHECO	PANAMA LN		KER08RTP097			0		0	0	0	0	2
304	Bakersfield	SJV		WEST BELTWAY	PANAMA LN	SR 119		KER08RTP097			0		0	0	0	0	2
305	**Caltrans**																
306	Caltrans	SJV		ELLINGTON	11TH AVE	SR155					1		1	1	1	1	1
307	Caltrans	SJV		I-5	LAVAL	LAVAL	Interchange	KER08RTP002	$11,300,000		x		x	x	x	x	x
308	Caltrans	SJV		I-5	COUNTY LINE	LAVAL					4		4	4	4	4	4
309	Caltrans	SJV		I-5	LAVAL	SR99					4		4	4	4	4	4
310	Caltrans	SJV		I-5	SR99	SR166					2		2	2	2	2	2
311	Caltrans	SJV		I-5	SR166	OLD RIVER RD					2		2	2	2	2	2
312	Caltrans	SJV		I-5	OLD RIVER RD	SR223					2		2	2	2	2	2
313	Caltrans	SJV		I-5	SR223	SR119					2		2	2	2	2	2
314	Caltrans	SJV		I-5	SR119	SR43					2		2	2	2	2	2
315	Caltrans	SJV		I-5	SR43	STOCKDALE					2		2	2	2	2	2
316	Caltrans	SJV		I-5	STOCKDALE	SR58					2		2	2	2	2	2
317	Caltrans	SJV		I-5	SR58	7TH STANDARD					2		2	2	2	2	2
318	Caltrans	SJV		I-5	7TH STANDARD	ROWLEE					2		2	2	2	2	2
319	Caltrans	SJV		I-5	ROWLEE	LERDO HWY					2		2	2	2	2	2
320	Caltrans	SJV		I-5	LERDO HWY	SR46					2		2	2	2	2	2
321	Caltrans	SJV		I-5	SR46	TWISSELMAN					2		2	2	2	2	2
322	Caltrans	SJV		I-5	TWISSELMAN	COUNTY LINE					2		2	2	2	2	2
323	Caltrans	IWV		SR14	SR395	POOLE				2		2				2	2
324	Caltrans	IWV		SR14	POOLE	INYOKERN	Add Lanes	KER08RTP006	$42,000,000	1		1				2	2
325	Caltrans	IWV		SR14	INYOKERN	SR178	Add Lanes	KER08RTP006	$42,000,000	1		1				2	2
326	Caltrans	IWV		SR14	SR178	6 mile s of 178	Add Lanes	KER08RTP017	$42,000,000	1		1				2	2
327	Caltrans	IWV		SR14	6 mile s of 178	REDROCK RANDSBURG	Add Lanes	KER08RTP024	$32,000,000	1		1				2	2
328	Caltrans	MD		SR14	REDROCK RANDSBURG	JAWBONE CANYON						2				2	2
329	Caltrans	MD		SR14	JAWBONE CANYON	CALIFORNIA CITY						2				2	2
330	Caltrans	MD		SR14	CALIFORNIA CITY	SR58BYPASS						2				2	2
331	Caltrans	MD		SR14	SR58BYPASS	DEAVER						2				2	2
332	Caltrans	MD		SR14	DEAVER	SR58						2				2	2
333	Caltrans	MD		SR14	ALTUS	SR58						2				2	2
334	Caltrans	MD		SR14	CAMELOT	ALTUS						2				2	2
335	Caltrans	MD		SR14	PURDY	CAMELOT						2				2	2
336	Caltrans	MD		SR14	SILVER QUEEN	PURDY						2				2	2
337	Caltrans	MD		SR14	BACKUS	SILVER QUEEN						2				2	2
338	Caltrans	MD		SR14	DAWN	BACKUS						2				2	2
339	Caltrans	MD		SR14	ROSAMOND	DAWN						2				2	2
340	Caltrans	MD		SR14	A AVE	ROSAMOND						2				2	2
341	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	SR33	GARDENER FIELD					1		1	1	1	1	1
342	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	GARDENER FIELD	2ND ST					1		1	1	1	1	1
343	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	2ND ST	ASH					1		1	1	1	1	1
344	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	ASH	HARRISON					1		1	1	1	1	1

Appendix B - Highway Project Listing on Regionally Significant Route Segments and Year Number of Lanes Modeled

										Year number of lanes modeled (each direction)							
SORT KEY	AGENCY	AIR BASIN	PM10 BASIN	STREET	BEGIN	END	Type of Imprvmnt.	RTP PROJECT ID/Other ID	COST (RTP, Other)	13	14	15	17	20	23	25	35
345	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	HARRISON	MIDWAY					1		1	1	1	1	1
346	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	MIDWAY	ELK HILLS					1		1	1	1	1	1
347	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	ELK HILLS	CHERRY AVE					1		1	1	1	1	1
348	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	CHERRY AVE	TUPMAN	Add Lanes	KER08RTP022	$115,000,000		1		1	1	1	2	2
349	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	CHERRY AVE	TUPMAN	Add Passing Lane	KER08RTP022	$9,000,000		2		2	2	2	2	2
350	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	TUPMAN	SR43					1		1	1	1	1	1
351	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	SR43	I-5					1		1	1	1	1	1
352	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	I-5	NORD	Add Lanes	KER08RTP099			1		1	1	1	1	2
353	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	NORD	HEATH	Add Lanes	KER08RTP099			1		1	1	1	1	2
354	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	HEATH	RENFRO	Add Lanes	KER08RTP099			1		1	1	1	1	2
355	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	RENFRO	ALLEN	Add Lanes	KER08RTP099			1		1	1	1	1	2
356	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	ALLEN	BARLOW	Add Lanes	KER08RTP099			1		1	1	1	1	2
357	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	BARLOW	BUENA VISTA BLVD	Add Lanes	KER08RTP099			1		1	1	1	1	2
358	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	BUENA VISTA BLVD	GREEN	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	1	1	1	2
359	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	GREEN	OLD RIVER RD	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	1	1	1	2
360	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	OLD RIVER RD	PROGRESS	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	1	1	1	2
361	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	PROGRESS	GOSFORD	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	1	1	1	2
362	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	GOSFORD	ASHE	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	1	1	1	2
363	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	ASHE	STINE RD	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	1	1	1	2
364	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	STINE RD	VAN HORN	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	1	1	1	2
365	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	VAN HORN	WIBLE RD	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	1	1	1	2
366	Caltrans	SJV		SR119	WIBLE RD	SR99	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	1	1	1	2
367	Caltrans	SJV		SR155	SR99	FREMONT					1		1	1	1	1	1
368	Caltrans	SJV		SR155	FREMONT	HIGH					1		1	1	1	1	1
369	Caltrans	SJV		SR155	HIGH	LEXINGTON					1		1	1	1	1	1
370	Caltrans	SJV		SR155	LEXINGTON	MAST AVE					1		1	1	1	1	1
371	Caltrans	SJV		SR155	MAST AVE	BROWNING					1		1	1	1	1	1
372	Caltrans	SJV		SR155	BROWNING	BOWMAN RD	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	1	1	1	2
373	Caltrans	SJV		SR155	BOWMAN RD	FAMOSO PORTERVILLE	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	1	1	1	2
374	Caltrans	SJV		SR155	FAMOSO PORTERVILLE	SR65					1		1	1	1	1	1
375	Caltrans	SJV		SR155	SR65	WOODY GRANITE					1		1	1	1	1	1
376	Caltrans	SJV		SR155	WOODY GRANITE	GRANITE					1		1	1	1	1	1
377	Caltrans	SJV		SR155	GRANITE	JACK RANCH					1		1	1	1	1	1
378	Caltrans	SJV	Y/5	SR155	JACK RANCH	RANCHERIA RD					1		1	1	1	1	1
379	Caltrans	MD	Y	SR155	RANCHERIA	WOFFORD						1				1	1
380	Caltrans	MD	Y	SR155	WOFFORD	SAWMILL						2				2	2
381	Caltrans	MD	Y	SR155	SAWMILL	SR178						1				1	1
382	Caltrans	SJV		SR166	SR33	OLD RIVER RD					1		1	1	1	1	1
383	Caltrans	SJV		SR166	OLD RIVER RD	I-5					1		1	1	1	1	1
384	Caltrans	SJV		SR166	I-5	SR99					1		1	1	1	1	1
385	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	SR58/SR99	BUCK OWENS		KER08RTP014	$59,000,000		3		3	3	3	3	3
386	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	BUCK OWENS	OAK		KER08RTP014	$59,000,000		3		4	4	4	4	4
387	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	OAK	OAK	Intersection	KER08RTP012	$19,100,000		2		4	4	4	4	4

Appendix B - Highway Project Listing on Regionally Significant Route Segments and Year Number of Lanes Modeled

										Year number of lanes modeled (each direction)							
SORT KEY	AGENCY	AIR BASIN	PM10 BASIN	STREET	BEGIN	END	Type of Imprvmnt.	RTP PROJECT ID/Other ID	COST (RTP, Other)	13	14	15	17	20	23	25	35
388	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	OAK	BEECH	Add Lanes	KER08RTP014	$59,000,000		2		3	3	3	3	3
389	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	BEECH	PINE ST	Add Lanes	KER08RTP014	$59,000,000		2		3	3	3	3	3
390	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	PINE ST	BAY ST	Add Lanes	KER08RTP014	$59,000,000		2		3	3	3	3	3
391	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	BAY ST	D ST	Add Lanes	KER08RTP014	$59,000,000		2		3	3	3	3	3
392	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	D ST	F ST	Add Lanes	KER08RTP014	$59,000,000		3		4	4	4	4	4
393	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	F ST	H ST	Add Lanes	KER08RTP014	$59,000,000		3		4	4	4	4	4
394	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	H ST	CHESTER	Add Lanes	KER08RTP014	$59,000,000		3		4	4	4	4	4
395	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	CHESTER	M ST	Add Lanes	KER08RTP014	$59,000,000		3		4	4	4	4	4
396	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	M ST	SR204					3		3	3	3	3	3
397	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	SR204	ALTA VISTA					3		3	3	3	3	3
398	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	ALTA VISTA	BEALE	Add Lanes	KER08RTP026	$81,000,000		3		3	3	3	3	4
399	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	BEALE	HALEY	Add Lanes	KER08RTP026	$81,000,000		3		3	3	3	3	4
400	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	HALEY	MT VERNON	Add Lanes	KER08RTP026	$81,000,000		3		3	3	3	3	4
401	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	MT VERNON	OSWELL	Add Lanes	KER08RTP026	$81,000,000		3		3	3	3	3	4
402	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	OSWELL	FAIRFAX					2		2	2	2	2	2
403	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	FAIRFAX	MORNING DR		KER08RTP111			2		3	3	3	3	3
404	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	MORNING DR	VINELAND	Add Lanes	KER08RTP010 KER08RTP112	$58,800,000		1		2	2	2	2	3
405	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	VINELAND	SR184	Add Lanes	KER08RTP011 KER08RTP025	$36,800,000 $231,500,000		1		3	3	3	3	3
406	Caltrans	SJV		SR179	SR184	MASTERSON Street	Add Lanes	KER08RTP011 KER08RTP025	$36,800,000 $231,500,000		1		3	3	3	3	3
407	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	MASTERSON Street	COMANCHE	Add Lanes	KER08RTP011 KER08RTP025	$36,800,000 $231,500,000		1		2	2	2	2	3
408	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	COMANCHE	MIRAMONTE	Add Lanes	KER08RTP011 KER08RTP025	$36,800,000 $231,500,000		1		2	2	2	2	3
409	Caltrans	SJV		SR178	MIRAMONTE	RANCHERIA RD		KER08RTP084			1		1	1	1	1	2
410	Caltrans	SJV/MD	Y/3	SR178	RANCHERIA RD	SR155					2		2	2	2	2	2
411	Caltrans	MD	Y	SR178	SR155	LAKE ISABELLA BLVD						1				1	1
412	Caltrans	MD	Y	SR178	LAKE ISABELLA BLVD	SIERRA WY						1				1	1
413	Caltrans	MD	Y	SR178	SIERRA WY	KELSO VALLEY						1				1	1
414	Caltrans	MD/IWV	Y/2	SR178	KELSO VALLEY	SR14				1		1				1	1
415	Caltrans	IWV		SR178	SR14	SR395				1		1				1	1
416	Caltrans	IWV		SR178	SR395	JACKS RANCH				2		2				2	2
417	Caltrans	IWV		SR178	JACKS RANCH	BRADY				2		2				2	2
418	Caltrans	IWV		SR178	BRADY	MAHAN				2		2				2	2
419	Caltrans	IWV		SR178	MAHAN	DOWNS				2		2				2	2
420	Caltrans	IWV		SR178	DOWNS	NORMA				2		2				2	2
421	Caltrans	IWV		SR178	NORMA	CHINA LAKE				2		2				2	2
422	Caltrans	IWV		SR178	INYOKERN	WARD				2		2				2	2
423	Caltrans	IWV		SR178	WARD	DRUMMOND				2		2				2	2

Appendix B - Highway Project Listing on Regionally Significant Route Segments and Year Number of Lanes Modeled

										Year number of lanes modeled (each direction)							
SORT KEY	AGENCY	AIR BASIN	PM10 BASIN	STREET	BEGIN	END	Type of Imprvmnt.	RTP PROJECT ID/Other ID	COST (RTP, Other)	13	14	15	17	20	23	25	35
424	Caltrans	IWV		SR178	DRUMMOND	LAS FLORES				2		2				2	2
425	Caltrans	IWV		SR178	LAS FLORES	RIDGECREST BLVD				2		2				2	2
426	Caltrans	IWV		SR178	CHINA LAKE	GATEWAY				2		2				2	2
427	Caltrans	IWV		SR178	GATEWAY	RICHMOND				2		2				2	2
428	Caltrans	IWV		SR178	RICHMOND	COUNTY LINE				1		1				1	1
429	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	MESA MARIN DR	SR178	Add Lanes	KER08RTP101			1		1	1	1	1	2
430	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	VINELAND	MESA MARIN DR	Add Lanes	KER08RTP101			1		1	1	1	1	2
431	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	MONICA ST	VINELAND	Add Lanes	KER08RTP101			1		1	1	1	1	2
432	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	SHALANE	MONICA ST	Add Lanes	KER08RTP101			1		1	1	1	1	2
433	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	MORNING DR	SHALANE	Add Lanes	KER08RTP101			1		1	1	1	1	2
434	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	NILES	PIONEER					1		1	1	1	1	3
435	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	PIONEER	MILLS					1		1	1	1	1	3
436	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	MILLS	EDISON					1		1	1	1	1	3
437	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	EDISON	BRUNDAGE					2		2	2	2	2	3
438	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	BRUNDAGE	SR58					2		2	2	2	2	3
439	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	SR58	KERRNITA		KER08RTP100			2		2	2	2	2	2
440	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	KERRNITA	REDBANK		KER08RTP100			1		1	1	1	1	2
441	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	REDBANK	WILSON		KER08RTP100			1		1	1	1	1	2
442	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	WILSON	MULLER		KER08RTP100			1		1	1	1	1	2
443	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	MULLER	WHITE LN		KER08RTP100			1		1	1	1	1	2
444	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	WHITE LN	HERMOSA		KER08RTP100			1		1	1	1	1	2
445	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	HERMOSA	FAIRVIEW RD		KER08RTP100			1		1	1	1	1	2
446	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	FAIRVIEW RD	PANAMA LN		KER08RTP100			1		1	1	1	1	2
447	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	PANAMA LN	KAM AVE		KER08RTP100			1		1	1	1	1	2
448	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	KAM AVE	MOUNTAIN VIEW		KER08RTP100			1		1	1	1	1	2
449	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	MOUNTAIN VIEW	MC KEE		KER08RTP100			1		1	1	1	1	2
450	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	MC KEE	SR119/PANAMA RD		KER08RTP100			1		1	1	1	1	2
451	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	SR119/PANAMA RD	HALL					2		2	2	2	2	2
452	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	HALL	DI GIORGIO					2		2	2	2	2	2
453	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	DI GIORGIO	TRI DUNCON					1		1	1	1	1	2
454	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	TRI DUNCON	BUENA VISTA BLVD					1		1	1	1	1	2
455	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	BUENA VISTA BLVD	SUNSET BLVD					1		1	1	1	1	2
456	Caltrans	SJV		SR184	SUNSET BLVD	SR223					1		1	1	1	1	2
457	Caltrans	MD		SR202	SR58	TEHACHAPI BLVD						2				2	2
458	Caltrans	MD		SR202	TEHACHAPI BLVD	RED APPLE						2				2	2
459	Caltrans	MD		SR202	RED APPLE	VALLEY BLVD						2				2	2
460	Caltrans	MD		SR202	VALLEY BLVD	GOLDEN HILLS						1				1	2
461	Caltrans	MD		SR202	GOLDEN HILLS	WOODFORD TEHACHAPI						1				1	1
462	Caltrans	MD		SR202	WOODFORD TEHACHAP	SCHOUT						1				1	1
463	Caltrans	MD		SR202	SCHOUT	BANDUCCI						1				1	1
464	Caltrans	MD	Y	SR202	BANDUCCI	CUMMINGS VALLEY						1				1	1
465	Caltrans	MD	Y	SR202	CUMMINGS VALLEY	BEAR VALLEY						1				1	1
466	Caltrans	MD	Y	SR202	BEAR VALLEY	GIRAUDO						1				1	1

Appendix B - Highway Project Listing on Regionally Significant Route Segments and Year Number of Lanes Modeled

										Year number of lanes modeled (each direction)							
SORT KEY	AGENCY	AIR BASIN	PM10 BASIN	STREET	BEGIN	END	Type of Imprvmnt.	RTP PROJECT ID/Other ID	COST (RTP, Other)	13	14	15	17	20	23	25	35
467	Caltrans	SJV		SR204	UNION	Q ST					3		3	3	3	3	3
468	Caltrans	SJV		SR204	Q ST	M ST					3		3	3	3	3	3
469	Caltrans	SJV		SR204	M ST	CHESTER					3		3	3	3	3	3
470	Caltrans	SJV		SR204	CHESTER	F ST					2		2/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	3
471	Caltrans	SJV		SR204	F ST	SR99					2		2	2	2	2	3
472	Caltrans	SJV		SR223	I-5	OLD RIVER RD					1		1	1	1	1	1
473	Caltrans	SJV		SR223	OLD RIVER RD	WIBLE RD					1		1	1	1	1	1
474	Caltrans	SJV		SR223	WIBLE RD	SR99					1		1	1	1	1	1
475	Caltrans	SJV		SR223	SR99	UNION					1		1	1	1	1	1
476	Caltrans	SJV		SR223	UNION	FAIRFAX					1		1	1	1	1	1
477	Caltrans	SJV		SR223	FAIRFAX	SR184					1		1	1	1	1	1
478	Caltrans	SJV		SR223	SR184	VINELAND					1		1	1	1	1	1
479	Caltrans	SJV		SR223	VINELAND	EDISON					1		1	1	1	1	1
480	Caltrans	SJV		SR223	EDISON	MALAGA					1		1	1	1	1	1
481	Caltrans	SJV		SR223	MALAGA	COMANCHE					1		1	1	1	1	1
482	Caltrans	SJV		SR223	COMANCHE	CAMPUS					2		2	2	2	2	2
483	Caltrans	SJV		SR223	CAMPUS	TEJON					2		2	2	2	2	2
484	Caltrans	SJV		SR223	TEJON	TOWER LINE					1		1	1	1	1	1
485	Caltrans	SJV		SR223	TOWER LINE	GENERAL BEALE					1		1	1	1	1	1
486	Caltrans	SJV		SR223	GENERAL BEALE	SR58					1		1	1	1	1	1
487	Caltrans	SJV		SR33	BARKER	TWISSELMAN					1		1	1	1	1	1
488	Caltrans	SJV		SR33	TWISSELMAN	SR46					1		1	1	1	1	1
489	Caltrans	SJV		SR33	SR46	LERDO HWY					1		1	1	1	1	1
490	Caltrans	SJV		SR33	LERDO HWY	LOST HILLS					1		1	1	1	1	1
491	Caltrans	SJV		SR33	LOST HILLS	LOKERN					1		1	1	1	1	1
492	Caltrans	SJV		SR33	LOKERN	SR58					1		1	1	1	1	1
493	Caltrans	SJV		SR33	SR58	SR58					1		1	1	1	1	1
494	Caltrans	SJV		SR33	SR58	BILL KIRBY					1		1	1	1	1	1
495	Caltrans	SJV		SR33	BILL KIRBY	MIDWAY					1		1	1	1	1	1
496	Caltrans	SJV		SR33	MIDWAY	ASH					1		1	1	1	1	1
497	Caltrans	SJV		SR33	ASH	HILLARD					1		1	1	1	1	1
498	Caltrans	SJV		SR33	HILLARD	10TH ST					2		2	2	2	2	2
499	Caltrans	SJV		SR33	10TH ST	6TH ST					2		2	2	2	2	2
500	Caltrans	SJV		SR33	6TH ST	2ND ST					2		2	2	2	2	2
501	Caltrans	SJV		SR33	2ND ST	MAIN ST					1		1	1	1	1	1
502	Caltrans	SJV		SR33	MAIN ST	SR119					1		1	1	1	1	1
503	Caltrans	SJV		SR33	SR119	WOOD					1		1	1	1	1	1
504	Caltrans	SJV		SR33	WOOD	CADET					1		1	1	1	1	1
505	Caltrans	SJV		SR33	CADET	BUSH					1		1	1	1	1	1
506	Caltrans	SJV		SR33	BUSH	SR166					1		1	1	1	1	1
507	Caltrans	SJV		SR33	SR166	CERRO NOROESTE					1		1	1	1	1	1
508	Caltrans	SJV		SR33	CERRO NOROESTE	COUNTY LINE					1		1	1	1	1	1
509	Caltrans	IWV		SR395	COUNTY LINE	SR14				2		2				2	2

Appendix B - Highway Project Listing on Regionally Significant Route Segments and Year Number of Lanes Modeled

										Year number of lanes modeled (each direction)							
SORT KEY	AGENCY	AIR BASIN	PM10 BASIN	STREET	BEGIN	END	Type of Imprvmnt.	RTP PROJECT ID/Other ID	COST (RTP, Other)	13	14	15	17	20	23	25	35
510	Caltrans	IWV		SR395	SR14	INYOKERN				1		1				1	2
511	Caltrans	IWV		SR395	INYOKERN	BOWMAN RD	Passing Lanes	KER08RTP089	$20,000,000	1		1				2	2
512	Caltrans	IWV		SR395	BOWMAN RD	CHINA LAKE	Passing Lanes	KER08RTP089	$20,000,000	1		1				2	2
513	Caltrans	IWV		SR395	CHINA LAKE	SEARLES				1		1				1	2
514	Caltrans	MD		SR395	SEARLES	GARLOCK						1				1	2
515	Caltrans	MD		SR395	GARLOCK	JOBERG						1				1	2
516	Caltrans	MD		SR395	JOBERG	COUNTY LINE						1				1	2
517	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	COUNTY LINE	CECIL AVE					1		1	1	1	1	1
518	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	CECIL AVE	SR155					1		1	1	1	1	1
519	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	SR155	POND					1		1	1	1	1	1
520	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	POND	SHERWOOD					1		1	1	1	1	1
521	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	SHERWOOD	SR46					1		1	1	1	1	1
522	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	SR46	5TH ST					1		1	1	1	1	1
523	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	5TH ST	6TH ST					1		1	1	1	1	1
524	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	6TH ST	7TH ST					1		1	1	1	1	1
525	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	7TH ST	POSO DR					1		1	1	1	1	1
526	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	POSO DR	FILBURN					2		2	2	2	2	2
527	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	FILBURN	JACKSON					2		2	2	2	2	2
528	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	JACKSON	KIMBERLINA RD					2		2	2	2	2	2
529	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	KIMBERLINA	POPLAR					2		2	2	2	2	2
530	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	POPLAR	SHAFTER					2		2	2	2	2	2
531	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	SHAFTER	CENTRAL					2		2	2	2	2	2
532	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	CENTRAL	LERDO HWY					2		2	2	2	2	2
533	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	LERDO HWY	LOS ANGELES					1		1	1	1	1	1
534	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	LOS ANGELES	7TH STANDARD					1		1	1	1	1	1
535	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	7TH STANDARD	BAKER					1		1	1	1	1	1
536	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	BAKER	SNOW					1		1	1	1	1	1
537	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	SNOW	KRATZMEYER					1		1	1	1	1	1
538	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	KRATZMEYER	REINA					1		1	1	1	1	1
539	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	REINA	HAGEMAN					1		1	1	1	1	1
540	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	HAGEMAN	SR58					1		1	1	1	1	1
541	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	SR58	PALM					1		1	1	1	1	1
542	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	PALM	BRIMHALL					1		1	1	1	1	1
543	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	BRIMHALL	STOCKDALE					1		1	1	1	1	1
544	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	STOCKDALE	PANAMA LN					1		1	1	1	1	1
545	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	PANAMA LN	I-5					1		1	1	1	1	1
546	Caltrans	SJV		SR43	I-5	SR119					1		1	1	1	1	1
547	Caltrans	SJV		SR46	COUNTY LINE	KECKS	Add Lanes	KER08RTP003	$232,000,000		2		2	2	2	2	2
548	Caltrans	SJV		SR46	KECKS	BITTERWATER VALLEY	Add Lanes	KER08RTP003	$232,000,000		2		2	2	2	2	2
549	Caltrans	SJV		SR46	BITTERWATER VALLEY	SR33	Add Lanes	KER08RTP003	$232,000,000		2		2	2	2	2	2
550	Caltrans	SJV		SR46	SR33	BROWN MATERIAL RD	Add Lanes	KER08RTP003	$232,000,000		2		2	2	2	2	2
551	Caltrans	SJV		SR46	BROWN MATERIAL RD	I-5	Add Lanes	KER08RTP018	$97,000,000		1		1	1	1	1	2
552	Caltrans	SJV		SR46	I-5	CORCORAN					1		1	1	1	1	1

Appendix B - Highway Project Listing on Regionally Significant Route Segments and Year Number of Lanes Modeled

										Year number of lanes modeled (each direction)							
SORT KEY	AGENCY	AIR BASIN	PM10 BASIN	STREET	BEGIN	END	Type of Imprvmnt.	RTP PROJECT ID/Other ID	COST (RTP, Other)	13	14	15	17	20	23	25	35
553	Caltrans	SJV		SR46	CORCORAN	ROWLEE					1		1	1	1	1	1
554	Caltrans	SJV		SR46	ROWLEE	WILDWOOD					1		1	1	1	1	1
555	Caltrans	SJV		SR46	WILDWOOD	SCOFIELD					1		1	1	1	1	1
556	Caltrans	SJV		SR46	SCOFIELD	LEONARD					1		1	1	1	1	1
557	Caltrans	SJV		SR46	LEONARD	WESTERN					1		1	1	1	1	1
558	Caltrans	SJV		SR46	WESTERN	MAGNOLIA					1		1	1	1	1	1
559	Caltrans	SJV		SR46	MAGNOLIA	CENTRAL					1		1	1	1	1	1
560	Caltrans	SJV		SR46	CENTRAL	PALM					1		1	1	1	1	1
561	Caltrans	SJV		SR46	PALM	GRIFFITH					1		1	1	1	1	1
562	Caltrans	SJV		SR46	GRIFFITH	F ST					1		1	1	1	1	1
563	Caltrans	SJV		SR46	F ST	SR43					1		1	1	1	1	1
564	Caltrans	SJV		SR46	SR43	ROOT					1		1	1	1	1	1
565	Caltrans	SJV		SR46	ROOT	SR99					1		1	1	1	1	1
566	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	COUNTY LINE	SR33					1		1	1	1	1	1
567	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	SR33	LOKERN					1		1	1	1	1	1
568	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	LOKERN	BUTTONWILLOW					1		1	1	1	1	1
569	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	BUTTONWILLOW	I-5					1		1	1	1	1	1
570	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	I-5	BRANDT					1		1	1	1	1	1
571	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	BRANDT	SR43					1		1	1	1	1	1
572	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	SR43	CHERRY		KER08RTP092			1		1	1	1	1	2
573	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	CHERRY	SUPERIOR		KER08RTP092			1		1	1	1	1	2
574	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	SUPERIOR	GREELEY		KER08RTP092			1		1	1	1	1	2
575	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	GREELEY	DRIVER		KER08RTP092			1		1	1	1	1	2
576	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	DRIVER	NORD		KER08RTP092			1		1	1	1	1	2
577	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	NORD	WEGIS		KER08RTP092			1		1	1	1	1	2
578	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	WEGIS	HEATH		KER08RTP092			1		1	1	1	1	2
579	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	HEATH	RENFRO		KER08RTP092			1		1	1	1	1	3
580	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	RENFRO	JENKINS		KER08RTP092			1		1	1	1	1	3
581	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	JENKINS	ALLEN		KER08RTP092			1		1	1	1	1	3
582	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	ALLEN	OLD FARM	Add Lanes	KER08RTP090	$8,800,000		2		3	3	3	3	3
583	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	OLD FARM	JEWETTA	Add Lanes	KER08RTP090	$8,800,000		2		3	3	3	3	3
584	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	JEWETTA	VERDUGO	Add Lanes	KER08RTP090	$8,800,000		2		3	3	3	3	3
585	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	VERDUGO	CALLOWAY	Add Lanes	KER08RTP090	$8,800,000		2		3	3	3	3	3
586	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	CALLOWAY	MAIN PLAZA	Add Lanes	KER08RTP007	$20,600,000		2		3	3	3	3	3
587	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	MAIN PLAZA	COFFEE		KER08RTP007	$20,600,000		2		3	3	3	3	3
588	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	COFFEE	PATTON		KER08RTP007	$20,600,000		2		3	3	3	3	3
589	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	PATTON	WEAR	Add Lanes	KER08RTP007	$20,600,000		2		3	3	3	3	3
590	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	WEAR	FRUITVALE	Add Lanes	KER08RTP007	$20,600,000		2		3	3	3	3	3
591	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	FRUITVALE	MOHAWK	Add Lanes	KER08RTP007	$20,600,000		2		3	3	3	3	3
592	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	MOHAWK	LANDCO	Add Lanes	KER08RTP118	$17,400,000		2		3	3	3	3	4
593	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	LANDCO	GIBSON	Add Lanes	KER08RTP007	$20,600,000		2		3	3	3	3	4
594	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	GIBSON	SR99	Add Lanes	KER08RTP007	$20,600,000		3		3	3	3	3	4
595	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	REAL	SR99					2		2	2	2	2	2

Appendix B - Highway Project Listing on Regionally Significant Route Segments and Year Number of Lanes Modeled

										Year number of lanes modeled (each direction)							
SORT KEY	AGENCY	AIR BASIN	PM10 BASIN	STREET	BEGIN	END	Type of Imprvmnt.	RTP PROJECT ID/Other ID	COST (RTP, Other)	13	14	15	17	20	23	25	35
596	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	SR99	H ST	Add Lanes	KER08RTP019 KER08RTP020	$50000000 $47400000		2/3		3	4	4	4	4
597	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	H ST	CHESTER	Add Lanes	KER08RTP019 KER08RTP093	$50000000 $47400000		2		3	3	3	3	4
598	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	CHESTER	UNION	Add Lanes	KER08RTP019 KER08RTP093	$50000000 $47400000		2		3	3	3	3	4
599	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	UNION	COTTONWOOD	Add Lanes	KER08RTP019 KER08RTP093	$50000000 $47400000		2		3	3	3	3	4
600	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	COTTONWOOD	MT VERNON					3		3	3	4	4	4
601	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	MT VERNON	OSWELL					3		3	3	4	4	4
602	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	OSWELL	FAIRFAX					3		3	3	4	4	4
603	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	FAIRFAX	SR184					3		3	3	3	3	3
604	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	SR184	EDISON					2		2	2	2	2	2
605	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	EDISON	COMANCHE					2		2	2	2	2	2
606	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	COMANCHE	TOWER LINE					2		2	2	2	2	2
607	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	TOWER LINE	GENERAL BEALE					2		2	2	2	2	2
608	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	GENERAL BEALE	BEND RD	Truck Lanes	SHOPP			2		2	2	2	2	3
609	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	BEND RD	BEALVILLE	Truck Lanes	SHOPP			2		2	2	2	2	3
610	Caltrans	SJV		SR58	BEALVILLE	BROOM RANCH					2		2	2	2	2	2
611	Caltrans	MD	Y	SR58	BROOM RANCH	SR 202						2				2	2
612	Caltrans	MD		SR58	SR202	MILL						2				2	2
613	Caltrans	MD		SR58	MILL	DENNISON						2				2	2
614	Caltrans	MD		SR58	DENNISON	TEHACHAPI BLVD						2				2	2
615	Caltrans	MD		SR58	TEHACHAPI BLVD	SAND CANYON						2				2	2
616	Caltrans	MD		SR58	SAND CANYON	RANDSBURG CUTOFF						2				2	2
617	Caltrans	MD		SR58	RANDSBURG CUTOFF	SR14						2				2	2
618	Caltrans	MD		SR58	SR14	20 MULE TEAM PARKWAY						2				2	2
619	Caltrans	MD		SR58	20 MULE TEAM PARKWA	OLD 58						2				2	2
620	Caltrans	MD		SR58	OLD 58	CALIFORNIA CITY						2				2	2
621	Caltrans	MD		SR58	CALIFORNIA CITY	MUROC						2				2	2
622	Caltrans	MD		SR58	MUROC	CLAY MINE						2				2	2
623	Caltrans	MD		SR58	CLAY MINE	20 MULE TEAM PARKWAY						2				2	2
624	Caltrans	MD		SR58	20 MULE TEAM	GEPHART						2				2	2
625	Caltrans	MD		SR58	GEPHART	BORAX						2				2	2
626	Caltrans	MD		SR58	BORAX	COUNTY LINE						2				2	2
627	Caltrans	SJV		SR65	COUNTY LINE	SR155					1		1	1	1	1	1
628	Caltrans	SJV		SR65	SR155	SHERWOOD					1		1	1	1	1	1
629	Caltrans	SJV		SR65	SHERWOOD	FAMOSO RD					1		1	1	1	1	1
630	Caltrans	SJV		SR65	FAMOSO RD	MERCED AVE					1		1	1	1	1	1
631	Caltrans	SJV		SR65	MERCED AVE	LERDO HWY					1		1	1	1	1	1
632	Caltrans	SJV		SR65	LERDO HWY	JAMES					1		1	1	1	1	1
633	Caltrans	SJV		SR65	JAMES	7TH STANDARD	Add Lanes	KER08RTP094			1		1	1	2	2	2

Appendix B - Highway Project Listing on Regionally Significant Route Segments and Year Number of Lanes Modeled

										Year number of lanes modeled (each direction)							
SORT KEY	AGENCY	AIR BASIN	PM10 BASIN	STREET	BEGIN	END	Type of Imprvmnt.	RTP PROJECT ID/Other ID	COST (RTP, Other)	13	14	15	17	20	23	25	35
634	Caltrans	SJV		SR65	7TH STANDARD	SR99					2		2	2	2	2	2
635	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	COUNTY LINE	CECIL AVE					3		3	3	3	3	3
636	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	CECIL	SR155					3		3	3	3	3	3
637	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	SR155	WOOLLOMES					3		3	3	3	3	3
638	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	WOOLLOMES	POND					3		3	3	3	3	3
639	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	POND	SHERWOOD					3		3	3	3	3	3
640	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	SHERWOOD	SR46					3		3	3	3	3	3
641	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	SR46	KIMBERLINA RD					3		3	3	3	3	3
642	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	KIMBERLINA RD	MERCED AVE					3		3	3	3	3	3
643	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	MERCED	LERDO HWY					3		3	3	3	3	3
644	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	LERDO HWY	7TH STANDARD					3		3	3	3	3	3
645	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	7TH STANDARD	SR65		KER08RTP104	$91,100,000		3		3	3	3	3	4
646	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	SR65	OLIVE		KER08RTP104	$91,100,000		3		3	3	3	3	4
647	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	SNOW RD	SNOW RD	New Interchange	KER08RTP115	$138,200,000		-		-	-	-	-	x
648	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	OLIVE	OLIVE	Ramp Improvemer	KER08RTP021	$108,000,000		-		-	-	-	-	x
649	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	OLIVE	SR204		KER08RTP104	$12,000,000		5		5	5	5	5	5
650	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	SR204	AIRPORT					4		4	4	4	4	4
651	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	AIRPORT	SR58(24TH ST)					4		4	4	4	4	4
652	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	SR58(24TH ST)	CALIFORNIA					4		4	4	4	4	4
653	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	CALIFORNIA	STOCKDALE					4		4	4	4	4	4
654	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	STOCKDALE	MING					4		4	4	4	4	4
655	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	MING	Wilson Road					4		4	4	4	4	4
656	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	Wilson Road	WHITE LN	Add Lanes	KER08RTP077	$52,000,000		4		4	4	4	4	4
657	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	WHITE LN	PANAMA LN	Add Lanes	KER08RTP077	$52,000,000		4		4	4	4	4	4
658	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	PANAMA LN	HOSKING	Add Lanes	KER08RTP077	$52,000,000		4		4	4	4	4	4
659	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	HOSKING	HOSKING	Interchange Imprc	KER08RTP009	$35,000,000		2		2	2	2	2	3
660	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	SR119	HOSKING	Add Lanes	KER08RTP077	$52,000,000		4		4	4	4	4	4
661	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	SR223	SR119					3		3	3	3	3	3
662	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	HERRING RD	SR223					3		3	3	3	3	3
663	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	COPUS RD	HERRING RD					3		3	3	3	3	3
664	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	SR166	COPUS RD					3		3	3	3	3	3
665	Caltrans	SJV		SR99	I-5	SR166					3		3	3	3	3	3
666	Caltrans	MD		TUCKER RD	RED APPLE	VALLEY						2				2	2
667	Caltrans	MD		VALLEY BL	TUCKER	REEVES	Add Lanes	Local				2				2	2
668	Caltrans	MD		VALLEY BL	REEVES	GOLDEN HILLS	Add Lanes	Local				2				2	2
669	**Kern County**																
670	Kern County	SJV		SR119	SR99	HUGHES LN	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	2	2	2	2
671	Kern County	SJV		SR119	HUGHES LN	UNION					1		1	2	2	2	2
672	Kern County	SJV		SR119	UNION	SR184					1		1	1	1	1	2
673	Kern County	SJV		7th STANDARD RD	SR 43/Enos Lane	SANTA FE WAY	Add Lanes	KER08RTP113	$11,500,000		1		1	1	1	1	1
674	Kern County	SJV		7th STANDARD RD	ZERKER RD	ALLEN	Add Lanes	KER08RTP005	$57,000,000		2		2	2	2	2	2
675	Kern County	SJV		7th STANDARD RD	ALLEN	OLD FARM	Add Lanes	KER08RTP005	$57,000,000		2		2	2	2	2	2
676	Kern County	SJV		7th STANDARD RD	OLD FARM	JEWETTA	Add Lanes	KER08RTP005	$57,000,000		2		2	2	2	2	2

Appendix B - Highway Project Listing on Regionally Significant Route Segments and Year Number of Lanes Modeled

										Year number of lanes modeled (each direction)							
SORT KEY	AGENCY	AIR BASIN	PM10 BASIN	STREET	BEGIN	END	Type of Imprvmnt.	RTP PROJECT ID/Other ID	COST (RTP, Other)	13	14	15	17	20	23	25	35
677	Kern County	SJV		7th STANDARD RD	CALLOWAY	RIVERLAKES	Add Lanes	KER08RTP005	$57,000,000		2		2	2	2	2	2
678	Kern County	SJV		7th STANDARD RD	RIVERLAKES	COFFEE	Add Lanes	KER08RTP005	$57,000,000		2		2	2	2	2	2
679	Kern County	SJV		7th STANDARD RD	COFFEE	SR99					2		2	2	2	2	2
680	Kern County	SJV		7th STANDARD RD	SR99	SR99					2		2	2	2	2	2
681	Kern County	SJV		7th STANDARD RD	SR99	SR65					2		2	2	2	2	2
682	Kern County	SJV		7th STANDARD RD	SR65	PEGASUS					2		2	2	2	2	2
683	Kern County	SJV		7th STANDARD RD	PEGASUS	WINGS WAY					2		2	2	2	2	2
684	Kern County	SJV		7th STANDARD RD	WINGS WAY	AIRPORT	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	2	2	2	2
685	Kern County	SJV		7th STANDARD RD	AIRPORT	MC CRAY					2		2	2	2	2	2
686	Kern County	SJV		7th STANDARD RD	MC CRAY	CHESTER					2		2	2	2	2	2
687	Kern County	MD		90TH WEST	ROSAMOND	HOLIDAY	Add Lanes	Local				1				1	2
688	Kern County	MD		90TH WEST	HOLIDAY	GASKELL	Add Lanes	Local				1				1	2
689	Kern County	MD		90TH WEST	GASKELL	A AVE	Add Lanes	Local				1				1	2
690	Kern County	SJV		AIRPORT	7TH STANDARD	DAY	Add Lanes	Local			1		2	2	2	2	2
691	Kern County	SJV		AIRPORT	DAY	SKYWAY	Add Lanes	Local			1		2	2	2	2	2
692	Kern County	SJV		AIRPORT	SKYWAY	NORRIS					2		2	2	2	2	2
693	Kern County	SJV		AIRPORT	NORRIS	DECATUR/OLIVE	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	3	3	3	3
694	Kern County	SJV		AIRPORT	DECATUR/OLIVE	ROBERTS LN	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	3	3	3	3
695	Kern County	SJV		AIRPORT	ROBERTS LN	STATE RD					2		2	3	3	3	3
696	Kern County	SJV		ALLEN	NORIEGA	HAGEMAN					1		1	2	2	2	2
697	Kern County	SJV		ALLEN	HAGEMAN	MEACHAM	Add Lanes	Local			1		2	2	2	2	2
698	Kern County	SJV		ALLEN	MEACHAM	SR58	Add Lanes	Local			1		2	2	2	2	2
699	Bakersfield	SJV		ASHE RD	SR 119	Curnow Road					1		1	1	1	2	2
700	Kern County	SJV		BRECKENRIDGE RD	SR 184/Morning Drive	VINELAND RD					1		1	1	1	1	2
701	Kern County	SJV		BRECKENRIDGE RD	VINELAND RD	Edison /Masterson					1		1	1	1	1	2
702	Kern County	SJV		BRECKENRIDGE RD	Edison /Masterson	BEAUJOLIAS					1		1	1	1	1	1
703	Kern County	SJV		BRECKENRIDGE RD	BEAUJOLIAS	COMANCHE DR					0		0	0	0	0	1
704	Kern County	SJV		CALLOWAY	7TH STANDARD	ETCHART	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	1	1	2	2
705	Kern County	SJV		CALLOWAY	SR58	HOLLAND ST	Add Lanes	Local			2		3	3	3	3	3
706	Kern County	SJV		CALLOWAY	HOLLAND ST	PALM					2		3	3	3	3	3
707	Kern County	SJV		CALLOWAY	PALM	BRIMHALL	Add Lanes	Local			2		3	3	3	3	3
708	Kern County	SJV		CALIFORNIA	WASHINGTON	MT VERNON					2		2	2	2	2	2
709	Kern County	SJV		CALIFORNIA	MT VERNON	EDISON					2		2	2	2	2	2
710	Kern County	SJV		CHASE AVE	Masterson Street	COMANCHE DR					0		0	0	0	1	1
711	Kern County	SJV		CHINA GRADE	CHESTER	MANOR					2		2	2	2	2	2
712	Kern County	SJV		CHINA GRADE	MANOR	MONTE CRISTO	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	1	1	1	2
713	Kern County	SJV		CHINA GRADE	MONTE CRISTO	CHINA GRADE LOOP/RO	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	1	1	1	2
714	Kern County	SJV		CHINA GRADE	CHINA GRADE LOOP/RO	ALFRED HARRELL	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	1	1	1	2
715	Kern County	IWV		CHINA LAKE BL	SPRINGER	MAHAN				1		1				1	1
716	Kern County	IWV		CHINA LAKE BL	MAHAN	SR395				1		1				1	1
717	Kern County	SJV		COFFEE	SNOW	NORRIS	Add Lanes	Local			1		1	2	2	2	3
718	Kern County	SJV		COMANCHE DR	Alfred Harrell Highway	SR 58					1		1	1	1	1	2
719	Kern County	SJV		COMANCHE DR	SR 58	MULLER					1		1	1	1	1	2

Appendix B - Highway Project Listing on Regionally Significant Route Segments and Year Number of Lanes Modeled

										Year number of lanes modeled (each direction)							
SORT KEY	AGENCY	AIR BASIN	PM10 BASIN	STREET	BEGIN	END	Type of Imprvmnt.	RTP PROJECT ID/Other ID	COST (RTP, Other)	13	14	15	17	20	23	25	35
720	Kern County	SJV		EDISON RD	SR 178	BRECKENRIDGE RD					1		1	1	1	1	2
721	Kern County	SJV		EDISON RD	BRECKENRIDGE RD	Edison Highway					1		1	1	1	1	2
722	Kern County	SJV		FAIRFAX RD	SR 58	REDBANK RD					1		1	2	2	2	2
723	Kern County	SJV		FRUITVALE AVE	SNOW	NORRIS					1		1	2	2	2	2
724	Kern County	SJV		FRUITVALE AVE	HAGEMAN RD	SR 58/Rosedale Highway					1		1	1	1	1	2
725	Kern County	SJV		GILMORE	FRUITVALE AVE	LANDCO					0		0	0	0	0	1
726	Kern County	SJV		GOSFORD	SR119	CURNOW					1		1	1	1	1	2
727	Kern County	SJV		HAGEMAN	NORD RD	WEGIS AVE					1		1	1	2	2	2
728	Kern County	SJV		HAGEMAN	WEGIS AVE	HEATH RD					1		1	1	1	1	2
729	Kern County	SJV		HAGEMAN	HEATH RD	RUDD					1		1	1	1	1	2
730	Kern County	SJV		HAGEMAN	RUDD	RENFRO					1		1	1	1	1	2
731	Kern County	SJV		HAGEMAN	RENFRO	JENKINS					1		1	1	1	2	2
732	Kern County	SJV		HAGEMAN	JENKINS	SANTA FE					3/2		3/2	3/2	3/2	3/2	3/2
733	Kern County	SJV		HAGEMAN	SANTA FE	ALLEN					3		3	3	3	3	3
734	Kern County	SJV		HEATH RD	HAGEMAN RD	SR 58/Rosedale Highway					1		1	2	2	2	2
735	Kern County	SJV		HEATH RD	SR 58/Rosedale Highway	Stockdale Highway					1		1	1	1	1	2
736	Kern County	SJV		LANDCO DR	HAGEMAN RD	OLIVE DR					0		0	1	1	1	2
737	Kern County	SJV		MANOR	MC CRAY	CHESTER					2		2	2	2	2	2
738	Kern County	SJV		MANOR	CHESTER	DAY					2		2	2	2	2	2
739	Kern County	SJV		MANOR	DAY	CHINA GRADE LOOP					2		2	2	2	2	2
740	Kern County	SJV		MANOR	CHINA GRADE LOOP	NORRIS					2		2	2	2	2	2
741	Kern County	SJV		MANOR	NORRIS	ROBERTS LN					2		2	2	2	2	2
742	Kern County	SJV		MEACHAM	RENFRO RD	JENKINS RD					1		1	1	1	1	2
743	Kern County	SJV		MEACHAM	JENKINS RD	ALLEN					1		1	2	2	2	2
744	Kern County	SJV		MOHAWK	HAGEMAN	DOWNING					0		0	3	3	3	3
745	Kern County	SJV		MOHAWK	DOWNING	SR58					3		3	3	3	3	3
746	Kern County	SJV		MT VERNON	SR178	BERNARD					2		2	2	2	2	2
747	Kern County	SJV		MT VERNON	BERNARD	COLLEGE					2		2	2	2	2	2
748	Kern County	SJV		MT VERNON	COLLEGE	FLOWER					2		2	2	2	2	2
749	Kern County	SJV		MT VERNON	FLOWER	NILES					2		2	2	2	2	2
750	Kern County	SJV		MT VERNON	NILES	KENTUCKY					2		2	2	2	2	2
751	Kern County	SJV		MT VERNON	KENTUCKY	EDISON HWY					2		2	2	2	2	2
752	Kern County	SJV		MT VERNON	EDISON HWY	CALIFORNIA					2		2	2	2	2	2
753	Kern County	SJV		MT VERNON	CALIFORNIA	VIRGINIA					2		2	2	2	2	2
754	Kern County	SJV		MT VERNON	VIRGINIA	BRUNDAGE					2		2	2	2	2	2
755	Kern County	SJV		NO. CHESTER	BEARDSLEY	ROBERTS LN					2		2	2	2	2	2
756	Kern County	SJV		NO. CHESTER	ROBERTS LN	DECATUR					2		2	2	2	2	2
757	Kern County	SJV		NO. CHESTER	DECATUR	NORRIS					2		2	2	2	2	2
758	Kern County	SJV		NO. CHESTER	NORRIS	CHINA GRADE LOOP					2		2	2	2	2	2
759	Kern County	SJV		NO. CHESTER	CHINA GRADE LOOP	DAY					2		2	2	2	2	2
760	Kern County	SJV		NO. CHESTER	DAY	MANOR					2		2	2	2	2	2
761	Kern County	SJV		NILES	MONTEREY	MT VERNON					2		2	2	2	2	2
762	Kern County	SJV		NILES	MT VERNON	OSWELL					2		2	2	2	2	2

Appendix B - Highway Project Listing on Regionally Significant Route Segments and Year Number of Lanes Modeled

										Year number of lanes modeled (each direction)							
SORT KEY	AGENCY	AIR BASIN	PM10 BASIN	STREET	BEGIN	END	Type of Imprvmnt.	RTP PROJECT ID/Other ID	COST (RTP, Other)	13	14	15	17	20	23	25	35
763	Kern County	SJV		NILES	OSWELL	STERLING RD					2		2	2	2	2	2
764	Kern County	SJV		NILES	STERLING RD	FAIRFAX					2		2	2	2	2	2
765	Kern County	SJV		NILES	FAIRFAX	BRENTWOOD					2		2	2	2	2	2
766	Kern County	SJV		NILES	BRENTWOOD	PARK DR					2		2	2	2	2	2
767	Kern County	SJV		NILES	PARK DR	SR184					2		2	2	2	2	2
768	Kern County	SJV		NORRIS RD	CHESTER AVE	MANOR					1		1	1	1	1	2
769	Kern County	SJV		NORRIS RD	SR 99	AIRPORT DR					1		1	1	1	1	2
770	Kern County	MD		OLD 58	ROSEWOOD	SR58BYPASS						2				2	2
771	Kern County	MD		OLD 58	ARROYO	ROSEWOOD						2				2	2
772	Kern County	MD		OLD 58	SR14	ARROYO						2				2	2
773	Kern County	MD		OLD 58	SR14	UNITED						2				2	2
774	Kern County	MD		OLD 58	UNITED	5TH ST						2				2	2
775	Kern County	MD		OLD 58	5TH	SR58BYPASS						2				2	2
776	Kern County	SJV		OLD RIVER	MCCUTCHEN(HOSKING)	SR119					1		1	1	1	2	2
777	Kern County	SJV		OLD RIVER	SR119	CURNOW					1		1	1	1	1	2
778	Kern County	SJV		OSWELL	BERNARD	COLLEGE	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	3
779	Kern County	SJV		OSWELL	COLLEGE	NILES	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	3
780	Kern County	SJV		OSWELL	NILES	KENTUCKY	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	3
781	Kern County	SJV		OSWELL	KENTUCKY	CALIFORNIA	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	3
782	Kern County	SJV		OSWELL	CALIFORNIA	EDISON HWY	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	3
783	Kern County	SJV		OSWELL	EDISON HWY	VIRGINIA	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	3
784	Kern County	SJV		OSWELL	VIRGINIA	BRUNDAGE	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	3
785	Kern County	SJV		OSWELL	WHITE LN	PANAMA LN					0		0	0	0	0	1
786	Kern County	SJV		PANAMA LN	SR 43/ENOS LN	RENFRO					1		2	2	2	2	2
787	Kern County	SJV		PANAMA LN	RENFRO	ALLEN	Add Lanes	Local			1		2	2	2	2	2
788	Kern County	MD		RANDSBURG CUTOFF	SR14	SR58BYPASS						1				1	1
789	Kern County	SJV		PATTON WAY	MEANY	SR 58/Rosedale Highway					1		1	1	1	1	2
790	Kern County	SJV		QUAIL CREEK RD	NORRIS	SNOW ROAD					1		1	1	1	2	2
791	Kern County	SJV		REDBANK	FAIRFAX	SR 184/Weedpatch Highway					1		1	2	2	2	2
792	Kern County	SJV		RENFRO RD	REINA	JOHNSON RD					1		1	1	1	1	2
793	Kern County	MD		ROSAMOND BL	TEHACHAPI WILLOW SP	80TH ST						1				1	1
794	Kern County	MD		ROSAMOND BL	80TH ST	70TH ST						1				1	1
795	Kern County	MD		ROSAMOND BL	70TH ST	65TH ST						1				1	1
796	Kern County	MD		ROSAMOND BL	65TH ST	60TH ST						1				1	1
797	Kern County	MD		ROSAMOND BL	60TH ST	50TH ST	Add Lanes	Local				2				2	2
798	Kern County	MD		ROSAMOND BL	50TH ST	40TH ST	Add Lanes	Local				3				3	3
799	Kern County	MD		ROSAMOND BL	40TH ST	30TH ST	Add Lanes	Local				3				3	3
800	Kern County	MD		ROSAMOND BL	30TH ST	25TH ST	Add Lanes	Local				3				3	3
801	Kern County	MD		ROSAMOND BL	25TH ST	SR14	Add Lanes	Local				3				3	3
802	Kern County	MD		ROSAMOND BL	SR14	20TH ST	Add Lanes	Local				3				3	3
803	Kern County	MD		ROSAMOND BL	20TH ST	SIERRA HWY	Add Lanes	Local				3				3	3
804	Kern County	MD		ROSAMOND BL	SIERRA HWY	15TH ST	Add Lanes	Local				3				3	3
805	Kern County	MD		ROSAMOND BL	15TH ST	10TH ST	Add Lanes	Local				3				3	3

Appendix B - Highway Project Listing on Regionally Significant Route Segments and Year Number of Lanes Modeled

										Year number of lanes modeled (each direction)							
SORT KEY	AGENCY	AIR BASIN	PM10 BASIN	STREET	BEGIN	END	Type of Imprvmnt.	RTP PROJECT ID/Other ID	COST (RTP, Other)	13	14	15	17	20	23	25	35
806	Kern County	SJV		SNOW RD	Allen Road	OLD FARM RD					1		1	1	1	2	2
807	Kern County	SJV		SNOW RD	OLD FARM RD	JEWETTA AVE					1		1	1	1	2	2
808	Kern County	SJV		SNOW RD	CALLOWAY DR	QUAIL CREEK RD					1		1	1	1	2	2
809	Kern County	SJV		SNOW RD	QUAIL CREEK RD	COFFEE RD					1		1	1	1	2	2
810	Kern County	SJV		SNOW RD	FRUITVALE AVE	Golden State Highway					1		1	2	2	2	2
811	Kern County	SJV		SO.CHESTER	WILSON	MING					2		2	2	2	2	2
812	Kern County	MD		TEHACHAPI WILLOW SP	IRONE	ROSAMOND						1				1	1
813	Kern County	MD		TEHACHAPI WILLOW SP	HAMILTON	IRONE						1				1	1
814	Kern County	MD		TEHACHAPI WILLOW SP	HIGHLINE	DENNISON						1				1	1
815	Kern County	MD		TEHACHAPI WILLOW SP	ABAJO	HIGHLINE						1				1	1
816	Kern County	SJV		UNION	BELLE TERRACE	MING	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	3	3	3	3
817	Kern County	SJV		UNION	WHITE LN	PACHECO	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	3
818	Kern County	SJV		UNION	HOSKING	MC KEE	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	3
819	Kern County	SJV		UNION	MC KEE	SR119	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	3
820	Kern County	SJV		VERDUGO LN	MEACHAM	ROSEDALE HIGHTWAY					1		1	1	1	1	1
821	Kern County	SJV		VINELAND RD	SR 58	EDISON HIGHWAY					1		1	1	1	1	2
822	Kern County	SJV		VINELAND RD	EDISON HIGHWAY	Eucalyptus Drive					1		1	1	1	1	2
823	Kern County	SJV		VINELAND RD	Eucalyptus Drive	PIONEER DR					1		1	1	1	1	2
824	Kern County	SJV		VINELAND RD	PIONEER DR	SR 184/Morning Drive					0		0	0	0	0	1
825	Kern County	SJV		WHITE LN(MULLER RD)	OSWELL	FAIRFAX					1		1	1	1	1	2
826	**California City**																
827	California City	MD		CAL CITY BL	SR14	RAILROAD						1				1	1
828	California City	MD		CAL CITY BL	RAILROAD	BARON BLVD						1				1	1
829	California City	MD		CAL CITY BL	BARON BLVD	NEURALIA						2				2	2
830	California City	MD		CAL CITY BL	NEURALIA	HACIENDA						2				2	2
831	California City	MD		CAL CITY BL	RANDSBURG MOJAVE	HACIENDA						2				2	2
832	California City	MD		CAL CITY BL	REDWOOD	RANDSBURG MOJAVE						2				2	2
833	California City	MD		CAL CITY BL	CARSON	REDWOOD						1				1	1
834	**Ridgecrest**																
835	Ridgecrest	IWV		CHINA LAKE BL	RIDGECREST BLVD	UPJOHN				2		2				2	2
836	Ridgecrest	IWV		CHINA LAKE BL	UPJOHN	BOWMAN RD				2		2				2	2
837	Ridgecrest	IWV		CHINA LAKE BL	BOWMAN RD	COLLEGE HEIGHTS				1		1				1	1
838	Ridgecrest	IWV		CHINA LAKE BL	COLLEGE HEIGHTS	DOLPHIN				1		1				1	1
839	Ridgecrest	IWV		CHINA LAKE BL	DOLPHIN	DOWNS				1		1				1	1
840	Ridgecrest	IWV		CHINA LAKE BL	DOWNS	SPRINGER				1		1				1	1
841	**Shafter**																
842	Shafter	SJV		LERDO HWY	POPLAR	SHAFTER					1		1	1	1	1	1
843	Shafter	SJV		LERDO HWY	SHAFTER	SR43					1		1	1	1	1	1
844	Shafter	SJV		LERDO HWY	SR43	MANNEL					2		2	2	2	2	2
845	Shafter	SJV		LERDO HWY	MANNEL	BEECH					2		2	2	2	2	2
846	Shafter	SJV		LERDO HWY	BEECH	CHERRY					2		2	2	2	2	2
847	Shafter	SJV		LERDO HWY	CHERRY	ZACHARY	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	3
848	Shafter	SJV		LERDO HWY	ZACHARY	ZERKER	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	3

Appendix B - Highway Project Listing on Regionally Significant Route Segments and Year Number of Lanes Modeled

										Year number of lanes modeled (each direction)							
SORT KEY	AGENCY	AIR BASIN	PM10 BASIN	STREET	BEGIN	END	Type of Imprvmnt.	RTP PROJECT ID/Other ID	COST (RTP, Other)	13	14	15	17	20	23	25	35
849	Shafter	SJV		LERDO HWY	ZERKER	SR99	Add Lanes	Local			2		2	2	2	2	3

Transportation Project Listing - Exempt Projects

Jurisdiction/ Agency	TIP Project ID	CTIPS ID (If available)	Description	Est. Cost	Exempt Code (per CTIPS)	Air Basins
Arvin	KER050501	20400000294	IN ARVIN: INSTALL NEW COMPRESSOR, NEW VESSELS AND NEW ROOF STRUCTURE AT EXISTING CNG STATION	$598,754	2.04	San Joaquin
Arvin	KER090401	20400000550	LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS RESURFACING, RECONSTRUCTION OR REHABILITATION AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS (NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY)	$792,000	1.10	San Joaquin
Arvin	KER101001	20400000620	IN ARVIN: ON SR 223 FROM COMANCHE RD TO DERBY ST; STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS	$1,084,000	4.12	San Joaquin
Arvin	KER110803	20400000634	PURCHASE TWO TYPE VII 30-PASSENGER DIESEL BUSES WITH ADDED A/C UNIT, REPEATER RADIO, FAREBOX, VIDEO SECURITY	$500,000	2.10	San Joaquin
Arvin	KER120401	20400000663	IN ARVIN: GROUPED PROJECT FOR PAVEMENT RESURFACING AND/OR REHABILITATION (NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY)	$773,750	1.10	San Joaquin
Bakersfield	KER050102	20400000389	IN BAKERSFIELD: WEST BELTWAY FROM SR119 TO 7TH STANDARD RD; CORRIDOR STUDY	$15,000,000	4.05	San Joaquin
Bakersfield	KER060402	20400000424	LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS RESURFACING, RECONSTRUCTION OR REHABILITATION AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS (NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY)	$4,410,000	1.10	San Joaquin
Bakersfield	KER100402	20400000591	GROUPED PROJECT FOR PAVEMENT RESURFACING AND/OR REHABILITATION (NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY)	$6,406,639	1.10	San Joaquin
Bakersfield	KER100506	20400000606	IN BAKERSFIELD: STOCKDALE HWY FROM RENFRO RD TO JENKINS RD; SIGNAL COORDINATION (INTERCONNECT)	$94,100	5.07	San Joaquin

Transportation Project Listing - Exempt Projects

Jurisdiction/ Agency	TIP Project ID	CTIPS ID (If available)	Description	Est. Cost	Exempt Code (per CTIPS)	Air Basins
Bakersfield	KER100507	20400000607	IN BAKERSFIELD: WHITE LANE FROM GOSFORD RD TO ASHE RD; SIGNAL COORDINATION (INTERCONNECT)	$172,500	5.07	San Joaquin
Bakersfield	KER100508	20400000608	IN BAKERSFIELD: GROUPED PROJECTS FOR SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS - SAFER ROADS	$418,000	5.07	San Joaquin
Bakersfield	KER100509	20400000609	IN BAKERSFIELD: GROUPED PROJECTS FOR TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES	$234,910	1.07	San Joaquin
Bakersfield	KER100510	20400000610	IN BAKERSFIELD: GROUPED PROJECTS FOR TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES	$628,360	1.07	San Joaquin
Bakersfield	KER100511	20400000611	IN BAKERSFIELD: RELOCATE AND UPGRADE CITY OF BAKERSFIELD TRAFFIC OPERATIONS CENTER	$393,750	1.07	San Joaquin
Bakersfield	KER101003	20400000622	IN BAKERSFIELD: ON STOCKDALE HIGHWAY FROM MCDONALD WAY TO NORTH STINE ROAD; LANDSCAPE AND SIDEWALK IMPROVEMENTS	$231,000	4.12	San Joaquin
Bakersfield	KER120402	20400000652	IN BAKERSFIELD: GROUPED PROJECT FOR PAVEMENT RESURFACING AND/OR REHABILITATION (NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY)	$8,271,772	1.10	San Joaquin
Bakersfield	KER120506	20400000669	IN BAKERSFIELD: GROUPED PROJECTS FOR INTERSECTION SIGNALIZATION	$1,320,500	5.07	San Joaquin
Bakersfield	KER120507	20400000670	IN BAKERSFIELD: GROUPED PROJECTS FOR INTERSECTION SIGNALIZATION	$1,027,300	5.07	San Joaquin
Bakersfield	KER120508	20400000671	IN BAKERSFIELD: GROUPED PROJECTS FOR TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES	$1,283,150	1.07	San Joaquin

Transportation Project Listing - Exempt Projects

Jurisdiction/ Agency	TIP Project ID	CTIPS ID (If available)	Description	Est. Cost	Exempt Code (per CTIPS)	Air Basins
Bakersfield	KER120509	20400000672	IN BAKERSFIELD: SOUTH H ST AT WHITE LN; SIGNAL MODIFICATION AND NEW LEFT TURN LANE	$175,000	5.01	San Joaquin
Bakersfield	KER120511	20400000674	IN BAKERSFIELD: GROUPED PROJECTS FOR SHOULDER IMPROVEMENTS	$785,700	1.04	San Joaquin
Bakersfield	KER120512	20400000675	IN BAKERSFIELD: GROUPED PROJECTS FOR BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES	$95,000	3.02	San Joaquin
Bakersfield	KER121001	10400000347	IN BAKERSFIELD: MT VERNON FROM COLUMBUS ST TO UNIVERSITY AVE; LANDSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS	$515,565	4.12	San Joaquin
Cal. City	KER061002	10400000228	IN CALIFORNIA CITY: ON CALIFORNIA CITY BETWEEN YERBA BLVD AND NEURALIA; CONSTRUCT SIDEWALK AND SIDEWALK IMPROVEMENTS	$710,000	3.02	Mojave Desert
Cal. City	KER100403	20400000592	GROUPED PROJECT FOR PAVEMENT RESURFACING AND/OR REHABILITATION (NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY)	$451,093	1.10	Mojave Desert
Cal. City	KER120403	20400000653	IN CALIFORNIA CITY: GROUPED PROJECT FOR PAVEMENT RESURFACING AND/OR REHABILITATION (NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY)	$381,698	1.10	Mojave Desert
Cal. City	KER120513	20400000676	IN CALIFORNIA CITY: CALIFORNIA CITY BLVD (SOUTH) AT YALE AVE; CONSTRUCT COLLEGE STATION PARK-AND-RIDE	$375,000	5.06	Mojave Desert
Delano	KER100603	20400000587	IN DELANO: SR 99 AT WOOLLOMES AVE; INTERCHANGE SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS	$5,500,000	5.04	San Joaquin

Transportation Project Listing - Exempt Projects

Jurisdiction/ Agency	TIP Project ID	CTIPS ID (If available)	Description	Est. Cost	Exempt Code (per CTIPS)	Air Basins
Delano	KER120404	20400000654	IN DELANO: GROUPED PROJECT FOR PAVEMENT RESURFACING AND/OR REHABILITATION (NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY)	$1,279,340	1.10	San Joaquin
Delano	KER120514	20400000677	IN DELANO: GROUPED PROJECTS FOR SHOULDER IMPROVEMENTS	$808,382	1.04	San Joaquin
GET	KER080808	20400000534	SOUTHWEST TRANSIT CENTER UPGRADE	$3,500,000	2.08	San Joaquin
GET	KER100505	20400000605	EXPANSION OF CNG FUELING STATION FUEL ISLAND	$600,000	2.04	San Joaquin
GET	KER100801	20400000572	PURCHASE SEVENTEEN REPLACEMENT CNG BUSES	$8,415,000	2.10	San Joaquin
GET	KER100807	20400000578	PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE	$10,058,000	2.01	San Joaquin
GET	KER110805	20400000638	AUTOMATED VEHICLE LOCATOR	$2,500,000	2.04	San Joaquin
GET	KER110806	20400000639	TWENTY BUS SHELTERS	$250,000	2.07	San Joaquin
GET	KER110807	20400000640	MOBILE RADIO REPLACEMENTS	$215,000	2.04	San Joaquin
GET	KER110808	20400000641	TWO FLOOR HOISTS	$400,000	2.04	San Joaquin
GET	KER120502	20400000665	PASSIVE SOLAR ELECTRIC CONVERSION SYSTEM	$2,474,337	2.06	San Joaquin
GET	KER120503	20400000666	PURCHASE TWO REPLACEMENT CNG OVER THE ROAD COACHES	$1,150,000	2.10	San Joaquin
GET	KER120504	20400000667	PURCHASE TWO REPLACEMENT CNG BUSES	$1,150,000	2.10	San Joaquin

Transportation Project Listing - Exempt Projects

Jurisdiction/ Agency	TIP Project ID	CTIPS ID (If available)	Description	Est. Cost	Exempt Code (per CTIPS)	Air Basins
GET	KER120802	20400000687	REPLACE BUS SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	$660,000	2.04	San Joaquin
GET	KER120803	20400000688	PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE	$9,544,300	2.01	San Joaquin
KCOG	KER100501	20400000601	IN KERN COUNTY: RIDESHARE PROGRAM	$236,079	3.01	Various
KCOG	KER120104	20400000650	PLANNING, PROGRAMMING AND MONITORING	$2,325,000	4.01	Various
KCOG	KER120412	20400000662	IN KERN COUNTY: REGIONAL TRAFFIC COUNT PROGRAM	$180,000	4.01	Various
KCOG	KER120501	20400000664	IN KERN COUNTY: RIDESHARE PROGRAM	$405,300	3.01	Various
Kern Co.	KER080113	20400000542	IN KERN COUNTY: ON HAGEMAN ROAD AT BURLINGTON NORTHERN SANTA FE RAILWAY; SEPARATION OF GRADE	$35,300,000	1.01	San Joaquin
Kern Co.	KER100410	20400000599	GROUPED PROJECT FOR PAVEMENT RESURFACING AND/OR REHABILITATION (NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY)	$5,438,694	1.10	Various
Kern Co.	KER100503	20400000603	PURCHASE OF THREE REPLACEMENT CNG 35' BUSES (ADA COMPLIANT)	$1,136,625	2.10	Various
Kern Co.	KER100514	20400000614	IN BAKERSFIELD: PIONEER DRIVE: GARGANO ROAD TO VINELAND ROAD; SURFACE UNPAVED STREET	$280,000	1.10	San Joaquin
Kern Co.	KER100515	20400000615	IN ROSAMOND: 55TH STREET WEST FROM ROSAMOND BLVD TO ASHE ST; SURFACE UNPAVED STREET	$481,250	1.10	Mojave Desert
Kern Co.	KER100516	20400000616	NEAR TEHACHAPI: REEVES ST FROM ALTA VISTA TO SR 202; SURFACE UNPAVED STREET	$251,250	1.10	Mojave Desert

Transportation Project Listing - Exempt Projects

Jurisdiction/ Agency	TIP Project ID	CTIPS ID (If available)	Description	Est. Cost	Exempt Code (per CTIPS)	Air Basins
Kern Co.	KER100517	20400000617	IN RIDGECREST: BOWMAN RD FROM JACKS RANCH RD TO DOWNS AVE; SURFACE UNPAVED STREET	$1,962,544	1.10	Indian Wells
Kern Co.	KER100518	20400000618	IN ROSAMOND: ASTORIA AVE FROM 60TH ST WEST TO 55TH ST WEST; SURFACE UNPAVED STREET	$375,000	1.10	Mojave Desert
Kern Co.	KER100519	20400000619	GROUPED PROJECTS FOR SHOULDER IMPROVEMENTS IN KERN COUNTY	$924,000	1.04	Various
Kern Co.	KER101008	20400000627	IN KERNVILLE: ON KERNVILLE RD, KERN RIVER DR, ADJACENT TO KERN RIVER IN RIVER PARK, BIG BLUE RD, TOBIAS ST, SIERRA WAY, PIUTE DR; SIDEWALK IMPROVEMENTS	$950,000	3.02	Mojave Desert / PM 10
Kern Co.	KER101009	20400000628	IN TAFT: ON ASHER AVENUE FROM 4TH STREET TO TAFT RAILS TO TRAILS; SIDEWALK IMPROVEMENTS	$275,000	3.02	San Joaquin
Kern Co.	KER120405	20400000655	IN KERN COUNTY: GROUPED PROJECT FOR PAVEMENT RESURFACING AND/OR REHABILITATION (NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY)	$7,344,405	1.10	Various
Kern Co.	KER120505	20400000668	PURCHASE FOUR REPLACEMENT CNG BUSES	$1,617,724	2.10	Various
Kern Co.	KER120510	20400000673	IN BAKERSFIELD: GROUPED PROJECTS FOR INTERSECTION SIGNALIZATION	$1,145,000	5.07	San Joaquin
Kern Co.	KER120515	20400000678	IN TEHACHAPI: ROOST AVE FROM BEAR VALLEY RD TO END; SURFACE UNPAVED STREET	$375,000	1.10	Mojave Desert
Kern Co.	KER120516	20400000679	IN ROSAMOND: SWEETSER RD FROM 65TH ST WEST TO 60TH ST WEST; SURFACE UNPAVED STREET	$250,000	1.10	Mojave Desert
Kern Co.	KER120517	20400000680	IN ROSAMOND: 60TH ST WEST FROM SWEETSER RD TO FAVORITO AVE; SURFACE UNPAVED STREET	$250,000	1.10	Mojave Desert

Transportation Project Listing - Exempt Projects

Jurisdiction/ Agency	TIP Project ID	CTIPS ID (If available)	Description	Est. Cost	Exempt Code (per CTIPS)	Air Basins
Kern Co.	KER120518	20400000681	IN KERN COUNTY: GROUPED PROJECTS FOR SHOULDER IMPROVEMENTS	$5,450,000	1.04	Various
Kern Co.	KER121002	10400000348	IN RIDGECREST: COLLEGE HEIGHTS BLVD FROM DOLPHIN AVE TO CERRO COSO COMMUNITY COLLEGE; CONSTRUCT PEDESTRIAN PATH AND LANDSCAPE IMPROVE	$473,000	4.12	Indian Wells
Kern Co.	KER121003	10400000340	IN BAKERSFIELD: CHESTER AVE FROM KERN RIVER PARKWAY TO OILDALE TOWN CENTER; CONSTRUCT SIDEWALK	$380,000	4.12	San Joaquin
Kern Co.	KER121004	10400000341	IN TEHACHAPI: TEHACHAPI CUMMINGS WATER DISTRICT PROPERTY FROM HIGHLINE RD TO VALLEY BLVD; CONSTRUCT BIKE/PEDESTRIAN PATH	$504,000	4.12	Mojave Desert
Kern Co.	KER121005	10400000342	IN ROSAMOND: DIAMOND ST FROM ROSAMOND BLVD TO ORANGE ST; CON SIDEWALK & LANDSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS, STREETLIGHTS, RESTRIPE RD, & BIKE LANES	$1,300,000	4.12	Mojave Desert
Kern Co.	KER121006	10400000344	IN AND NEAR LOST HILLS: SR 46 FROM 0.1 MILE WEST OF CALIFORNIA AQUEDUCT TO LOST HILLS RD; CONSTRUCT SIDEWALK	$351,000	4.12	San Joaquin
Kern Co.	KER121007	10400000345	IN BAKERSFIELD: BERNARD ST FROM HALEY ST TO MT VERNON AVE; CONSTRUCT SIDEWALKS	$316,000	4.12	San Joaquin
McFarland	KER120406	20400000656	IN MCFARLAND: W KERN AVE FROM WEST OF FRONTAGE RD TO EAST OF 2ND ST; PEDESTRIAN/LANDSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS	$296,460	4.09	San Joaquin
Ridgecrest	KER050406	20400000383	GROUPED PROJECT FOR PAVEMENT RESURFACING AND/OR REHABILITATION (NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY)	$473,261	1.10	Indian Wells

Transportation Project Listing - Exempt Projects

Jurisdiction/ Agency	TIP Project ID	CTIPS ID (If available)	Description	Est. Cost	Exempt Code (per CTIPS)	Air Basins
Ridgecrest	KER120407	20400000657	IN RIDGECREST: GROUPED PROJECT FOR PAVEMENT RESURFACING AND/OR REHABILITATION (NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY)	$750,000	1.10	Indian Wells
Ridgecrest	KER120519	20400000682	IN RIDGECRST: SOUTH SUNLAND DR FROM UPJOHN AVE TO BOWMAN RD; SURFACE UNPAVED STREET	$575,000	1.10	Indian Wells
Ridgecrest	KER120520	20400000683	IN RIDGECREST: GROUPED PROJECTS FOR INTERSECTION SIGNALIZATION	$350,000	5.02	Indian Wells
Shafter	KER100406	20400000595	GROUPED PROJECT FOR PAVEMENT RESURFACING AND/OR REHABILITATION (NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY)	$325,000	1.10	San Joaquin
Shafter	KER101004	20400000623	IN SHAFTER: ON SANTA FE WAY FROM LOS ANGELES AVENUE TO RIVERSIDE AVENUE; BEAUTIFICATION	$160,000	4.12	San Joaquin
Shafter	KER120408	20400000658	IN SHAFTER: GROUPED PROJECT FOR PAVEMENT RESURFACING AND/OR REHABILITATION (NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY)	$594,000	1.10	San Joaquin
Shafter	KER120521	20400000684	IN SHAFTER: INTERMODAL RAIL FACILITY EXPANSION	$3,712,166	2.11	San Joaquin
Shafter	KER120522	20400000685	IN SHAFTER: GROUPED PROJECTS FOR SHOULDER IMPROVEMENTS	$564,781	1.04	San Joaquin
State	KER080111	20400000525	IN BAKERSFIELD: AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS FROM THE SR 119/99 SEPARATION TO THE SR 65/99 SEPARATION; BRIDGE AESTHETIC IMPROVEMENT	$1,640,000	4.09	San Joaquin

Transportation Project Listing - Exempt Projects

Jurisdiction/ Agency	TIP Project ID	CTIPS ID (If available)	Description	Est. Cost	Exempt Code (per CTIPS)	Air Basins
State	KER110201	20400000642	GROUPED PROJECTS FOR PAVEMENT RESURFACING AND/OR REHABILITATION ON THE STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM - HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE	$14,460,454	1.10	Various
State	KER120107	10400000337	KERN & TULARE: SR99 AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS; BRIDGE ENHANCEMENT FOR 24 STRUCTURES, AESTHETIC WORK	$1,909,000	4.09	San Joaquin
State	KER120201	20400000694	GROUPED PROJECTS FOR BRIDGE REHABILITATION AND RECONSTRUCTION - SHOPP PROGRAM	$62,817,000	1.19	Various
State	KER120202	20400000695	GROUPED PROJECTS FOR SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS - SHOPP COLLISION REDUCTION PROGRAM	$12,953,000	1.09	Various
State	KER120203	20400000696	GROUPED PROJECTS FOR EMERGENCY REPAIR - SHOPP EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM	$3,066,000	1.12	Various
State	KER120204	20400000697	GROUPED PROJECTS FOR SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS - SHOPP MANDATES PROGRAM	$16,198,000	1.02	Various
State	KER120205	20400000698	GROUPED PROJECTS FOR PAVEMENT RESURFACING AND/OR REHABILITATION - SHOPP ROADWAY PRESERVATION PROGRAM	$6,383,000	1.10	Various
Taft	KER050408	20400000385	GROUPED PROJECT FOR PAVEMENT RESURFACING AND/OR REHABILITATION (NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY)	$702,768	1.10	San Joaquin
Taft	KER060408	20400000430	GROUPED PROJECT FOR PAVEMENT RESURFACING AND/OR REHABILITATION (NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY)	$306,060	1.10	San Joaquin
Taft	KER100407	20400000596	GROUPED PROJECT FOR PAVEMENT RESURFACING AND/OR REHABILITATION (NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY)	$145,648	1.10	San Joaquin

Transportation Project Listing - Exempt Projects

Jurisdiction/ Agency	TIP Project ID	CTIPS ID (If available)	Description	Est. Cost	Exempt Code (per CTIPS)	Air Basins
Taft	KER100502	20400000602	IN TAFT: PURCHASE AND INSTALLATION OF TEN BUS SHELTERS	$149,500	2.07	San Joaquin
Taft	KER101005	20400000624	IN TAFT: ON HILLARD STREET FROM "A" STREET TO RAILS TO TRAILS; CONSTRUCT PEDESTRIAN AND BIKE IMPROVEMENTS	$317,000	3.02	San Joaquin
Taft	KER120409	20400000659	IN TAFT: GROUPED PROJECT FOR PAVEMENT RESURFACING AND/OR REHABILITATION (NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY)	$252,797	1.10	San Joaquin
Taft	KER121008	10400000346	IN TAFT: SUNSET RAILROAD CORRIDOR FROM 2ND ST TO SR 119; CONSTRUCT BIKE/PEDESTRIAN PATH	$770,000	4.12	San Joaquin
Tehachapi	KER100408	20400000597	GROUPED PROJECT FOR PAVEMENT RESURFACING AND/OR REHABILITATION (NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY)	$228,000	1.10	Mojave Desert
Tehachapi	KER101006	20400000625	IN TEHACHAPI: ON TEHACHAPI BLVD FROM HAYES STREET TO ROBINSON STREET; STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS	$709,000	4.12	Mojave Desert
Tehachapi	KER120410	20400000660	IN TEHACHAPI: GROUPED PROJECT FOR PAVEMENT RESURFACING AND/OR REHABILITATION (NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY)	$352,423	1.10	Mojave Desert
Tehachapi	KER120523	20400000686	IN TEHACHAPI: CURRY ST AT VALLEY BLVD; GUTTER REMOVAL	$482,000	1.02	Mojave Desert
Tehachapi	KER121009	10400000343	IN TEHACHAPI: TEHACHAPI BLVD FROM SNYDER AVE TO DENNISON RD; CONSTRUCT SIDEWALK, PEDESTRIAN LIGHTING, & LANDSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS	$547,000	4.12	Mojave Desert

Transportation Project Listing - Exempt Projects

Jurisdiction/ Agency	TIP Project ID	CTIPS ID (If available)	Description	Est. Cost	Exempt Code (per CTIPS)	Air Basins
Various	KER060601	20400000418	GROUPED PROJECTS FOR BRIDGE REHABILITATION AND RECONSTRUCTION - HIGHWAY BRIDGE PROGRAM (HBP). NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY. (40 CFR TABLES 2&3) (INCLUDES SEISMIC RETROFIT)	$7,100,000	1.19	Various
Various	KER060608	20400000483	GROUPED PROJECTS FOR SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS - HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP). NON-CAPACITY INCREASING PROJECTS ONLY. (40 CFR TABLES 2&3)	$275,200	1.06	Various
Various	KER080602	20400000549	GROUPED PROJECTS FOR SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS - SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FEDERAL PROGRAM. NON-CAPACITY INCREASING PROJECTS ONLY. (40 CFR TABLES 2&3)	$536,420	3.02	Various
Various	KER100601	20400000571	GROUPED PROJECTS FOR SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS - HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP). NON-CAPACITY INCREASING PROJECTS ONLY. (40 CFR TABLES 2&3)	$230,944	1.06	Various
Various	KER110601	20400000637	GROUPED PROJECTS FOR SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS - HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP). NON-CAPACITY INCREASING PROJECTS ONLY. (40 CFR TABLES 2&3)	$2,413,300	1.06	Various
Various	KER110602	20400000643	GROUPED PROJECTS FOR SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS - SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FEDERAL PROGRAM. NON-CAPACITY INCREASING PROJECTS ONLY. (40 CFR TABLES 2&3)	$2,434,500	3.02	Various
Various	KER110802	20400000633	GROUPED PROJECTS FOR OPERATING ASSISTANCE TO TRANSIT AGENCIES	$2,155,292	2.01	Various
Various	KER110804	20400000635	GROUPED PROJECTS FOR OPERATING ASSISTANCE TO TRANSIT AGENCIES	$397,746	2.01	Various
Various	KER110809	20400000644	GROUPED PROJECTS FOR PURCHASE OF OPERATING EQUIPMENT FOR VEHICLES	$36,952	2.05	Various

Transportation Project Listing - Exempt Projects

Jurisdiction/ Agency	TIP Project ID	CTIPS ID (If available)	Description	Est. Cost	Exempt Code (per CTIPS)	Air Basins
Various	KER110810	20400000645	GROUPED PROJECTS FOR PURCHASE OF NEW BUSES AND RAIL CARS TO REPLACE EXISTING VEHICLES OR FOR MINOR EXPANSIONS OF THE FLEET	$1,069,000	2.10	Various
Various	KER120801	20400000648	GROUPED PROJECTS FOR OPERATING ASSISTANCE TO TRANSIT AGENCIES	$9,239,138	2.01	Various
Wasco	KER100409	20400000598	GROUPED PROJECT FOR PAVEMENT RESURFACING AND/OR REHABILITATION (NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY)	$431,821	1.10	San Joaquin
Wasco	KER101007	20400000626	IN WASCO: ON SR 43 FROM POSO DRIVE TO FILBURN AVENUE; LANDSCAPE IMPROVEMENT	$633,447	4.12	San Joaquin
Wasco	KER120411	20400000661	IN WASCO: GROUPED PROJECT FOR PAVEMENT RESURFACING AND/OR REHABILITATION (NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS ONLY)	$722,345	1.10	San Joaquin
Wasco	KER121010	10400000349	IN WASCO: SR43 FROM POSO DRIVE TO FILBURN AVE; CONSTRUCT LANDSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS	$845,812	4.12	San Joaquin

APPENDIX C

CONFORMITY ANALYSIS DOCUMENTATION

- 2013 adjust_vmt Spreadsheet (updated analysis years only)
- 2013 Conformity EMFAC Spreadsheet (updated analysis years and new line item emission reductions to be consistent with the 2007 8-Hour Ozone Plan as revised in 2011 and 2008 PM2.5 Plan as revised in 2011)
- 2013 Conformity Paved Road Spreadsheet (updated to include January 2011 EPA update to AP-42 methodology)
- 2013 Conformity Unpaved Road Dust Spreadsheet
- 2013 Conformity Construction Spreadsheet
- 2013 Conformity Trading Spreadsheets (PM-10 and PM2.5) (new PM2.5 sheet developed consistent with 2008 PM2.5 Plan as revised in 2011)
- 2013 Conformity Totals Spreadsheet (updated to include new conformity budgets consistent with the 2007 8-Hour Ozone Plan as revised in 2011 and 2008 PM2.5 Plan as revised in 2011 and corresponding EPA approvals)

Kern COG (SJV Portion) 2013 Conformity

Variable	Source	2014	2017	2020	2023	2025	2035	
EDP	EMFAC 2007	500,632	536,308	572,095	608,620	634,269	773,953	
EVMT	EMFAC 2007	21,951,564	23,720,446	25,545,062	27,129,886	28,146,334	33,686,624	
MVMT	TPA Model	21,157,378	22,675,577	24,344,632	25,848,254	26,954,200	32,932,425	
N	Calculated	482,520	512,684	545,211	579,868	607,405	756,625	<= Read New Vehicle Population Here

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

4/25/2012

Kern COG (MD portion) 2013 Conformity

Variable	Source	Analysis Year			
		2015	2025	2035	
EDP	EMFAC 2007	141,868	180,038	218,149	
EVMT	EMFAC 2007	6,866,440	8,584,790	10,136,643	
MVMT	TPA Model	4,588,113	5,842,857	7,632,569	<=Enter Modeled Daily VMT Here
N	Calculated	94,795	122,535	164,259	<= Read New Vehicle Population Here

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

2013 Conformity Analysis, Kern County

EMFAC Emission Estimates

EMFAC Emissions (tons/day)
KERN (SJV)

Pollutant	Source	Description	2014	2017	2020	2023	2025	2035
Carbon Monoxide	EMFAC 2007 (Winter Run)	CO Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)		69.03			52.03	51.24
		Conformity Total		69			52	51
Ozone	EMFAC 2010 (Summer Run)	ROG Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)	12.08	10.34	9.10	8.32	8.03	7.59
	Existing Local Reductions	Rule 9310 (School Buses)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Existing State Reductions	Carl Moyer Program & AB 1493 GHG Standards	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	New/Proposed Local Reductions	Rule 9410 (Employer Based Trip Reduction)	0.21	0.14	0.19	0.18	0.18	0.18
	New/Proposed State Reductions	Smog Check, RFG & Truck Model	3.68	2.85	2.01	1.43	1.43	1.43
		Conformity Total	8.18	7.34	6.90	6.71	6.42	5.96
Ozone	EMFAC 2010 (Summer Run)	NOx Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)	63.82	49.72	38.34	33.22	30.96	28.79
	Existing Local Reductions	Rule 9310 (School Buses)	0.04	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.07	0.07
	Existing State Reductions	Carl Moyer Program & AB 1493 GHG Standards	0.12	0.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	New/Proposed Local Reductions	Rule 9410 (Employer Based Trip Reduction)	0.19	0.16	0.13	0.10	0.10	0.10
	New/Proposed State Reductions	Smog Check & Truck Model	27.76	23.78	19.39	18.86	18.86	18.86
		Conformity Total	35.71	25.61	19.74	14.19	11.93	9.76
PM-10	EMFAC 2007 (Annual Run)	PM-10 Total (All Vehicles Total) * includes tire & brake wear			2.17		1.95	2.05
	ARB	Existing Reflash, Idling, and Moyer (HDI, PFR, Moyer, AB1493, Reflash)			0.02		0.02	0.02
		Conformity Total			2.15		1.93	2.03
PM-10	EMFAC 2007 (Annual Run)	NOx Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)			39.54		31.04	28.80
	ARB	Existing Reflash, Idling, and Moyer (HDI, PFR, Moyer, AB1493, Reflash)			5.45		5.45	5.45
		Conformity Total			34.09		25.59	23.35
PM2.5	EMFAC 2010 (Annual Run)	PM2.5 Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total) * includes tire & brake wear	2.42	1.94			1.30	1.40
	Existing Local Reductions	Rule 9310 (School Buses)	0.01	0.01			0.01	0.01
	Existing State Reductions	Carl Moyer Program & AB 1493 GHG Standards	0.00	0.01			0.01	0.01
	New/Proposed State Reductions	Smog Check & Truck Model	1.44	1.31			0.28	0.05
		Conformity Total	1.00	0.60			1.10	1.30
PM2.5	EMFAC 2010 (Annual Run)	NOx Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)	64.37	50.05			31.04	28.80
	Existing Local Reductions	Rule 9310 (School Buses)	0.11	0.31			0.29	0.25
	Existing State Reductions	Carl Moyer Program & AB 1493 GHG Standards	0.17	0.08			0.01	0.01
	New/Proposed State Reductions	Smog Check & Truck Model	26.29	27.53			15.36	10.05
		Conformity Total	37.80	22.10			15.40	18.50

4/26/2012

2013 Conformity Analysis, Kern County -- Other

EMFAC Emission Estimates

EMFAC Emissions (tons/day)

KERN - MD

Pollutant	Source	Description	2015	2025	2035
Ozone	EMFAC 2007 (Summer Run)	ROG Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)	2.51	1.87	2.06
	ARB	Reflash, Public Fleet, Idling, AB 1493, Moyer	0.01	0.01	0.01
		Conformity Total	2.50	1.86	2.05
Ozone	EMFAC 2007 (Summer Run)	NOx Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)	10.36	6.14	5.82
	ARB	Reflash, Public Fleet, Idling, AB 1493, Moyer	1.21	1.21	1.21
		Conformity Total	9.15	4.93	4.61

2013 Conformity Analysis, Kern County

Paved Road Dust Emission Estimates

Paved Road Dust Emissions (tons/day)

KERN 2020

		VMT Daily	VMT (million/year)	Base Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tons/day)	District Rule 8061/8SR Control Rates	Control-Adjusted Emissions
Enter Freeway VMT ==>	Freeway	13,144,806	4,798	366.600	357.287	0.979	0.147	0.835
Enter Arterial VMT ==>	Arterial	9,402,709	3,432	436.371	425.288	1.165	0.337	0.773
Enter Collector VMT ==>	Collector	342,417	125	15.891	15.488	0.042	0.666	0.014
	Urban	712,503	260	247.832	241.536	0.662	0.679	0.212
Enter Total of Urban and Rural	Rural	741,897	271	1115.819	1087.473	2.979	0.090	2.711
Local VMT Here => 1,454,700								
	Totals	24,344,632	8,886	2182.513	2127.070	5.828		4.545

KERN 2025

		VMT Daily	VMT (million/year)	Base Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tons/day)	District Rule 8061/8SR Control Rates	Control-Adjusted Emissions
Enter Freeway VMT ==>	Freeway	14,430,952	5,267	402.470	392.246	1.075	0.147	0.917
Enter Arterial VMT ==>	Arterial	10,511,084	3,837	487.810	475.418	1.303	0.337	0.864
Enter Collector VMT ==>	Collector	386,262	141	17.926	17.471	0.048	0.666	0.016
	Urban	796,692	291	276.999	269.962	0.740	0.679	0.237
Enter Total of Urban and Rural	Rural	829,210	303	1247.139	1215.457	3.330	0.090	3.030
Local VMT Here => 1,625,902								
	Totals	26,954,200	9,838	2432.343	2370.553	6.495		5.064

KERN 2035

		VMT Daily	VMT (million/year)	Base Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tons/day)	District Rule 8061/8SR Control Rates	Control-Adjusted Emissions
Enter Freeway VMT ==>	Freeway	17,787,365	6,492	496.078	483.476	1.325	0.147	1.130
Enter Arterial VMT ==>	Arterial	12,667,209	4,624	587.873	572.939	1.570	0.337	1.041
Enter Collector VMT ==>	Collector	516,785	189	23.984	23.374	0.064	0.666	0.021
	Urban	960,922	351	334.099	325.612	0.892	0.679	0.286
Enter Total of Urban and Rural	Rural	1,000,144	365	1504.224	1466.012	4.016	0.090	3.655
Local VMT Here => 1,961,066								
	Totals	32,932,425	12,020	2946.259	2871.413	7.867		6.133

DO NOT CHANGE ANY ITEMS BELOW THIS LINE

KERN
HPMS Local Urban/Rural Percent
From 1998 Assembly of Statistical Reports - Caltrans
49.0% Urban
51.0% Rural
100.0% Total

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

KERN

	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total/Average
Rain Days	7.2	6.6	6.0	4.0	1.8	0.0	0	0	1.0	1.4	3.8	5.0	36.8
Total Days	31	28	31	30	31	30	31	31	30	31	30	31	365
Rain Reduction Factor	0.94	0.94	0.95	0.97	0.99	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.97	0.96	0.97

4/25/2012

Paved Road Dust Emissions (tons/day)

KERN 2013

			VMT Daily	VMT (million/year)	Base Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tons/day)
Enter Freeway VMT ==>		Freeway	122,053	45	3.404	3.318	0.009
Enter Arterial VMT ==>		Arterial	421,150	154	19.545	19.049	0.052
Enter Collector VMT ==>		Collector	28,444	10	1.320	1.287	0.004
		Urban	41,913	15	14.572	14.202	0.039
Enter Total of Urban and Rural		Rural	43,623	16	65.610	63.943	0.175
Local VMT Here =>	85,536						
		Totals	657,183	240	104.452	101.798	0.279

KERN 2015

			VMT Daily	VMT (million/year)	Base Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tons/day)
Enter Freeway VMT ==>		Freeway	127,337	46	3.551	3.461	0.009
Enter Arterial VMT ==>		Arterial	430,005	157	19.956	19.449	0.053
Enter Collector VMT ==>		Collector	28,733	10	1.333	1.300	0.004
		Urban	42,754	16	14.865	14.488	0.040
Enter Total of Urban and Rural		Rural	44,500	16	66.928	65.227	0.179
Local VMT Here =>	87,254						
		Totals	673,329	246	106.634	103.925	0.285

KERN 2025

			VMT Daily	VMT (million/year)	Base Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tons/day)
Enter Freeway VMT ==>		Freeway	146,036	53	4.073	3.969	0.011
Enter Arterial VMT ==>		Arterial	510,074	186	23.672	23.071	0.063
Enter Collector VMT ==>		Collector	31,237	11	1.450	1.413	0.004
		Urban	49,890	18	17.346	16.906	0.046
Enter Total of Urban and Rural		Rural	51,927	19	78.098	76.114	0.209
Local VMT Here =>	101,817						
		Totals	789,164	288	124.639	121.473	0.333

KERN 2035

			VMT Daily	VMT (million/year)	Base Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tons/day)
Enter Freeway VMT ==>		Freeway	215,876	79	6.021	5.868	0.016
Enter Arterial VMT ==>		Arterial	828,537	302	38.452	37.475	0.103
Enter Collector VMT ==>		Collector	33,761	12	1.567	1.527	0.004
		Urban	59,975	22	20.852	20.323	0.056
Enter Total of Urban and Rural		Rural	62,422	23	93.884	91.499	0.251
Local VMT Here =>	122,397						
		Totals	1,200,571	438	160.775	156.691	0.429

DO NOT CHANGE ANY ITEMS BELOW THIS LINE

KERN
HPMS Local Urban/Rural Percent
From 1998 Assembly of Statistical Reports - Caltrans
49.0% Urban
51.0% Rural
100.0% Total

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

4/25/2012

KERN

	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total/Average
Rain Days	7.2	6.6	6.0	4.0	1.8	0.0	0	0	1.0	1.4	3.8	5.0	36.8
Total Days	31	28	31	30	31	30	31	31	30	31	30	31	365
Rain Reduction Factor	0.94	0.94	0.95	0.97	0.99	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99	0.99	0.97	0.96	0.97

2013 Conformity Analysis, Kern County

Unpaved Road Dust Emission Estimates

Unpaved Road Dust Emissions (tons/day)

KERN 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	74.0	10	270.1	270.100	242.654	0.665	0.484	0.343

KERN 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	74.0	10	270.1	270.100	242.654	0.665	0.484	0.343

KERN 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	74.0	10	270.1	270.100	242.654	0.665	0.484	0.343

DO NOT CHANGE ANY ITEMS BELOW THIS LINE

KERN	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	Total/Average
Rain Days	7.2	6.8	6.0	4.0	1.8	0.0	0	0	1.0	1.4	3.8	5.0	36.8
Total Days	31	28	31	30	31	30	31	31	30	31	30	31	365
Rain Reduction Factor	0.77	0.76	0.81	0.87	0.94	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.97	0.95	0.87	0.84	0.90

2013 Conformity Analysis, Kern County -- Other

Unpaved Road Dust Emission Estimates

Unpaved Road Dust Emissions (tons/day)

KERN -- IWV 2013

	Miles	Vehicle Passes per Day	VMT (1000/year)	Base Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Emissions (PM10 tons/day)
City/County	46.7	10	170.6	170.565	0.467

KERN -- IWV 2015

	Miles	Vehicle Passes per Day	VMT (1000/year)	Base Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Emissions (PM10 tons/day)
City/County	46.7	10	170.6	170.565	0.467

KERN -- IWV 2025

	Miles	Vehicle Passes per Day	VMT (1000/year)	Base Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Emissions (PM10 tons/day)
City/County	46.7	10	170.6	170.565	0.467

KERN -- IWV 2035

	Miles	Vehicle Passes per Day	VMT (1000/year)	Base Emissions (PM10 tpy)	Emissions (PM10 tons/day)
City/County	46.7	10	170.6	170.565	0.467

2013 Conformity Analysis, Kern County

Road Construction Dust Estimates

Road Construction Dust

KERN

Description	2020		2025		2035	
	Year	Lane Miles	Year	Lane Miles	Year	Lane Miles
Baseline	2005	4790	2020	5664	2025	5752
Horizon	2020	5,664	2025	5,752	2035	6,834
Difference	15	874	5	88	10	1082
Lane Miles per Year		58		18		108
Acres Disturbed		226		68		420
Acre-Months		4068		1229		7554
Emissions (tons/year)		447.488		135.168		830.976
Annual Average Day Emissions (tons)		1.226		0.370		2.277
District Rule 8021 Control Rates		0.290		0.290		0.290
Total Emissions (tons per day)		**0.870**		**0.263**		**1.616**

2013 Conformity Analysis, Kern County -- Other

Road Construction Dust Estimates

Road Construction Dust

KERN - INDIAN WELLS VALLEY

Description	2013		2015		2025		2035	
	Year	Lane Miles	Year	Lane Miles	Year	Lane Miles	Year	Lane Miles
Baseline	2005	266	2013	361	2015	361	2025	412
Horizon	2013	361	2015	361	2025	412	2035	439
Difference	8	95	2	0	10	51	10	27
Lane Miles per Year		12		0		5		3
Acres Disturbed		46		0		20		10
Acre-Months		829		0		356		189
Emissions (tons/year)		91.200		0.000		39.168		20.736
Total Emissions (tons per day)		**0.250**		**0.000**		**0.107**		**0.057**

PM10 Emission Trading Worksheet

KERN CONFORMITY ESTIMATES (tons/day)

	2020		2025		2035	
	PM10	NOx	PM10	NOx	PM10	NOx
Total On-Road Exhaust	2.150	34.090	1.930	25.590	2.030	23.350
Paved Road Dust	4.545		5.064		6.133	
Unpaved Road Dust	0.343		0.343		0.343	
Road Construction Dust	0.870		0.263		1.616	
Total	**7.908**	**34.090**	**7.600**	**25.590**	**10.122**	**23.350**

Difference (2020 Budget - 2020)

	PM10	NOx
2020 Budgets	14.7	39.5
2020	7.9	34.1
Difference	**6.8**	**5.4**
* 1.5 (Adjustment to NOx Budget)	-10.2	

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	14.7	39.5
2025	7.6	25.6
Difference	**7.1**	**13.9**
* 1.5 (Adjustment to NOx Budget)	-10.7	

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	14.7	39.5
2035	10.1	23.4
Difference	**4.6**	**16.1**
* 1.5 (Adjustment to NOx Budget)	-6.9	

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

1:1.5 PM10 to NOx Trading

	PM10	NOx
2020 Budget	**14.7**	**39.5**

Adjusted 2020 Budget	**N/A**	**N/A**
2020 Conformity Total	**7.9**	**34.1**
Difference	**#VALUE!**	**#VALUE!**

NOTE: TRADING NOT NECESSARY

Adjusted 2020 Budget	**N/A**	**N/A**
2025 Conformity Total	**7.6**	**25.6**
Difference	**#VALUE!**	**#VALUE!**

NOTE: TRADING NOT NECESSARY

Adjusted 2020 Budget	**N/A**	**N/A**
2035 Conformity Total	**10.1**	**23.4**
Difference	**#VALUE!**	**#VALUE!**

NOTE: TRADING NOT NECESSARY

2013 Conformity Analysis, Kern County

PM-2.5 Emissions Trading

PM2.5 Emission Trading Worksheet

KERN CONFORMITY ESTIMATES (tons/day)

	2017		2025		2035	
	PM2.5	NOx	PM2.5	NOx	PM2.5	NOx
Total On-Road Exhaust	0.60	22.10	1.10	15.40	1.30	18.50

Difference (2014 Budget - 2017)

	PM2.5	NOx
2014 Budgets	1.2	43.8
2017	0.6	22.1
Difference	**0.6**	**21.7**
* 9 (Adjustment to NOx Budget)	-5.4	

NOTE: IF PM25 DIFFERENCE IS NEGATIVE, IMPLEMENT TRADING BELOW; IF NOT, INSERT RESULTS DIRECTLY INTO TOTALS SHEET

Difference (2014 Budget - 2025)

	PM2.5	NOx
2014 Budgets	1.2	43.8
2025	1.1	15.4
Difference	**0.1**	**28.4**
* 9 (Adjustment to NOx Budget)	-0.9	

NOTE: IF PM25 DIFFERENCE IS NEGATIVE, IMPLEMENT TRADING BELOW; IF NOT, INSERT RESULTS DIRECTLY INTO TOTALS SHEET

Difference (2014 Budget - 2035)

	PM2.5	NOx
2014 Budgets	1.2	43.8
2035	1.3	18.5
Difference	**-0.1**	**25.3**
* 9 (Adjustment to NOx Budget)	0.9	

NOTE: IF PM2.5 DIFFERENCE IS NEGATIVE, IMPLEMENT TRADING BELOW; IF NOT, INSERT RESULTS DIRECTLY INTO TOTALS SHEET

1:9 PM2.5 to NOx Trading

	PM2.5	NOx
2014 Budget	**1.2**	**43.8**

Adjusted 2017 Budget	**N/A**	**N/A**
2017 Conformity Total	**0.6**	**22.1**
Difference	**#VALUE!**	**#VALUE!**

NOTE: TRADING NOT NECESSARY

Adjusted 2025 Budget	**N/A**	**N/A**
2025 Conformity Total	**1.1**	**15.4**
Difference	**#VALUE!**	**#VALUE!**

NOTE: TRADING NOT NECESSARY

Adjusted 2035 Budget	**1.3**	**42.9**
2035 Conformity Total	**1.3**	**18.5**
Difference	**0.0**	**24.4**

NOTE: FINAL DIFFERENCE MUST BE POSITIVE

2013 Conformity Analysis, Kern County

Summary of Total Emissions

2013 Conformity Results Summary -- KERN

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total	DID YOU PASS?
		CO (tons/day)	CO
Carbon Monoxide	2010 Budget	180	
	2017	69	YES
	2018 Budget	180	
	2018	67	YES
	2025	52	YES
	2035	51	YES

		ROG (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	ROG	NOx
Ozone	2014 Budget	9.7	42.7		
	2014	8.2	35.7	YES	YES
	2017 Budget	8.7	31.7		
	2017	7.3	25.6	YES	YES
	2020 Budget	8.2	25.1		
	2020	6.9	19.7	YES	YES
	2023 Budget	7.9	18.6		
	2023	6.7	14.2	YES	YES
	2025	6.4	11.9	YES	YES
	2035	6.0	9.8	YES	YES

		PM-10 (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	PM-10	NOx
PM-10	2020 Budget	14.7	39.5		
	2020	7.9	34.1	YES	YES
	2020 Budget	14.7	39.5		
	2025	7.6	25.6	YES	YES
	2020 Budget	14.7	39.5		
	2035	10.1	23.4	YES	YES

		PM2.5 (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)	PM2.5	NOx
1997 PM2.5 24 Hour & Annual Standards and 2006 24-Hour Standard	2014 Budget	1.2	43.8		
	2014	1.0	37.8	YES	YES
	2014 Budget	1.2	43.8		
	2017	0.6	22.1	YES	YES
	2014 Budget	1.2	43.8		
	2025	1.1	15.4	YES	YES
	Adjusted 2014 Budget	1.3	42.9		
	2035	1.3	18.5	YES	YES

4/25/2012

2013 Conformity Analysis, Kern County -- Other

Summary of Total Emissions

2013 Conformity Results Summary -- KERN (Mojave Desert)

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total			DID YOU PASS?	
		ROG (tons/day)	NOx (tons/day)		ROG	NOx
Ozone	2008 Budget	5	18			
	2015	3	9		YES	YES
	2025	2	5		YES	YES
	2035	2	5		YES	YES

2013 Conformity Analysis, Kern County -- Other

Summary of Total Emissions

2013 Conformity Results Summary -- KERN (Indian Wells Valley)

Pollutant	Scenario	Emissions Total		DID YOU PASS?
		PM-10 (tons/day)		PM-10
PM-10	2013 Budget	1.7		
	2013	1.0		YES
	2015	0.8		YES
	2025	0.9		YES
	2035	1.0		YES

APPENDIX D

TIMELY IMPLEMENTATION DOCUMENTATION FOR TRANSPORTATION CONTROL MEASURES

Kern COG
Timely Implementation Documentation

RACM Commitment	Agency	Commitment Description	Commitment Schedule	Commitment Funding	TIP	TIP Project ID	Project Description	2011 Implementation Status	2013 Conformity Update
								(as of 2/12)	(as of 4/12)
KE 14.10	KCOG	Public Education Program	02/03 - 04/05	$40,000 per year	2002	KER020122	IN KERN COUNTY: COUNTYWIDE WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON SAN JOAQUIN PORTION OF KERN COUNTY, PUBLIC OUTREACH PROGRAM, AND SOME CAPITAL	Complete	Complete
KE 1.1	Arvin	New bus service to Ikea plant and business park	2002	Not specified				Complete	Complete
KE 1.5	Arvin	Construct transfer station	2005	$650,000 CMAQ (includes local)	2002	KER000503	CONSTRUCT NEW TRANSIT TRANSFER STATION	Complete	Complete
KE 9.3	Arvin	Drive Approach Modification Project; Traffic Signal Project	2003; 2003	$395,000 Total				Complete	Complete
KE 10.2	Arvin	Bike Racks on Buses	2002	Not specified				Complete	Complete
KE 5.2 and 5.16	Bakersfield	Traffic signal interconnect projects	2003	$1 M CMAQ (includes local)					

Kern COG
Timely Implementation Documentation

RACM Commitment	Agency	Commitment Description	Commitment Schedule	Commitment Funding	TIP	TIP Project ID	Project Description	2011 Implementation Status	2013 Conformity Update
								(as of 2/12)	(as of 4/12)
					1998	KER960506	TRAFFIC OPERATIONS CENTER: MANAGEMENT CENTER TO LINK ALL TRAFFIC SIGNALS TO CITY HALL- PURCHASE HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE - CONSTRUCTION OF CENTER (PHASE 2)	Complete	Complete
					2002	KER000504	SIGNALIZATION, COMMUNICATION / SYNCHRONIZATION OF SOUTH H STREET FROM WHITE LANE TO PANAMA LANE	Complete	Complete
					2002	KER000505	SIGNALIZATION, COMMUNICATION / SYNCHRONIZATION OF STINE ROAD FROM WHITE LANE TO HARRIS ROAD	Complete	Complete
					2002	KER000506	SIGNALIZATION, COMMUNICATION / SYNCHRONIZATION OF ASHE ROAD FROM CLUB VIEW DRIVE TO NORTH HALF MOON BLVD.	Complete	Complete
					2002	KER000507	SIGNALIZATION, COMMUNICATION / SYNCHRONIZATION OF MISC. BRANCH COMMUNICATIONS AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS	Complete	Complete

Kern COG
Timely Implementation Documentation

RACM Commitment	Agency	Commitment Description	Commitment Schedule	Commitment Funding	TIP	TIP Project ID	Project Description	2011 Implementation Status	2013 Conformity Update
								(as of 2/12)	(as of 4/12)
					2002	KER010502	SIGNALIZATION: COMMUNICATION / SYNCHRONIZATION OF THREE IDENTIFIED SIGNAL LOCATIONS	Complete	Complete
					2002	KER990512	IN BAKERSFIELD -TRAFFIC SIGNAL WIRED INTERCONNECT ON NILES ST. FROM ALTA VISTA DR. TO HALEY ST.	Complete	Complete
					2002	KER990520	IN BAKERSFIELD -(TRUNK LINE) TRAFFIC SIGNAL WIRED INTERCONNECT ON CHESTER AVENUE FROM 23RD ST. TO W. COLUMBUS ST.	Complete	Complete
					2002	KER010503	SIGNALIZATION: COMMUNICATION / SYNCHRONIZATION OF MISC. BRANCH COMMUNICATIONS AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS	Complete	Complete
KE 5.3	Bakersfield	Intersection improvements at White and Wible Road; Westside Parkway	2003; 2007 +	Not specified					
								Complete	Complete

Kern COG
Timely Implementation Documentation

RACM Commitment	Agency	Commitment Description	Commitment Schedule	Commitment Funding	TIP	TIP Project ID	Project Description	2011 Implementation Status	2013 Conformity Update
								(as of 2/12)	(as of 4/12)
					2000	KER970508	SIGNALIZATION: TRUNK LINE COMMUNICATIONS/SYNCHRO. - WHITE LANE FROM WIBLE ROAD TO HUGHES LANE	Complete	Complete
					2002	KER010501	SIGNALIZATION: COMMUNICATION / SYNCHRONIZATION OF GOSFORD ROAD FROM WHITE LANE TO STOCKDALE HWY.	Complete	Complete
					2002	KER020102	IN BAKERSFIELD: FROM STOCKDALE HWY TO TRUXTUN AVE AT ROUTE 99; CONSTRUCT 4-LANE AND 6-LANE NEW FACILITY - Note: In 2009 FTIP, this project has six phases due to funding.	Phase 1 is complete. Phases 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 are under construction.	Phase 1 is complete. Phases 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 are under construction.
KE 9.5	California City	Expand bike lanes by about 75%	2003	Not specified				Complete	Complete
KE 1.5	Kern County	Service to Shafter, Wasco, McFarland, Delano, Lost Hills, Lamont, Weedpatch, Ridgecrest, California City and Mojave	2003	$400,000 per year				Complete	Complete

Kern COG
Timely Implementation Documentation

RACM Commitment	Agency	Commitment Description	Commitment Schedule	Commitment Funding	TIP	TIP Project ID	Project Description	2011 Implementation Status	2013 Conformity Update
								(as of 2/12)	(as of 4/12)
KE 5.2	County	Six signal projects	2005	$4,515,000 Total					
					2000	KER000521	SIGNALIZATION, SYNCHRONIZATION, CHANNELIZATION AND RELATED SAFETY MODIFICATIONS ON OLIVE DRIVE FROM FRUITVALE AVENUE TO COFFEE ROAD	Complete	Complete
					2000	KER990519	SIGNALIZATION, SIGNAL SYNCHRONIZATION, CHANNELIZATION AND RELATED SAFETY MODIFICATIONS - NILES ST. FROM VIRGINIA ST. TO MORNING DR.	Complete	Complete
					2000	KER990518	SIGNAL SYNCHRONIZATION, CHANNELIZATION AND RELATED SAFETY MODIFICATIONS - FAIRFAX RD. FROM BRUNDAGE LANE TO COLLEGE AVE.	Complete	Complete
					2000	KER990523	SIGNALIZATION, SIGNAL SYNCHRONIZATION, CHANNELIZATION AND RELATED SAFETY MODIFICATIONS - OSWELL ST. FROM BRUNDAGE LANE TO BERNARD ST.	Complete	Complete

Kern COG
Timely Implementation Documentation

RACM Commitment	Agency	Commitment Description	Commitment Schedule	Commitment Funding	TIP	TIP Project ID	Project Description	2011 Implementation Status	2013 Conformity Update
								(as of 2/12)	(as of 4/12)
					2000	KER000533	SYNCHRONIZATION CHANNELIZATION AND RELATED SAFETY MODIFICATIONS ON CALIFORNIA AVENUE FROM WASHINGTON STREET TO EDISON HIGHWAY	Complete	Complete
								Complete	Complete
KE 10.2	County	Retrofit buses with bike racks	2005	$80,000 CMAQ (includes local)	2002	KER000528	INSTALL BIKE CYCLE RACKS ON BUS FLEET	Complete	Complete
KE 10.2	Delano	Bike racks on four full size transit buses	2003	Not specified				Complete	Complete
J 34	GET	Develop and implement an area vehicle locator		$2.2 million	2002	KER990526	Area Vehicle Locator (Phase 1)	Complete	Complete
						KER990527	Area Vehicle Locator (Phase 2)		
KE 9.3	Ridgecrest	Construct 1.5 miles of bicycle lane on existing streets and 2.67 miles of new bike lanes	2003	$165,000 TEA	2002	KER990902	IN RIDGECREST - CHELSEA STREET BICYCLE PATH EXTENSION PROJECT	Complete	Complete

Kern COG
Timely Implementation Documentation

RACM Commitment	Agency	Commitment Description	Commitment Schedule	Commitment Funding	TIP	TIP Project ID	Project Description	2011 Implementation Status	2013 Conformity Update
								(as of 2/12)	(as of 4/12)
KE 1.5	Shafter	Analyze transit system for route expansion; construct a CNG facility; two CNG mini-vans for enhanced service	2000; 2003	Not specified				Complete	Complete
KE 1.5	Taft	Construct transit transfer station	2002	$375,000 CMAQ	2002	KER990550	IN THE CITY OF TAFT - CONSTRUCT TRANSIT TRANSFER STATION	Complete	Complete
KE 9.5 and 9.2	Tehachapi	1.3 miles of Class I bike trails adjacent to several roadways in community	2003	Not specified				Complete	Complete
SJ 5.3	Wasco	Traffic signal at Highway 46 and Griffith Avenue	Not specified	$221,000				Complete	Complete
KE 7.17	Wasco	Construct new transit transfer station	design in 2002	$619,710 CMAQ	2002	KER000520	CONSTRUCT NEW TRANSIT TRANSFER STATION	Complete	Complete

Kern COG
Timely Implementation Documentation

RACM Commitment	Agency	Commitment Description	Commitment Schedule	Commitment Funding	TIP	TIP Project ID	Project Description	2011 Implementation Status	2013 Conformity Update
								(as of 2/12)	(as of 4/12)
KE 9.1	Wasco	Convert two mid-block alleys to pedestrian walkways	2002	TEA	2002	KER001001	DOWNTOWN STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT	Complete	Complete

Kern Council of Governments
2002 RACM Timely Implementation Documentation

RACM Commitment	Agency	Measure Title	Measure Description (not verbatim)	2011 Implementation Status (as of 2/12)	2013 Conformity Update (as of 4/12)
14.9	KCOG	Business, Industry and Governmental Outreach Program	Implement multi-agency outreach program and promote incentives for 2002-03 through 2004-05	Commitment Complete.	Commitment Complete.
KE5.4	Bakersfield	Site-Specific Transportation Control Measures	Encourage implementation...include various channelization and signal modification projects identified by special traffic studies or development for the next 5 years (2007)	Projects prior to 2007 complete (see Project TID Table). Westside Parkway will continue to be tracked.	Projects prior to 2007 complete (see Project TID Table). Westside Parkway will continue to be tracked.
KE1.1	County of Kern	Regional Express Bus Program	Purchase buses to operate regional express bus service	The County of Kern continues to offer regional express bus service.	The County of Kern continues to offer regional express bus service.
KE1.7	County of Kern	Free transit during special events	Offer one day of free travel from Bakersfield to Kernville Whisky Flat Days and Frazier Park Lilac Festival	The County of Kern has offered free transit for these events and will continue to do so.	The County of Kern has offered free transit for these events and will continue to do so.
KE9.2	County of Kern	Encouragement of Pedestrian Travel	Implement Bikeway Master Plan	Program implementation continues.	Implementation of the Bikeway Master Plan continues to occur along with updates to the Kern County General Plan. Kern County is updating the Bikeway Master Plan with the assistance of Kern COG. The County of Kern continues to seek grant opportunities for pedestrian and bicycle projects.
KE14.4	County of Kern	Voluntary No Drive Day Programs	Conduct voluntary employee no-drive day programs during the ozone season through media and employer based public awareness activities in 2002	Commitment Complete.	Commitment Complete.
KE5.1	Taft	Develop Intelligent Transportation Systems	Provide areas for pedestrian and bicyclist in vicinity of commercial development and promote use of such areas.	Commitment Complete.	Commitment Complete.
KE9.3	Taft	Bicycle/Pedestrian Program	Provide facilities for only pedestrian and bicycle use.	Commitment Complete.	Commitment Complete.
KE9.5	Taft	Encouragement of Bicycle Travel	Provide funding for bikeway system. Provide education materials	Commitment Complete.	Commitment Complete.
KE1.7	Wasco	Free transit during special events	Provide free transit between Saturday's events during the Wasco Rose Festival beginning in 2002 through 2005	Commitment Complete.	Commitment Complete.

Kern Council of Governments
2002 RACM Timely Implementation Documentation

RACM Commitment	Agency	Measure Title	Measure Description (not verbatim)	2011 Implementation Status	2013 Conformity Update
KE3.9	Wasco	Encourage merchants and employers to subsidize the cost of transit for employees	Offer free transportation to full time, permanent City of Wasco, School District and High School District employees beginning in 2002 through 2005	Commitment Complete.	Commitment Complete.
KE9.8	Wasco	Close streets for special events for use by bikes and pedestrians	Close streets to vehicles for the annual Wasco Festival of Roses	Yes, the parade route was closed for vehicle traffic and open to foot traffic. Closure will continue for annual event.	Yes, the parade route was closed for vehicle traffic and open to foot traffic. Closure will continue for annual event.

APPENDIX E

PUBLIC MEETING PROCESS DOCUMENTATION

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON THE DRAFT 2013 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM, 2011 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AMENDMENT #3 AND ADDENDUM #3 TO THE SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, AND CORRESPONDING DRAFT CONFORMITY ANALYSIS

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Kern Council of Governments will hold a public hearing at 7 P.M. June 21, 2012 at Kern COG's office, 1401 19th Street, Suite 300, Bakersfield, CA 93301 regarding the Draft 2013 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (2013 FTIP), 2011 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Amendment #3 and Addendum #3 to the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (EIR), and corresponding Draft Conformity Analysis. The hearing is intended to receive public comments.

- The 2013 FTIP is a listing of capital improvement and operational expenditures that use federal and state monies for transportation projects in Kern County during the next four years.
- The RTP is a long-term strategy to meet Kern County's transportation needs through 2035. The document is also referred to as the 2011 RTP.
- The 2011 RTP Amendment #3 contains project information updates to the Thomas Roads Improvement Program.
- The Addendum #3 to the Subsequent EIR outlines changes to the 2011 RTP as analyzed in the 2011 EIR and evaluates whether those changes or new information or changed circumstances would require substantial changes to the impacts identified or mitigation measures proposed.
- The Draft Conformity Analysis contains the documentation to support a finding that the Draft 2013 FTIP and Draft 2011 RTP Amendment #3 meets the air quality conformity requirements for carbon monoxide, ozone and particulate matter.

This public notice also satisfies the program of projects (POP) requirements of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Urbanized Area Formula Program, Section 5307. If no comments are received on the proposed POP, the proposed transit program (funded with FTA 5307 dollars) will be the final program.

Individuals with disabilities may call Kern Council of Governments at 661/861-2191 (or TTY: 661/832-7433, or TDD: 800/874-9436) 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 begin on May 14, 2012 and conclude June 27, 2012. The draft documents are available for review at the Kern COG office, located at 1401 19th Street, Suite 300, Bakersfield, CA 93301 and on the Kern COG website at www.kerncog.org

Public comments are welcomed at the hearing, or may be submitted in writing by 5 P.M. on June 27, 2012 to Robert R. Ball at the address below.

After considering the comments, the documents will be considered for adoption, by resolution, by the Kern Council of Governments at a regularly scheduled meeting to be held on 7 P.M. July 19, 2012. The documents will then be submitted to state and federal agencies for approval.

Contact Person: Robert R. Ball, Interim Executive Director
Kern Council of Governments
1401 19th Street, Bakersfield, CA 93301
661/861-2191

BEFORE THE KERN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF KERN

RESOLUTION NO. XX

In the matter of:

2013 Federal Transportation Improvement Program, 2011 Regional Transportation Plan Amendment #3 and Addendum #3 to the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report, and Corresponding Conformity Analysis

---

WHEREAS, the Kern Council of Governments (Kern COG) 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, a 2011 Regional Transportation Plan Amendment #3 has been prepared in full compliance with federal guidance; and

WHEREAS, a 2011 Regional Transportation Plan Amendment #3 has been prepared in accordance with state guidelines adopted by the California Transportation Commission; and

WHEREAS, 2013 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (2013 FTIP) and 2011 RTP Amendment #3 have 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 Kern Council of Governments forum and general public involvement; and

WHEREAS, the 2013 FTIP program listing is consistent with: 1) the 2011 Regional Transportation Plan Amendment #3; 2) the 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program; and 3) the Corresponding Conformity Analysis; and

WHEREAS, the 2013 FTIP and 2011 RTP Amendment #3 contain the MPO's certification of the transportation planning process assuring that all federal requirements have been fulfilled; and

WHEREAS, the 2013 FTIP and 2011 RTP Amendment #3 meet all applicable transportation planning requirements per 23 CFR Part 450.

WHEREAS, projects submitted in 2013 FTIP and 2011 RTP Amendment #3 must be financially constrained and the financial plan affirms that funding is available; and

WHEREAS, an Addendum #3 to the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report was prepared to assess the environmental effects of the proposed 2011 RTP Amendment #3; and

WHEREAS, the 2013 FTIP and 2011 RTP Amendment #3 include a new Conformity Analysis; and

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

WHEREAS, the 2013 FTIP and 2011 RTP Amendment #3 do not interfere with the timely implementation of the Transportation Control Measures; and

WHEREAS, the 2013 FTIP and 2011 RTP Amendment #3 conform to the applicable SIPs; and

WHEREAS, the documents have been widely circulated and reviewed by Kern COG 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 Kern County consistent with public participation process adopted by Kern COG; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted on June 21, 2012 to hear and consider comments on the 2013 FTIP and 2011 RTP Amendment #3 and Addendum #3 to the Subsequent EIR and Corresponding Conformity Analysis; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that Kern COG adopts the 2013 FTIP and 2011 RTP Amendment #3 and Addendum #3 to the Subsequent EIR and Corresponding Conformity Analysis.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Kern COG finds that the 2013 FTIP and 2011 RTP Amendment #3 and Addendum #3 to the Subsequent EIR are in conformity with the

requirements of the Federal Clean Air Act Amendments and applicable State Implementation Plans for air quality.

AUTHORIZED AND SIGNED THIS 19TH DAY OF JULY 2012.

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_____
Steven Morgan, Chairman
Kern Council of Governments

ATTEST:

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution of the Kern Council of Governments duly adopted at a regular meeting thereof held on the 19th day of July 2012.

_____ _____

Robert R. Ball, Interim Executive Director
Kern Council of Governments

Date:

APPENDIX F

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

Summary of Comments and Responses

As part of the development of the TIP, stakeholders, technical staff, and the general public were given the opportunity to comment. The public review period was held May 14, 2012 to June 27, 2012.

2013 Federal Transportation Improvement Program, Regional Transportation Plan Amendment #3, and Conformity Analysis

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) – letter dated 6/21/12

As with the 2011 RTP and subsequent FTIP revisions, FHWA would like to commend KCOG for its efforts in furthering a continuous, comprehensive, and cooperative transportation planning process. See attached letter.

Response: *Comment acknowledged.*

Conformity Analysis

Technical correction
Air Pollution Control Districts in the Kern Region (Figures 1), Ozone/Carbon Monoxide Planning Areas (Figure 2), and Particulate Matter Planning Areas (Figure 3) have been incorporated into the final document.

U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration

Federal Highway Administration
California Division

650 Capitol Mall, Suite 4-100
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 498-5001
(916) 498-5008 (fax)

June 21, 2012

In Reply Refer To:
HDA-CA

Mr. Robert Ball
Acting Executive Director
Kern Council of Governments
1401 19th Street, Suite 300
Bakersfield, CA 93301

Dear Mr. Ball:

SUBJECT: Draft 2013 FTIP, Draft 2011 RTP Amendment #3 and conformity determination comments

Dear Mr. Ball:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft KCOG 2013 FTIP, 2011 RTP amendment # 3 and corresponding conformity determination via the public review and comment period. As with the 2011 RTP and subsequent FTIP revisions, FHWA would like to commend KCOG for its efforts in furthering a continuous, comprehensive, and cooperative transportation planning process. Some specific items of note:

- As was mentioned in the recent certification review, we commend your continued effort in this area. It is impressive how KCOG integrates environmental justice into the performance objectives of the RTP.

- We commend KCOG's continued aggressive public outreach efforts with its abundant use of multiple venues and public workshops.

- We commend the consistency and detail of project descriptions in both the RTP and FTIP. This effort greatly helps with the air quality conformity analysis as required by the conformity regulations (49 CFR part 93).

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment. Our staff looks forward and is available to discuss our comments on the FTIP and RTP with your staff in the coming months and to provide technical assistance on the core products of the transportation planning process.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Joseph Vaughn at (916) 498-5346 or joseph.vaughn@dot.gov.

Sincerely,

For
Vincent P. Mammano
Division Administrator

cc: (e-mail)

Ray Sukys, FTA
Paul Page, FTA
Muhaned Aljabiry, Caltrans HQ
Dennis Jacobs, Caltrans HQ
Garth Hopkins, Caltrans HQ
Jeff Sorensen, Caltrans, Dist. 6
Kevin Tucker, Caltrans HQ
Robert Ball, KCOG RBall@kerncog.org
Raquel Pacheco,KCOG rpacheco@kerncog.org
Joseph Vaughn, FHWA
Jermaine Hannon, FHWA

KCOG TIP Binder

JVAUGHN/mb