



*City of Ceres • City of Hughson • City of Modesto • City of Newman • City of Oakdale • City of Patterson  
City of Riverbank • City of Turlock • City of Waterford • County of Stanislaus*

December 17, 2010

Muhaned Aljabiry, Chief  
Caltrans, Division of Programming, MS 82  
Office of Federal Transportation Management Programming  
PO Box 942874  
Sacramento, CA 94274

Attention: Abhijit Bagde

**Subject: Submittal of the Stanislaus Council of Governments (StanCOG)  
Amendment #3 to the 2011 FTIP – Type 4 Formal Amendment**

Dear Mr. Aljabiry:

Enclosed for your review and approval is Amendment #3 to the 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP). The StanCOG Board adopted Amendment #3 at its December 15, 2010 meeting. Amendment #3 is summarized as follows:

**Caltrans:**

1. CTIPS #114-0000-0141 –Carryover Rt. 219 Widening project from 2009 FTIP as a new project to 2011 FTIP.
  - Add new project and revise RIP, CMIA, and Federal Demonstration programming for the Rt. 219 widening project.

Documentation associated with this amendment is provided as indicated below.

In accordance with the FHWA checklist for this type of amendment, an MPO may submit the documentation from the original conformity determination (i.e., the 2011 Final Air Quality Conformity Analysis) with a cover sheet attached that details the changes to the TIP and/or Plan through the submitted Amendment and stating that those changes do not affect the MPOs ability to rely on the previous regional emissions analysis.

The 2011 FTIP is the programming document that identifies four years (FY 10/11, FY 11/12, FY 12/13, and FY 13/14) of federal, state and local funding sources for projects in Stanislaus County that are eligible to proceed without a conformity determination. The Draft Amendment #3 to the 2011 FTIP contains regionally significant projects that are

included in the 2011 RTP, where the design concept and scope and year open to traffic is unchanged. These projects are eligible to rely on a previous emissions analysis. Therefore, the 2011 Final Air Quality Conformity Analysis is also being provided.

- **Project List:** Attachment 1 includes a summary of programming changes that result from Amendment #3 to the 2011 FTIP and a spreadsheet in CTIPs format that includes the project to be added to the pending 2011 FTIP via Amendment #3.

This project and/or project phase are consistent with the 2011 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which was adopted by StanCOG on July 21, 2010, and approved by the FHWA/FTA on December 14, 2010. Per consultation with Caltrans, the project included in Attachment 1 has been entered into CTIPs after MPO adoption but prior to Caltrans submittal to FHWA.

- **Conformity Requirements:** Stanislaus Council of Governments 2011 FTIP as amended meets the transportation conformity provisions 40 CFR 93.122(g). The conformity determination is based on the 2011 Conformity Analysis for the 2011 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which was adopted by StanCOG on July 21, 2010, and approved by the FHWA/FTA on December 14, 2010. Attachment 2 includes the original conformity analysis.

As indicated above, the project and/or project phase contained in Amendment #3 are consistent with the 2011 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and therefore do not affect the ability to rely on the previous regional emissions analysis. In addition, the project and/or project phase contained in Amendment #3 do not interfere with the timely implementation of any approved TCMs.

- **Updated Financial Plan:** Attachment 3 includes the Financial Plan from the 2011 FTIP which has been updated to include the project list as provided in Attachment 1.
- **Public Involvement:** Attachment 4 includes the Public Notice and Adoption Resolution.

The public review and comment period was open for 30 days commencing on November 12, 2010 and ending on December 13, 2010 at 5 p.m. A public meeting was held on December 1, 2010 at 6:00 p.m. (and no comments were received). The StanCOG Policy Board of Directors adopted Amendment #3 to the 2011 FTIP at its December 15, 2010 Policy Board meeting.

If you have any questions regarding this document, please contact me at (209) 525-4600 or Rosa De León Park at (209) 525-4642.

Sincerely,



Vincent J. Harris  
Executive Director

Attachment 1: Summary of Changes (and related documentation)

Attachment 2: Conformity Analysis

Attachment 3: Financial Plan

Attachment 4: Public Notice and Resolution

cc:

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Tony Boren       | Council of Fresno County Governments            |
| Ron Brummett     | Kern Council of Governments                     |
| Terri King       | Kings County Association of Governments         |
| Patricia Taylor  | Madera County Transportation Commission         |
| Jesse Brown      | Merced County Association of Governments        |
| Andrew Chesley   | San Joaquin Council of Governments              |
| Ted Smalley      | Tulare County Association of Governments        |
| Don Hunsaker     | SJVAPCD   |
| Muhaned Aljabiry | Caltrans Division of Transportation Programming |
| Abhijit Bagde    | Caltrans Division of Transportation Programming |
| Mike Brady       | Caltrans Division of Transportation Planning    |
| Annette Clark    | Caltrans District 10                            |
| Ken Baxter       | Caltrans District 10                            |
| Sinaren Pheng    | Caltrans District 10 DLAE                       |
| Dennis Wade      | California Air Resources Board                  |
| Karina O'Connor  | U.S. Environmental Protection Agency            |
| Lisa Hanf        | U.S. Environmental Protection Agency            |
| Ted Matley       | Federal Transit Administration                  |
| Cari Anderson    | Cari Anderson Consulting                        |

# **ATTACHMENT #1**

## STATEMENT OF CHANGE

**AGENCY** Various  
**Amendment Type:** Formal (Type 4)  
**Amendment #:** 3

| Existing or New Project | MPO FTIP ID (CTIPS ID#) | SPONSOR AGENCY | PROJECT TITLE                   | Programming     |                  | Phase | Fund Source             | % Cost Increase/Decrease | Description of Change   |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---|
|                         |                         |                |                                 | Current Federal | Proposed Federal |       |                         |                          |   |
| New                     | 114-0000-0141           | Caltrans       | SR 219 Widening Project Phase 2 | N/A             | 2010/11          | CON   | CMIA, RIP, Federal Demo | N/A                      | Add new Project to 2011 FTIP. This is a carryover project from the 2009 FTIP. Programming changes are as follows:<br>Add \$18.813 M in CMIA Funds in FY 10/11; Add \$4.480 M in Federal Demo Funds in FY 10/11; Add \$8.447 RIP funds in FY 10/11. Total funds added to 2011 FTIP is \$31.740 Million. Including Prior Year funding, Total Project Cost is \$50.5 M. Adds project scope reflecting 4 lane widening on 219, from Morrow to SR 108. |

**Stanislaus Council of Governments - Federal Transportation Improvement Program**

**(Dollars in Thousands)**

**State Highway System**

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| DIST: PPNO: EA: CTIPS ID:<br>10 9940C 0A872 114-0000-0141 | TITLE (DESCRIPTION):<br>SR 219 Widening (SR 219 Widening, Phase 2. (Near Salida, on Route 219 from Morrow Road to Route 108. Widen to 4 lanes).) | MPO Aprv: <i>11</i><br>State Aprv: <i>11</i><br>Federal Aprv: <i>11</i> |
| COUNTY: ROUTE: PM:<br>Stanislaus County 219 2.9 / 4.9     |  | EPA TABLE II or III EXEMPT CATEGORY:                                    |

IMPLEMENTING AGENCY: Caltrans

MPO ID:

PRJ MGR: Christina Hibbard

PHONE: (209) 948-7889

EMAIL:

**PROJECT VERSION HISTORY** (Printed Version is Shaded)

| Version | Status   | Official Date | Updated By | Change Reason                           | Amend No. | Dollars in Thousands - Total For Project |         |       |  |
|---------|----------|---------------|------------|---|-----------|--|---------|-------|--|
|         |          |               |            |   |           | Prog Con                                 | Prog RW | PE    |  |
| 3       | Active   | 11/12/2010    | DNGUYEN2   | Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change      | 3         | 31,740                                   | 16,760  | 2,000 |  |
| 2       | Official | 09/22/2009    | SPHILIPS   | Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change      | 10        | 30,348                                   | 20,290  | 3,370 |  |
| 1       | Official | 01/29/2009    | SPHILIPS   | Amendment - Split/Combined - Split Into | 3         | 29,500                                   | 19,000  | 2,000 |  |

|   |       | PRIOR  | 10/11  | 11/12 | 12/13 | 13/14 | 14/15 | 15/16 | BEYOND | TOTAL  |
|---|-------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| • State Bond - Corridor Mobility Improvement Account    |       |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|   | PE    |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|   | RW    |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|   | CON   |        | 18,813 |       |       |       |       |       |        | 18,813 |
|   | TOTAL |        | 18,813 |       |       |       |       |       |        | 18,813 |
| • RIP - Regional Improvement Program                    |       |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|   | PE    | 1,528  |        |       |       |       |       |       |        | 1,528  |
|   | RW    |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|   | CON   |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|   | TOTAL | 1,528  |        |       |       |       |       |       |        | 1,528  |
| • RIP - Regional Improvement Program                    |       |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|   | PE    | 472    |        |       |       |       |       |       |        | 472    |
|   | RW    | 16,760 |        |       |       |       |       |       |        | 16,760 |
|   | CON   |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|   | TOTAL | 17,232 |        |       |       |       |       |       |        | 17,232 |
| • Demo - High Priority Project / Demonstration Projects |       |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|   | PE    |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|   | RW    |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|   | CON   |        | 4,480  |       |       |       |       |       |        | 4,480  |
|   | TOTAL |        | 4,480  |       |       |       |       |       |        | 4,480  |
| • RIP -   |       |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|   | PE    |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|   | RW    |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|   | CON   |        | 8,447  |       |       |       |       |       |        | 8,447  |
|   | TOTAL |        | 8,447  |       |       |       |       |       |        | 8,447  |
| <b>Project Total</b>                                    |       |        |        |       |       |       |       |       |        |        |
|   | PE    | 2,000  |        |       |       |       |       |       |        | 2,000  |
|   | RW    | 16,760 |        |       |       |       |       |       |        | 16,760 |
|   | CON   |        | 31,740 |       |       |       |       |       |        | 31,740 |
|   | TOTAL | 18,760 | 31,740 |       |       |       |       |       |        | 50,500 |

**Comments:**

\*\*\*\*\* Version 3 - 11/07/2010 \*\*\*\*\*

The SR 219 Expressway project between SR 99 and SR 108 is a CMIA Project being implemented in two phases. Phase 1 (which is complete) widened SR 219 from a two-lane to a four-lane conventional highway between SR 99 and Morrow Road. Rt. 219 Phase 1 included standard roadway tapering to the existing 2-lane segment at Morrow. The Phase 2 project is to widen SR 219 to 4 lanes between Morrow Road and SR 108 and includes roadway tapers. The Conformity Analysis reflected the two phases as described above. The RTP identifies the Phase 2 project in Appendix M-1 as a 4-lane widening from Dale Road to Morrow. StanCOG finds the project in FTIP Amendmt #3 is consistent with the RTP listing.

**ATTACHMENT #2**

## ATTACHMENT 2

### CONFORMITY ANALYSIS

Section 93.122(g) allows conformity determinations for new TIP/RTPs to satisfy the requirements of Section 93.118 (motor vehicle emissions budgets) or 93.119 (Interim emissions in areas without budgets) without a new regional emissions analysis if the previous emissions analysis applies.

Per the FHWA checklist dated October 28, 2005 summarizing the conformity analysis documentation for Reliance on a Previous Regional Emissions Analysis, an MPO may submit the documentation from the original conformity determination with a cover sheet attached that details the changes to the TIP and/or Plan through the submitted Amendment and stating that those changes do not affect the MPOs ability to rely on the previous regional emissions analysis.

For Stanislaus Council of Governments Amendment #3 to the 2011 FTIP, the Project List (Attachment 1) documents the proposed changes to the Stanislaus Council of Governments 2011 FTIP. The proposed changes include a regionally significant project (Route 219 Widening) that is included in the 2011 RTP, where the design concept and scope and year open to traffic is unchanged. This project is eligible to rely on a previous emissions analysis.

In addition, the pending Stanislaus Council of Governments 2011 Final Air Quality Conformity Analysis, which was adopted by StanCOG on July 21, 2010, is consistent with the requirements of 93.118 (including that conformity to all currently applicable budgets is demonstrated).

The StanCOG Amendment #3 to the 2011 FTIP does not result in any changes to conformity analysis for the San Joaquin Valley and supports timely implementation of all transportation control measures set forth in the 2011 Final Air Quality Conformity Analysis (2011 AQCA) document. Specifically, there have been no revisions to the following items:

1. Federal and state conformity requirements (2011 AQCA p.7);
2. Air quality designations applicable to the San Joaquin Valley (2011 AQCA p.9);
3. Conformity test requirements and analysis year (2011 AQCA p.9-13);
4. Latest planning assumptions (2011 AQCA p.15);
5. Socioeconomic data 2011 AQCA (p.17);
6. Transportation modeling (2011 AQCA p.17);
7. Traffic estimates (2011 AQCA p.21);
8. Vehicle registration data (2011 AQCA p.22);
9. State Implementation Plan measures (2011 AQCA p.22);
10. Air quality modeling (2011 AQCA p.24);
11. Transportation control measures (2011 AQCA p.29).

Finally, all items on the FHWA checklist are documented in the 2011 Final Air Quality Conformity Analysis documentation, which is currently pending federal approval.

\*\*A copy of the 2011 Final AQ conformity document is included as documentation as part of FTIP amendment #3.



# Stanislaus Council of Governments

## Air Quality Conformity Document

July 2010

1111 I Street  
Suite 308  
Modesto, CA 95354  
(209) 525-4600  
[www.stancog.org](http://www.stancog.org)

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

JULY 2010

STANISLAUS COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

CARLOS YAMZON  
1111 I STREET, SUITE 308  
MODESTO, CA 95354  
209-525-4600

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |    |
|--|----|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY  | 1  |
| CONFORMITY REQUIREMENTS  | 1  |
| CONFORMITY TESTS   | 2  |
| RESULTS OF THE CONFORMITY ANALYSIS   | 2  |
| REPORT ORGANIZATION  | 3  |
| CHAPTER 1: FEDERAL AND STATE REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS                               | 5  |
| A.    FEDERAL AND STATE CONFORMITY REGULATIONS                                     | 5  |
| B.    CONFORMITY REGULATION REQUIREMENTS   | 7  |
| C.    AIR QUALITY DESIGNATIONS APPLICABLE TO THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY                | 9  |
| D.    CONFORMITY TEST REQUIREMENTS   | 9  |
| E.    ANALYSIS YEARS   | 13 |
| CHAPTER 2: LATEST PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS AND TRANSPORTATION MODELING                 | 15 |
| A.    LATEST PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS  | 15 |
| B.    SOCIOECONOMIC DATA   | 17 |
| C.    TRANSPORTATION MODELING  | 17 |
| D.    TRAFFIC ESTIMATES  | 21 |
| E.    VEHICLE REGISTRATIONS  | 22 |
| F.    STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN MEASURES   | 22 |
| CHAPTER 3: AIR QUALITY MODELING  | 24 |
| A.    EMFAC2007  | 24 |
| B.    ADDITIONAL PM-10 ESTIMATES   | 25 |
| C.    PM2.5 APPROACH   | 26 |
| D.    SUMMARY OF PROCEDURES FOR REGIONAL EMISSIONS ESTIMATES                       | 28 |
| CHAPTER 4: TRANSPORTATION CONTROL MEASURES   | 29 |
| A.    TRANSPORTATION CONFORMITY REGULATION REQUIREMENTS FOR TCMS                   | 29 |
| B.    APPLICABLE AIR QUALITY IMPLEMENTATION PLANS                                  | 31 |
| C.    IDENTIFICATION OF 2002 RACM THAT REQUIRE TIMELY IMPLEMENTATION DOCUMENTATION | 32 |
| D.    TCM FINDINGS FOR THE TIP AND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN                    | 34 |
| E.    RTP CONTROL MEASURE ANALYSIS IN SUPPORT OF 2003 PM-10 PLAN                   | 34 |
| CHAPTER 5: INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION  | 36 |
| A.    INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION   | 36 |
| B.    PUBLIC CONSULTATION  | 38 |
| CHAPTER 6: TIP AND RTP CONFORMITY  | 39 |
| REFERENCES   | 42 |

## **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 .....   | 10 |
| Table 1-2: | Adequate Budgets from the 2007 Ozone Plan.....   | 11 |
| Table 1-3: | On-Road Motor Vehicle PM-10 Emissions Budgets.....                                       | 12 |
| Table 1-4: | On-Road Motor Vehicle PM2.5 Emissions Budgets.....                                       | 13 |
| Table 1-5: | San Joaquin Valley Conformity Analysis Years .....                                       | 14 |
| Table 2-1: | Summary of Latest Planning Assumptions for the StanCOG Conformity Analysis..<br>.....    | 16 |
| Table 2-2: | Traffic Network Comparison for Horizon Years Evaluated in Conformity Analysis..<br>..... | 21 |
| Table 2-3: | 2007 Ozone Plan Measures Assumed in the Conformity Analysis.....                         | 22 |
| Table 2-4: | 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan Measures Assumed in the Conformity Analysis....              | 23 |
| Table 2-5: | 2008 PM2.5 Plan Measures Assumed in the Conformity Analysis.....                         | 23 |
| Table 6-1: | Conformity Results Summary .....   | 41 |

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report presents the Conformity Analysis for the 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and the 2011 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The Stanislaus Council of Governments (StanCOG) is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in Stanislaus County, California, and is responsible for regional transportation planning.

The Clean Air Act Section 176(c) (42 U.S.C. 7506(c)) and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR 93 Subpart A) require that each new RTP and TIP be demonstrated to conform to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) before the RTP and TIP are approved by the MPO or accepted by the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT). This analysis demonstrates that the criteria specified in the transportation conformity regulations for a conformity determination are satisfied by the 2011 FTIP and 2011 RTP; a finding of conformity is therefore supported. The 2011 FTIP and 2011 RTP and corresponding Conformity Analysis were approved by the StanCOG Policy Board on July 21, 2010. FHWA/FTA last issued a finding of conformity for the 2009 TIP and 2007 RTP, including amendments, on January 29, 2009.

The 2011 TIP and 2011 RTP have been financially constrained in accordance with the requirements of 40 CFR 93.108 and consistent with the U.S. DOT metropolitan planning regulations (23 CFR Part 450). A discussion of financial constraint and funding sources is included in the appropriate documents.

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

### **CONFORMITY REQUIREMENTS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **CONFORMITY TESTS**

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

## **RESULTS OF THE CONFORMITY ANALYSIS**

A regional emissions analysis was conducted for the years 2011, 2012, 2014, 2017, 2018 (via interpolation), 2020, 2023, 2025 and 2035 for each applicable pollutant. All analyses were

conducted using the latest planning assumptions and emissions models. The major conclusions of the StanCOG Conformity Analysis are:

- For carbon monoxide, the total regional on-road vehicle-related emissions associated with implementation of the 2011 FTIP and the 2011 RTP for the analysis years are projected to be less than the 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 2011 FTIP and the 2011 RTP for all years tested are projected to be less than the adequate emissions budgets specified in the *2007 Ozone Plan*. The conformity tests for ozone are therefore satisfied.
- For PM-10, the total regional vehicle-related emissions (PM-10 and NOx) associated with implementation of the 2011 FTIP and the 2011 RTP for all years tested are either (1) projected to be less than the approved emissions budgets, or (2) less than the emission budgets using the approved PM-10 and 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 2011 FTIP and the 2011 RTP for the analysis years are projected to be less than the adequate emission budgets specified in the *2008 PM2.5 Plan*. The conformity tests for PM2.5 for both the 1997 and 2006 standards are therefore satisfied.
- The 2011 FTIP and the 2011 RTP will not impede and will support timely implementation of the TCMs that have been adopted as part of applicable air quality implementation plans. The current status of TCM implementation is documented in Chapter 4 of this report.
- Since the local SJV procedures (e.g., Air District Rule 9120 Transportation Conformity) have not been approved by EPA, consultation has been conducted in accordance with Federal requirements.

## REPORT ORGANIZATION

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

Appendix E includes public meeting documentation conducted on the 2011 FTIP and 2011 RTP and corresponding Conformity Analysis on May 19, 2010. Comments received on the conformity

analysis and responses made as part of the public involvement process are included in Appendix F.

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

The criteria for determining conformity of transportation programs and plans under the Federal transportation conformity regulation (40 CFR Parts 51 and 93) and the applicable conformity tests for the San Joaquin Valley nonattainment areas are summarized in this section. The Conformity Analysis for the Draft 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Draft 2011 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) was prepared based on these criteria and tests. Presented first is a review of the development of the applicable conformity regulation and guidance procedures, followed by summaries of conformity regulation requirements, air quality designation status, conformity test requirements, and analysis years for the Conformity Analysis.

The Stanislaus Council of Governments (StanCOG) is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for Stanislaus County in the San Joaquin Valley. As a result of this designation, StanCOG prepares the TIP, RTP, and associated conformity analyses. The TIP serves as a detailed four-year programming document for the preservation, expansion, and management of the transportation system. The 2011 RTP has a 2035 horizon that provides the long term direction for the continued implementation of the freeway/expressway plan, as well as improvements to arterial streets, transit, and travel demand management programs. The TIP and RTP include capacity enhancements to the freeway/expressway system commensurate with available funding.

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

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

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

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

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

## FEDERAL RULE

The initial November 15, 1991 deadline for conformity criteria and procedures was partially completed through the issuance of supplemental interim conformity guidance issued on June 7, 1991 for carbon monoxide, ozone, and particulate matter ten microns or less in diameter (PM-10). EPA subsequently promulgated the Conformity Final Rule in the November 24, 1993 *Federal Register* (EPA, 1993). The 1993 Rule became effective on December 27, 1993. The Federal Transportation Conformity Final Rule has been amended several times from 1993 to 2002. These amendments have addressed a number of items related to conformity lapses, grace periods, and other related issues to streamline the conformity process.

On July 1, 2004 EPA published the final rule, Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments for the New 8-hour Ozone and PM2.5 National Ambient Air Quality Standards and Miscellaneous Revisions for Existing Areas; Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments – Response to Court Decision and Additional Rule Changes (EPA, 2004a).

EPA issued a final rule on May 6, 2005 to add the following particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter (PM2.5) precursors to the transportation conformity rule: nitrogen oxides (NOx), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), sulfur oxides (SOx), and ammonia (NH3) (EPA, 2005). The rule specifies when each of these precursors must be considered in PM2.5 nonattainment areas, before and after PM2.5 SIPs are submitted.

In late March 2006, EPA and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) published “Transportation Conformity Guidance for Qualitative Hot-Spot Analyses in PM2.5 and PM10 Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas”. This guidance affects Federal project-level approvals for “projects of air quality concern” in PM2.5 and PM10 nonattainment areas on or after April 5, 2006.

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

EPA published the Transportation Conformity Rule 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.

## MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL GUIDANCE

EPA issued “multi-jurisdictional” guidance on July 21, 2004 to clarify how nonattainment areas with multiple agencies should conduct conformity determinations based on the changes to the Conformity Rule (EPA, 2004b). This guidance applies to the San Joaquin Valley since there are multiple MPOs within a single nonattainment area. The main principle of the guidance is that one regional emissions analysis is required for the entire nonattainment area. However, separate modeling and conformity documents may be developed by each MPO.

Part 3 of the guidance applies to nonattainment areas that have adequate or approved conformity budgets addressing a particular air quality standard. This Part currently applies to the San Joaquin Valley for carbon monoxide, ozone and PM-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.

EPA published a budget adequacy determination for the 2012 conformity budget contained in the 2008 PM2.5 Plan May 12, 2010, effective May 27, 2010. The Rule allows MPOs to make independent conformity determinations for their plans and TIPs as long as all of the other subareas in the nonattainment area have conforming transportation plans and TIPs in place at the time of each MPO and DOT conformity determination.

#### **DISTRICT RULE**

The San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (Air District) adopted Rule 9120 Transportation Conformity on January 19, 1995 in response to requirements in Section 176(c)(4)(c) of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments. Rule 9120 contains the Transportation Conformity Rule promulgated November 24, 1993 verbatim. The Rule provides guidance for the development of consultation procedures and processes at the local level. As required by the Transportation Conformity Rule, Rule 9120 was submitted to EPA on January 24, 1995 as a revision to the State SIP. The rule becomes effective on the date EPA promulgates interim, partial, or final approval in the Federal Register.

To date, the Rule has not received approval by EPA. Section 51.390(b) of the Transportation Conformity Rule states: “Following EPA approval of the State conformity provisions (or a portion thereof) in a revision to the applicable implementation plan, conformity determinations would be governed by the approved (or approved portion of the) State criteria and procedures.” It should also be noted that EPA has changed 40 CFR 51.390 to streamline the requirements for State conformity SIPs. Since a transportation conformity SIP has not been approved for the SJV, the Federal transportation conformity rule still governs.

#### **B. CONFORMITY REGULATION REQUIREMENTS**

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

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

2) *Methods / Modeling:*

*Latest Planning Assumptions* — Section 93.110 specifies that conformity determinations must be based upon the most recent planning assumptions in force at the time the conformity analysis begins. This is defined as “the point at which the MPO begins to model the impact of the proposed transportation plan or TIP on travel and/or emissions. New data that becomes available after an analysis begins is required to be used in the conformity determination only if a significant delay in the analysis has occurred, as determined through 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 2010 (see Chapter 2).

*Latest Emissions Models* — Section 93.111 requires that the latest emission estimation models specified for use in SIPs must be used for the conformity analysis. EMFAC2007 was used in the Conformity Analysis and is documented in Chapter 3.

3) *Timely Implementation of TCMs* — Section 93.113 provides a detailed description of the steps necessary to demonstrate that the new TIP/RTP are providing for the timely implementation of TCMs, as well as demonstrate that the plan and/or program is not interfering with this implementation. TCM documentation is included in Chapter 4 of the Conformity Analysis.

4) *Consultation* — Section 93.105 requires that the conformity determination be made in accordance with the consultation procedures outlined in the Federal regulations. These include:

- MPOs are required to provide reasonable opportunity for consultation with State air agencies, local air quality and transportation agencies, the USDOT and EPA (Section 93.105(a)(1)).
- MPOs are required to establish a proactive public involvement process, which provides opportunity for public review and comment prior to taking formal action on a conformity determination (Section 93.105(e)).

The TIP, RTP, and corresponding conformity determinations are prepared by each MPO. Copies of the Draft documents are provided to member agencies and others, including FHWA, Federal Transit Administration (FTA), EPA, Caltrans, CARB, and the Air District for review. Both the TIP and RTP are required to be publicly available and an opportunity for public review and comment is provided. The consultation process for the conformity analysis includes a 30-day comment period followed by a public meeting. However, the comment period for this conformity analysis was 45 days concurrent with the Draft 2011 TIP and RTP, and associated California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documents.

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

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

StanCOG is located in the federally designated San Joaquin Valley Air Basin. The borders of the basin are defined by mountain and foothill ranges to the east and west. The northern border is consistent with the county line between San Joaquin and Sacramento Counties. The southern border is less defined, but is roughly bounded by the Tehachapi Mountains and, to some extent, the Sierra Nevada range. Conformity for the 2011 FTIP and RTP includes analysis of existing and future air quality impacts for each applicable pollutant.

The San Joaquin Valley is currently designated as nonattainment for the NAAQS for 8-hour ozone, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>; and has a maintenance plan for PM<sub>10</sub>, 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<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>:

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

On November 13, 2009, EPA published Air Quality Designations for the 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard, effective December 14, 2009. Nonattainment areas are required to meet the standard by 2014; transportation conformity applies by December 14, 2010. In the San Joaquin Valley, the 1997 standards (both 24-hour and annual) will continue to apply. It is important to note that the 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment area boundary for the San Joaquin Valley is exactly the same as the nonattainment area boundary for the 1997 annual standard.

## **D. CONFORMITY TEST REQUIREMENTS**

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

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

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

**CARBON MONOXIDE**

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

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

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

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

**OZONE**

Under the existing conformity regulation, regional emissions analyses for ozone areas must address nitrogen oxides (NOx) and volatile organic compounds (VOC) precursors. It is important to note that in California, reactive organic gases (ROG) are considered equivalent to and are used in place of volatile organic compounds (VOC). The motor vehicle emission budgets for ozone are specified in the 2007 Ozone Plan in tons per average summer day. EPA published the notice of adequacy determination for the 2011, 2014, and 2017 budgets in the Federal Register on January 22, 2009, effective February 6, 2009.

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

The adequate conformity budgets from Table 9.3 of the Plan are provided in the table below. These budgets will be used to compare to emissions resulting from the 2011 FTIP and RTP. CARB subsequently updated Madera County and San Joaquin County budgets; these updates are reflected in the table below.

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

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

**PM-10**

The 2007 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)

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

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

The PM-10 SIP allows trading from the motor vehicle emissions budget for the PM-10 precursor NOx to the motor vehicle emissions budget for primary PM-10 using a 1.5 to 1 ratio. The trading mechanism allows the agencies responsible for demonstrating transportation conformity in the San Joaquin Valley to supplement the 2005 budget for PM-10 with a portion of the 2005 budget for NOx, and use these adjusted motor vehicle emissions budgets for PM-10 and NOx to demonstrate transportation conformity with the PM-10 SIP for analysis years after 2005. As noted above, EPA approved the 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan (with minor technical corrections to the conformity budgets) on November 12, 2008, which includes continued approval of the trading mechanism.

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

### PM2.5

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

The 2008 PM2.5 Plan contains motor vehicle emission budgets for PM2.5 and NOx established based on average annual daily emissions. The motor vehicle emissions budget for PM2.5 includes directly emitted PM2.5 motor vehicle emissions from tailpipe, brake wear and tire wear. VOC, SOx, ammonia, and dust (from paved roads, unpaved roads, and road construction) were found to be insignificant and not included in the motor vehicle emission budgets for conformity purposes. The conformity budgets from Table 7-2 of the Plan are provided below and will be used to compare emissions resulting from the 2011 FTIP and RTP.

The Clean Air Act requires all states to attain the 1997 PM2.5 standards as expeditiously as practicable beginning in 2010, but by no later than April 5, 2015. States must identify their attainment dates based on the rate of reductions from their control strategies and the severity of the PM2.5 problem. Modeling must be used to verify that the control strategy is as expeditious as practicable. The 2008 PM2.5 Plan shows that the San Joaquin Valley PM2.5 nonattainment area can attain the annual PM2.5 NAAQS in 2014. The SIP has identified subarea budgets for each MPO in the nonattainment area. For this Conformity Analysis, the SJV will continue to conduct determinations for subarea emission budgets as established in the applicable implementation plan.

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

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

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

**E. ANALYSIS YEARS**

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

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

Section 93.118(b)(2) clarifies that when a maintenance plan has been submitted, conformity must be demonstrated for the last year of the maintenance plan and any other years for which the maintenance plan establishes budgets in the time frame of the transportation plan. Section

93.118(d)(2) indicates that a regional emissions analysis may be performed for any years, the attainment year, and the last year of the plan’s forecast. Other years may be determined by interpolating between the years for which the regional emissions analysis is performed.

**Table 1-5:  
 San Joaquin Valley Conformity Analysis Years**

| <b>Pollutant</b> | <b>Budget Years<sup>1</sup></b> | <b>Attainment/<br/>Maintenance<br/>Year</b> | <b>Intermediate<br/>Years</b> | <b>RTP Horizon<br/>Year</b> |
|------------------|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| CO               | NA                              | 2018  | 2017/2025                     | 2035                        |
| Ozone            | 2011/2014/2017                  | 2023  | 2025                          | 2035                        |
| PM-10            | NA                              | 2020  | 2025                          | 2035                        |
| PM2.5            | 2012                            | 2014  | 2017/2025                     | 2035                        |

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, 2005b). 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.

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

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

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

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

According to the conformity regulation, the time the conformity analysis begins is “the point at which the MPO or other designated agency begins to model the impact of the proposed transportation plan or TIP on travel and/or emissions.” The conformity analysis and initial modeling began in February, 2010. On January 21, 2010, a summary of transportation model updates and latest planning assumptions was transmitted to the San Joaquin Valley Interagency Consultation Group (IAC) for review and comment or concurrence. Both EPA and FHWA subsequently indicated that there were no comments or concerns regarding the summary and provided concurrence.

Key elements of the latest planning assumption guidance include:

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

StanCOG uses the Cube transportation modeling software developed by Citilabs to estimate travel. The model was validated in 2009 for the 2006 base year. The latest planning assumptions used in the transportation model validation and Conformity Analysis is summarized in Table 2-1.

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

| <b>Assumption</b>                  | <b>Year and Source of Data (MPO action)</b>   | <b>Modeling</b>  | <b>Next Scheduled Update</b>  |
|------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Population                         | Base Year: 2006 Census<br><br>Projections: Trend forecast at the county level are based on historical population data from D.O.F and historical employees from E.D.D.                                       | This data is controlled at city & community level and disaggregated at the TAZ level for use in Cube software in the base year validation. Forecasts are also at the city and community level. | 2010-11 data from the Census, Department of Finance, and E.D.D regional and local agencies will be used for the next traffic model validation.                    |
| Employment                         | Base Year: 2006 State Employment Development Department (EDD)<br><br>Projections: Trend forecast at the county level are based on historical employees from E.D.D.  | This data is controlled at city & community level and disaggregated at the TAZ level for use in Cube software in the base year validation. Forecasts are also at the city and community level. | 2010-11 data from the Department of Employment Development (EDD) will be used for the next traffic model validation.  |
| Traffic Counts                     | 2006, HPMS, Cities, Stanislaus County, and Caltrans,  | Cube was validated using these traffic counts.   | Traffic counts are updated as often as possible.  |
| Vehicle Miles of Travel            | The transportation model was restructured, calibrated and validated in 2009. VMT was compared to State VMT estimate in 2006.  | Cube is the transportation model used to estimate VMT in Stanislaus 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                             | Survey data were based on posted speeds collected in 2009.<br><br>Speed distributions were also updated in EMFAC2007, using methodology approved by ARB and with information from the transportation model. | Cube. The transportation model includes a feedback loop that assures congested speeds are consistent with travel speeds used throughout the traffic modeling process.<br><br>EMFAC2007         | If new speed data is available, it will be included in the next model validation.   |
| Vehicle Registrations              | EMFAC2007 is the most recent model for use in California conformity analyses. Vehicle registration data is included by ARB in the model and cannot be updated by the user.                                  | EMFAC2007  | ARB has committed to update the fleet information in EMFAC on a 3-year cycle (see 1/31/06 letter to EPA and FHWA). The next update is scheduled to occur in 2010. |
| State Implementation Plan Measures | Latest implementation status of commitments in prior SIPs.  | Emission reduction credits consistent with the SIPs are post-processed via spreadsheets as documented in Ch. 4.  | Updated for every conformity analysis.  |

## **B. SOCIOECONOMIC DATA**

### POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT AND LAND USE

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

#### *Supporting Documentation:*

Population and employment data were developed in 2009 using regression analysis on historical data provided by the Department of Finance (D.O.F.) and the Employment Development Department (E.D.D) for use in the StanCOG Transportation Model. StanCOG updated the countywide 2006 base year data and the countywide projections for Population, Employment and Housing based on conformity milestone years to the year 2035. The land use projections were developed annually to the year 2050. The final milestone year in the conformity analysis is the year 2035. Staff controlled the data at the community and city level for the 3,200 traffic analysis zones in the transportation model.

StanCOG applied historical population and employment data in a trend regression equation at the county level. The methodology provided the countywide forecasts of population and employment for use in the transportation model. The methodology was approved by the Stanislaus County Planning Directors and the Stanislaus Council of Governments' Policy Board in December 2009.

The population and employment forecasts were then disassembled using general plan land use information from the jurisdictions by applying estimates of market absorption rates, employment and housing balance ratios and/or past growth patterns. Population and employment growth was distributed among the County's jurisdictions and controlled to match jurisdictional totals. Population and employment growth were distributed among the County jurisdictions using GIS shape files provided by the US Census to delineate community, city and sometimes zip code boundaries and control totals for each jurisdiction. The demographic and land use information were organized for use in the StanCOG Transportation Model by the following variables: Population, Single Family Households, Multiple Family Households, and Employment, which is represented by retail, service, governments, education, and other. Land use and socioeconomic data at the zonal level are then used for determining trip generation in the first step of the transportation modeling process.

## **C. TRANSPORTATION MODELING**

The San Joaquin Valley Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) utilize the TP+/Viper or 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 StanCOG transportation modeling methodology meets the requirements.

The StanCOG Travel Demand Model is a conventional travel model used for traffic forecasting. It uses land use and socioeconomic data to generate trips and then distributes them to a road network that uses road capacity, distance and speed to assign traffic volumes generated from 3,200 traffic analysis zones. The model generates and combines trips by travel by purpose including home-based-work, home-based-shop, home-based-other, work-other, other-other, and external travel (travel through the region).

In 2009-10, a peak hour module was added to account for trips in the AM hours (6:30-7:30 am) the PM (4:30-5:30 pm) and the off peak (22 hours). At the same time, the Travel Model was updated with a congestion feedback loop process to account for congested speed and congested time in addition to free flow speed and free flow time.

The model study area covers all of Stanislaus County, and a fraction of Merced and San Joaquin counties. It maintains 72 gateways to account for the internal/external and thru-trip trip components of travel in the modeling region.

### 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:*

Travel estimates at specific roadway locations in the StanCOG Transportation Model were validated against counts provided by the cities, Stanislaus county and Caltrans in the 2005-2007 period. Many of the counts were collected from 2006. StanCOG staff and the transportation-consulting firm of Dowling, Inc., of Oakland, California developed the validation and performed the calibration adjustments. Facility types are within acceptable parameters to traffic counts based on FHWA standards; the 2006 model's overall VMT estimate is + 3.6% of the target provided by Caltrans in the Office of Travel Statistics (2006 California Public Road Data).

## SPEEDS

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

### *Supporting Documentation:*

The StanCOG Model includes a speed feedback loop that uses congested travel times as an input into the final distribution step and the assignment step for each period: AM, PM and off-peak. The feedback loop provides the congested travel speeds that in turn are used as input to the air pollution emissions model. In this regard, the travel model and the emissions model are consistent with each other for estimating travel speeds throughout the conformity analysis.

## 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:*

Transit service assumptions are included in the Transit File as a direct input into the StanCOG Transportation Model. Proxy variables included in this step include historical ridership trends, current and future transit routes and projected fare increases and percentage of people that use transit in the region based on the Census Transportation Planning Package. Potential transit ridership for each Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) is projected and then input into the model as low/medium/high factor for each TAZ. StanCOG is in the process of developing a mode choice component in the model.

## 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:*

Assumptions in the 2011 RTP, the 2011 FTIP and the CMP have been used to perform the 2011 StanCOG Air Quality Conformity Analysis. StanCOG staff have approached these documents

using its newest modeling tools developed in 2008-10 to address institutional and policy goals in the aforementioned planning documents. The model was validated by comparing estimates of select link volumes in the model with base year traffic counts observed in the field. The base year validation meets FHWA criteria for all functional classifications of roadway and VMT including freeways, expressways, highways, ramps, arterials, minor arterials, and collectors. For example, freeway estimates are within 5% of observed counts in the StanCOG model. The base year validation meets criteria for percent error relative to traffic counts on groups of roads (screenlines) throughout each county.

For Serious and above nonattainment areas, transportation conformity guidance, Section 93.122(b)(3) of the conformity 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 StanCOG Travel Demand Model was validated to 2006 counts. The 2006 base year VMT estimate is within acceptable parameters (+/- 3.6%) of Highway Performance Monitoring System observed counts, by facility type and overall. As a result additional adjustments were not required prior to the conformity analysis.

#### FUTURE NETWORKS

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

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

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

§93.126, §93.127, §93.128 require that all projects in the TIP/RTP that are exempt from conformity requirements or exempt from the regional emissions analysis be documented. In addition, the reason for the exemption (Table 2, Table 3, traffic signal synchronization) must also

be documented (see Appendix B). It is important to note that the CTIPs exemption code is provided in response to FHWA direction.

*Supporting Documentation:*

The build highway networks include qualifying projects based on the Draft 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (2011 FTIP) and 2011 Regional Transportation Plan (2011 RTP). Not all of the street and freeway projects included in the TIP/RTP qualify for inclusion in the highway network. Projects that call for study, design, right-of-way acquisition, or non-capacity improvements are not included in the networks. When these projects result in actual facility construction projects, the associated capacity changes are coded into the network as appropriate. Since the networks define capacity in terms of number of through traffic lanes, only construction projects that increase the lane-miles of through traffic are included.

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

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

**D. TRAFFIC ESTIMATES**

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

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

| <b>Horizon Year</b> | <b>Total Population<br/>(thousands)</b> | <b>Employment<br/>(thousands)</b> | <b>Average<br/>Weekday VMT<br/>(millions)</b> | <b>Lane Miles</b> |
|---------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| <b>2011</b>         | 551.5                                   | 186.8                             | 12.0  | N/A               |
| <b>2012</b>         | 560.5                                   | 189.6                             | 12.1  | N/A               |
| <b>2014</b>         | 578.5                                   | 195.1                             | 12.5  | N/A               |
| <b>2017</b>         | 605.6                                   | 203.4                             | 13.6  | N/A               |
| <b>2020</b>         | 632.7                                   | 211.7                             | 14.2  | 3,719             |
| <b>2023</b>         | 659.7                                   | 220.1                             | 14.8  | N/A               |
| <b>2025</b>         | 677.7                                   | 225.6                             | 15.1  | 3,791             |
| <b>2035</b>         | 767.8                                   | 253.3                             | 17.0  | 3,851             |

## E. VEHICLE REGISTRATIONS

StanCOG 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. See [http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/onroad/latest\\_version.htm](http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/onroad/latest_version.htm). EMFAC2007 is the most recent model for use in California conformity analyses. Vehicle registrations, age distribution and fleet mix are developed and included in the model by CARB and cannot be updated by the user.

## F. STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN MEASURES

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

### CARBON MONOXIDE

No committed control measures are included in the conformity demonstration.

### OZONE

Committed control measures in the 2007 Ozone Plan that reduce mobile source emissions and are included in the conformity demonstration are shown in Table 2-3.

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

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

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

PM-10

Committed control measures in the EPA approved 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan that reduce mobile source emissions and are included in the conformity demonstration are shown in Table 2-4.

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

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

PM2.5

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

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

| Measure Description   | Pollutants                 |
|---|----------------------------|
| ARB Adopted State and Local Measures not included in EMFAC 2007 | Annual PM2.5<br>Annual NOx |

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

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

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

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

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

EPA published a budget adequacy determination for the 2012 conformity budgets contained in the 2008 PM2.5 Plan on May 12, 2010, effective May 27, 2010.

The conformity regulation requirements for the selection of the horizon years are summarized in Chapter 1; regional emissions have been estimated for the horizon years summarized in Table 1-5.

### **A. EMFAC2007**

The EMFAC model (short for EMISSION FACTOR) is a computer model that can estimate emission rates for motor vehicles for calendar years from 1970 to 2040 operating in California. Pollutant emissions for hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, particulate matter, lead, sulfur oxides, and carbon dioxide are output from the model. Emissions are calculated for passenger cars, eight different classes of trucks, motorcycles, urban and school buses and motor homes.

EMFAC is used to calculate current and future inventories of motor vehicle emissions at the state, county, air district, air basin, or county within air basin level. EMFAC contains default vehicle activity data that can be used to estimate a motor vehicle emission inventory in tons/day for a specific day, month, or season, and as a function of ambient temperature, relative humidity, vehicle population, mileage accrual, miles of travel and speeds.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The core methodology for estimating paved road dust emissions is based on the algorithm published in the 5th Edition of AP-42 (U.S. EPA) (<http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ap42/ch13/>). CARB default assumptions for roadway silt loading by roadway class, rainfall correction factor average vehicle weight remain unchanged. Emissions are estimated for five roadway classes including freeways, arterials, collectors, local roads, and rural roads. Countywide VMT information is used for each road class to prepare the emission estimates.

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

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

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

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

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

The PM-10 SIP allows trading from the motor vehicle emissions budget for the PM-10 precursor NO<sub>x</sub> to the motor vehicle emissions budget for primary PM-10 using a 1.5 to 1 ratio. The trading mechanism will be used only for conformity analyses for analysis years after 2005.

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

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

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

2006 Standard – EPA published 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard Nonattainment area designations on November 13, 2009 with an effective date of December 14, 2009. Conformity to the 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard will apply December 14, 2010. The 1997 standards will continue to apply as they were not revoked. It is important to note that the 2006 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> nonattainment area boundary for the San Joaquin Valley is exactly the same as the nonattainment area boundary for the 1997 annual standard.

The following 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.

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

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

- 2011 adjust\_vmt Spreadsheet
- 2011 Conformity EMFAC Spreadsheet
- 2011 Conformity Paved Road Spreadsheet
- 2011 Conformity Unpaved Road Dust Spreadsheet
- 2011 Conformity Construction Spreadsheet
- 2011 Conformity Trading Spreadsheet
- 2011 Conformity Totals Spreadsheet

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

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

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

The Transportation Conformity regulation requires that the TIP/RTP “must provide for the timely implementation of TCMs in the applicable implementation plan.” The Federal definition 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 only applicable ozone plan is the *1994 Ozone Attainment Demonstration Plan* and the *Revised 1996 Rate of Progress Plan*.

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

- TCM1 – Traffic Flow Improvements
- TCM2 – Public Transit

- TCM3 – Rideshare Programs (Rule 9001)
- TCM4 – Bicycle Programs
- TCM5 – Alternative Fuels Program

Most of the TCMs in the plans were implemented in the short term, and have been fully implemented. As a result, any resulting creditable emission reduction benefits have been incorporated into the traffic forecasts for the region. However, the TIP/RTP provides continued funding for transportation projects that support TCM programs (e.g., traffic flow improvements, public transit, rideshare programs, and bicycle programs). In addition, voluntary implementation of Rule 9001 (Employee Commute Options) is ongoing even though the Rule was not approved by EPA and cannot be implemented as a mandatory program under SB437.

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

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

The Amended 2003 PM-10 Plan was approved by EPA on April 28, 2004 (effective June 25, 2004). A local government control measure assessment was completed for this plan. The analysis focused on transportation-related fugitive dust emissions, which are not TCMs by definition. The local government commitments are included in the *Regional Transportation Planning Agency Commitments for Implementation Document, April 2003*.

However, the *Amended 2002 and 2005 Ozone Rate of Progress Plan* contains commitments that reduce ozone related emissions; these measures are documented in the *Regional Transportation Planning Agency Commitments for Implementation Document, April 2002*. These commitments are included by reference in the Amended 2003 PM-10 Plan to provide emission reductions for precursor gases and help to address the secondary particulate problem. Since these commitments are included in the Plan by reference, the commitments were approved by EPA as TCMs. Accordingly, they will be tracked for timely implementation through 2010.

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

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

The RTPA Commitment Documents, Volumes One and Two, dated April 2002 (Ozone RACM) were reviewed, using a "Summary of Commitments" table. Commitments that contain specific Federal funding/transportation projects/schedules were identified for further documentation. In some cases, local jurisdictions used the same Federal funding/transportation projects/schedules for various measures; these were identified as combined with ("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, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, 2007 and 2009 TIP). This documentation has been updated as part of this Conformity Analysis. A summary of this information is provided in Appendix D.

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

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

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

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

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

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

In May 2003, the San Joaquin Valley MPO Executive Directors committed to conduct feasibility analyses as part of each new RTP in support of the 2003 PM-10 Plan. This commitment was retained in the 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan. In accordance with this commitment, StanCOG 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. StanCOG 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, StanCOG will also consider a commitment to "Repave or overlay paved roads with rubberized asphalt".

Based on consultation with CARB and the Air District, StanCOG 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

StanCOG and its member jurisdictions consider both short- and long-term PM-10 emission reductions to be a priority. Every two to three years, StanCOG conducts a Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) "Call for Projects" that includes funding for PM-10 projects. These additional projects are included in the FTIP once that process is concluded. Reliable long-term funding estimates for the PM-10 portion of the "Call for Projects" process are not available and therefore, not included in the RTP. Currently, Caltrans incorporates rubberized asphalt as general policy to meet recycled content requirements on high volume state highway facilities. In 2003, Caltrans established a goal of using at least 15 percent rubberized asphalt concrete compared to all flexible pavement by weight; Caltrans has exceeded this goal each year. In 2005, AB 338 was passed and requires Caltrans to gradually phase in the use of crumb rubber, which is used to make rubberized-asphalt concrete, on state highway construction and repair projects, to the extent feasible. StanCOG will continue to work with member jurisdictions and evaluate the ability to proceed with PM-10 projects as part of the FTIP and RTP.

## **CHAPTER 5: INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION**

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

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

### **A. INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION**

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

The interagency consultation process for the 2011 TIP, RTP, CEQA document, and corresponding Conformity Analysis began on the May 28, 2009 IAC conference call with a

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

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

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

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

StanCOG engages various agencies in the development of their plans and specifically in the development of the FTIP and corresponding conformity analysis, by distributing notifications of preparation and inviting their comments. These agencies include state, local, tribal agencies responsible for planned growth, economic development, environmental protection, airport operations, freight movement, land use management, natural resources, conservation and historic preservation. The contact list for state and federal resource agencies is maintained by the California DOT. StanCOG adds local organizations and contacts to this list and will update it as necessary. A list of these agencies is available upon request.

## **B. PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

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

All MPOs in the San Joaquin Valley have standard public involvement procedures. In general, the TIP/RTP and corresponding conformity analysis are the subject of a public notice and 30 day review period prior to adoption. However, the comment period for this conformity analysis was 45 days concurrent with the public review of the Draft 2011 TIP and RTP, and associated CEQA documents. A public meeting is also conducted prior to adoption and all public comments are responded to in writing. The Appendices contain corresponding documentation supporting the public involvement procedures.

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

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

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

This chapter presents the results of the conformity tests, satisfying the remaining requirement of the transportation conformity regulation. Separate tests were conducted for carbon monoxide (CO), 8-hour ozone (ROG and NO<sub>x</sub>), PM-10 and PM2.5. The applicable conformity tests were reviewed in Chapter 1. For each test, the required emissions estimates were developed using the transportation and emission modeling approaches required under the transportation conformity regulation and summarized in Chapters 2 and 3. The results are summarized below, followed by a more detailed discussion of the findings for each pollutant. Table 6-1 presents results for CO, ozone (ROG/NO<sub>x</sub>), PM-10 (PM-10/NO<sub>x</sub>), and PM2.5 (PM2.5/NO<sub>x</sub>) respectively, in tons per day for each of the horizon years tested.

For 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 budgets established for ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> for an average summer (ozone) season day. EPA published a budget adequacy determination for the 2011, 2014, and 2017 conformity budgets in the Federal Register on January 22, 2009, effective February 6, 2009. The modeling results for all analysis years indicate that the on-road vehicle ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions predicted for each of the "Build" scenarios are less than the emissions budgets. The TIP/RTP therefore satisfy the conformity emissions test for volatile organic compounds and nitrogen oxides.

For PM-10, the applicable conformity test is the emissions budget test, using the 2007 PM-10 Maintenance Plan budgets for PM-10 and 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 published a budget adequacy determination for the 2012 conformity budget contained in the 2008 PM2.5 Plan May 12, 2010, effective May 27, 2010.. 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. EPA published a budget adequacy determination for the 2012 conformity budget contained in the 2008 PM2.5 Plan May 12, 2010, effective May 27, 2010. The modeling results for all analysis years indicate that the on-road vehicle PM2.5 and NOx emissions predicted for the "Build" scenarios are less than the emissions budget. The TIP/RTP therefore satisfy the conformity emissions test for PM2.5 and nitrogen oxides.

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

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

| Pollutant       | Scenario    | Emissions Total | DID YOU PASS? |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Carbon Monoxide |             | CO (tons/day)   | CO            |
|                 | 2010 Budget | 130             |               |
|                 | 2017        | 45              | YES           |
|                 | 2018 Budget | 130             |               |
|                 | 2018        | 43              | YES           |
|                 | 2025        | 30              | YES           |
|                 | 2035        | 25              | YES           |

|       |             | ROG (tons/day) | NOx (tons/day) | ROG  | NOx |
|-------|-------------|----------------|----------------|------|-----|
|       |             | 2011 Budget    | 9.0            | 22.3 |     |
| Ozone | 2011        | 8.8            | 21.9           | YES  | YES |
|       | 2014 Budget | 7.5            | 17.2           |      |     |
|       | 2014        | 7.2            | 16.6           | YES  | YES |
|       | 2017 Budget | 6.5            | 13.4           |      |     |
|       | 2017        | 6.3            | 13.0           | YES  | YES |
|       | 2023        | 5.0            | 8.5            | YES  | YES |
|       | 2025        | 4.6            | 7.6            | YES  | YES |
|       | 2035        | 3.7            | 6.3            | YES  | YES |

|       |                      | PM-10 (tons/day)     | NOx (tons/day) | PM-10 | NOx |
|-------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------|-------|-----|
|       |                      | Adjusted 2020 Budget | 6.9            | 10.5  |     |
| PM-10 | 2020                 | 6.9                  | 10.5           | YES   | YES |
|       | Adjusted 2020 Budget | 7.2                  | 10.1           |       |     |
|       | 2025                 | 7.2                  | 7.8            | YES   | YES |
|       | Adjusted 2020 Budget | 7.9                  | 9.0            |       |     |
|       | 2035                 | 7.9                  | 6.4            | YES   | YES |

| 1997 PM2.5 24 Hour & Annual Standards and 2006 24-Hour Standard |      | PM2.5 (tons/day) | NOx (tons/day) | PM2.5 | NOx |
|---|------|------------------|----------------|-------|-----|
|   |      | 2012 Budget      | 0.9            | 20.8  |     |
|   | 2012 | 0.8              | 20.0           | YES   | YES |
|   | 2014 | 0.7              | 16.8           | YES   | YES |
|   | 2017 | 0.6              | 13.1           | YES   | YES |
|   | 2025 | 0.6              | 7.6            | YES   | YES |
|   | 2035 | 0.6              | 6.2            | YES   | YES |

## REFERENCES

- CAA. 1990. *Clean Air Act*, as amended November 15, 1990. (42 U. S. C. Section 7401et seq.) November 15, 1990.
- EPA. 1993. 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93. *Criteria and Procedures for Determining Conformity to State or Federal Implementation Plans of Transportation Plans, Programs and Projects Funded or Approved Under Title 23 U.S.C. or the Federal Transit Act*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Federal Register, November 24, 1993, Vol. 58, No. 225, p. 62188.
- EPA. 2004a. 40 CFR Part 93. *Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments for the New 8-hour Ozone and PM2.5 National Ambient Air Quality Standards and Miscellaneous Revisions for Existing Areas; Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments – Response to Court Decision and Additional Rule Changes*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Federal Register, July 1, 2004, Vol. 69, No. 126, p. 40004.
- EPA. 2004b. *Companion Guidance for the July 1, 2004, Final Transportation Conformity Rule: Conformity Implementation in Multi-jurisdictional Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas for Existing and New Air Quality Standards*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. July 21, 2004.
- EPA. 2005a. *Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments for the New PM2.5 National Ambient Air Quality Standards: PM2.5 Precursors; Final Rule*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Federal Register, May 6, 2005, Vol. 70, No. 87, p. 24280.
- EPA. 2005b. *Guidance for Creating Annual On-Road Mobile Source Emission Inventories for PM2.5 Nonattainment Areas for Use in SIPs and Conformity*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. EPA420-B-05-008. August 2005
- EPA, 2008. 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93. *Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments To Implement Provisions Contained in the 2005 Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU); Final Rule*. Federal Register, January 24, 2008, Vol. 73, No. 16, p. 4420.
- EPA, 2010a. 40 CFR Part 93. *Transportation Conformity Rule 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.
- 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<br>Page 9             |          |
| §93.104<br>(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.<br>Page 1              |          |
| §93.104<br>(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<br>(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<br>Page 20,<br>App. B |          |
| §93.108                | Document that the TIP/RTP is financially constrained (23 CFR 450).   | E.S.<br>Page 1              |          |
| §93.109<br>(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,<br>5, 6     |          |
| §93.109<br>(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<br>Page 9             |          |
| §93.110<br>(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<br>Page 15            |          |
| USDOT/EP<br>A guidance | Document the use of planning assumptions less than five years old. If unable, include written justification for the use of older data. (1/18/02)   | Ch. 2<br>Page 17            |          |
| §93.110<br>(c,d,e,f)   | Document any changes in transit operating policies and assumed ridership levels since the previous conformity determination. Document the use of the   | Ch. 2<br>Page 19            |          |

| 40 CFR                         | Criteria   | Page                              | Comments |
|--------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|----------|
|                                | 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<br>Page 24                  |          |
| §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<br>Page 36                  |          |
| §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<br>Page 32,<br>App. E       |          |
| §93.114                        | Document that the conformity analyses performed for the TIP is consistent with the analysis performed for the Plan, in accordance with 23 CFR 450.324(f)(2).   | Analysis addresses both documents |          |
| §93.118 (a, c, e) <sup>j</sup> | 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<br>Page 41                  |          |
| §93.118 (b)                    | Document for which years consistency with motor vehicle emissions budgets must be shown.   | Ch. 1<br>Page 13                  |          |
| §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<br>Page 41                  |          |
| §93.119 <sup>i</sup>           | 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. | N/A                               |          |
| §93.119 (g)                    | Document the use of the appropriate analysis years in the regional emissions analysis for areas without applicable SIP budgets.  | N/A                               |          |
| §93.119 (h,i)                  | Document how the baseline and action scenarios are defined for each analysis year.   | N/A                               |          |
| §93.122 (a)(1)                 | Document that all regionally significant federal and non-Federal projects in the   | Ch. 2<br>Page 20,                 |          |

| 40 CFR                           | Criteria   | Page                 | Comments |
|----------------------------------|--|----------------------|----------|
|                                  | 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                |          |
| §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<br>Page 22     |          |
| §93.122 (a)(4,5,6)               | For nonregulatory measures that are not included in the STIP, include written commitments from appropriate agencies. Document that assumptions for measures outside the transportation system (e.g. fuels measures) are the same for baseline and action scenarios. Document that factors such as ambient temperature are consistent with those used in the SIP unless modified through interagency consultation.  | N/A                  |          |
| §93.122 (b)(1)(i) <sup>ii</sup>  | Document that a network-based travel model is in use that is validated against observed counts for a base year no more than 10 years before the date of the conformity determination. Document that the model results have been analyzed for reasonableness and compared to historical trends and explain any significant differences between past trends and forecasts (for per capita vehicle-trips, VMT, trip lengths mode shares, time of day, etc.).  | Ch. 2<br>Page 17, 19 |          |
| §93.122 (b)(1)(ii) <sup>2</sup>  | Document the land use, population, employment, and other network-based travel model assumptions.   | Ch. 2<br>Page 17     |          |
| §93.122 (b)(1)(iii) <sup>2</sup> | Document how land use development scenarios are consistent with future transportation system alternatives, and the reasonable distribution of employment and residences for each alternative.  | Ch. 2<br>Page 17     |          |
| §93.122 (b)(1)(iv) <sup>2</sup>  | Document use of capacity sensitive assignment methodology and emissions estimates based on a methodology that differentiates between peak and off-peak volumes and speeds, and bases speeds on final assigned volumes.   | Ch. 2<br>Page 19     |          |
| §93.122 (b)(1)(v) <sup>2</sup>   | Document the use of zone-to-zone travel impedances to distribute trips in reasonable agreement with the travel times estimated from final assigned traffic volumes. Where transit is a significant factor, document that zone-to-zone travel impedances used to distribute trips are used to model mode split.   | Ch. 2<br>Page 19     |          |
| §93.122 (b)(1)(vi) <sup>2</sup>  | Document how travel models are reasonably sensitive to changes in time, cost, and other factors affecting travel choices.  | Ch. 2<br>Page 19     |          |

| 40 CFR                          | Criteria  | Page                       | Comments |
|---------------------------------|---|----------------------------|----------|
| §93.122<br>(b)(2) <sup>2</sup>  | Document that reasonable methods were used to estimate traffic speeds and delays in a manner sensitive to the estimated volume of travel on each roadway segment represented in the travel model.   | Ch. 2<br>Page 19           |          |
| §93.122<br>(b)(3) <sup>2</sup>  | Document the use of HPMS, or a locally developed count-based program or procedures that have been chosen through the consultation process, to reconcile and calibrate the network-based travel model estimates of VMT.  | Ch. 2<br>Page 20           |          |
| §93.122<br>(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   | N/A                        |          |
| §93.122<br>(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<br>Page 25, 26       |          |
| §93.122<br>(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,<br>§93.127,<br>§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<br>Page 20,<br>App B |          |

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

<sup>ii</sup> 40 CFR 93.122(b) refers only to serious, severe and extreme ozone areas and serious CO areas above 200,000 population

**Disclaimers**

This checklist is intended solely as an informational guideline to be used in reviewing Transportation Plans and Transportation Improvement Programs for adequacy of their conformity documentation. It is in no way intended to replace or supersede the Transportation Conformity regulations of 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93, the Statewide and Metropolitan Planning Regulations of 23 CFR Part 450 or any other EPA, FHWA or FTA guidance pertaining to transportation conformity or statewide and metropolitan planning. This checklist is not intended for use in documenting transportation conformity for individual transportation projects in nonattainment or maintenance areas. 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93 contain additional criteria for project-level conformity determinations. **Document #46711**

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

| AGENCY            | PROJECT ID | CTIPs PROJECT ID | Description   | Total Cost    | Exemption Code |
|-------------------|------------|------------------|---|---------------|----------------|
| Countywide        | CW01       |                  | Planning and Technical Studies for Rail service   | \$5,000,000   | 4.05           |
| Stanislaus County | SC04       |                  | Seismic Bridge Replacement  | \$10,746,500  | 1.19           |
| Stanislaus County | SC05       |                  | Install Traffic Signal/Intersection Improvements  | \$62,597,700  | 5.02           |
| Stanislaus County | SC13       |                  | Seismic Bridge Retrofit   | \$1,639,100   | 1.19           |
| Stanislaus County | SC14       |                  | Seismic Bridge Replacement  | \$15,070,600  | 1.19           |
| Stanislaus County | SC15       |                  | Seismic Bridge Retrofit - Mandatory   | \$5,829,100   | 1.19           |
| Stanislaus County | SC16       |                  | Seismic Bridge Retrofit   | \$1,056,800   | 1.19           |
| Stanislaus County | SC17       |                  | Seismic Bridge Replacement  | \$26,269,200  | 1.19           |
| Stanislaus County | SC18       |                  | Seismic Bridge Replacement: 4 lane bridge with pedestrian access  | \$35,666,400  | 1.19           |
| Stanislaus County | SC27       |                  | Replace Bridge (Critical)   | \$2,627,000   | 1.19           |
| Stanislaus County | SC28       | 21400000269      | Roadway Rehabilitation  | \$2,300,000   | 1.10           |
| Stanislaus County | SC66       |                  | Rebuild and Replaces Transit Buses  | \$13,417,800  | 2.03           |
| Stanislaus County | SC67       | 21400000415      | Capital Purchases (Buses, Electronic Fareboxes, Camera Systems, Bus Stop Facilities, etc.)                                  | \$8,404,100   | 2.1            |
| Stanislaus County | SC68       |                  | Install and Implement Technology Systems to Improve Transit Operations  | \$741,100     | 2.01           |
| Stanislaus County | SC86       |                  | Operating Costs   | \$15,560,000  | 2.01           |
| Ceres, City of    | C01        |                  | Install Traffic Signals   | \$11,341,400  | 5.07           |
| Ceres, City of    | C02        | 21400000258      | Reconstruct Major Streets (Annual Basis)  | \$20,979,000  | 1.10           |
| Ceres, City of    | C03        |                  | Reconstruct various Alleys (Annual Basis)   | \$522,400     | 1.10           |
| Ceres, City of    | C29        | 21400000227      | Capital Purchases and Installation (Buses and Bus Stop Improvements including, Shelters, Lighting, Trash Recepticals, etc.) | \$2,199,600   | 2.07           |
| Ceres, City of    | C31        |                  | Bus Turn-outs   | \$345,100     | 5.06           |
| Ceres, City of    | C32        |                  | Transit Plan - Study for future routes in newly annexed areas, new schools & transit center                                 | \$47,800      | 4.05           |
| Ceres, City of    | C35        |                  | Operating Costs   | \$5,050,000   | 2.01           |
| Modesto, City of  | M157       |                  | Various Transit Construct Projects  | \$30,519,500  | 2.06/2.07      |
| Modesto, City of  | M158       | 21400000396      | Capital Purchases (Buses, Shop Trucks and Support Equipment, Bus Stop Facilities, etc.)                                     | \$165,415,000 | 2.04/2.05      |
| Modesto, City of  | M160       | 21400000278      | Rehabilitation and Maintenance - Equipment, Vehicles, Bus Stops, etc.   | \$95,276,400  | 2.03           |
| Modesto, City of  | M162       | 21400000285      | Federally Mandated Training and Education   | \$744,200     | 4.05           |
| Modesto, City of  | M167       |                  | Transit Enhancements  | \$1,860,300   | 2.01           |
| Modesto, City of  | M168       | 21400000281      | Upgrade to Fareboxes, AVL systems, Computer Systems and other Technology Improvements                                       | \$11,161,800  | 2.01           |
| Modesto, City of  | M170       |                  | Lease Transit Administrative Facility   | \$2,790,500   | 2.04           |
| Modesto, City of  | M171       | 21400000278      | Operating Costs   | \$60,320,600  | 2.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T58        |                  | Various Transit Construct Projects  | \$6,567,400   | 2.06/2.07      |
| Turlock, City of  | T59        | 21400000210      | Capital Purchases (Buses, Bus Stop and Station Improvements, Support Equipment, etc.)                                       | \$19,221,600  | 2.04/2.05      |
| Turlock, City of  | T73        |                  | Federally Mandated Training and Education   | \$279,100     | 4.05           |
| Turlock, City of  | T74        | 21400000211      | Maintenance on Vehicles and Facilities  | \$35,347,000  | 2.03           |
| Turlock, City of  | T78        |                  | Transit Enhancements  | \$744,200     | 2.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T79        |                  | Upgrade to Fareboxes, AVL systems, Computer Systems and other Technology Improvements                                       | \$744,200     | 2.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T81        | 21400000223      | Operating Costs   | \$8,130,200   | 2.01           |
| Modesto, City of  | M172       |                  | Terminal Program NEPA   | \$382,500     | 4.01           |
| Modesto, City of  | M173       |                  | Utility Master Plan (Sign Plan/Elec./Util. Study)   | \$206,000     | 4.01           |
| Modesto, City of  | M174       |                  | Rehab/Expand NW Term. Apron (Const)   | \$1,236,000   | 2.07           |
| Modesto, City of  | M175       |                  | Terminal Expansion (Design)   | \$1,725,500   | 4.01           |
| Modesto, City of  | M176       |                  | Enhance Airport Storm Drain System (Design)   | \$446,800     | 4.01           |
| Modesto, City of  | M177       |                  | Terminal Expansion (Const, Phase-1)   | \$8,626,800   | 2.07           |
| Modesto, City of  | M178       |                  | Enhance Airport Storm Drain System (const, Phase-1)   | \$1,150,300   | 2.07           |
| Modesto, City of  | M179       |                  | Terminal Expansion (const, Phase-2)   | \$3,885,600   | 2.07           |
| Modesto, City of  | M180       |                  | Enhance Airport Storm Drain System (const, Phase-2)   | \$1,184,800   | 2.07           |
| Modesto, City of  | M181       |                  | Construct Maintenance Building (Design)   | \$579,700     | 4.01           |
| Modesto, City of  | M182       |                  | Construct ARFF Building (Design)  | \$579,700     | 4.01           |
| Modesto, City of  | M183       |                  | Rehab Runway (Airfield Pavement Maintenance, Design)  | \$231,900     | 4.01           |
| Oakdale, City of  | O14        |                  | Fencing and Security Cameras  | \$546,400     | 4.01           |
| Oakdale, City of  | O15        |                  | Runway/Taxi Maintenance and Upgrades  | \$546,400     | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T81        |                  | Airfield: Slurry and Restripe Runways   | \$82,400      | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T82        |                  | Navigational Aids: Install AWOS   | \$154,500     | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T83        |                  | Install Obstruction lights on utility poles   | \$1,100       | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T84        |                  | Apron and Taxiway rehabilitation and drainage improvements  | \$1,648,000   | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T85        |                  | Improve access road   | \$185,400     | 1.03           |

| AGENCY            | PROJECT ID | CTIPs PROJECT ID | Description   | Total Cost   | Exemption Code |
|-------------------|------------|------------------|---|--------------|----------------|
| Turlock, City of  | T86        |                  | Construct 20 new hangars  | \$643,800    | 2.07           |
| Turlock, City of  | T87        |                  | Construct additional vehicular parking  | \$77,300     | 2.07           |
| Turlock, City of  | T88        |                  | Install perimeter fencing and gates   | \$442,900    | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T89        |                  | Relocate runway 12-30 & build new entry/exit connector taxiways               | \$3,186,400  | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T90        |                  | Develop Pavement Maintenance Plan   | \$11,300     | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T91        |                  | Install MIRL on Runway 12-30  | \$135,100    | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T92        |                  | Install 2 PAPIS   | \$84,500     | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T93        |                  | Install 2 REILs   | \$84,500     | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T94        |                  | Install MITL on formal runway and new taxiways                                | \$40,600     | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T95        |                  | Install airfield signage  | \$135,100    | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T96        |                  | Install 12,000-gallon fuel tank   | \$202,600    | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T97        |                  | Construct pollution abatement facility  | \$202,600    | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T98        |                  | Construct 20 new hangars  | \$703,500    | 2.07           |
| Turlock, City of  | T99        |                  | Extend fire protection system   | \$405,200    | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T100       |                  | Airfield electrical service infrastructure                                    | \$168,900    | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T101       |                  | Additional drainage improvements  | \$1,409,200  | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T102       |                  | Extend runway 12-30   | \$692,200    | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T103       |                  | Extend entry/exit connector taxiways  | \$519,100    | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T104       |                  | Relocate PAPIS  | \$16,700     | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T105       |                  | Relocate REILs  | \$16,700     | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T106       |                  | Extend MITL   | \$49,900     | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T107       |                  | Extend MIRL   | \$33,300     | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T108       |                  | Install 12,000-gallon fuel tank   | \$249,200    | 4.01           |
| Turlock, City of  | T109       |                  | Construct 20 new hangars  | \$865,200    | 2.07           |
| Turlock, City of  | T110       |                  | Construct new terminal/administration building facility                       | \$519,100    | 2.07           |
| Turlock, City of  | T111       |                  | Construct maintenance/storage building  | \$103,900    | 2.07           |
| Stanislaus County | SC63       |                  | Add Class I bike path in conjunction with Claribel roadway widening           | \$1,890,900  | 3.02           |
| Stanislaus County | SC64       |                  | Add Class II bike lanes   | \$281,400    | 3.02           |
| Ceres, City of    | C19        |                  | Hatch Rd Bike/Ped Project - Phase III   | \$257,500    | 3.02           |
| Ceres, City of    | C20        |                  | Construct Bike/Ped Facility (3 Phases)  | \$265,300    | 3.02           |
| Ceres, City of    | C21        |                  | Mitchell Rd Bike/Ped Project - Phase I  | \$281,400    | 3.02           |
| Ceres, City of    | C22        |                  | Mitchell Rd Bike/Ped Project - Phase II                                       | \$298,600    | 3.02           |
| Ceres, City of    | C23        |                  | Mitchell Rd Bike/Ped Project - Phase III                                      | \$316,700    | 3.02           |
| Ceres, City of    | C24        |                  | Mitchell Rd Bike/Ped Project - Phase IV                                       | \$326,200    | 3.02           |
| Ceres, City of    | C25        |                  | Hatch Rd TID Bike/Ped Project - Phase IV                                      | \$401,200    | 3.02           |
| Ceres, City of    | C26        |                  | Misc. Bike/Pedestrian Facility Projects                                       | \$346,100    | 3.02           |
| Ceres, City of    | C27        |                  | Mitchell Rd Bike/Ped Project - Phase V  | \$8,028,800  | 3.02           |
| Hughson, City of  | H01        |                  | Various Intersection Improvements   | \$5,926,500  | 5.01           |
| Hughson, City of  | H13        |                  | Roadway Rehabilitation  | \$165,000    | 1.10           |
| Hughson, City of  | H14        |                  | Construct Class I, Class II, Class III Bikeway Improvements (Per Master Plan) | \$164,000    | 3.02           |
| Hughson, City of  | H15        |                  | Construct Class I Bike Path   | \$675,400    | 3.02           |
| Hughson, City of  | H16        | 31400000392      | Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk, Pedestrian Improvements                            | \$1,507,100  | 3.02           |
| Hughson, City of  | H17        |                  | Sidewalk In-Fill and Streetscape Improvements (ADA)                           | \$2,243,200  | 3.02           |
| Modesto, City of  | M05        | 21400000259      | Roadway Rehabilitation  | \$24,648,600 | 1.10           |
| Modesto, City of  | M18        | 2140000398       | Various Intersection Improvements   | \$79,890,300 | 5.01           |
| Modesto, City of  | M85        |                  | Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements at Railroad crossing                          | \$141,400    | 3.02           |
| Modesto, City of  | M87        |                  | Bicycle Improvements - Signage/stripping                                      | \$2,465,900  | 3.02           |
| Modesto, City of  | M112       |                  | Bicycle Lane Widening   | \$613,700    | 3.02           |
| Modesto, City of  | M126       |                  | Construction Improvements - Class I Trail along MID Lateral 5 & 6             | \$27,684,700 | 3.02           |
| Modesto, City of  | M127       |                  | Trail Improvements - Class I Bikeway  | \$27,684,700 | 3.02           |
| Modesto, City of  | M155       |                  | Trail Improvements  | \$48,141,200 | 3.02           |
| Modesto, City of  | M156       |                  | Trail Improvements  | \$51,350,700 | 3.02           |
| Newman, City of   | N01        |                  | Reconstruct Roadways  | \$581,400    | 1.10           |
| Newman, City of   | N02        |                  | Install Traffic Signals   | \$709,100    | 5.02           |
| Newman, City of   | N03        |                  | Install 4 Lane Arterial Roadway Improvements                                  | \$5,453,900  | 1.10           |
| Newman, City of   | N04        | 11400000077      | Construct Class I Bike Lane   | \$1,019,600  | 3.02           |
| Oakdale, City of  | O01        | 11400000075      | Install Traffic Signals and Various Intersection Improvements                 | \$1,072,200  | 5.02           |
| Oakdale, City of  | O12        | 21400000261      | Roadway Rehabilitation  | \$555,000    | 1.10           |

| AGENCY             | PROJECT ID | CTIP's PROJECT ID | Description   | Total Cost   | Exemption Code |
|--------------------|------------|-------------------|---|--------------|----------------|
| Oakdale, City of   | O13        |                   | Construct Class I Bike Lane   | \$437,100    | 3.02           |
| Oakdale, City of   | O14        |                   | Construct Class I Bike Lane   | \$506,500    | 3.02           |
| Patterson, City of | P02        |                   | Install Traffic Signals and Various Intersection Improvements             | \$14,668,100 | 5.02           |
| Patterson, City of | P05        |                   | Roadway Rehabilitation  | \$495,000    | 1.10           |
| Riverbank, City of | R01        |                   | Install Traffic Signals and Various Intersection Improvements             | \$15,210,900 | 5.02           |
| Riverbank, City of | R08        |                   | Construct right-hand turn lane on SB First St Approach                    | \$1,925,700  | 5.01           |
| Riverbank, City of | R09        |                   | Reconstruct Roadway and Extend Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk                  | \$94,552,300 | 5.01           |
| Riverbank, City of | R15        |                   | Pedestrian Bridge over Stanislaus River                                   | \$7,313,100  | 3.02           |
| Riverbank, City of | R16        | 21400000407       | Construct Class I Bike/Ped Trail  | \$1,178,100  | 3.02           |
| Riverbank, City of | R17        | 21400000407       | Construct Class I Bike/Ped Trail  | \$1,178,100  | 3.02           |
| Turlock, City of   | T28        |                   | Install Traffic Signals and Various Intersection Improvements             | \$4,105,100  | 5.02           |
| Turlock, City of   | T35        | 21400000285       | Roadway Rehabilitation  | \$1,875,000  | 1.10           |
| Turlock, City of   | T46        |                   | Construct Class I Bike Paths  | \$3,625,700  | 3.02           |
| Turlock, City of   | T49        |                   | Construct Bicycle Parking Area  | \$258,800    | 3.02           |
| Turlock, City of   | T51        |                   | Construct Bicycle Paths   | \$2,267,700  | 3.02           |
| Waterford, City of | W01        | 2140000164        | Curb, Gutter, Sidewalk, and Bike/ Pedestrian Improvements                 | \$1,591,400  | 3.02           |
| Waterford, City of | W02        |                   | Install Traffic Signals and Various Intersection Improvements             | \$3,664,700  | 5.02           |
| Waterford, City of | W03        |                   | Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk; and Bike/Pedestrian Improvements               | \$506,800    | 3.02           |
| Waterford, City of | W04        |                   | Roadway Rehabilitation  | \$210,000    | 1.10           |
| Waterford, City of | W05        |                   | Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk; Bike/Pedestrian and Roadside Rest Improvements | \$1,304,800  | 3.02           |
| Waterford, City of | W06        |                   | Construct new pedestrian bridge   | \$2,076,400  | 3.02           |
| Waterford, City of | W07        |                   | Install Class I Bike Path - Phase I                                       | \$2,076,400  | 3.02           |
| StanCOG            | ST07       |                   | Transportation Enhancement Activities                                     | \$4,448,000  | 4.09           |
| StanCOG            | ST08       |                   | Planning and Monitoring Activities  | \$2,636,000  | 4.01           |
| StanCOG            | ST09       | 21400000255       | Regional Rideshare and Vanpool Program                                    | \$1,000,000  | 3.01           |



| Jurisdiction/ Agency | CITPs Project ID | RTP/TIP Project ID | Description   | Location                           | Project Limits                                | Total Cost   | 2011 | 2012 | 2014 | 2017 | 2020 | 2023 | 2025 | 2035 |
|----------------------|------------------|--------------------|---|------------------------------------|---|--------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M02                | Reconstruct to 8-lane Interchange                                       | SR-99                              | SR-99 & Standford Interchange                 | \$40,117,700 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M03                | Construct 4-lane Freeway  | SR-132                             | SR-99 to West of Dakota/Nebraska              | \$62,290,600 |      |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M10                | Widen Roadway to 2-lane collector and Rehabilitation                    | Rosemore Ave                       | Kansas Ave to Blue Gum Ave                    | \$1,669,400  |      | x    |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M11                | Widen from 2 to 4 lanes   | Morton Blvd                        | Tuolumne Blvd to Yosemite Blvd (SR-132)       | \$4,644,600  |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M12                | Widen from 2 to 4 lanes   | Blue Gum Ave                       | Polist Rd to Rosemore Ave                     | \$4,179,200  |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M13                | Widen from 2 to 6 lanes   | Claratina Ave                      | Coffee Rd to Oakdale Rd                       | \$7,508,300  |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M14                | Widen from 4 to 6 lanes   | Oakdale Rd                         | Sylvan Ave to Floyd Ave                       | \$5,012,600  |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M15                | Widen from 2 to 4 lanes   | Dale Rd                            | Kierman Ave to Ladd Rd                        | \$11,553,900 |      |      |      |      |      |      | x    |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M16                | Widen from 4 to 6 lanes   | E. Briggsmore Ave                  | Claus Rd to GP Boundary                       | \$3,664,600  |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M17                | Widen from 2 to 6 lanes   | Dale Rd                            | Pelandale Ave to Standford Ave                | \$9,786,500  |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M19                | Widen from 2 to 6 lanes   | Dale Rd                            | Pelandale Ave to Kierman Ave                  | \$10,975,800 |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M20                | Widen from 4 to 6 lanes   | Oakdale Rd                         | Sylvan Ave to Claratina Ave                   | \$11,964,500 |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M21                | Widen from 4 to 6 lanes   | Oakdale Rd                         | Floyd Ave to Briggsmore Ave                   | \$12,113,500 |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M22                | Widen from 2 to 4 lanes   | Sylvan Ave                         | Roselle Ave to Claus Rd                       | \$12,678,000 |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M23                | Construct 4-lane Minor Arterial   | New Road between Finney and Dakota | Beckwith Rd to Murphy Rd                      | \$18,477,900 |      |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M24                | Extend as 6-lane Arterial   | Pelandale/Claratina Expressway     | Oakdale Rd to Roselle Ave                     | \$16,023,800 |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M25                | Widen from 2 to 6-lane Expressway                                       | Pelandale/Claratina Expressway     | McHenry Ave to Coffee Rd                      | \$17,910,800 |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M26                | Widen from 4 to 6 lanes   | Standford Ave                      | Dale Rd to Prescott Rd                        | \$19,316,500 |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M28                | Widen from 2 to 4 lanes   | Paradise Rd                        | Carpenter Rd to Sutter Ave                    | \$9,618,400  |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M29                | Widen from 2 to 4 lanes   | Roselle Ave                        | Floyd Ave to Clarbelt Rd                      | \$29,660,300 |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M30                | Widen from 2 to 4 lanes   | Beckwith Rd                        | SR-99 to GP Boundary                          | \$30,173,700 |      |      |      |      |      |      | x    |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M31                | Widen from 4 to 6 lanes   | Briggsmore Ave                     | Prescott Rd to Oakdale Rd                     | \$47,001,800 |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M36                | Widen to 4 lanes  | Woodland Ave                       | Carpenter Rd to Kearney Ave                   | \$17,074,300 |      |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M37                | Widen from 2 to 4 lanes   | Floyd Ave                          | Oakdale Rd to 1,000 feet west of Oakdale Rd   | \$24,916,300 |      |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M38                | Widen from 4 to 6 lanes   | Crows Landing Rd                   | SR-99 to 7th St                               | \$9,243,200  |      |      |      |      |      |      | x    |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M39                | Widen from 4 to 6 lanes   | Tully Rd                           | Pelandale Ave to GP Boundary                  | \$13,887,800 |      |      |      |      |      |      | x    |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M40                | Widen to 6 lane expressway  | Carpenter Rd                       | Hatch Rd to Paradise Rd                       | \$16,776,300 |      |      |      |      |      |      | x    |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M41                | Widen from 4 to 6 lanes   | McHenry Ave                        | Standford Ave to GP Boundary                  | \$16,785,900 |      |      |      |      |      |      | x    |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M42                | Widen from 2 to 6 lane expressway                                       | Claus Rd                           | Briggsmore Ave to Sylvan Ave                  | \$20,764,300 |      |      |      |      |      |      | x    |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M43                | Widen from 4 to 6 lanes   | Mitchell Rd                        | Yosemite Blvd (SR-132) to Modesto GP Boundary | \$21,929,300 |      |      |      |      |      |      | x    |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M44                | Widen from 2 to 6-lane expressway                                       | Claus Rd                           | Sylvan Ave to Clarbelt Rd                     | \$23,560,300 |      |      |      |      |      |      | x    |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M45                | Widen from 4 to 6 lanes   | Crows Landing Rd                   | Whitmore Ave to SR-99                         | \$31,212,900 |      |      |      |      |      |      | x    |      |
| Modesto, City of     |                  | M46                | Widen from 2 to 4 lanes   | Scenic Dr                          | Oakdale Rd to Claus Rd                        | \$18,632,600 |      |      |      |      |      |      | x    |      |
| Oakdale, City of     |                  | O02                | Construct New 4-lane Roadway  | Warnerville Rd                     | Yosemite Ave to Kaufman Rd                    | \$4,371,000  |      | x    |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Oakdale, City of     |                  | O03                | Widen Roadway to 4-lanes  | Kaufman Rd                         | Gregor St to Patterson Rd                     | \$2,813,800  |      |      | x    |      |      |      |      |      |
| Oakdale, City of     |                  | O05                | Construct New 2-lane Roadway  | D St                               | Rodeo to Stearns Rd                           | \$2,892,200  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Oakdale, City of     |                  | O06                | Widen Roadways to 4-lanes   | Sierra Rd                          | 5th St to Stearns Rd                          | \$3,298,300  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Oakdale, City of     |                  | O07                | Widen Roadway to 5-lanes  | F St                               | Maad Ave to Stearns Rd                        | \$2,824,000  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Oakdale, City of     |                  | O08                | Construct New 2-lane Roadway  | Orsi Rd                            | Sierra Rd to F St                             | \$2,326,100  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Oakdale, City of     |                  | O10                | Widen Roadway to 4-lanes  | Stearns Rd                         | A St to F St                                  | \$1,284,500  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Oakdale, City of     |                  | O11                | Widen Roadway to 4-lanes  | Stearns Rd                         | F St to Sierra Rd                             | \$2,020,100  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Patterson, City of   |                  | P01                | Widen to 4-lanes; Realign and Reconstruct Roadway                       | Sperry Ave                         | Ward Ave to SR-33                             | \$7,164,400  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Patterson, City of   |                  | P03                | Construct new 3-lane Roadway Segment                                    | Sperry Ave                         | S. 1st St to Locust Ave                       | \$5,970,300  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Patterson, City of   |                  | P04                | Reconstruct Sperry Ave Interchange. Widen Sperry Ave (Rogers Rd to I-5) | I-5                                | I-5 & Sperry Rd                               | \$13,842,400 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Turlock, City of     |                  | T01                | Reconstruct Interchange   | SR-99                              | SR-99 & Fulkerth Rd                           | \$13,842,400 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Turlock, City of     |                  | T02                | Widen from 2 to 5-lane Arterial   | Fulkerth Rd                        | Dianne to SR-99                               | \$336,400    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Turlock, City of     |                  | T03                | Widen existing 2-5 lanes to 6-lane Arterial                             | W. Main St                         | Tegner Rd to Walnut Rd                        | \$1,811,100  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Turlock, City of     |                  | T04                | Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane Arterial                                    | W. Main St                         | Washington Rd to Tegner Rd                    | \$2,443,900  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Turlock, City of     |                  | T05                | Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane Arterial                                    | Fulkerth Rd                        | Tegner Rd to Dianne Dr                        | \$634,200    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Turlock, City of     |                  | T06                | Install Median; Add one (1) lane  | Monte Vista Ave                    | Olive Ave to Berkeley Ave                     | \$1,439,700  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Turlock, City of     |                  | T07                | Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane Arterial                                    | Fulkerth Rd                        | Washington Rd to Tegner Rd                    | \$3,736,900  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Turlock, City of     |                  | T08                | Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane Arterial                                    | Washington Rd                      | Linwood Ave to Fulkerth Rd                    | \$2,378,200  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |

| Jurisdiction/<br>Agency | CTIPs<br>Project ID | RTP/TIP<br>Project ID | Description                               | Location          | Project Limits                        | Total Cost   | 2011 | 2012 | 2014 | 2017 | 2020 | 2023 | 2025 | 2035 |
|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T09                   | Construct new 2-lane Industrial Collector | Tegner Rd         | Linwood Ave to W. Main St             | \$474,800    |      |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T10                   | Construct new 2-lane Collector            | W. Canal Dr       | SR-99 to Tegner Rd                    | \$2,256,900  |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |      |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T11                   | Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane Arterial      | N. Olive Ave      | Tuolumne Rd to Tornell Rd             | \$827,800    |      |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T12                   | Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane Arterial      | N. Olive Ave      | Canal Dr to Wayside Rd                | \$931,600    |      |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T13                   | Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane Arterial      | N. Olive Ave      | Wayside Dr to North Ave               | \$970,400    |      |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T14                   | Widen from 2-lane to 3-lane Collector     | W. Linwood Ave    | Walnut Rd to Lander Ave               | \$672,800    |      |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T15                   | Widen from 2-lane to 3-lane Collector     | W. Linwood Ave    | Walnut Rd to Washington Rd            | \$4,597,500  |      |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T16                   | Construct new 2-lane Collector            | W. Canal Dr       | Washington Rd to Kilroy Rd            | \$2,740,100  |      |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T17                   | Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane Arterial      | East Ave          | Golden State Blvd to Daubenberger Rd  | \$6,511,100  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | x    |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T18                   | Complete 6-lane Boulevard                 | Golden State Blvd | Taylor Rd to Monte Vista Ave          | \$3,617,100  |      |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T19                   | Complete 6-lane Boulevard                 | Golden State Blvd | Monte Vista Ave to Fulkerth Rd        | \$3,135,300  |      |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T20                   | Construct new Collector                   | N. Kilroy Ave     | W. Main St to W. Canal Dr             | \$812,000    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | x    |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T21                   | Complete 2-lane Industrial Collector      | Tegner Rd         | Monte Vista Ave to Fulkerth Rd        | \$736,800    |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |      |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T22                   | Construct new 2-lane Industrial Collector | Tegner Rd         | Fulkerth Rd to north of Pedretti Park | \$1,088,100  |      |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T23                   | Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane Collector     | Taylor Rd         | Tegner Rd to Golden State Blvd        | \$552,400    |      |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T24                   | Construct new Industrial Collector        | S. Kilroy Ave     | Spengler Way to W. Linwood Ave        | \$1,020,600  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | x    |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T25                   | Widen from 2-lane to 4-lane Arterial      | Taylor Rd         | Golden State Blvd to SR-99            | \$152,500    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | x    |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T26                   | Widen from 5-lane to 6-lane Arterial      | W. Main St        | Walnut Rd to SR-99                    | \$19,256,500 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | x    |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T27                   | Construct new 2-lane Industrial Collector | Tegner Rd         | W. Main St to Fulkerth Rd             | \$3,055,100  |      |      |      |      | x    |      |      |      |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T29                   | Construct New Interchange                 | SR-99             | Lander Ave (SR-165) to S. City Limits | \$39,103,200 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | x    |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T30                   | Construct New Interchange                 | SR-99             | W. Main St                            | \$20,861,200 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | x    |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T31                   | Reconstruct existing Interchange          | SR-99             | Taylor Rd                             | \$8,407,100  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | x    |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T32                   | Construct New Overpass                    | SR-99             | Tuolumne Rd                           | \$10,592,200 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | x    |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T33                   | Construct 4-lane Expressway               | Washington Rd     | Fulkerth Rd to Monte Vista Ave        | \$2,921,900  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | x    |
| Turlock, City of        |                     | T34                   | Widen Intersection from 2 to 4 lanes      | Golden State Blvd | Golden State Blvd & Taylor Rd         | \$2,939,900  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      | x    |

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

Stanislaus COG 2011 Conformity

| Variable | Source     | Analysis Year |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |
|----------|------------|---------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
|          |            | 2011          | 2012       | 2014       | 2017       | 2020       | 2023       | 2025       | 2035       |
| EDP      | EMFAC 2007 | 371,970       | 378,117    | 390,719    | 410,417    | 431,111    | 454,936    | 471,548    | 561,047    |
| EVMT     | EMFAC 2007 | 12,085,012    | 12,289,217 | 12,796,523 | 13,613,519 | 14,338,863 | 15,135,808 | 15,658,155 | 18,620,034 |
| MVMT     | TPA Model  | 12,040,783    | 12,065,540 | 12,513,170 | 13,581,703 | 14,214,936 | 14,761,720 | 15,096,875 | 16,961,103 |
| N        | Calculated | 370,609       | 371,235    | 382,067    | 409,458    | 427,385    | 443,692    | 454,645    | 511,061    |

<=Enter Modeled Daily VMT Here

<= Read New Vehicle Population Here

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

**EMFAC Emissions (tonns/day)**  
STANISLAUS

| Pollutant                              | Source  | Description  | 2017  |       | 2025        |             | 2035        |             |
|--|---|--|-------|-------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|  |   |  | 2011  | 2014  | 2017        | 2023        | 2025        | 2035        |
| Carbon Monoxide                        | EMFAC 2007 (Winter Run)   | CO Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)                                  | 8.66  | 7.31  | 6.39        | 5.04        | 4.73        | 3.75        |
|  | EMFAC 2007 (Summer Run)   | CO Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)                                  | 8.66  | 7.31  | 6.39        | 5.04        | 4.73        | 3.75        |
|  | District Existing Local Reductions                                | Indirect Source Mitigation and School Bus Fleet rules                  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00        | 0.00        | 0.00        | 0.00        |
|  | ARB Existing Local Reductions                                     | Reflesh, idling, and Moyer   | 0.01  | 0.01  | 0.01        | 0.00        | 0.00        | 0.00        |
|  | District New/Proposed Local Reductions                            | Employee Trip Reduction  | 0.09  | 0.09  | 0.09        | 0.09        | 0.09        | 0.09        |
|  | ARB New/Proposed State Reductions                                 | Passenger and Truck Measures included in the Draft State Strategy      | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00        | 0.00        | 0.00        | 0.00        |
|  | <b>Conformity Total</b>   |  |       |       |             | <b>3.95</b> | <b>3.64</b> | <b>3.66</b> |
|  | EMFAC 2007 (Summer Run)   | NOx Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)                                 | 23.69 | 18.14 | 14.48       | 9.76        | 8.94        | 7.57        |
|  | District Existing Local Reductions                                | Indirect Source Mitigation and School Bus Fleet rules                  | 0.23  | 0.14  | 0.21        | 0.18        | 0.18        | 0.18        |
|  | ARB Existing Local Reductions                                     | Reflesh, idling, and Moyer   | 1.52  | 1.35  | 1.20        | 1.09        | 1.09        | 1.09        |
| District New/Proposed Local Reductions | Employee Trip Reduction   | 0.03   | 0.03  | 0.04  | 0.04        | 0.04        | 0.04        |             |
| ARB New/Proposed State Reductions      | Passenger and Truck Measures included in the Draft State Strategy | 0.00   | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00        | 0.00        | 0.00        |             |
| <b>Conformity Total</b>                |   |  |       |       | <b>7.45</b> | <b>7.40</b> | <b>6.36</b> |             |
| PM10                                   | EMFAC 2007 (Annual Run)   | PM10 Total (All Vehicles Total)  |       |       |             | 0.88        | 0.85        | 0.90        |
|  | ARB   | * includes tire & brake wear   |       |       |             | 0.01        | 0.01        | 0.01        |
|  | EMFAC 2007 (Annual Run)   | Existing Reflash, idling, and Moyer (HD), PFR, Moyer, AB1493, Reflash) |       |       |             |             |             |             |
|  | <b>Conformity Total</b>   |  |       |       |             |             |             |             |
| PM10                                   | EMFAC 2007 (Annual Run)   | NOx Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)                                 |       |       |             | 11.63       | 8.92        | 7.52        |
|  | ARB   | Existing Reflash, idling, and Moyer (HD), PFR, Moyer, AB1493, Reflash) |       |       |             | 1.09        | 1.09        | 1.09        |
|  | <b>Conformity Total</b>   |  |       |       |             |             |             |             |
|  |   |  |       |       |             |             |             |             |
| PM2.5                                  | EMFAC 2007 (Annual Run)   | PM2.5 Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)                               |       |       |             | 0.79        | 0.72        | 0.25        |
|  | ARB   | * includes tire & brake wear   |       |       |             | 0.01        | 0.01        | 0.01        |
|  | ARB   | Adopted State and Local Measures not included in EMFAC 2007            |       |       |             | 0.00        | 0.00        | 0.00        |
|  | <b>Conformity Total</b>   |  |       |       |             |             |             |             |
| PM2.5                                  | EMFAC 2007 (Annual Run)   | NOx Total Exhaust (All Vehicles Total)                                 |       |       |             | 21.55       | 18.13       | 14.47       |
|  | ARB   | Adopted State and Local Measure not included in EMFAC 2007             |       |       |             | 1.54        | 1.37        | 1.37        |
|  | ARB   | 2007 State Strategy  |       |       |             | 0.00        | 0.00        | 0.00        |
|  | <b>Conformity Total</b>   |  |       |       |             |             |             |             |

Paved Road Dust Emissions (tons/day)

STANISLAUS 2020

|               | VMT Daily         | VMT (million/year) | Base Emissions (PM10 tpy) | Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tpy) | Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tons/day) | District Rule 8061/ISR Control Rates | Control-Adjusted Emissions |
|---------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Freeway       | 6,054,275         | 2,210              | 633,886                   | 612,711                        | 1,679                               | 0.075                                | 1,553                      |
| Arterial      | 3,653,327         | 1,337              | 551,910                   | 533,369                        | 1,461                               | 0.262                                | 1,049                      |
| Collector     | 3,570,419         | 1,303              | 537,913                   | 519,861                        | 1,424                               | 0.407                                | 0,845                      |
| Urban         | 590,445           | 216                | 374,865                   | 362,285                        | 0,993                               | 0.324                                | 0,671                      |
| Rural         | 336,470           | 123                | 608,097                   | 587,690                        | 1,610                               | 0.090                                | 1,485                      |
| <b>Totals</b> | <b>14,214,936</b> | <b>5,188</b>       | <b>2706,771</b>           | <b>2615,936</b>                | <b>7,167</b>                        |                                      | <b>5,593</b>               |

STANISLAUS 2025

|               | VMT Daily         | VMT (million/year) | Base Emissions (PM10 tpy) | Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tpy) | Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tons/day) | District Rule 8061/ISR Control Rates | Control-Adjusted Emissions |
|---------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Freeway       | 6,657,136         | 2,430              | 697,116                   | 673,722                        | 1,846                               | 0.075                                | 1,707                      |
| Arterial      | 3,603,533         | 1,368              | 573,033                   | 553,803                        | 1,517                               | 0.262                                | 1,099                      |
| Collector     | 3,657,573         | 1,335              | 551,043                   | 532,551                        | 1,459                               | 0.407                                | 0,865                      |
| Urban         | 623,389           | 228                | 395,781                   | 382,499                        | 1,048                               | 0.324                                | 0,706                      |
| Rural         | 355,244           | 130                | 642,026                   | 620,481                        | 1,700                               | 0.090                                | 1,547                      |
| <b>Totals</b> | <b>15,096,875</b> | <b>5,510</b>       | <b>2859,000</b>           | <b>2763,056</b>                | <b>7,570</b>                        |                                      | <b>5,917</b>               |

STANISLAUS 2035

|               | VMT Daily         | VMT (million/year) | Base Emissions (PM10 tpy) | Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tpy) | Rain Adj. Emissions (PM10 tons/day) | District Rule 8061/ISR Control Rates | Control-Adjusted Emissions |
|---------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Freeway       | 7,578,831         | 2,766              | 793,634                   | 767,001                        | 2,101                               | 0.075                                | 1,944                      |
| Arterial      | 4,033,519         | 1,472              | 607,682                   | 587,290                        | 1,609                               | 0.262                                | 1,155                      |
| Collector     | 4,257,270         | 1,554              | 641,392                   | 619,858                        | 1,698                               | 0.407                                | 1,007                      |
| Urban         | 693,275           | 254                | 441,420                   | 426,607                        | 1,169                               | 0.324                                | 0,799                      |
| Rural         | 396,209           | 145                | 716,061                   | 692,031                        | 1,896                               | 0.090                                | 1,725                      |
| <b>Totals</b> | <b>16,961,103</b> | <b>6,191</b>       | <b>3200,189</b>           | <b>3092,796</b>                | <b>8,473</b>                        |                                      |                            |

DO NOT CHANGE ANY ITEMS BELOW THIS LINE

STANISLAUS  
 HPMAS Local Urban/Rural Percent  
 From 1998 Assembly of Statistical Reports - Cellines  
 93.7% Urban  
 36.5% EUGB  
 100.0% Total

Road Type Base EF (lb PM10 / VMT)

|           |             |
|-----------|-------------|
| Freeway   | 0.000523793 |
| Arterial  | 0.000825524 |
| Collector | 0.000825524 |
| Urban     | 0.003479828 |
| Rural     | 0.000902942 |

STANISLAUS

|                       | January | February | March | April | May  | June | July | August | September | October | November | December | Total Average |
|-----------------------|---------|----------|-------|-------|------|------|------|--------|-----------|---------|----------|----------|---------------|
| Rain Days             | 9.0     | 8.0      | 7.7   | 4.7   | 2.0  | 1.0  | 0    | 0      | 1.0       | 2.3     | 5.7      | 7.3      | 48.7          |
| Total Days            | 31      | 28       | 31    | 30    | 31   | 30   | 31   | 31     | 30        | 31      | 30       | 31       | 365           |
| Rain Reduction Factor | 0.83    | 0.93     | 0.84  | 0.96  | 0.98 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00   | 0.99      | 0.96    | 0.95     | 0.94     | 0.87          |

Unpaved Road Dust Emissions (tons/day)

STANISLAUS 2020

|             |       |                        |                 |                           |                                |                                     |                                      |                            |
|-------------|-------|------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| City/County | 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 |
|             | 47.02 | 10                     | 171.6           | 171.623                   | 148.585                        | 0.407                               | 0.333                                | 0.277                      |

STANISLAUS 2025

|             |       |                        |                 |                           |                                |                                     |                                      |                            |
|-------------|-------|------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| City/County | 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 |
|             | 47.02 | 10                     | 171.6           | 171.623                   | 148.585                        | 0.407                               | 0.333                                | 0.277                      |

STANISLAUS 2035

|             |       |                        |                 |                           |                                |                                     |                                      |                            |
|-------------|-------|------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| City/County | 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 |
|             | 47.02 | 10                     | 171.6           | 171.623                   | 148.585                        | 0.407                               | 0.333                                | 0.277                      |

DO NOT CHANGE ANY ITEMS BELOW THIS LINE

STANISLAUS

|         |          |       |       |      |      |      |        |           |         |          |          |               |
|---------|----------|-------|-------|------|------|------|--------|-----------|---------|----------|----------|---------------|
| January | February | March | April | May  | June | July | August | September | October | November | December | Total Average |
| 9.0     | 8.00     | 7.7   | 4.7   | 2.0  | 1.0  | 0    | 0      | 1.0       | 2.3     | 5.7      | 7.3      | 40.7          |
| 31      | 28.00    | 31    | 30    | 31   | 30   | 31   | 31     | 30        | 31      | 30       | 31       | 365           |
| 0.71    | 0.71     | 0.75  | 0.84  | 0.94 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00   | 0.97      | 0.92    | 0.81     | 0.76     | 0.87          |

Rain Days  
Total Days  
Rain Reduction Factor

### Road Construction Dust

#### STANISLAUS

| Description                           | 2020     |              | 2025 |              | 2035 |              |
|---------------------------------------|----------|--------------|------|--------------|------|--------------|
|                                       | Year     | Lane Miles   | Year | Lane Miles   | Year | Lane Miles   |
|                                       | Baseline | 2005         | 3513 | 2020         | 3719 | 2025         |
| Horizon                               | 2020     | 3,719        | 2025 | 3,791        | 2035 | 3,851        |
| Difference                            | 15       | 206          | 5    | 72           | 10   | 60           |
| Lane Miles per Year                   |          | 14           |      | 14           |      | 6            |
| Acres Disturbed                       |          | 53           |      | 56           |      | 23           |
| Acre-Months                           |          | 959          |      | 1005         |      | 419          |
| Emissions (tons/year)                 |          | 105.472      |      | 110.592      |      | 46.080       |
| Annual Average Day Emissions (tons)   |          | 0.289        |      | 0.303        |      | 0.126        |
| District Rule 8021 Control Rates      |          | 0.290        |      | 0.290        |      | 0.290        |
| <b>Total Emissions (tons per day)</b> |          | <b>0.205</b> |      | <b>0.215</b> |      | <b>0.090</b> |

**PM10 Emission Trading Worksheet**

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

|                        | 2020         |               | 2025         |              | 2035         |              |
|------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                        | PM10         | NOx           | PM10         | NOx          | PM10         | NOx          |
| Total On-Road Exhaust  | 0.870        | 10.540        | 0.840        | 7.830        | 0.890        | 6.430        |
| Paved Road Dust        | 5.583        |               | 5.917        |              | 6.622        |              |
| Unpaved Road Dust      | 0.272        |               | 0.272        |              | 0.272        |              |
| Road Construction Dust | 0.205        |               | 0.215        |              | 0.090        |              |
| <b>Total</b>           | <b>6.930</b> | <b>10.540</b> | <b>7.244</b> | <b>7.830</b> | <b>7.873</b> | <b>6.430</b> |

**Difference (2020 Budget - 2020)**

|                                  | PM10        | NOx        |
|----------------------------------|-------------|------------|
| 2020 Budgets                     | 6.7         | 10.8       |
| 2020                             | 6.9         | 10.5       |
| <b>Difference</b>                | <b>-0.2</b> | <b>0.3</b> |
| * 1.5 (Adjustment to NOx Budget) | 0.3         |            |

**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                     | 6.7         | 10.8       |
| 2025                             | 7.2         | 7.8        |
| <b>Difference</b>                | <b>-0.5</b> | <b>3.0</b> |
| * 1.5 (Adjustment to NOx Budget) | 0.8         |            |

**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                     | 6.7         | 10.8       |
| 2035                             | 7.9         | 6.4        |
| <b>Difference</b>                | <b>-1.2</b> | <b>4.4</b> |
| * 1.5 (Adjustment to NOx Budget) | 1.8         |            |

**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 | 6.7  | 10.8 |

|                       |            |            |
|-----------------------|------------|------------|
| Adjusted 2020 Budget  | 6.9        | 10.5       |
| 2020 Conformity Total | 6.9        | 10.5       |
| <b>Difference</b>     | <b>0.0</b> | <b>0.0</b> |

**NOTE: FINAL DIFFERENCE MUST BE POSITIVE**

|                       |            |            |
|-----------------------|------------|------------|
| Adjusted 2020 Budget  | 7.2        | 10.1       |
| 2025 Conformity Total | 7.2        | 7.8        |
| <b>Difference</b>     | <b>0.0</b> | <b>2.3</b> |

**NOTE: FINAL DIFFERENCE MUST BE POSITIVE**

|                       |            |            |
|-----------------------|------------|------------|
| Adjusted 2020 Budget  | 7.9        | 9.0        |
| 2035 Conformity Total | 7.9        | 6.4        |
| <b>Difference</b>     | <b>0.0</b> | <b>2.6</b> |

**NOTE: FINAL DIFFERENCE MUST BE POSITIVE**

**2011 Conformity Results Summary -- STANISLAUS**

| Pollutant       | Scenario    | Emissions Total |  | DID YOU PASS? |  |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|--|---------------|--|
|                 |             | CO (tons/day)   |  | CO            |  |
| Carbon Monoxide | 2010 Budget | 130             |  |               |  |
|                 | 2017        | 45              |  | YES           |  |
|                 | 2018 Budget | 130             |  |               |  |
|                 | 2018        | 43              |  | YES           |  |
|                 | 2025        | 30              |  | YES           |  |
|                 | 2035        | 25              |  | YES           |  |

|       |             | ROG (tons/day) |      | NOx (tons/day) |     | DID YOU PASS? |  |
|-------|-------------|----------------|------|----------------|-----|---------------|--|
|       |             | ROG            | NOx  | ROG            | NOx |               |  |
| Ozone | 2011 Budget | 9.0            | 22.3 |                |     |               |  |
|       | 2011        | 8.8            | 21.9 | YES            | YES |               |  |
|       | 2014 Budget | 7.5            | 17.2 |                |     |               |  |
|       | 2014        | 7.2            | 16.6 | YES            | YES |               |  |
|       | 2017 Budget | 6.5            | 13.4 |                |     |               |  |
|       | 2017        | 6.3            | 13.0 | YES            | YES |               |  |
|       | 2023        | 5.0            | 8.5  | YES            | YES |               |  |
|       | 2025        | 4.6            | 7.6  | YES            | YES |               |  |
|       | 2035        | 3.7            | 6.3  | YES            | YES |               |  |

|       |                      | PM-10 (tons/day) |      | NOx (tons/day) |     | DID YOU PASS? |  |
|-------|----------------------|------------------|------|----------------|-----|---------------|--|
|       |                      | PM-10            | NOx  | PM-10          | NOx |               |  |
| PM-10 | Adjusted 2020 Budget | 6.9              | 10.5 |                |     |               |  |
|       | 2020                 | 6.9              | 10.5 | YES            | YES |               |  |
|       | Adjusted 2020 Budget | 7.2              | 10.1 |                |     |               |  |
|       | 2025                 | 7.2              | 7.8  | YES            | YES |               |  |
|       | Adjusted 2020 Budget | 7.9              | 9.0  |                |     |               |  |
|       | 2035                 | 7.9              | 6.4  | YES            | YES |               |  |

| 1997 PM2.5 24 Hour & Annual Standards and 2006 24-Hour Standard |             | PM2.5 (tons/day) |      | NOx (tons/day) |     | DID YOU PASS? |  |
|---|-------------|------------------|------|----------------|-----|---------------|--|
|   |             | PM2.5            | NOx  | PM2.5          | NOx |               |  |
|   | 2012 Budget | 0.9              | 20.8 |                |     |               |  |
|   | 2012        | 0.8              | 20.0 | YES            | YES |               |  |
|   | 2014        | 0.7              | 16.8 | YES            | YES |               |  |
|   | 2017        | 0.6              | 13.1 | YES            | YES |               |  |
|   | 2025        | 0.6              | 7.6  | YES            | YES |               |  |
|   | 2035        | 0.6              | 6.2  | YES            | YES |               |  |

**APPENDIX D**

**TIMELY IMPLEMENTATION DOCUMENTATION FOR  
TRANSPORTATION CONTROL MEASURES**















Stanislaus Council of Governments  
Timely Implementation Documentation

| RACM Commitment                | Agency           | Commitment Description                                       | Commitment Schedule | Commitment Funding     | TIP       | TIP Project ID | Project Description                               | Implementation Status<br>(as of 10/08)  | 2011 Conformity Update<br>(as of 3/10) |
|--------------------------------|------------------|--|---------------------|------------------------|-----------|----------------|---|---|--|
| 315.2                          | Pittsburg        | Coordinate Traffic Signal Systems                            |                     | DMQ                    | 2004      | 1140000249     | West Avenue/Les Pines Ave Traffic Signal          | Complete  | Complete                               |
| 315.15                         | Merced           | Encourage the purchase and use of alternative motor vehicles |                     | DMQ                    | 2007      | 1140000076     | Purchase CNG Vehicle                              | Complete  | Complete                               |
| 317.1B                         | Merced           | Encourage the purchase and use of alternative motor vehicles | 2002/2009           | DMQ                    | 2002      | 115174300      | Purchase CNG Vehicle                              | Complete  | Complete                               |
|                                |                  |  | 2002                | PTA Section 5307 funds | N/A       | N/A            | Purchase CNG Vehicle                              | Complete  | Complete                               |
|                                |                  |  | 2002/2004           | DMQ                    | 2002      | 115174351      | Purchase CNG Vehicle                              | Complete  | Complete                               |
|                                |                  |  | 2004/2005           | PTA Section 5307 funds | N/A       | N/A            | Purchase CNG Vehicle                              | Complete  | Complete                               |
| <b>New Projects Identified</b> |                  |  |                     |                        |           |                |   |   |  |
| 319.3                          | Grass            | Reduce Traffic Congestion at Major Intersections             | 2007                | DMQ                    | 2004/2007 | 11410000221    | Traffic Signal Coordination                       | Complete  | Complete                               |
| 319.2                          | Merced/Pittsburg | Encouragement of Pedestrian Travel                           | 2007                | DMQ/Local              | 2007      | 1140000046     | Street and 8th Sts Lane and pedestrian facilities | PTA submitted to Caltrans - Project entered calendar 2008. Project 75% completed. Estimated completion date is March 2009 | Project Complete                       |
| 317.1B                         | Merced           | Encourage the purchase and use of alternative motor vehicles | 2006                | DMQ/Local              | 2004/07   | 11410000246    | Purchase CNG VAD Truck                            | Complete  | Complete                               |
| 311.1                          | Tulare           | Street Transit Alternatives                                  | 2008                | PTA Section 5307 funds | 2007      | 11400000271    | Purchase new bus                                  | Delivery ordered will October 2008. Will be out of service during 2009  | Project complete and in operation      |
| 310.2                          | Tulare           | Street Trucking Buses  | 2008                | PTA Section 5307 funds | 2007      | 11400000272    | Bus fleet   | Complete  | Complete                               |
| 317.15                         | Tulare           | Encourage the purchase and use of alternative motor vehicles | 2007                | DMQ/Local              | 2007      | 11400000247    | Purchase CNG Vehicle                              | Complete  | Complete                               |

Stanislaus Council of Governments  
2002 RACM Timely Implementation Documentation

| <b>RACM Commitment</b> | <b>Agency</b> | <b>Measure Title</b>                             | <b>Measure Description (not verbatim)</b>   | <b>Implementation Status (as of 10/08)</b>   | <b>2011 Conformity Update (as of 3/10)</b>  |
|------------------------|---------------|--|---|--|---|
| ST3.1                  | StanCOG       | Commuter Solutions                               | Provide regional rideshare services through FY2002/03   | Project and commitment Completed. See Project TID Table.   | Commitment Completed  |
| ST5.3                  | Ceres         | Reduce Traffic Congestion at Major Intersections | Evaluate 3 critical intersections per year to determine if delays exceed allowable limits (if... then)                | Evaluated 20 intersections between 2003 and 2005 to see if the intersections still meet city's General Plan Level of service requirements of D for the major roads. Subsequently, changed timing at 14 intersections, implemented split phase timing at 3 locations and removing 2 locations from the coordination program. Also see ST5.4. The City of Ceres has completed two additional signal coordination projects and has added signals at one intersection, previously controlled by stop signs, to relieve congestion. | On-going, evaluations continue, no new synchronization plans identified as needed as of this date                   |
| ST5.9                  | Ceres         | Bus Pullouts in Curbs for Passenger Loading      | Provide bus pull-outs in curbs or parking lanes beginning FY2002/2003 and continue through FY2010/2011                | Bus pull-outs have been constructed along the south side of Service Road at the Central Valley High School. Bus pullout installed on the north side of Hatch Road, east of Herndon Road April 2008. The City of Ceres continues to implement this program through its plan check and permitting process.   | Ceres has incorporated bus pullouts into their plan check and permitting process to ensure these projects continue. |
| ST11.1                 | Modesto       | Regional Express Bus Program                     | Purchase of buses to operate regional express bus service   | See Project TID Table. The latest bus ordered has been received (12/06) and placed into service. Five buses have been received since last update. Projected to receive seven more buses by 2nd quarter 2009.   | Modesto has 7 new busses that were delivered in December 2009.  |
| ST1.5                  | Modesto       | Expansion of Public Transportation Systems       | Monitor needs on heavily used routes and newly develop areas and implement as appropriate                             | Based on current service levels and ridership monitoring, no service expansions expected in 2007. Route expansions are expected to occur within the next 3-5 years. No service expansions necessary (implemented) since last update.   | No service expansions/implementations necessary since last update   |
| ST5.2                  | Modesto       | Coordinate Traffic Signal Systems                | Implement and enhance synchronized traffic signal systems   | See Project TID Table. Modesto continues to implement the signal coordination program. Data collection complete. Consultant is converting new plans from Syncure to BITran Systems Quick Net to solve compatibility issues. Once conversion is complete, consultant will implement signal coordination program.  | Signal coordination program has been completed. Final report is being completed.                                    |
| ST5.3                  | Modesto       | Reduce Traffic Congestion at Major Intersections | Implement a wide range of traffic control techniques designed to facilitate smooth, safe travel through intersections | See Project TID Table. Modesto continues to review and improve traffic flow at congested intersections through the use of design modifications, addition of turn lanes, signalization and roundabout installation to replace stop sign controlled intersections. Traffic signal installed on Sisk Road at Vintage Faire Mall. A second traffic signal on Sisk Road has been approved with estimated installation date of spring 2009.  | Projects are complete and operational   |
| ST5.4                  | Modesto       | Site-Specific Transportation Control Measures    | Geometric or traffic control improvements at specific congested intersections or at other substandard locations       | Congested street segments have been improved. See Project TID Table. Installation of traffic signal approved for intersection of Tully Road and Stoddard Avenue adjacent to Modesto Junior College to improve traffic flow and student safety. Modesto continues to review and improve traffic flow at congested intersections through the use of design modifications, addition of turn lanes, signalization and roundabout installation to replace stop sign controlled intersections.                                       | Project is complete and operational   |

Stanislaus Council of Governments  
2002 RACM Timely Implementation Documentation

| <u>RACM Commitment</u> | <u>Agency</u> | <u>Measure Title</u>                                    | <u>Measure Description (not verbatim)</u>  | <u>Implementation Status (as of 10/08)</u>   | <u>2011 Conformity Update (as of 3/10)</u>  |
|------------------------|---------------|---|--|--|---|
| ST5.13                 | Modesto       | Fewer stop signs  | Remove stop signs and implement alternative intersection control devices   | See Project TID Table. Installation of traffic signals approved for intersections of Sylvan Avenue and Claus Road, and Floyd Avenue and Lincoln Oak Drive. Completion date estimated to be spring 2009. Modesto continues to review and improve traffic flow at congested intersections through the use of design modifications, addition of turn lanes, signalization and roundabout installation to replace stop sign controlled intersections.  | Projects are complete and operational   |
| ST9.5                  | Modesto       | Encouragement of Bicycle Travel                         | Bike to work day and family cycling festival   | Modesto participated in 2008 Bike to Work Day and the Family Cycling Festival  | Modesto has and will continue to participate in the "Bike to Work" events and Family Cycling Festivals.                                 |
| ST10.2                 | Modesto       | Bike Racks on Buses                                     | Add bicycle racks to new buses   | All new urban buses have Bike Racks on them. Two new buses are on order and they will have bike racks on them. Racks will be installed as new buses are purchased.   | Racks will be installed as new buses are purchased.   |
| ST15.2                 | Modesto       | Pedestrian and Bicycle Overpasses Where Safety Dictates | Implementation as development occurs   | See Project TID Table. The Sylvan/Millbrock pedestrian/bicycle overcrossing was completed in 2008. Further overcrossings will be added as development occurs.  | Further overcrossings will be added as development occurs.  |
| ST10.2                 | Oakdale       | Bike Racks on Buses                                     | The Riverbank-Oakdale Transit Authority currently is adding bicycle racks to buses and hopes to continue doing so as long funding remains available. | See Project TID Table. All currently serviceable buses have bike racks on them and all the new buses will be purchased with the bike racks. No expansion of the bus fleet is anticipated at this time. Program will continue as needed   | Racks will be installed as new buses are purchased.   |
| ST1.5                  | Patterson     | Expansion of Public Transportation Systems              | The City of Patterson continually monitors their Dial-A-Ride service to determine the transit needs within the city.                                 | City of Patterson have an MOU with the Stanislaus County to operate Patterson Dial-a-Ride. Stanislaus County monitor the need for additional public transportation through the number of ride denials and the number of calls being received from Patterson residents. City of Patterson plan to expand public transportation as a need is shown and ridership would be adequate to meet the requirements of the Transportation Development Act farebox requirements. The City of Patterson is currently planning a new transit hub for all major transit vehicles in the Patterson area. The location has been selected and the hub should be operational by the end of 2009. | Construction is underway and expected to be completed by July 2010.   |
| ST5.2                  | Patterson     | Coordinate Traffic Signal Systems                       | City of Patterson will evaluate signals as they are installed to measure their performance with the adjacent signals.                                | See Project TID Table. Ward Avenue/Las Palmas Avenue traffic signal coordination completed. The City of Patterson will continue to coordinate traffic signal throughout the city.  | Patterson will continue to evaluate and coordinate traffic signals throughout the City.   |
| ST5.13                 | Patterson     | Fewer stop signs  | This is on going process and city of Patterson is constantly evaluating the intersections for potential implementation of roundabouts                | City has continued to monitor need for additional traffic signals  | Patterson continues to evaluate the need for traffic signals and/or roundabouts. No new improvements have been identified at this time. |

Stanislaus Council of Governments  
2002 RACM Timely Implementation Documentation

| <u>RACM Commitment</u> | <u>Agency</u> | <u>Measure Title</u>  | <u>Measure Description (not verbatim)</u>  | <u>Implementation Status (as of 10/08)</u>  | <u>2011 Conformity Update (as of 3/10)</u>  |
|------------------------|---------------|---|--|---|---|
| ST9.2                  | Patterson     | Encouragement of Pedestrian Travel                              | City of Patterson will continue to encourage the pedestrian travel   | The Miscellaneous Sidewalk Repairs Project has been completed. The City anticipates further curb & gutter improvements to occur during the new FY 07/08. Traffic safety improvements and rumble dots have been installed in the Walnut Square subdivision. New improvements have been incorporated under the Traffic safety improvements program and will move further as soon as Caltrans issues the "Notice to Proceed". Patterson has one bicycle/pedestrian project currently under construction (see Project TID Table). Construction started for the Las Palmas pedestrian/bikeway; completion expected in 2009. City will continue to monitor development for further pedestrian/bikeway projects. | Las Palmas pedestrian/bikeway was completed.  |
| ST5.1                  | Riverbank     | Develop Intelligent Transportation Systems                      | City of Riverbank currently operates two message signs to divert traffic and will continue to use as needed.   | The City of Riverbank continues to operate two changeable message signs to divert traffic for major events and traffic operations.  | The City of Riverbank continues to operate two changeable message signs to divert traffic for major events and traffic operations.  |
| ST5.9                  | Riverbank     | Bus Pullouts in Curbs for Passenger Loading                     | City of riverbank will implement this measure as needed as development occurs and transit expands  | The bus pullouts has installed on the Oakdale Road. In addition, the transit system uses the crossroads commercial development parking lot as a bus pullout for the commercial center. No additional implementation is warranted at this time.  | New bus pullouts installed as warranted.  |
| ST10.2                 | Riverbank     | Bike Racks on Buses   | The Riverbank-Oakdale Transit Authority currently is adding bicycle racks to buses and hopes to continue doing so as long funding remains available. | All of the buses have bike racks on them. Bike racks will be ordered for all the new buses. See Project TID Table.  | Bike racks will be ordered for all the new buses.   |
| ST17.15                | Riverbank     | Encourage the purchase and use of alternative, cleaner vehicles | The city of riverbank will continue to purchase cleaner vehicles as funding remains available.   | See Project TID Table. The city of Riverbank will continue to purchase cleaner vehicles as funding remains available.   | The city of Riverbank will continue to purchase cleaner vehicles as funding remains available.  |
| ST1.4                  | Turlock       | Mass Transit Alternatives                                       | Implement a fixed route bus service, Establish routes and procure a CNG minibus.   | The City of Turlock has expanded its fixed routes from two routes to four fixed routes and has increased the number of completed runs per route per day from 12 to 17. The City of Turlock has also increased its fixed route bus fleet from 12 passenger buses to 30 passenger buses. The City of Turlock has completed the purchase of the Minibus and continues to monitor the need for expanded fixed and demand route transit service through the Transit Needs Assessment Process. See Project TID Table. The City of Turlock has decreased headway times from 45 to 35 minutes, thereby increasing efficiency.   | The City of Turlock continues to utilize 4 fixed routes and has increased runs per day to 18. The City of Turlock continues to monitor the need for expanded services. No new route at this time. |

Stanislaus Council of Governments  
2002 RACM Timely Implementation Documentation

| <b>RACM Commitment</b> | <b>Agency</b>     | <b>Measure Title</b>  | <b>Measure Description (not verbatim)</b>  | <b>Implementation Status (as of 10/08)</b>  | <b>2011 Conformity Update (as of 3/10)</b>   |
|------------------------|-------------------|---|--|---|--|
| ST10.2                 | Turlock           | Bike Racks on Buses   | Bike Racks on Buses  | All currently serviceable buses have bike racks on them and all the new buses will be purchased with the bike racks. See Project TID Table.   | Bike racks will be ordered for all the new buses.  |
| ST11.15                | Turlock           | Encourage the purchase and use of alternative, cleaner vehicles | Purchase of Compressed Natural Gas Vehicles (CNG)  | The City has purchased a number of different types of CNG vehicles. The City of Turlock continues to replace gas burning vehicles with CNG Vehicles. See Project TID Table.   | The City of Turlock continues to replace gas burning vehicles with CNG vehicles. Turlock recently purchased 2 additional coaches - expected delivery in July 2010.   |
| ST1.5                  | Stanislaus County | Expansion of Public Transportation Systems                      | Expand and enhance existing public transit services. Monitor needs for increased frequencies on heavily used routes; implement as appropriate; implement service as appropriate for newly developed areas. | In August 2007, on a demonstration basis, the County plans to start a hybrid non-emergency medical, student and commuter service to Modesto to Merced and to medical facilities in Madera and Fresno. No service expansions are planned for 2008. Will continue to monitor needs for increased services.  | Services have been expanded to provide morning and afternoon service to the City of Merced.  |
| ST1.7                  | Stanislaus County | Free transit during special events                              |  | The County continues to offer free transit coupons for "Try Transit Week" in October.   | The County has expanded the free transit program to include work commutes for City of Modesto and certain Stanislaus County employees.   |
| ST5.9                  | Stanislaus County | Bus Pullouts in Curbs for Passenger Loading                     | Provide Bus Pullouts in curbs, or queue jumper lanes for passenger loading in future developments.   | As per the Stanislaus County General Plan, the County will continue to require bus pullouts, shelter, and/or park-and-ride lots on all new developments where appropriate. County Public Works will continue to monitor all new developments to ensure compliance. County has not identified a need at this time.                                 | As per the Stanislaus County General Plan, the County will continue to require bus pullouts, shelter, and/or park-and-ride lots on all new developments where appropriate. County Public Works will continue to monitor all new developments to ensure compliance. County has not identified any additional needs at this time.                    |
| ST5.16                 | Stanislaus County | Adaptive traffic signals and signal timing                      | Future traffic signal projects will be evaluated to determine if adaptive traffic signals and signal timing can be implemented in a safe and cost-effective manner.  | Signals Constructed since 2002, as well as all our signals, are as adaptive as technology allows. All of the signals are actuated, the timing is traffic driven during the non-peak hours. During the peak hour the signal in most likely to operate using the maximum time allotted per phase, which has been determined from the traffic study. | Signals constructed since 2002, as well as all our signals, are as adaptive as technology allows. All of the signals are actuated, the timing is traffic driven during the non-peak hours. During the peak hours, the signal is most likely to operate using the maximum time allotted per phase which has been determined from the traffic study. |
| ST10.2                 | Stanislaus County | Bike Racks on Buses   | Bicycle racks would be placed on a to-be-determined number of buses to increase bicycle travel.  | All County fixed route transit buses have bike racks. Bike racks will be installed on all new bus purchases.  | Bike racks have been expanded from 2 to 3 racks per bus.   |

**APPENDIX E**

**PUBLIC MEETING PROCESS DOCUMENTATION**

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

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that STANISLAUS COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (STANCOG) will hold a public hearing on MAY 19, 2010 at STANCOG BOARD ROOM, 1111 I STREET SUITE 308, MODESTO CA., 95354, regarding the Draft 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (2011 FTIP), the Draft 2011 Regional Transportation Plan (2011 RTP), the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and corresponding Draft Air Quality Conformity Analysis for the 2011 FTIP and 2011 RTP. The purpose of this combined public hearing is to receive public comments on these documents.

- The 2011 FTIP is a near-term listing of capital improvement and operational expenditures utilizing federal and state monies for transportation projects in STANISLAUS COUNTY during the next four years.
- The 2011 RTP is a long-term strategy to meet STANISLAUS COUNTY transportation needs out to the year 2035.
- The Program EIR provides an analysis of potential environmental impacts related to the implementation of the RTP as required by the California Environmental Quality Act.
- The Conformity Analysis contains the documentation to support a finding that the 2011 FTIP and 2011 RTP meet the air quality conformity requirements for carbon monoxide, ozone and particulate matter.

Individuals with disabilities may call the STANCOG Main Office Telephone Number at (209)-525-4600,(with 3-working-day advance notice) to request auxiliary aids necessary to participate in the public hearing. Translation services are available (with 3-working-day advance notice) to participants speaking any language with available professional translation services.

A concurrent 45-day public review and comment period will commence on April 30, 2010 and conclude on June 14, 2010. The draft documents are available for review at the STANCOG office, located at 1111 I STREET, SUITE 308, MODESTO, CA 95354 and on the STANCOG website at [WWW.STANCOG.ORG](http://WWW.STANCOG.ORG).

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

After considering the comments, the documents will be considered for adoption, by resolution, by the STANCOG POLICY BOARD at a regularly scheduled meeting to be held on JULY 21, 2010 AT 6:00 P.M.. The documents will then be submitted to state and federal agencies for approval.

Contact Person: Carlos P. Yamzon, Senior Regional Planner  
Address: Stanislaus Council of Governments  
1111 I Street, Suite 308  
Modesto, CA 95354

Telephone Number: 209-525-4600

Email: [cyamzon@stancog.org](mailto:cyamzon@stancog.org)E-mail



WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted on May 19, 2010 to hear and consider comments on the 2011 RTP, 2011 FTIP, and Corresponding Conformity Analysis; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that Stanislaus Council of Governments adopts the 2011 RTP, 2011 FTIP, and Corresponding Conformity Analysis.

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

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION was passed and adopted by the Stanislaus Council of Governments this 21st day of July 2010.

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

ATTEST:

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution of the Stanislaus Council of Governments duly adopted at a regular meeting thereof held on the 21st day of July 2010.

Signed:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Executive Director

## **APPENDIX F**

### **RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS**

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

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

**ATTACHMENT #3**  
**REVISED FINANCIAL PLAN**

TABLE 1: REVENUE

**State of California**  
**2010/11-2013/14 Federal Transportation Improvement Program**  
**Amendment #3**  
**(\$'s in \$1,000)**

| FUNDING SOURCE  |  | 2010/11          |                 | 2011/12         |                 | 2012/13         |                 | 2013/14         |                  | CURRENT TOTAL |
|---|--|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|
|   |  | Previous         | Current         | Previous        | Current         | Previous        | Current         | Previous        | Current          |               |
| LOCAL   | Sales Tax  | \$768            | \$768           | \$488           | \$488           | \$51,601        | \$51,601        | \$528           | \$528            | \$53,385      |
|   | -- City  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0           |
|   | -- County  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0           |
|   | -- Other (e.g. Transportation Development Act)                               | \$768            | \$768           | \$488           | \$488           | \$51,601        | \$51,601        | \$528           | \$528            | \$53,385      |
|   | Gas Tax  | \$6,291          | \$6,291         | \$6,316         | \$6,316         | \$11,047        | \$11,047        | \$9,792         | \$9,792          | \$33,446      |
|   | -- Gas Tax (Subventions to Cities)   | \$5,962          | \$5,962         | \$6,316         | \$6,316         | \$11,047        | \$11,047        | \$8,790         | \$8,790          | \$32,115      |
|   | -- Gas Tax (Subventions to Counties)   | \$329            | \$329           | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$1,002         | \$1,002          | \$1,331       |
|   | Other Local Funds  | \$6,030          | \$6,030         | \$4,120         | \$4,120         | \$60            | \$60            | \$156           | \$156            | \$10,366      |
|   | -- City General Funds  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0           |
|   | -- Street Taxes and Developer Fees   | \$5,970          | \$5,970         | \$4,060         | \$4,060         | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$10,030      |
|   | -- Other (e.g. registration fees (AB434), Prop 42)                           | \$60             | \$60            | \$60            | \$60            | \$60            | \$60            | \$156           | \$156            | \$336         |
|   | Transit  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0           |
|   | -- Transit Fares   | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0           |
|   | -- Other Transit (e.g., parcel/property taxes, parking revenue, etc)         | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0           |
| Tolls (e.g. non-state owned bridges)  | \$0  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |               |
| Other (Please specify - Add additional lines if needed)                     | \$0  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |               |
| <b>Local Total</b>  | <b>\$13,089</b>  | <b>\$13,089</b>  | <b>\$10,924</b> | <b>\$10,924</b> | <b>\$62,708</b> | <b>\$62,708</b> | <b>\$10,476</b> | <b>\$10,476</b> | <b>\$97,197</b>  |               |
| REGIONAL  | Tolls  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0           |
|   | -- Bridge  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0           |
|   | -- Corridor  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0           |
|   | Regional Transit Fares/Measures  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0           |
|   | Regional Sales Tax   | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0           |
|   | Regional Bond Revenue  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0           |
|   | Regional Gas Tax   | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0           |
|   | Vehicle Registration Fees (CARB Fees, SAFE)                                  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0           |
|   | Other (Please specify - Add additional lines if needed)                      | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0           |
|   | <b>Regional Total</b>  | <b>\$0</b>       | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>       | <b>\$0</b>    |
| STATE   | State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP-Grand Total)          | \$107,888        | \$107,888       | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$107,888     |
|   | SHOPP (Including Augmentation)   | \$107,888        | \$107,888       | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$107,888     |
|   | SHOPP Prior*   | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0           |
|   | SHOPP Minor  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0           |
|   | State Transportation Improvement Program (Grand Total: STIP, STIP Prior, TE) | \$1,092          | \$9,539         | \$2,146         | \$2,146         | \$2,348         | \$2,348         | \$5,261         | \$5,261          | \$19,294      |
|   | STIP (Including Augmentation)  | \$606            | \$9,053         | \$606           | \$606           | \$764           | \$764           | \$3,250         | \$3,250          | \$13,673      |
|   | Transportation Enhancement   | \$486            | \$486           | \$1,540         | \$1,540         | \$1,584         | \$1,584         | \$2,011         | \$2,011          | \$5,621       |
|   | STIP Prior*  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0           |
|   | Transportation Enhancement   | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0           |
|   | CMIA or Proposition 1 B <sup>4</sup>   | \$0              | \$18,813        | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$18,813      |
|   | GARVEE Bonds (Includes Debt Service Payments)                                | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0           |
|   | Highway Maintenance (HM)   | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0           |
|   | Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP)                                     | \$1,530          | \$1,530         | \$0             | \$0             | \$8,390         | \$8,390         | \$0             | \$0              | \$9,920       |
| State Transit Assistance (STA)<br>(e.g., population/revenue based, Prop 42) | \$0  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |               |
| Other (Please specify - Bridge Seismic Retrofit Bond)                       | \$0  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$1,591         | \$1,591         | \$2,777         | \$2,777         | \$4,368          |               |
| <b>State Total</b>  | <b>\$110,510</b>   | <b>\$137,770</b> | <b>\$2,146</b>  | <b>\$2,146</b>  | <b>\$12,329</b> | <b>\$12,329</b> | <b>\$8,038</b>  | <b>\$8,038</b>  | <b>\$160,283</b> |               |

TABLE 1: REVENUE

**State of California**  
**2010/11-2013/14 Federal Transportation Improvement Program**  
**Amendment #3**  
**(\$'s in \$1,000)**

| FUNDING SOURCE  |  | 2010/11          |                 | 2011/12         |                  | 2012/13          |                 | 2013/14         |                  | CURRENT TOTAL   |
|---|--|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|
|   |  | Previous         | Current         | Previous        | Current          | Previous         | Current         | Previous        | Current          |                 |
| FEDERAL TRANSIT   | Bus and Bus Related Grants (5309c)                                 | \$2,500          | \$2,500         | \$2,500         | \$2,500          | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$5,000         |
|   | Clean Fuel Formula Program (5308)                                  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | Elderly & Persons with Disabilities Formula Program (5310)         | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | Fixed Guideway Modernization (5309a)                               | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | Intercity Bus (5311f)  | \$100            | \$100           | \$100           | \$100            | \$100            | \$100           | \$100           | \$100            | \$400           |
|   | Job Access and Reverse Commute Program (5316)                      | \$265            | \$265           | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$265           |
|   | Metropolitan Planning (5303)                                       | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | New and Small Starts (Capital Investment Grants) (5309b)           | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | New Freedom (5317)   | \$128            | \$128           | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$128           |
|   | Nonurbanized Area Formula Program (5311)                           | \$399            | \$399           | \$420           | \$420            | \$442            | \$442           | \$465           | \$465            | \$1,726         |
|   | Public Transportation on Indian Reservation (5311c)                | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | Transit in the Parks (5320)  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | Urbanized Area Formula Program (5307)                              | \$8,893          | \$8,893         | \$9,383         | \$9,383          | \$10,106         | \$10,106        | \$10,453        | \$10,453         | \$38,835        |
|   | Other (PTM/SEA Transit)  | \$324            | \$324           | \$879           | \$879            | \$500            | \$500           | \$500           | \$500            | \$2,203         |
| <b>Federal Transit Total</b>                                      | <b>\$12,609</b>  | <b>\$12,609</b>  | <b>\$13,282</b> | <b>\$13,282</b> | <b>\$11,148</b>  | <b>\$11,148</b>  | <b>\$11,518</b> | <b>\$11,518</b> | <b>\$48,557</b>  |                 |
| FEDERAL HIGHWAY   | <b>Federal Highway Non-Discretionary</b>                           |                  |                 |                 |                  |                  |                 |                 |                  |                 |
|   | Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)                       | \$6,575          | \$6,575         | \$6,459         | \$6,459          | \$6,693          | \$6,693         | \$6,814         | \$6,814          | \$26,541        |
|   | Surface Transportation Program (Regional)                          | \$5,199          | \$5,199         | \$5,293         | \$5,293          | \$5,388          | \$5,388         | \$5,485         | \$5,485          | \$21,365        |
|   | High Risk Rural Road (HRRR)  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$14            | \$14             | \$14            |
|   | Highway Bridge Program (HBP)                                       | \$2,764          | \$2,764         | \$89            | \$89             | \$13,401         | \$13,401        | \$22,966        | \$22,966         | \$39,220        |
|   | Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)                          | \$512            | \$512           | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$512           |
|   | Railway (Section 130)  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | Safe Routes to School (SRTS) (SAFETEA-LU)                          | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | Safe Routes to School (SR2S)                                       | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | Transportation Improvements (TI)                                   | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | Federal Lands Highway  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | Other (Please specify - Add additional lines if needed)            | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | <b>Subtotal</b>  | <b>\$15,050</b>  | <b>\$15,050</b> | <b>\$11,841</b> | <b>\$11,841</b>  | <b>\$25,482</b>  | <b>\$25,482</b> | <b>\$35,279</b> | <b>\$35,279</b>  | <b>\$87,652</b> |
|   | <b>Federal Highway Discretionary Programs</b>                      |                  |                 |                 |                  |                  |                 |                 |                  |                 |
|   | Bridge Discretionary Program                                       | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | Corridor Infrastructure Improvement Program (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1302) | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | Coordinated Border Infrastructure (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1303)           | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | Ferry Boat Discretionary   | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | High Priority Projects (HPP) and Demo                              | \$9,050          | \$13,530        | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$13,530        |
|   | National Scenic Byways Program                                     | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
| Projects of National/Regional Significance (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1301) | \$0  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
| Public Lands Highway  | \$0  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
| Recreational Trails   | \$0  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
| Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program      | \$0  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
| Other (Please specify - Add additional lines if needed)           | \$0  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
| <b>Subtotal</b>   | <b>\$9,050</b>   | <b>\$13,530</b>  | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>       | <b>\$0</b>       | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$13,530</b>  |                 |
| <b>Federal Highway Total</b>                                      | <b>\$24,100</b>  | <b>\$28,580</b>  | <b>\$11,841</b> | <b>\$11,841</b> | <b>\$25,482</b>  | <b>\$25,482</b>  | <b>\$35,279</b> | <b>\$35,279</b> | <b>\$101,182</b> |                 |
| <b>FEDERAL TOTAL<sup>2</sup></b>                                  | <b>\$36,709</b>  | <b>\$41,189</b>  | <b>\$25,123</b> | <b>\$25,123</b> | <b>\$36,630</b>  | <b>\$36,630</b>  | <b>\$46,797</b> | <b>\$46,797</b> | <b>\$149,739</b> |                 |
| INNOVATIVE FINANCE <sup>3</sup>                                   | TIFIA (Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act)   | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | State Infrastructure Bank  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | Section 129 Loans  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | Rail Rehab & Improvement Financing                                 | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | Private Activity Bonds   | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | Private Concession Fees  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | Private Donations  | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | Program Income (from a federal project)                            | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
|   | Other (Please specify - Add additional lines if needed)            | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0             |
| <b>Innovative Financing Total</b>                                 | <b>\$0</b>   | <b>\$0</b>       | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>       | <b>\$0</b>       | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>       |                 |
| <b>REVENUE TOTAL</b>  | <b>\$160,308</b>   | <b>\$192,048</b> | <b>\$38,193</b> | <b>\$38,193</b> | <b>\$111,667</b> | <b>\$111,667</b> | <b>\$65,311</b> | <b>\$65,311</b> | <b>\$407,219</b> |                 |

NOTES:

- <sup>1</sup>Regional: Some MPOs may not have regional fund sources. In these cases, data is shown as "zero" or not applicable
- <sup>2</sup>Federal Total: Is the sum of federal highway and federal transit programs
- <sup>3</sup>Innovative Finance: Toll revenues are included under local and regional while GARVEE bond revenues are included under state
- <sup>4</sup>Proposition 1B: Subtotal is a sum of funding for various programs funded under proposition 1B except for STIP Augmentation and SHOPP Augmentation
- \*Note: STIP/SHOPP funding coming from prior STIP/SHOPP programs

TABLE 2: PROGRAMMED

**State of California**  
**2010/11-2013/14 Federal Transportation Improvement Program**  
**Amendment #3**  
**(\$'s in \$1,000)**

| FUNDING SOURCE  |  | 2010/11   |           | 2011/12  |          | 2012/13  |          | 2013/14  |           | CURRENT TOTAL |
|---|--|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|---------------|
|   |  | Previous  | Current   | Previous | Current  | Previous | Current  | Previous | Current   |               |
| LOCAL   | Local Total  | \$13,089  | \$13,089  | \$10,924 | \$10,924 | \$62,708 | \$62,708 | \$10,476 | \$10,476  | \$97,197      |
|   |  |           |           |          |          |          |          |          |           |               |
| REGIONAL <sup>1</sup>                                 | Tolls  | \$0       | \$0       | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0       | \$0           |
|   | -- Bridge  | \$0       | \$0       | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0       | \$0           |
|   | -- Corridor  | \$0       | \$0       | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0       | \$0           |
|   | Regional Transit Fares/Measures  | \$0       | \$0       | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0       | \$0           |
|   | Regional Sales Tax   | \$0       | \$0       | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0       | \$0           |
|   | Regional Bond Revenue  | \$0       | \$0       | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0       | \$0           |
|   | Regional Gas Tax   | \$0       | \$0       | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0       | \$0           |
|   | Vehicle Registration Fees (CARB Fees, SAFE)                                  | \$0       | \$0       | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0       | \$0           |
|   | Other (Please specify - Add additional lines if needed)                      | \$0       | \$0       | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0       | \$0           |
|   | Regional Total   | \$0       | \$0       | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0       | \$0           |
| STATE   | State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP-Grand Total)          | \$107,888 | \$107,888 | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0       | \$107,888     |
|   | SHOPP (Including Augmentation)   | \$107,888 | \$107,888 | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0       | \$107,888     |
|   | SHOPP Prior*   | \$0       | \$0       | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0       | \$0           |
|   | SHOPP Minor  | \$0       | \$0       | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0       | \$0           |
|   | State Transportation Improvement Program (Grand Total: STIP, STIP Prior, TE) | \$1,092   | \$9,539   | \$2,146  | \$2,146  | \$2,348  | \$2,348  | \$5,261  | \$5,261   | \$19,294      |
|   | STIP (Including Augmentation)  | \$606     | \$9,053   | \$606    | \$606    | \$764    | \$764    | \$3,250  | \$3,250   | \$13,673      |
|   | Transportation Enhancement   | \$486     | \$486     | \$1,540  | \$1,540  | \$1,584  | \$1,584  | \$2,011  | \$2,011   | \$5,621       |
|   | STIP Prior*  | \$0       | \$0       | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0       | \$0           |
|   | Transportation Enhancement   | \$0       | \$0       | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0       | \$0           |
|   | CMIA or Proposition 1 B <sup>1</sup>   | \$0       | \$18,813  | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0       | \$18,813      |
|   | GARVEE Bonds (Includes Debt Service Payments)                                | \$0       | \$0       | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0       | \$0           |
|   | Highway Maintenance (HM)   | \$0       | \$0       | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0       | \$0           |
|   | Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP)                                     | \$1,530   | \$1,530   | \$0      | \$0      | \$8,390  | \$8,390  | \$0      | \$0       | \$9,920       |
|   | State Transit Assistance (STA)<br>(e.g., population/revenue based, Prop 42)  | \$0       | \$0       | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0      | \$0       | \$0           |
| Other (Please specify - Bridge Seismic Retrofit Bond) | \$0  | \$0       | \$0       | \$0      | \$1,591  | \$1,591  | \$2,777  | \$2,777  | \$4,368   |               |
| State Total   | \$110,510  | \$137,770 | \$2,146   | \$2,146  | \$12,329 | \$12,329 | \$8,038  | \$8,038  | \$160,283 |               |

TABLE 2: PROGRAMMED

**State of California**  
**2010/11-2013/14 Federal Transportation Improvement Program**  
**Amendment #3**  
**(\$'s in \$1,000)**

| FUNDING SOURCE  |  | 2010/11          |                  | 2011/12         |                 | 2012/13          |                  | 2013/14         |                 | CURRENT TOTAL    |                 |
|---|--|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|
|   |  | Previous         | Current          | Previous        | Current         | Previous         | Current          | Previous        | Current         |                  |                 |
| FEDERAL TRANSIT   | Bus and Bus Related Grants (5309c)                                 | \$2,500          | \$2,500          | \$2,500         | \$2,500         | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$5,000          |                 |
|   | Clean Fuel Formula Program (5308)                                  | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | Elderly & Persons with Disabilities Formula Program (5310)         | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | Fixed Guideway Modernization (5309a)                               | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | Intercity Bus (5311f)  | \$100            | \$100            | \$100           | \$100           | \$100            | \$100            | \$100           | \$100           | \$400            |                 |
|   | Job Access and Reverse Commute Program (5316)                      | \$265            | \$265            | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$265            |                 |
|   | Metropolitan Planning (5303)                                       | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | New and Small Starts (Capital Investment Grants) (5309b)           | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | New Freedom (5317)   | \$128            | \$128            | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$128            |                 |
|   | Nonurbanized Area Formula Program (5311)                           | \$399            | \$399            | \$420           | \$420           | \$442            | \$442            | \$465           | \$465           | \$1,726          |                 |
|   | Public Transportation on Indian Reservation (5311c)                | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | Transit in the Parks (5320)  | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | Urbanized Area Formula Program (5307)                              | \$8,893          | \$8,893          | \$9,383         | \$9,383         | \$10,106         | \$10,106         | \$10,453        | \$10,453        | \$38,835         |                 |
|   | Other (PTMISEA Transit)  | \$324            | \$324            | \$879           | \$879           | \$500            | \$500            | \$500           | \$500           | \$2,203          |                 |
| <b>Federal Transit Total</b>                                      |  | <b>\$12,609</b>  | <b>\$12,609</b>  | <b>\$13,282</b> | <b>\$13,282</b> | <b>\$11,148</b>  | <b>\$11,148</b>  | <b>\$11,518</b> | <b>\$11,518</b> | <b>\$48,557</b>  |                 |
| FEDERAL HIGHWAY   | <b>Federal Highway Non-Discretionary</b>                           |                  |                  |                 |                 |                  |                  |                 |                 |                  |                 |
|   | Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)                       | \$2,921          | \$2,921          | \$4,530         | \$4,530         | \$6,411          | \$6,411          | \$6,382         | \$6,382         | \$20,244         |                 |
|   | Surface Transportation Program (Regional)                          | \$5,199          | \$5,199          | \$5,293         | \$5,293         | \$5,388          | \$5,388          | \$5,485         | \$5,485         | \$21,365         |                 |
|   | High Risk Rural Road (HRRR)  | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$14            | \$14            | \$14             |                 |
|   | Highway Bridge Program (HBP)                                       | \$2,764          | \$2,764          | \$89            | \$89            | \$13,401         | \$13,401         | \$22,966        | \$22,966        | \$39,220         |                 |
|   | Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)                          | \$512            | \$512            | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$512            |                 |
|   | Railway (Section 130)  | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | Safe Routes to School (SRTS) (SAFETEA-LU)                          | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | Safe Routes to School (SR2S)                                       | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | Transportation Improvements (TI)                                   | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | Federal Lands Highway  | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | Other (Please specify - Add additional lines if needed)            | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | <b>Subtotal</b>  |                  | <b>\$11,396</b>  | <b>\$11,396</b> | <b>\$9,912</b>  | <b>\$9,912</b>   | <b>\$25,200</b>  | <b>\$25,200</b> | <b>\$34,847</b> | <b>\$34,847</b>  | <b>\$81,355</b> |
|   | <b>Federal Highway Discretionary Programs</b>                      |                  |                  |                 |                 |                  |                  |                 |                 |                  |                 |
|   | Bridge Discretionary Program                                       | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | Corridor Infrastructure Improvement Program (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1302) | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | Coordinated Border Infrastructure (SAFETEA-LU Sec.1303)            | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | Ferry Boat Discretionary   | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | High Priority Projects (HPP) and Demo                              | \$9,050          | \$13,530         | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$13,530         |                 |
|   | National Scenic Byways Program                                     | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
| Projects of National/Regional Significance (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1301) | \$0  | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             |                  |                 |
| Public Lands Highway  | \$0  | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             |                  |                 |
| Recreational Trails   | \$0  | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             |                  |                 |
| Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program      | \$0  | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             |                  |                 |
| Other (Please specify - Add additional lines if needed)           | \$0  | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             |                  |                 |
| <b>Subtotal</b>   |  | <b>\$9,050</b>   | <b>\$13,530</b>  | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>       | <b>\$0</b>       | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$13,530</b>  |                 |
| <b>Federal Highway Total</b>                                      |  | <b>\$20,446</b>  | <b>\$24,926</b>  | <b>\$9,912</b>  | <b>\$9,912</b>  | <b>\$25,200</b>  | <b>\$25,200</b>  | <b>\$34,847</b> | <b>\$34,847</b> | <b>\$94,885</b>  |                 |
| <b>FEDERAL TOTAL<sup>2</sup></b>                                  |  | <b>\$33,055</b>  | <b>\$37,535</b>  | <b>\$23,194</b> | <b>\$23,194</b> | <b>\$36,348</b>  | <b>\$36,348</b>  | <b>\$46,365</b> | <b>\$46,365</b> | <b>\$143,442</b> |                 |
| INNOVATIVE FINANCE <sup>3</sup>                                   | TIFIA (Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act)   | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | State Infrastructure Bank  | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | Section 129 Loans  | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | Rail Rehab & Improvement Financing                                 | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | Private Activity Bonds   | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | Private Concession Fees  | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | Private Donations  | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | Program Income (from a federal project)                            | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | Other (Please specify - Add additional lines if needed)            | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              | \$0              | \$0             | \$0             | \$0              |                 |
|   | <b>Innovative Financing Total</b>                                  |                  | <b>\$0</b>       | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>       | <b>\$0</b>       | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>      | <b>\$0</b>       | <b>\$0</b>      |
| <b>PROGRAMMED TOTAL</b>   |  | <b>\$156,654</b> | <b>\$188,394</b> | <b>\$36,264</b> | <b>\$36,264</b> | <b>\$111,385</b> | <b>\$111,385</b> | <b>\$64,879</b> | <b>\$64,879</b> | <b>\$400,922</b> |                 |

NOTES:

<sup>1</sup>Regional: Some MPOs may not have regional fund sources. In these cases, data is shown as "zero" or not applicable.

<sup>2</sup>Federal Total: Is the sum of federal highway and federal transit programs.

<sup>3</sup>Innovative Finance: Toll revenues are included under local and regional while GARVEE bond revenues are included under state.

<sup>4</sup>Proposition 1B: Subtotal is a sum of funding for various programs funded under proposition 1B except for STIP Augmentation and SHOPP Augmentation.

\*Note: STIP/SHOPP funding coming from prior STIP/SHOPP programs.

TABLE 3: REVENUE - PROGRAMMED

**State of California**  
**2010/11-2013/14 Federal Transportation Improvement Program**  
**Amendment #3**  
**(\$'s in \$1,000)**

| FUNDING SOURCE  |  | 2010/11  |         | 2011/12  |         | 2012/13  |         | 2013/14  |         | CURRENT TOTAL |
|---|--|----------|---------|----------|---------|----------|---------|----------|---------|---------------|
|   |  | Previous | Current | Previous | Current | Previous | Current | Previous | Current |               |
| LOCAL   | <b>Local Total</b>   | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   |  |          |         |          |         |          |         |          |         |               |
| REGIONAL <sup>1</sup>                                 | Tolls  | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | - Bridge   | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | - Corridor   | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | Regional Transit Fares/Measures  | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | Regional Sales Tax   | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | Regional Bond Revenue  | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | Regional Gas Tax   | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | Vehicle Registration Fees (CARB Fees, SAFE)                                  | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | Other (Please specify - Add additional lines if needed)                      | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | <b>Regional Total</b>  | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
| STATE   | State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP-Grand Total)          | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | SHOPP (Including Augmentation)   | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | SHOPP Prior*   | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | SHOPP Minor  | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | State Transportation Improvement Program (Grand Total: STIP, STIP Prior, TE) | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | STIP (Including Augmentation)  | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | Transportation Enhancement   | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | STIP Prior*  | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | Transportation Enhancement   | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | CMIA or Proposition 1 B <sup>1</sup>   | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | GARVEE Bonds (Includes Debt Service Payments)                                | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | Highway Maintenance (HM)   | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP)                                     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | State Transit Assistance (STA)   | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
|   | (e.g., population/revenue based, Prop 42)                                    | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0           |
| Other (Please specify - Bridge Seismic Retrofit Bond) | \$0  | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     |               |
| <b>State Total</b>                                    | \$0  | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     | \$0      | \$0     |               |

TABLE 3: REVENUE - PROGRAMMED

**State of California**  
**2010/11-2013/14 Federal Transportation Improvement Program**  
**Amendment #3**  
**(\$'s in \$1,000)**

| FUNDING SOURCE   |  | 2010/11        |                | 2011/12        |                | 2012/13      |              | 2013/14      |                | CURRENT TOTAL  |
|--|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|
|  |  | Previous       | Current        | Previous       | Current        | Previous     | Current      | Previous     | Current        |                |
| <b>FEDERAL TRANSIT</b>                                       | Bus and Bus Related Grants (5309c)                                 | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Clean Fuel Formula Program (5308)                                  | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Elderly & Persons with Disabilities Formula Program (5310)         | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Fixed Guideway Modernization (5309a)                               | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Intercity Bus (5311)   | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Job Access and Reverse Commute Program (5316)                      | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Metropolitan Planning (5303)                                       | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | New and Small Starts (Capital Investment Grants) (5309b)           | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | New Freedom (5317)   | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Nonurbanized Area Formula Program (5311)                           | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Public Transportation on Indian Reservation (5311c)                | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Transit in the Parks (5320)  | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Urbanized Area Formula Program (5307)                              | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Other (Please specify - PTMISEA Transit)                           | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
| <b>Federal Transit Total</b>                                 | <b>\$0</b>   | <b>\$0</b>     | <b>\$0</b>     | <b>\$0</b>     | <b>\$0</b>     | <b>\$0</b>   | <b>\$0</b>   | <b>\$0</b>   | <b>\$0</b>     | <b>\$0</b>     |
| <b>FEDERAL HIGHWAY</b>                                       | <b>Federal Highway Non-Discretionary</b>                           |                |                |                |                |              |              |              |                |                |
|  | Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)                       | \$3,654        | \$3,654        | \$1,929        | \$1,929        | \$282        | \$282        | \$432        | \$432          | \$6,297        |
|  | Surface Transportation Program (Regional)                          | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | High Risk Rural Road (HRRR)  | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Highway Bridge Program (HBP)                                       | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)                          | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Railway (Section 130)  | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Safe Routes to School (SRTS) (SAFETEA-LU)                          | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Safe Routes to School (SR2S)                                       | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Transportation Improvements (TI)                                   | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Federal Lands Highway  | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Other (Please specify - Add additional lines if needed)            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | <b>Subtotal</b>  | <b>\$3,654</b> | <b>\$3,654</b> | <b>\$1,929</b> | <b>\$1,929</b> | <b>\$282</b> | <b>\$282</b> | <b>\$432</b> | <b>\$432</b>   | <b>\$6,297</b> |
|  | <b>Federal Highway Discretionary Programs</b>                      |                |                |                |                |              |              |              |                |                |
|  | Bridge Discretionary Program                                       | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Corridor Infrastructure Improvement Program (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1302) | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Coordinated Border Infrastructure (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1303)           | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Ferry Boat Discretionary   | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | High Priority Projects (HPP) and Demo                              | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | National Scenic Byways Program                                     | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Projects of National/Regional Significance (SAFETEA-LU Sec. 1301)  | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
| Public Lands Highway   | \$0  | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            |                |
| Recreational Trails  | \$0  | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            |                |
| Transportation and Community and System Preservation Program | \$0  | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            |                |
| Other (Please specify - Add additional lines if needed)      | \$0  | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            |                |
| <b>Subtotal</b>  | <b>\$0</b>   | <b>\$0</b>     | <b>\$0</b>     | <b>\$0</b>     | <b>\$0</b>     | <b>\$0</b>   | <b>\$0</b>   | <b>\$0</b>   | <b>\$0</b>     |                |
| <b>Federal Highway Total</b>                                 | <b>\$3,654</b>   | <b>\$3,654</b> | <b>\$1,929</b> | <b>\$1,929</b> | <b>\$282</b>   | <b>\$282</b> | <b>\$432</b> | <b>\$432</b> | <b>\$6,297</b> |                |
| <b>INNOVATIVE FINANCE<sup>3</sup></b>                        | <b>FEDERAL TOTAL<sup>2</sup></b>                                   | <b>\$3,654</b> | <b>\$3,654</b> | <b>\$1,929</b> | <b>\$1,929</b> | <b>\$282</b> | <b>\$282</b> | <b>\$432</b> | <b>\$432</b>   | <b>\$6,297</b> |
|  | TIFIA (Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act)   | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | State Infrastructure Bank  | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Section 129 Loans  | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Rail Rehab & Improvement Financing                                 | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Private Activity Bonds   | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Private Concession Fees  | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Private Donations  | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Program Income (from a federal project)                            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
|  | Other (Please specify - Add additional lines if needed)            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0            | \$0          | \$0          | \$0          | \$0            | \$0            |
| <b>Innovative Financing Total</b>                            | <b>\$0</b>   | <b>\$0</b>     | <b>\$0</b>     | <b>\$0</b>     | <b>\$0</b>     | <b>\$0</b>   | <b>\$0</b>   | <b>\$0</b>   | <b>\$0</b>     |                |
| <b>REVENUE - PROGRAMMED TOTAL</b>                            | <b>\$3,654</b>   | <b>\$3,654</b> | <b>\$1,929</b> | <b>\$1,929</b> | <b>\$282</b>   | <b>\$282</b> | <b>\$432</b> | <b>\$432</b> | <b>\$6,297</b> |                |

NOTES:

<sup>1</sup>Regional: Some MPOs may not have regional fund sources. In these cases, data is shown as "zero" or not applicable  
<sup>2</sup>Federal Total: Is the sum of federal highway and federal transit programs  
<sup>3</sup>Innovative Finance: Toll revenues are included under local and regional while GARVEE bond revenues are included under state  
<sup>4</sup>Proposition 1B: Subtotal is a sum of funding for various programs funded under proposition 1B except for STIP Augmentation and SHOPP Augmentation  
<sup>5</sup>Note: STIP/SHOPP funding coming from prior STIP/SHOPP programs

**ATTACHMENT #4**  
**PUBLIC NOTICE AND RESOLUTION**

**DECLARATION OF PUBLICATION  
(C.C.P. S2015.5)**

**COUNTY OF STANISLAUS  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident Of the County aforesaid; I am over the age of Eighteen years, and not a party to or interested In the above entitle matter. I am a printer and Principal clerk of the publisher of **THE MODESTO BEE**, printed in the City of **MODESTO**, County of **STANISLAUS**, State of California, daily, for which said newspaper has been adjudged a newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of the County of **STANISLAUS**, State of California, Under the date of **February 25, 1951, Action No. 46453**; that the notice of which the annexed is a printed copy, has been published in each issue there of on the following dates, to wit:

Nov 14, 2010

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING ON  
THE DRAFT AMENDMENT #3 TO  
THE PENDING 2011 FEDERAL  
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT  
PROGRAM AND 2011 AIR QUALITY  
CONFORMITY ANALYSIS**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Stanislaus Council of Governments will hold a public hearing on December 1, 2010 @ 6:00 p.m. at 1111 J Street, Suite 308, Modesto, CA regarding the Draft Amendment #3 to the pending 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and 2011 Final Air Quality Conformity Analysis. The purpose of the meeting is to receive public comments.

- The 2011 FTIP is a listing of capital improvement and operational expenditures utilizing federal and state monies for transportation projects in Stanislaus County during the next four years that are eligible to proceed without a conformity determination.
- The Draft Amendment #3 to the 2011 FTIP contains regionally significant projects that are included in the pending 2011 RTP, where the design concept and scope and year open to traffic is unchanged.
- The pending 2011 Air Quality Conformity Analysis contains the documentation to support a finding that the Draft Amendment #3 meets the air quality conformity requirements for carbon monoxide, ozone, and particulate matter.

Individuals with disabilities may call Cindy Malekos at (209) 525-4600 (with 3-working-day advance notice) to request auxiliary aids necessary to participate in the public meeting. Translation services are available (with 3-working-day advance notice) to participants speaking any language with available professional translation services.

A concurrent 30-day public review and comment period will commence on Friday, November 12, 2010 and conclude Monday, December 13, 2010 at 5:00 pm. The draft documents are available for review at the StanCOG office, located at 1111 J Street, Suite 308, Modesto, CA and on our website at [www.stancog.org](http://www.stancog.org).

Public comments are welcomed at the meeting, or may be submitted in writing by 5:00 pm Monday, December 13, 2010 to Rosa DeLeon Park at the address below.

After considering the comments, the documents will be considered for adoption, by resolution, by the Stanislaus Council of Governments at a regularly scheduled meeting to be held on December 15, 2010. The documents will then be submitted to state and federal agencies for approval.

Contact Person:  
Rosa DeLeon Park  
Transit/Programming Manager  
1111 J Street, Suite 308  
Modesto, CA 95354  
Tel. (209) 525-4642  
E-mail: [rpark@stancog.org](mailto:rpark@stancog.org)  
Pub Dates Nov. 14, 2010

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury That the foregoing is true and correct and that This declaration was executed at

**MODESTO, California** on

November 15th, 2010

(By Electronic Facsimile Signature)



**DECLARATION OF PUBLICATION  
(C.C.P. S2015.5)**

**COUNTY OF STANISLAUS  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the above entitled matter. I am a printer and principal clerk of the publisher of **THE MODESTO BEE**, which has been adjudged a newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of the County of **STANISLAUS**, State of California, under the date of **February 25, 1951, Action No. 46453**. The notice of which the annexed is a printed copy has been published in each issue thereof on the following dates, to wit:

**Vida En El Valle Publication  
DECEMBER 1, 2010**

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed at **MODESTO, California** on

**DECEMBER 1, 2010**



(Signature)

**AVISO DE JUNTA ABIERTA SOBRE LA ENMIENDA PRELIMINAR #3 AL PROGRAMA DE MEJORAMIENTO DEL TRANSPORTE FEDERAL Y AL ANALISIS DE CONFORMIDAD CON LA CALIDAD DEL AIRE DE 2011 PENDIENTES**

POR MEDIO DE LA PRESENTE SE INFORMA QUE el Consejo de Gobiernos de Stanislaus celebrará una audiencia pública el 1° de diciembre del 2010 a las 6 p.m. en el 1111 de la calle I, Suite 308, Modesto, CA, pertinente a la Enmienda Preliminar #3 al Programa de Mejoramiento del Transporte Federal (FTIP por sus siglas en inglés) y al Analisis de Conformidad con la Calidad del Aire de 2011 en proceso. El proposito de la junta es escuchar al publico.

El FTIP 2011 es una lista de importantes mejoras y gastos operacionales que utilizarán fondos estatales y federales para proyectos de transporte en el Condado Stanislaus durante los próximos cuatro años, y que pueden ser comenzados sin que se demuestre conformidad.

La Enmienda Preliminar #3 al FTIP 2011 comprende proyectos importantes para la región que están incluidos en el Plan Regional de Transporte 2011 pendiente, donde el concepto de diseño, el alcance y el año de apertura siguen siendo los mismos.

El Analisis de Conformidad con la Calidad del Aire de 2011 pendiente contiene la documentación necesaria para demostrar que la Enmienda Preliminar #3 cumple con los requisitos de calidad del aire respecto del monóxido de carbono, ozono y materia en suspensión.

Personas con discapacidades pueden comunicarse con Cindy Malekos al (209) 525-4600 (con tres días hábiles de anticipación) para solicitar los elementos auxiliares que les permitan participar en esta junta pública. Hay un servicio de intérprete disponible (con tres días hábiles de anticipación) para personas que hablen cualquier idioma para el que haya servicios profesionales de traducción.

El viernes 12 de noviembre se iniciará un periodo de 30 días para el estudio y comentario de parte del publico, concluyendo el lunes 13 de diciembre del 2010 a las 5 p.m. Los documentos preliminares estarán disponibles para su observación en las oficinas del StanCOG, ubicada en el 1111 de la calle I, Suite 308, Modesto, CA., y en nuestro sitio virtual [www.stancong.org](http://www.stancong.org).

Se le invita a hacer sus comentarios en la reunión o someterlos por escrito antes del lunes 13 de diciembre del 2010 a las 5 p.m. a nombre de Rosa DeLeon Park en el domicilio indicado abajo.

Después de evaluar los comentarios, los documentos se someterán para su adopción por resolución en la junta ordinaria del Consejo de Gobiernos de Stanislaus programada para el 15 de diciembre del 2010. Los documentos serán entonces sometidos para su aprobación ante las agencias estatales y federales.

Contacto: Rosa DeLeon Park, Directora de Tránsito y Programación  
1111 I Street, Suite 308  
Modesto, CA 95354  
Tel: (209) 525-4642  
Correo Electrónico: [rpark@stancong.org](mailto:rpark@stancong.org)

**STANISLAUS COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS**

**RESOLUTION 10-30**

**RESOLUTION ADOPTING AMENDMENT #3 TO THE 2011 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (FTIP)**

WHEREAS, the Stanislaus Council of Governments 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, Amendment #3 to the 2011 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) has been prepared to comply with Federal and State requirements for local projects and through a cooperative process between the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the State Department of Transportation (Caltrans), principal elected officials of general purpose local governments and their staffs, and public owner operators of mass transportation services acting through the Stanislaus Council of Governments forum and general public involvement; and

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

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

WHEREAS, Amendment #3 to the 2011 FTIP meets all applicable transportation planning requirements per 23 CFR Part 450.

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

WHEREAS, Amendment #3 to the 2011 FTIP has been developed consistent with 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93 to contain regionally significant projects that are included in the 2011 RTP, where the design concept and scope and year open to traffic is unchanged; and

WHEREAS, Amendment #3 to the 2011 FTIP meets the transportation conformity provisions of 40 CFR 93.122(g).

WHEREAS, Amendment #3 to the 2011 FTIP relies on the federally approved 2011 Air Quality Conformity Determination

WHEREAS, Amendment #3 to the 2011 FTIP does not interfere with the timely implementation of the Transportation Control Measures; and

WHEREAS, Amendment #3 to the 2011 FTIP conforms to the applicable SIPs; and

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

WHEREAS, a public meeting was conducted on December 1, 2010 to hear and consider comments on Amendment #3 to the 2011 FTIP; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Stanislaus Council of Governments finds that the 2011 Regional Transportation Plan and Amendment #3 to the 2011 FTIP are in conformity with the requirements of the Federal Clean Air Act Amendments and applicable State Implementation Plan for air quality.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that Stanislaus Council of Governments adopts Amendment #3 to the 2011 FTIP.

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION was introduced at a regular meeting of the Stanislaus Council of Governments, on the 15<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2010. A motion was made and seconded to adopt the foregoing Resolution. Motion carried and the Resolution was adopted.

MEETING DATE: December 15<sup>th</sup>, 2010



JIM RIDENOUR, CHAIR

ATTEST:



VINCENT J. HARRIS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR