

Draft CMAQ 2025

Summary of Comments and Responses

Version 1

Arvin – Kern COG comments p.2; TTAC comments p.4

Bakersfield – Kern COG comments p.5; TTAC comments p.15

California City – Kern COG comments p.16

Delano – Kern COG comments p.17; TTAC comments p.21

Kern County – Kern COG comments p.22; TTAC comments p.31

McFarland – Kern COG comments p.34; TTAC comments p.36

Ridgecrest – Kern COG comments p.37

Shafter – Kern COG comments p.39; TTAC comments p.40

Tehachapi – Kern COG comments p.41; TTAC comments p.43

Wasco – Kern COG comments p.44; TTAC comments p.47

2025 Call for Projects

Arvin KCOG – Summary of Comments and Responses

The following is a summarized list of information requests or comments made by the Kern COG staff. A response is requested.

KCOG Staff Comment	Applicant Response
Arvin 01 – 4 th Ave Complete Streets	
1. #2 Project Eligibility: This project will be sent to Caltrans Local Assistance for eligibility determination since CRS map lists as local road.	Although the roadway is classified as local in the CRS mapping system, from past experience with CMAQ funding this has typically not been a requirement, or an issue. (examples can be provided if it would help)
2. #5 Project Description: Please note the project description has been revised to include the full project scope. Arvin: 4th Ave from N. Derby St to N. A St; Construct Asphalt Paved Shoulders, Sidewalks, Curb and Gutter, Curb Ramps, Drive Approaches, and Other Related Improvements a. The north side of 4th Ave already has sidewalks. Is this project only for the south side? b. Please describe “other related improvements”.	A. The South side of 4 th Ave will be the majority of the project and will include complete street improvements along the entire southern length of the street. However, a small approximately 300 foot section along the North, starting at Derby Street, does not have improvements and will be included in this project. B. Other related improvements include signage and striping, as necessary, and minor drainage improvements to maintain current flow patterns.
3. #7 Programming Year for R/W: a. Does the project require utility relocation? b. If so, who is funding the relocation? c. What is the schedule for utility relocation?	A. Project is not anticipated to require utility relocation. B. If relocation is necessary, these utilities are in under franchise agreements and encroachment permits and relocation would be at their cost.
4. #14 Cost Effectiveness: Revised Cost-Effectiveness is 619.63. Not eligible for points. a. Pg 8 CMAQ Emission Calculations for AADT is inconsistent with Pg 11 Total AADT estimate. Revise AADT. b. Staff can not replicate Annual Emission Reductions lbs/yr. Please revise.	A. Pg 8 and Pg 11 Total AADT equal 460. The calculated 457 on page 11 is based on estimates and therefore, as stated in the recommendation, was rounded to 460. B. I have checked the spreadsheet and math for this calculation and get 0.0827. It was rounded to 0.08, as the

2025 Call for Projects

	<p>0.0027 is insignificant or not material.</p> <p>C. Can you provide your excel spreadsheet for verification. I have attached our spreadsheet so you can see the formula used and values included.</p>
Arvin 02 – Arvin Ave Complete Streets	
<p>1. #2 Project Eligibility: This project will be sent to Caltrans Local Assistance for eligibility determination since CRS map lists as local road.</p>	<p>Although the roadway is classified as local in the CRS mapping system, from past experience with CMAQ funding this has typically not been a requirement, or an issue. (examples can be provided if it would help)</p>
<p>2. #5 Project Description:</p> <p>a. Please note the project description has been revised.</p> <p>Arvin: Arvin Ave from B St to C St & C St from Arvin Ave to Bear Mountain Blvd/Hwy 223; Construct Asphalt Paved Shoulders, Sidewalks, Curb And Gutter, Curb Ramps, Drive Approaches, and Other Related Improvements</p> <p>b. Please describe “other related improvements”.</p>	<p>Other related improvements would be in addition to these would be minor in nature and required to complete the project. The project would likely include additional street signs and striping.</p>
<p>3. #7 Programming Year for R/W:</p> <p>a. Does the project require utility relocation?</p> <p>b. If so, who is funding the relocation?</p> <p>c. What is the schedule for utility relocation?</p>	<p>A. Project is not anticipated to require utility relocation.</p> <p>B. If relocation is necessary, these utilities are in under franchise agreements and encroachment permits and relocation would be at their cost.</p>
<p>4. #14 Cost-Effectiveness (\$/ lb) could not be replicated in PM 10 Excel Spreadsheet. Please provide revised CMAQ Emission Calculations pg. 8.</p>	<p>A. I have double checked the formula and calculated this by hand and come up with the same number. Can you provide your spreadsheet so I can verify or determine the issue?</p> <p>B. Can you provide your excel spreadsheet for verification. I have attached our spreadsheet so you can see the formula used and values included.</p>

2025 Call for Projects

Arvin TTAC – Summary of Comments and Responses

The following is a summarized list of information requests or comments made by the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee members. A response is requested.

TTAC Member Comment	Applicant Response
Arvin 01 - 4 th Ave Complete Streets	
1. 4 th Avenue appears classified as “local” via CRS mapping system.	Although the roadway is classified as local in the CRS mapping system, from past experience with CMAQ funding, this has typically not been a requirement or issue.
2. Encroachment permit may be needed for any improvements proposed in the county ROW on Derby St.	Encroachment permits will be obtained as needed to complete the project.
Arvin 02 - Arvin Ave Complete Streets	
1. Proposed roadways appear classified as “local” via CRS mapping system.	Although the roadway is classified as local in the CRS mapping system, from past experience with CMAQ funding, this has typically not been a requirement or issue.

2025 Call for Projects

Bakersfield – KCOG Summary of Comments and Responses

The following is a summarized list of information requests or comments made by the Kern COG staff. A response is requested.

KCOG Staff Comment	Applicant Response
Bakersfield 01 – Olive Dr Adaptive Signal	
1. #5 Project description: Provide correct limits; resolution states Renfro Rd and application states Frontier HS. Based on CRS maps, Olive Dr ends at Allen and becomes Kratzmeyer Rd.	Application revised. See attachment “ 2025-CMAQ-Application_Olive Dr Adaptive_REVISE ”
2. #8 VMT Reduction: 17,287,890 miles is VMT not VMT Reduction. Not eligible for points	Agreed. See attachment “ 2025-CMAQ-Application_Olive Dr Adaptive_REVISE ”
3. #8-#13 Emission Reductions: Page 8 footnote #4 - Emission factors should reference Emission Factor Tables, September 2024.	Footnote corrected. Sep 2024 EmFac tables were used for emissions reductions calculations. See attachment “ Cost-Benefit_Olive Dr Adaptive_REVISE ”.
4. #14 Cost Effectiveness: Staff ran the CARB database and the result is \$88.90/lb for CE.	The figure for reported for line (14) was the Total CE, rather than the CMAQ CE. Line (14) figure corrected to reflect CMAQ CE. See attachment “ Cost-Benefit_Olive Dr Adaptive_REVISE ”
5. #15 Livability & Safety: a. Livability #5: The existing accident rate is not higher than the state average rate; not eligible for points. b. Livability #6: No rates provided, not eligible for points	a. Agreed, the existing accident rate is not higher than the state average rate and thus not eligible for points. b. City staff worked out the fatality rates for reach segment and found them to be lower than the statewide fatality rate. Therefore, not eligible for points. See attachment “ 2025 Before-After Crash Analysis_REVISE ”.
Bakersfield 02 – California Ave Adaptive Signal	
1. #5 Project Description: Please note the project description has been revised to include the full project scope. Bakersfield: California Ave from Oak St to Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd; installation of adaptive signal coordination	Application revised. Please see attachment “ 2025-CMAQ-Application-California Ave Adaptive_REVISE ”.

2025 Call for Projects

2. #8 VMT Reduction: 16,984,958 miles is VMT not VMT Reduction. Not eligible for points.	Agreed. Please see attachment " 2025-CMAQ-Application-California Ave Adaptive_REVISE ".
3. #8-#13 Emission Reductions: Page 8 footnote #4 - Emission factors should reference Emission Factor Tables, September 2024.	Footnote corrected. Sep 2024 EmFac tables were used for emissions reductions calculations. See attachment " Cost-Benefit_California Ave Adaptive_REVISE ".
4. #13 CO Reduction: Please note, the correct CO is 1.42 kg/day based off the after speed factor for CO for 1.129.	Agreed. Emissions reductions figure for CO corrected. See attachment " 2025-CMAQ-Application-California Ave Adaptive_REVISE ".
5. #14 Cost Effectiveness: Staff ran the CARB database and the result is \$103.20/lb for CE.	The figure for reported for line (14) was the Total CE, rather than the CMAQ CE. Line (14) figure corrected to reflect CMAQ CE. See attachment " Cost-Benefit_California Ave Adaptive_REVISE ". Revised. See attachment " 2025-CMAQ-Application-California Ave Adaptive_REVISE_v2 ".
6. #15 Livability & Safety: a. Livability #5: The existing accident rate is not higher than the state average rate; not eligible for points. b. Livability #6: No rates provided, not eligible for points	a. Agreed, the existing accident rate is not higher than the state average rate and thus not eligible for points. b. City staff worked out the fatality rates for reach segment and found them to be lower than the statewide fatality rate. Therefore, not eligible for points. See attachment " 2025-CMAQ-Before-After Crash Analysis_REVISE ".
Bakersfield 03 – Southwest Adaptive Expansion	
1. #5 Project description Resolution states Panama Ln and application states Target Entrance Please confirm correct limits.	Application revised. See attachment " 2025-CMAQ-Application_Southwest Expansion_REVISE ".
2. #8 VMT Reduction: 26,005,850 miles is VMT not VMT Reduction. Not eligible for points.	Agreed. See attachment " 2025-CMAQ-Application-California Ave Adaptive_REVISE ".
3. #8-#13 Emission Reductions: Page 3 footnote #4 - Emission factors should reference Emission Factor Tables, September 2024. a. For CO emission reduction total (pg 6) revise to show calculation divided by 7.	Footnote corrected. Sep. 2024 tables were used for reported CE. a. CO emission reduction is divided by 7 on the final tabulation page of the CE. See attached spreadsheet " Cost-Benefit_Emissions_LOS_Southwest ".

2025 Call for Projects

	<p>Expansion", "Tabulation & Cost-Benefit" tab, Cell E33, the figure used for CE in \$/lb, shows formula =SUM(E30:E32)/7.</p> <p>Project limits and footnote updated. See attachment "Cost-Benefit_Emissions_LOS_Southwest Expansion_REVISE".</p>
<p>4. #14 Cost Effectiveness: Staff ran the CARB database and the result is \$106.87/lb for CE.</p> <p>a. Please provide spreadsheet to show calculations</p>	<p>The figure for reported for line (14) was the Total CE, rather than the CMAQ CE. Line (14) has been corrected to reflect CMAQ CE. See attachment "2025-CMAQ-Application_Southwest Adaptive Expansion_REVISE".</p> <p>a. See spreadsheet attachment "Cost-Benefit_Emissions_LOS_Southwest Expansion"</p>
<p>5. #15 Livability & Safety:</p> <p>a. Livability #5: The existing accident rate is not higher than the state average rate; not eligible for points.</p> <p>b. Livability #6: No rates provided, not eligible for points</p>	<p>a. Agreed, the existing accident rate is not higher than the state average rate and thus not eligible for points.</p> <p>b. City staff worked out the fatality rates for reach segment and found them to be lower than the statewide fatality rate. Therefore, not eligible for points. See attachment "2025 Before-After Crash Analysis_REVISE".</p>
Bakersfield 04 – Wilson Rd Adaptive Signal	
<p>1. #5 Project Description: Please note the project description has been revised to include the full project scope Bakersfield: Wilson Rd from Edgemont Dr to S. Chester Ave; installation of adaptive signal coordination</p>	<p>Application Revised. Please see attachment "2025-CMAQ-Application-Wilson Rd Adaptive_REVISE".</p>
<p>2. #8 VMT Reduction: 10,692,275 miles is VMT not VMT Reduction. Not eligible for points.</p>	<p>Agreed. Please see attachment "2025-CMAQ-Application-Wilson Rd Adaptive_REVISE".</p>
<p>3. #8-#13 Emission Reductions: Page 8 footnote #4 - Emission factors should reference Emission Factor Tables, September 2024.</p> <p>a. #13 CO Reduction: Staff ran the CARB database and the result is 0.93 for CO reduction.</p>	<p>Footnote corrected. Sep 2024 EmFac tables were used for emissions reductions calculations. See attachment "Cost-Benefit_Wilson Rd Adaptive_REVISE".</p> <p>a. City staff yielded the same 0.93 result using the prescribed methods (see" Cost-</p>

2025 Call for Projects

	<p>Benefit_Wilson Rd Adaptive_REVISE”), but the automated CE calculation tool yielded 0.94 with the same inputs. See attachment “ARB Calcs_Wilson Rd Adaptive_INPUTS”.</p> <p>Note, the inputs shown on page 4 of the attachment are rounded figures for concise display and not the actual figures used to carry out the calculations.</p> <p>Footnote updated. See attachment “Cost-Benefit_Wilson Rd Adaptive_REVISE_v2”</p>
<p>6. #15 Livability & Safety:</p> <p>a. Livability #5: The existing accident rate is not higher than the state average rate; not eligible for points.</p> <p>b. Livability #6: No rates provided, not eligible for points</p>	<p>a. Agreed, the existing accident rate is not higher than the state average rate and thus not eligible for points.</p> <p>b. City staff worked out the fatality rates for reach segment and found them to be lower than the statewide fatality rate. Therefore, not eligible for points. See attachment “2025 Before-After Crash Analysis_REVISE”.</p>
Bakersfield 05 – Union Ave Adaptive Signal	
1. #5 Project description Resolution states Monterey St and application does not include limits for Union Ave segment. Please confirm correct limits.	Application revised. See attachment “2025-CMAQ-Application_Union Ave & Memorial Medical Corridor Adaptive_REVISE” .
2. #8 VMT Reduction: 5,916,740 miles is VMT not VMT Reduction. Not eligible for points.	Agreed. See attachment “2025-CMAQ-Application_Union Ave & Memorial Medical Corridor Adaptive_REVISE” .
<p>3. #8-#13 Emission Reductions: Page 3 footnote #4 - Emission factors should reference Emission Factor Tables, September 2024.</p> <p>a. Page 5: Incorrect project segments listed in Emission Reductions Totals table. Please revise.</p> <p>b. Page 5: Recalculate CO. Please provide spreadsheet to show calculations</p>	<p>Footnote corrected. Sep 2024 EmFac tables were used for emissions reductions calculations. See attachment “Cost-Benefit_Emissions_LOS_Union-Memorial Medical Corridor_REVISE”.</p> <p>a. Project segment names corrected. See attachment “Cost-Benefit_Emissions_LOS_Union-Memorial Medical Corridor_REVISE”.</p> <p>b. CO emission reduction is reduced by 7 on the final tabulation page of the CE. See attached spreadsheet “Cost-Benefit_Emissions_LOS_Union-Memorial Medical Corridor”, “Tabulation & Cost-</p>

2025 Call for Projects

	<p>Benefit” tab, Cell E32, the figure used for CE in \$/lb, shows formula =SUM(E30:E31)/7</p> <p>Footnote updated. Spreadsheet revised to show “34th St” rather than “Memorial Medical Corridor (34th St)”, and “Espee St” has been dropped from “Espee St/Monterey St” to match project limits stated in resolution verbatim. See attachment “Cost-Benefit_Emissions_LOS_Union-34th St Adaptive_REVISE”.</p> <p>CE updated. See attachment “2025-CMAQ-Application_Union Ave & 34th St Adaptive_REVISE_v2”.</p>
<p>4. #15 Livability & Safety:</p> <p>a. Livability #5: The existing accident rate is not higher than the state average rate; not eligible for points.</p> <p>b. Livability #6: No rates provided, not eligible for points</p>	<p>a. Agreed, the existing accident rate is not higher than the state average rate and thus not eligible for points.</p> <p>b. City staff worked out the fatality rates for reach segment and found them to be lower than the statewide fatality rate. Therefore, not eligible for points. See attachment “2025 Before-After Crash Analysis_REVISE”.</p>
Bakersfield 06 – Planz Rd Adaptive Signal	
<p>1. #5 Project Description: Please note the project description has been revised to include the full project scope. Bakersfield: Planz Rd from Wilson Rd to S. Union Ave; installation of adaptive signal coordination</p>	<p>Application revised. Please see attachment “2025-CMAQ-Application_Planz Rd_REVISE”.</p>
<p>2. #8 VMT Reduction: 8,542,400 miles is VMT not VMT Reduction. Not eligible for points.</p>	<p>Agreed. See attachment “2025-CMAQ-Application_Planz Rd_REVISE”.</p>
<p>3. #8-#13 Emission Reductions: Page 3 footnote #4 - Emission factors should reference Emission Factor Tables, September 2024.</p>	<p>Footnote corrected. Sep 2024 EmFac tables were used for emissions reductions calculations. See attachment “Cost-Benefit_Planz Rd Adaptive_REVISE”.</p>
<p>4. #14 Cost-Effectiveness: Staff ran the CARB database and the result is \$117.84/lb for CE.</p> <p>a. CO emissions for after speed is 1.0439. Please provide spreadsheet to show calculations</p>	<p>The figure for reported for line (14) was the Total CE, rather than the CMAQ CE. Line (14) figure corrected to reflect CMAQ CE. See attachment “2025-CMAQ-Application_Planz Rd_REVISE”</p> <p>a. CO emission “after” factor used for CE was 1.0439. See excel attachment “Cost-</p>

2025 Call for Projects

	<p>Benefit_Emissions_LOS_Planz Rd_REVISE".</p> <p>Note, in the ARB automated calculator printout provided in the original application, the before/after emissions factors show rounded figures for concision and not the actual figures used to carry out the calculations.</p> <p>The CO emissions reduced figure of "0.87" came from the CARB automated calculator documentation provided in the original application submission. Application revised to show a CO emissions reduction of 0.86 kg/day as advised. See attachment "2025-CMAQ-Application_Planz Rd_REVISE v2".</p>
<p>5. #15 Livability & Safety:</p> <p>a. Livability #5: The existing accident rate is not higher than the state average rate; not eligible for points.</p> <p>b. Livability #6: No rates provided, not eligible for points</p>	<p>a. Agreed, the existing accident rate is not higher than the state average rate and thus not eligible for points.</p> <p>b. City staff worked out the fatality rates for reach segment and found them to be lower than the statewide fatality rate. Therefore, not eligible for points. See attachment "2025 Before-After Crash Analysis_REVISE".</p>
Bakersfield 07 – Downtown Grid Adaptive Signal	
<p>1. #1 Resolution: Eye St from Truxtun Ave to 18th St is not listed in resolution. Segment should be removed.</p>	<p>Application revised. See attachment "2025-CMAQ-Application-Downtown Grid Adaptive_REVISE".</p>
<p>2. #2 Project Eligibility: This project will be sent to Caltrans Local Assistance for eligibility determination since CRS map lists F St (Truxtun Ave to 18th), L St (Truxtun Ave to 18th St), and Eye St (Truxtun Ave to 18th St, as local roads.</p>	<p>Understood.</p>
<p>3. #8 VMT Reduction: 4,054,636 miles is VMT not VMT Reduction. Not eligible for points.</p>	<p>Agreed. See attachment "2025-CMAQ-Application-Downtown Grid Adaptive_REVISE".</p>
<p>4. #9-#14 Emission Reductions: Page 3 footnote #4 - Emission factors should reference Emission Factor Tables, September 2024.</p> <p>a. Missing Emission Reduction calculations for Q St between 14th</p>	<p>Footnote corrected, September 2024 EmFac tables were used for CE. See attachment "Cost-Benefit_Emissions_LOS_Downtown Grid_REVISE".</p>

2025 Call for Projects

<p>& 21st. Staff was unable to replicate calculations.</p> <p>b. Staff not able to replicate annual project segment VMT. Please recalculate.</p> <p>c. Staff not able to replicate emission reductions using CARB database. Please recalculate.</p>	<p>a. See attachment “Cost-Benefit_Emissions_LOS_Downtown Grid_REVISE”, “Q St” tab for missing documentation.</p> <p>b. See attachment “Cost-Benefit_Emissions_LOS_Downtown Grid_REVISE”, “Tabulation & Cost-Benefit” tab, Cell L15. The figure reported on line (8) is an aggregate VMT based on the individual project segment AADT, Operating Days Per Year, and Segment length.</p> <p>c. See attachment “Cost-Benefit_Emissions_LOS_Downtown Grid_REVISE”. Emissions reductions calculations were carried out for each proposed segment (see tabs “F St”, “H St”, “Eye St”, “L St”, and “Q St”), then tabulated and summed (see “Tabulation & Cost-Benefit” tab) to estimate the total amount of emissions reduced from all combined segments.</p> <p>Footnote updated. Eye St had been removed from any spreadsheet. After removing Eye St from quantity estimates, requested CMAQ funding was reduced. See “Cost-Benefit_Emissions_LOS_Downtown Grid_REVISE_v2”.</p> <p>Eye St had been removed from spreadsheet. See “2025-CMAQ-Before-After Crash Analysis_REVISE_v2”.</p>
<p>5. #15 Livability & Safety:</p> <p>a. Livability #5: The existing accident rate is not higher than the state average rate; not eligible for points.</p> <p>b. Livability #6: No rates provided, not eligible for points</p>	<p>a. Agreed, the existing accident rate is not higher than the state average rate and thus not eligible for points.</p> <p>b. City staff worked out the fatality rates for reach segment and found them to be lower than the statewide fatality rate. Therefore, not eligible for points. See attachment “2025 Before-After Crash Analysis_REVISE”.</p>
<p>Bakersfield 08 – Niles St Bike Lanes</p>	
<p>1. #2 Project Eligibility: Will send to Caltrans HQ for eligibility determination since the project already exists.</p>	<p>Understood.</p>

2025 Call for Projects

<p>2. #5 Project Description: Revise project description to include full scope. CMAQ does not allow for maintenance of existing infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Google maps show existing bicycle lanes. b. Resolution states corridor improvements, application states installation of Class I bike lanes, and project justification states streetscape and safety and improvements with installation of Class II & IV bike lanes. 	<p>Project description: Description was updated in attached revised project application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Existing bike lanes are Class II, this project will convert them to Class IV (Separated bike lanes). b. Class I was referring to the distinction made by the ARB emissions calculator. This has been edited, see attached revised project application and justification.
<p>3. #6 Project Funding: What funding was used for the NiMo project FY 22-23?</p>	<p>Project Funding: Local funding (Measure 'N' or Public Safety and Vital Services Funds) were used for the design of this project. No construction has taken place.</p>
<p>4. #8-13: Emission reductions: Incorrect emission factors used in calculation (pages 6-7). Need to use Emission Factor Tables, September 2024</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. After using the CARB database, staff received these results: #8 VMT reduction: 18,182 annual miles #9 VOC reduction: 0.0243 kg/day #12 PM2.5 reduction: 0.002 kg/day 	<p>Emissions calculations were updated using the Sept. 2024 emission factors. All reductions have been recalculated and listed on the attached Revised project application.</p> <p>Values corrected. Please see attachment "[3] 2025 CMAQ App_Emission Calculations_NIMO_REVISED_10-7-25."</p>
<p>5. #14 Cost-Effectiveness: Staff ran the CARB database and the result is \$1,600.50/lb for CE.</p>	<p>Updated cost effectiveness has been changed on Revised Project Application and Revised emission calculations</p> <p>Values corrected. Please see attachment "[3] 2025 CMAQ App_Emission Calculations_NIMO_REVISED_10-7-25."</p>
<p>6. #15 Livability & Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Livability #5: No statewide rate provided. Please provide average rate for a similar facility. Area project rate is not provided in required format. Provide before and after accident rate per VMT (accidents/ millions of vehicle miles (MVM)). Not eligible for points as is. b. No fatality rates provided, not eligible for points as is. 	<p>Statewide rate of 0.61 was provided in attachment 5 (accident rate analysis). Updated accident rate analysis and amended answers in attached Revised Justification and Benefits</p> <p>Understood</p>
<p>Bakersfield 09 – Monitor St Bike Lanes</p>	

2025 Call for Projects

1. #2 Project Eligibility: This project will be sent to Caltrans Local Assistance for eligibility determination since CRS map lists Monitor St from White Ln to Merrimac Ave as a local road.	Understood.
2. #5 Project Description: Revise project description to include full scope. Clarify project activity: resolution states corridor improvements, application states installation of streetscape and safety and improvements with installation of Class II & IV bike lanes.	<p>Streetscape was removed from project description. Additional info was added to coversheet. See attached Revised coversheet and Revised Project Background and Justification.</p> <p>Safety improvements will include Rapid Rectangular Flashing Beacon (RRFB) Assemblies at midblock crossings, raised (Class IV) bike lanes, buffered (class II) bike lanes, protected intersections, and updated signage and striping</p>
3. Page 2, Project Background and Justification: correct project limit to Monitor Street.	Corrected. See attached revised Project Background and Justification.
4. #6 Project Funding: Cost estimates include utility relocations. a. Are there R/W conflicts? b. What is the R/W schedule?	<p>There are no r/w conflicts. All relocations are vertical adjustments to account for pavement work.</p> <p>Assuming project is selected and added to the FTIP in March 2026, The City plans to submit PES documents in March/April 26 and plans to have all R/W Coordination (notification, liability, etc.) ready for submittal in June of 26 (pending PES approval). Final plans should be complete Q1 of 2026.</p>
5. #8-13: Emission reductions: Incorrect emission factors used in calculation (pages 6-7). Need to use Emission Factor Tables, September 2024 a. After using the CARB database, staff received these results: #8 VMT reduction: 19,963 annual miles #9 VOC reduction: 0.023 kg/day #10 NOX reduction: 0.015 kg/day #12 PM2.5 reduction: 0.015 kg/day	Emission factors updated to used Sept 2024 data. All reductions have been recalculated and listed on the attached Revised project application.
6. #14 Cost-Effectiveness: Staff ran the CARB database and the result is \$11,993.39/lb for CE.	Updated cost effectiveness has been changed on Revised Project Application and Revised emission calculations
7. #15 Livability & Safety a. Livability #5: No statewide rate provided. Please provide average rate for a similar facility. Area project rate is not provided in	Statewide rate of 0.61 was provided in attachment 5 (accident rate analysis). Updated accident rate analysis and amended answers in attached Revised Justification and Benefits

2025 Call for Projects

<p>required format. Provide before and after accident rate per VMT (accidents/ millions of vehicle miles (MVM)). Not eligible for points as is.</p> <p>b. No fatality rates provided, not eligible for points as is.</p>	<p>Understood</p>
--	-------------------

2025 Call for Projects

Bakersfield TTAC – Summary of Comments and Responses

The following is a summarized list of information requests or comments made by the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee members. A response is requested.

TTAC Member Comment	Applicant Response
Bakersfield 08 – Niles St Bike Lanes	
1. County of Kern has a funded HSIP project to construct medians at county limit west of Virginia St which may reduce travel lanes. Coordination advised to ensure bike lane transition from city to county meets safety standards.	The City will adhere to state standards and municipal guidelines. If project is approved for funding, the City will coordinate with County for conformity.

2025 Call for Projects

California City KCOG – Summary of Comments and Responses

The following is a summarized list of information requests or comments made by the Kern COG staff. A response is requested.

KCOG Staff Comment	Applicant Response
California City 01 – California City Blvd Pedestrian Improvements	
<p>1. #5 Project Description: Please note the project description has been revised. California City: California City Blvd from Victor Way to Neuralia Rd; Pedestrian Improvements, ADA Curb Ramps, Crosswalks, Striping, Signage, and Intersection Enhancements.</p> <p>a. Please describe “intersection enhancements”.</p>	<p><i>Intersection enhancements encompass ADA compliance and accessibility measures, including provisions for wheelchair and stroller access within paved areas and clearly marked crosswalks. These crossing enhancements facilitate safe movement for individuals using wheelchairs, strollers, or carts from sidewalks to streets, and ensuring appropriate grading and cross slopes in the paved zones between ADA ramps. The standard width is 12 feet of new paved improvements, allowing for a 10-foot-wide crosswalk.</i></p>
<p>2. #7 Programming Year for R/W:</p> <p>a. Does the project require utility relocation?</p> <p>b. If so, who is funding the relocation?</p> <p>c. What is the schedule for utility relocation?</p>	<p><i>No utility relocation needed for project.</i></p>
<p>3. #8 VMT Reduction: Staff is not able to replicate VMT Displaced. Please provide supporting documentation for VMT Displaced.</p>	<p><i>The Growth Factor Adjustment (GFA) in Equation 4 was revised from 1 to 0.65, Resulting in a VMT reduction. See attached revised calculations</i></p>
<p>4. #10, #11, #12, #14: Staff is not able to replicate Emission Reductions. Please provide supporting documentation for Emission Reductions</p>	<p><i>As vehicle miles traveled (VMT) changed, the associated emissions reductions were also affected. Please refer to the attached calculations for details and revised project application.</i></p>
<p>5. #15 Safety Question 5: Please note Safety #5 not eligible for points.</p>	<p><i>Acknowledged</i></p>

2025 Call for Projects

Delano – KCOG Summary of Comments and Responses

The following is a summarized list of information requests or comments made by the Kern COG staff. A response is requested.

KCOG Staff Comment	Applicant Response
Delano 01 – Timmons Ave Pave unpaved shoulders	
1. #5 Project description: Revise project limits to project justification for consistency because there are existing sidewalks and shoulders.	<i>Revised project description to specify project limits, considering only segments that need shoulder improvements.</i>
2. #14 Cost Effectiveness: No supporting documentation for ADT. Kern COG Traffic Count Database shows ADT of 568. Provide ADT source and recalculate CE if needed.	<i>Use Kern COG Traffic Count Database as data source for ADT. Timmons Ave has ADT of 568 VPD. Recalculated Emission Calculations.</i>
3. #15 Livability & Safety: a. Page 4, #1 response is for Livability #3. b. Page 4, #2 response is for Livability #4. Widen road is not CMAQ eligible. Is the project creating another vehicle travel lane?	<i>a. Revised item #15 Livability & Safety. b. There shall be no additional vehicle lane involved in the project.</i>
4. #22 RACM/BACM (Page 4, #3): Not eligible for points	N/A
Delano 02 – Cecil Ave Pave unpaved shoulders - NOT ELIGIBLE	
1. #2 Project eligibility: not eligible. Based on google maps, there are shoulders and gravel in project limits.	<i>Application calls for widening of shoulder to 6 feet wide (4 foot addition to existing 2 foot wide shoulders).</i>
2. #14 Cost Effectiveness: No supporting documentation for ADT. Kern COG Traffic Count Database shows ADT of 5,732. Provide ADT source and recalculate CE if needed.	<i>Use Kern COG Traffic Count Database as data source for ADT. Cecil Avenue has ADT of 5,732 VPD. Recalculated Emission Calculations.</i>
3. #11 PM 10 Reduction and #14 Cost Effectiveness: Revise application form for PM10 and CE to be consistent with calculation sheet results page 5.	Revised calculations.

2025 Call for Projects

4. #13 CO Reduction: Please note, the correct CO is 1.42 kg/day based off the after speed factor for CO for 1.129.	N/A
5. #15 Livability & Safety: Page 4, Livability #4. Widen road is not CMAQ eligible. Is the project creating another vehicle travel lane?	<i>There shall be no additional vehicle lane involved in the project</i>
6. #22 RACM/BACM (Page 4, #3): Not eligible for points	N/A
Delano 03 – W Garces Hwy Pave unpaved shoulders - NOT ELIGIBLE.	
1. #2 Project eligibility: not eligible. Based on google maps, there are shoulders and gravel in project limits.	<i>Application calls for widening of shoulders to 6 feet wide (4 foot addition to existing 2 foot wide shoulders).</i>
2. #14 Cost Effectiveness: No supporting documentation for ADT. Kern COG Traffic Count Database shows ADT of 4,376. Provide ADT source and recalculate CE if needed.	<i>Used Kern COG Traffic Count Database as data source for ADT. Garces Highway has ADT of 4,376 VPD. Recalculated Emission Calculations.</i>
3. #15 Livability & Safety: a. Page 4, #1 response is for Livability #3. b. Page 4, #2 is response to Safety #5. No rates provided for accidents, not eligible for points.	<i>a. Revised item #15 Livability & Safety. b. Revised item #15 Livability & Safety.</i>
4. #22 RACM/BACM (Page 4, #3): Not eligible for points	N/A
Delano 04 – County Line Rd from High St to Heitt St: Pave unpaved shoulders	
1. #2 Project eligibility: Revise project description to correct limits; remove limits with existing shoulders and add "north side" to the description. Based on Google Maps, from RR to East Falcon Wy, there are shoulders	<i>Revised project description to change project limits, considering only the North side that needs shoulder improvements.</i>
2. #6 Project funding: a. If down scoping project limits, need to revise project cost. b. Project is within 2 miles of RR, has Delano started coordination with the RR?	<i>a. Revised Project funding on item #6 considering project is at north side only. b. The City of Delano is within 2-mile radius of the UPRR. Project Coordination with UPRR is done during the ROW Certs processing with Caltrans.</i>
3. #14 Cost Effectiveness: No supporting documentation for ADT. Kern COG Traffic Count Database shows ADT of 5,515. Provide ADT source and recalculate CE if needed.	<i>Used Kern COG Traffic Count Database as data source for ADT. County Line Road has ADT of 5,515 VPD. Recalculated Emission Calculations.</i>

2025 Call for Projects

4. #15 Livability & Safety: a. Livability #4. Widen road is not CMAQ eligible. Is the project creating another vehicle travel lane?	<i>a. Revised item #15 Livability & Safety. No, the project is adding/widening the shoulder on the north side of this road.</i>
5. #22 RACM/BACM (Page 4, #4): Not eligible for points	N/A
Delano 05 – County Line Rd from Girard St to Driver Rd: Pave unpaved shoulders	
1. #2 Project eligibility: Revise project description to correct limits; remove limits with existing shoulders and add "north side" to the description. Based in Google maps there are shoulders in some sections near San Felice St, Browning Rd, Randolph St. Girard to Kalibo St.	<i>Revised project description to change project limits, considering only segments that need shoulder improvements. The project will involve the whole length of the North Side of County Line Road and the South Side of County Line Road from San Felice Way to Driver Road.</i> <i>Corrected project limits will be provided.</i>
2. #6 Project Funding: a. If downs coping project limits, need to revise project cost b. Project is within 2 miles of RR, has Delano started coordination with the RR?	<i>a. Revised Project funding on item #6 considering project is at north side only. b. The City of Delano is within 2-mile radius of the UPRR. Project Coordination with UPRR is done during the ROW Certs processing with Caltrans.</i>
3. #7 Programming Year by Phase: a. For R/W: Does the project require utility relocation? b. If so, who is funding the relocation? c. What is the schedule for utility relocation?	<i>a. There is no utility relocation involved in all shoulder improvements project in Delano. There may involved lowering and raising manholes and water valve boxes. b. We include the lowering and raising manholes and valve in the ROW Certs to be included in the request for Federal Funds. c. No utility relocation will be included in the project.</i>
4. #14 Cost Effectiveness: No supporting documentation for ADT. Kern COG Traffic Count Database shows ADT of 4,836. Provide ADT source and recalculate CE if needed.	<i>Used Kern COG Traffic Count Database as data source for ADT. County Line Road has ADT of 4,836 VPD. Recalculated Emission Calculations.</i>
5. #15 Livability and Safety: no responses submitted	<i>Revised item #15 Livability & Safety.</i>
Delano 06 – Hiett Ave: Pave unpaved shoulders	
1. #2 Project Eligibility: Revise project description to correct limits; remove limits with existing shoulders and add "north side" to the description. Based on Google maps, there are shoulders from 11th to approx. Viejo Dr	<i>Revised project description to change project limits, considering only the west side that needs shoulder improvements.</i>

2025 Call for Projects

<p>2. #7 Programming Year for R/W:</p> <p>a. Does the project require utility relocation?</p> <p>b. If so, who is funding the relocation?</p> <p>c. What is the schedule for utility relocation?</p>	<p><i>a. There is no utility relocation involved in all shoulder improvements project in Delano. There may involve lowering and raising manholes and water valve boxes.</i></p> <p><i>b. We include the lowering and raising manholes and valve in the ROW Certs to be included in the request for Federal Funds.</i></p> <p><i>c. No utility relocation will be included in the project.</i></p>
<p>3. #14 Cost Effectiveness: No supporting documentation for ADT. Kern COG Traffic Count Database shows ADT of 1,746. Provide ADT source and recalculate CE if needed.</p>	<p><i>Used Kern COG Traffic Count Database as data source for ADT. County Line Road has ADT of 1,746 VPD. Recalculated Emission Calculations.</i></p>
<p>4. #15 Livability & Safety:</p> <p>a. Page 4, #1 response is for Livability #3.</p> <p>b. Page 4, #2 is response to #4. Widen road is not CMAQ eligible. Is the project creating another vehicle travel lane?</p>	<p><i>a. Revised item #15 Livability & Safety.</i></p> <p><i>b. There shall be no additional vehicle lane involved in the project.</i></p>
<p>5. #22 RACM/BACM (Page 4, #4): Not eligible for points</p>	<p><i>N/A</i></p>

2025 Call for Projects

Delano TTAC – Summary of Comments and Responses

The following is a summarized list of information requests or comments made by the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee members. A response is requested.

TTAC Member Comment	Applicant Response
Delano 02 – Cecil Ave Shoulder Improvements	
1. Please clarify project limits. Title says Melcher and Lytle, but Project Description says Albany and Melcher. Road appears to already have a shoulder. Caltrans may not consider this project eligible for CMAQ.	Revised project description to reflect the true project limits between Melcher Road and Lytle Avenue. Project calls for an additional 3 feet of shoulder improvements. This is a continuation of the previous CMAQ project from Melcher to Albany St,
2. PM 10 in application shows 16.52 kg/day. Cost effectiveness in calculations shows \$2.34. Does not match the front sheet of the application.	Revised application and CE Calculations to match .
Delano 03 – Garces Hwy Shoulder Improvements	
1. Road appears to already have a shoulder. Caltrans may not consider this project eligible for CMAQ.	Project calls for an additional 3-foot shoulder to make a 6-foot-wide shoulder. A similar CMAQ project has been approved in the past
2. Listed on the CMAQ summary as Garces Highway between Hiatt Ave. and Casey Rd. Project claims to reduce the generation of PM 10 dust. Project will alleviate PM 2.5 problem in the area but has 0 reductions of PM 2.5. Need to see ARB calculations.	The application did not require ARB calculations. PM2.5 Reduction is N/A.

2025 Call for Projects

Kern County KCOG – Summary of Comments and Responses

The following is a summarized list of information requests or comments made by the Kern COG staff. A response is requested.

KCOG Staff Comment	Applicant Response
Kern Co 02 – Allen Rd shoulders	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. #5 Project description <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Resolution identifies Allen Rd: Rosedale Hwy to 300 ft n/o Allen Ln. Application identifies Allen Rd: Rosedale Hwy to 400 ft s/o Meacham. Please confirm correct limits. b. Application form identifies surface unpaved shoulders only. Justification is inconsistent with the form:.. sidewalks, curb and gutter, and other ped improves. Shoulders are not identified in justification. Please confirm the scope . 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Project limits – Both are correct. We will use the resolution version to avoid confusion. b. “Surface unpaved shoulder” is a description requirement from a previous FHWA review specifically for use in the FTIP description line when CMAQ funds were proposed for improvement as a sidewalk. We keep this description to avoid problems encountered in the past by Caltrans, <p>The final project is a sidewalk; however, this road has gravel, paved shoulders and dirt sidewalks; therefore, project should be called out as a sidewalk. Dust mitigation is the primary purpose since this is in a PM10 non-attainment area.</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. #7 Programming Year RW Phase <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the Right of Way include utility relocation? b. Are property owners in agreement with Right of Way acquisition? c. What is the Right of Way schedule? 	<p>Utility Relocation is currently underway as a local non-participating cost. ROW is proposed in Year 1 to allow for maximum processing time. Only 1 parcel acquisition needed, owners have not been contacted.</p> <p>Survey baselines and topo maps are complete. Project is at 30% design. PE & ROW is proposed in year 1 (FY 26/27) which will give us sufficient time to complete ROW acquisition prior to CON phase.</p>
Kern Co 03 – Art Lane dirt road	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. #2 Project Eligibility: This project will be sent to Caltrans Local Assistance for eligibility determination since CRS map lists as local road. 	Duly noted.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. #5 Project description: Will scope include paving unpaved shoulders and/or sidewalks? 	Only 40 ft of ROW exists. Road paving proposed is 12 ft with 8 ft shoulder, no sidewalks.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. #7 Programming Year RW Phase <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the Right of Way include utility relocation? 	<p>No additional ROW proposed. All work to be complete within existing ROW.</p> <p>No utilities are to be relocated.</p>

2025 Call for Projects

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Are property owners in agreement with Right of Way acquisition? c. What is the Right of Way schedule? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4. #15 Livability #2: In regard to “the road is unpaved, deterring many travelers from driving, walking, or biking on it” – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Encouraging increase of VMT is not the intent of CMAQ. Not eligible for points. b. Since only improving the road, walking in the roadway is not safe and thus not acceptable for this criteria. Not eligible for points. c. Also inconsistent with Pedestrian Level of Service listed as not improved. Not eligible for points. 	<p>The livability criteria in question:</p> <p>2) Modal connectivity will be enhanced since Art Lane feeds into Habecker Road, a collector that provides access to the neighboring school, and a health clinic.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5. #15 Livability and Safety: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Safety #5 - Not eligible for points b. Safety #6 - Not eligible for points 	Duly noted.
Kern Co 04 – Bernard at Haley roundabout	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. #5 Project description: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. what are ancillary facilities? b. Missing high visibility crosswalks? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ancillary is a term used by Caltrans Environmental staff to group all of the supporting facilities/structures that enhance the overall function of the transportation system; including: ped crossing, ped paths, parking, safety features, drainage facilities, culverts, and other installations that manage stormwater and prevent roadway damage. b. High visibility crosswalks will be provided.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. #15 Livability & Safety #5: Please note after rate is equal to statewide average. 	Duly noted.
Kern Co 05 – Boron shoulders	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. #2 Project Eligibility: This project will be sent to Caltrans Local Assistance for eligibility determination since CRS map lists as minor collector road (Boron Ave) and Local road (Prospect St) 	Boron is an unincorporated rural community that is highly disadvantaged. They have no functionally classified roads in this community of 2,000 persons. Many federal programs have set-asides for rural communities. Please express to Caltrans staff the need for CMAQ eligibility in small towns like Boron.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. #5 Project description: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Please provide full project scope. b. Google maps shows most of the segment on Boron already has shoulders or some type of shoulder treatment (gravel). c. Prospect does show a need for shoulders. d. What are the ADA upgrades? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Project will surface unpaved surfaces by constructing curb, gutter, & sidewalk along Boron Ave (Nudgent St - Boron Frontage Rd) & Prospect St. (Roberts Ave to Boron Ave.) b. Correct. Some areas have curb and gutter. This is a sidewalk gap project. The final product will be continuous sidewalks for improved access to the senior center and 2 schools. c. This is a sidewalk gap project.

2025 Call for Projects

	d. The final product will have ADA accessible curb ramps and driveways.
3. #7 Programming Year: a. Are property owners in agreement with Right of Way acquisition? b. What is the plan for multiple phases in one fiscal year?	a. ROW is required for 1 parcel to develop a drainage sump. There are numerous vacant properties available for purchase. b. Survey baselines and topo are complete to establish 30% design. PE & ROW is proposed in year 1 (FY 26/27) which will give us sufficient time to complete ROW acquisition.
Kern Co 06 – Columbus roundabout	
1. #5 Project description: Application indicates ped path while project justification (page 7) indicates high visibility crosswalk. Project justification includes more project scope. Please confirm which is correct.	Two projects are proposed on this alignment. Pedestrian improvements will tie-into the proposed roundabout where high visibility crosswalks are proposed.
2. #7 Programming Year: a. What is the plan for multiple phases in one fiscal year? b. Has coordination with property owners begun?	Survey baselines and topo maps are complete. PE is proposed in year 1 (FY 26/27) which will give us sufficient time to complete. One minor ROW take is anticipated. A consultant is proposed to expedite completion of design & meet timeliness requirements.
3. #8 VMT Reduction: a. 22 is incorrect. b. Page 12 traffic count identifies 9,083 which is inconsistent with ADT identified on page 17. Please confirm.	KernCOG ADT was 9,083 in 2016; however, an updated 2023 ADT from KernCOG is 9,209 daily vehicle trips for this project area. New ADT has been applied in the formulas.
4. #13 CO reduction: should be divided by 7 which equals 3.142 kg/day	Noted.
5. #14 Cost Effectiveness: Recalculate with CO divided by 7.	Recalculated cost effectiveness is \$6,105.38/lb
6. #15 Livability and Safety: Safety #5 - Not eligible for points	Noted.
7. #17, #18 Level of Service: No supporting documentation provided. Not eligible for points.	Noted; however, Bike and Ped LOS were provided. Some point should be eligible.
8. #19, #20, #21 Level of Service: application results are inconsistent with supporting document (page 16). Please clarify.	Same explanation for VMT Reduction above.
Kern Co 07 – Columbus ped path NOT ELIGIBLE	
1. #2 Eligibility: Scope is surface unpaved shoulders. Shoulders exist. Not eligible.	We apologize for the confusion. The title page and project description described “Pedestrian path improvements and ancillary facilities.” On two occasions the use of “Surfacing of unpaved shoulders” was erroneously referred to in

2025 Call for Projects

	<p>the application on page 2 and 8 in Section 2 of the Livability & Safety section.</p> <p>The final proposed project is a sidewalk to improve pedestrian access where no dirt shoulder exists. Emission calculation formulas for pedestrian facilities were used to analyze replacement of auto trips to improve pedestrian access and not the dirt shoulder formulas which are less cost effective. Bicycle and pedestrian facilities are eligible uses of CMAQ, just not as competitive as in this case.</p>
2. #6 Funding: No funding type identified.	<p>Funding has been identified as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Local = Roads Fund \$162,553.00. b. Federal = CMAQ Funding \$1,254,646.00
3. #9, #10, #11, #12 Emission Reductions: Emission factors for this CMAQ cycle are from September 2024. Emission reductions are incorrect. Page 19 identifies source for emission factors from November 2020. Pages 13 and 14 have different emission factors referenced. Need recalculation.	<p>Previous emission factors were erroneously used. Emission factors have been updated per September 2024 CARB data. New data is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. ROG (VOC) = 21.80 lbs/year (0.027kg/day) b. NOx = 13.13 lbs/year (0.016kgs/day) c. PM2.5 = 0.45 lbs/year (0.001kg/year) d. PM10 = 3.01 lbs/year (0.004kg/year)
4. #15 Livability and Safety: Safety #5 - Not eligible for points	<p>Noted, however, 9 collisions occurred between January 2022 and December 2024, resulting in 4 injuries. The existing collision rate (4.25) is higher than the statewide average (1.68) which should be eligible for points.</p>
5. #21 Cost Effectiveness: Incorrect since emission reductions were not calculated correctly. Need recalculation.	<p>Revised Cost Effectiveness Calculation has improved to \$2,482.40/lb from \$6,309.59/lb</p>
Kern Co 08 – Fruitvale and Downing shoulders	
<p>1. #1 Resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identifies Fruitvale segment as bike lane project while application lists only surface unpaved shoulder. b. #5 Project description: Application indicates surface unpaved shoulder while project justification (page 7) includes more project scope. There are existing shoulders on Fruitvale and on Downing. Maintenance is not eligible for CMAQ funding c. Please confirm project limits. 	<p>a. "Surface unpaved shoulder" is a description recommendation from a previous FHWA review when CMAQ funds were proposed for improvements within the road shoulder which can include a sidewalk or bike lane. We continue to use this description for maximum flexibility during scoping, especially because the Resolution is prepared 1 mo. before the application is due and we may not have a final project scope identified. Dust mitigation in gap areas is the primary purpose since this is in a PM10 non-attainment area. No maintenance is proposed.</p>

2025 Call for Projects

	<p>The final project is a combination of sidewalk and bike lanes by surfacing dirt areas in the roadway. Locations that have shoulders, will be converted to bike lanes.</p> <p>Project limits remain unchanged. They must include the full scope as to not cause the need for amendment changes in the FTIP during the environmental stage.</p>
2. #6 Funding: No federal funding type identified.	Federal request is \$3,137,237.
3. #15 Livability and Safety: a. Safety #5 - Not eligible for points b. Safety #6 - Not eligible for points	Noted.
Kern Co 09 – Gardiner shoulders	
1. #2 Project Eligibility: This project will be sent to Caltrans Local Assistance for eligibility determination since CRS map lists as Local road	Boron is an unincorporated rural community that is highly disadvantaged. They have no functionally classified roads in this community of 2,000 persons. Many federal programs have set-asides for rural communities. Please express to Caltrans staff the need for CMAQ eligibility in small towns like Boron.
2. #7 Programming Year: What is the plan for multiple phases in one fiscal year?	Survey baselines and topo maps are complete. PE is proposed in year 1 (FY 26/27), which should be sufficient time to complete and meet timeliness requirements.
3. #8 and #11 VMT Reduction and Emissions Calculations: please provide supporting documentation for ADT referenced in pages 13 and 16	Using Institute of Transportation Engineers' trip generation manual, 9.43 trips/day is the average for each single family dwelling (per land use code 210.) This project will benefit 65 dwellings which results in an ADT of 612.95 trips/day.
4. #15 Livability and Safety: Safety #5 - Not eligible for points	Noted.
Kern Co 10 – Hageman Rd shoulders	
1. #5 Project description: Several segments along the project limits have shoulders or gravel treatment. Please clarify project limits.	Project limits were chosen based on existing dirt shoulder limits. At the environmental phase, we cannot separate improved from unimproved areas as the entire project limit must be evaluated; however, the proposed project will only improve dirt sections within these limits.
2. #15 Livability and Safety: a. Safety #5 - Not eligible for points b. Safety #6 - Not eligible for points	Noted.

2025 Call for Projects

Kern Co 11 – Heath Rd shoulders	
<p>1. #5 Project description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Please clarify project limits. There are already shoulders on one side of the road. There are shoulders near Stockdale Highway. b. What are ancillary facilities? c. Please confirm that no additional vehicle travel lane is being built for this project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Project is proposed on the west side of Heath Road from City Limit to Johnson Road to construct sidewalks where the current dirt shoulder exists. b. Ancillary is a term used by Caltrans Environmental staff to group all of the supporting facilities/structures that enhance the overall function of the transportation system; including: ped crossing, ped paths, parking, safety features, drainage facilities, culverts, and other installations that manage stormwater and prevent roadway damage. c. No additional vehicle lane is proposed.
<p>2. #15 Livability and Safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Safety #5 - Not eligible for points b. Safety #6 - Not eligible for points 	Noted.
<p>3. #16 and #17 HWY LOS: please provide supporting documentation.</p>	<p>LOS is a qualitative measure that evaluates comfort, safety and convenience of ped/bike facilities. Complete streets are the new Caltrans directive to standardize safe transportation which should include buffers for sidewalks, bike lanes, crosswalks, & signage. A specific study was not conducted; however, the Highway Capacity Manual evaluates pedestrian facilities based on low stress (1) to high stress (4) scale. Since the area proposed is at an uncontrolled crossing and lacks pedestrian facilities we rated LOS as D. Any improvement increases the LOS. Conservatively, we only increased LOS by 1 factor to C, since sidewalks are needed further north to Rosedale Hwy.</p>
Kern Co 12 – Niles Ave shoulders NOT ELIGIBLE	
<p>1. #2 Eligibility: Road has no room for shoulders because curbing exists. Maintenance is not eligible for CMAQ funding. Please clarify project scope.</p>	<p>“Surface unpaved shoulder” is a description from a previous FHWA review specifically for the FTIP when CMAQ funds were proposed for improvement as a sidewalk. We keep this description to avoid problems encountered in the past by Caltrans. Dust mitigation is the primary purpose since this is in a PM10 non-attainment area.</p> <p>Bicycle and pedestrian facilities are eligible uses of CMAQ. The final project is a sidewalk in gap areas as this road has dirt sidewalks & unpaved surfaces in the roadway. The project limit includes the full limits of the unpaved areas (or gaps) which is required as part of the environmental phase;</p>

2025 Call for Projects

	however, the proposed project will only improve dirt sections within these limits.
2. #15 Livability and Safety: a. Safety #5 - Not eligible for points b. Safety #6 - Not eligible for points	a Noted.
3. #16 and #17 HWY LOS: please provide supporting documentation.	LOS is a qualitative measure that evaluates comfort, safety and convenience of ped/bike facilities. Complete streets are the new Caltrans directive to standardize safe transportation which should include buffers for sidewalks, bike lanes, crosswalks, & signage. A specific study was not conducted; however, the Highway Capacity Manual evaluates pedestrian facilities based on low stress (1) to high stress (4) scale. Since the area proposed is at an uncontrolled crossing and lacks pedestrian facilities on the south side we rated LOS as D. Any improvement increases the LOS. Conservatively, we only increased LOS by 1 factor to C.
Kern Co 13 – Niles traffic signal	
1. #11 and #12 PM 2.5 and PM 10: Staff not able to replicate emission reductions using CARB database. Please recalculate.	Emission reductions have been recalculated. Previous calculations were utilizing improper tables. New data is as follows: a. ROG (VOC) = 42.69 lbs/year (0.05 kg/day) b. CO = 1852.54 lbs/year (2.31kg/day) c. NOx = 446.57 lbs/year (0.56 kg/day) d. PM2.5 = 4.42 lbs/year (0.006 kg/day) e. PM10 = 4.77 lbs/year (0.006 kg/day)
2. #13 CO reduction: CO should be divided by 7 which equals 0.288 kg/day	Original data was erroneously entered and thus incorrect. Based on correct data entry = 1852.54 pounds of CO per year. 1852.54 lbs converted to kilograms = $1852.54 / 2.2 = 842.07$ kgs of CO. $842.07 \text{ kg of CO} / 365 \text{ days} = 2.31 \text{ kg of CO per day}$.
3. #15 Livability and Safety: Safety #5 - Not eligible for points	Noted.
4. #19 Bike LOS: application identifies LOS C but supporting documentation identifies LOS D. Not eligible for points.	Erroneously entered. Correct LOS for Bicycle should be D after project implementation.
Kern Co 14 – Potomac shoulders	
1. #2 Project Eligibility: This project will be sent to Caltrans Local Assistance for eligibility determination since CRS map lists as Local road	Please remove project from consideration. We no longer wish to pursue this application.

2025 Call for Projects

2. #5 Project description: a. Application indicates surface unpaved shoulder while project justification (page 8) includes more project scope. Please clarify project scope. b. What are ancillary facilities?	Please remove project from consideration. We no longer wish to pursue this application.
3. #7 Programming Year FY 26/27: a. Has County already begun coordination with Railroad? b. What is the RW schedule?	Please remove project from consideration. We no longer wish to pursue this application.
4. #8 and #11 VMT Reduction and Emissions Calculations: please provide supporting documentation for ADT referenced in pages 13 and 14	Please remove project from consideration. We no longer wish to pursue this application.

Kern Co 15 – Rosedale shoulders NOT ELIGIBLE

1. #2 Eligibility: Scope is surface unpaved shoulders. Shoulders exist. Not eligible.	<p>“Surface unpaved shoulder” is a description from a previous FHWA review specifically for the FTIP when CMAQ funds were proposed for improvement as a sidewalk. We keep this description to avoid problems encountered in the past by Caltrans. Dust mitigation is the primary purpose since this is in a PM10 non-attainment area.</p> <p>Bicycle and pedestrian facilities are eligible uses of CMAQ. The final project is a sidewalk in gap areas as this road has unpaved surfaces in the roadway. The project limit includes the full limits of the unpaved areas (or gaps) which is required as part of the environmental phase; however, the project will only improve dirt sections within these limits.</p>
2. #5 Project description: a. Application indicates surface unpaved shoulder while project justification (page 7) includes more project scope. Please clarify project scope. b. What are ancillary facilities?	<p>a. The project scope is to surface unpaved surfaces which includes curb, gutter, & sidewalk.</p> <p>b. Ancillary is a term used by Caltrans Environmental staff to group all of the supporting facilities/structures that enhance the overall function of the transportation system; including: ped crossing, ped paths, parking, safety features, drainage facilities, culverts, and other installations that manage stormwater and prevent roadway damage.</p>
3. #8 VMT Reduction: Staff could not replicate. Please revise adjustment factor (page 16) and recalculate.	Per CARB’s <i>Methods to Find the Cost Effectiveness of Funding Air Quality Projects</i> , staff calculated approximately 7 activity centers within 1/2-mile of the intersection of Rosedale Highway and Allen Road: a grocery store/shopping center on SW corner of Rosedale @ Allen, 4 churches on the Allen Road and two schools exist on Rosedale Highway. For 7 activity centers, a credit of (0.010) was used for the adjustment factor calculation.

2025 Call for Projects

4. #14 Cost Effectiveness: application cost effectiveness is inconsistent with supporting documentation (page 13). Please revise.	Staff has reviewed the application content and has not found inconsistency within the cost effectiveness, please advise so that Staff may make corrections.
5. #15 Livability and Safety: Safety #6 - Not eligible for points	Noted.

2025 Call for Projects

Kern County TTAC – Summary of Comments and Responses

The following is a summarized list of information requests or comments made by the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee members. A response is requested.

TTAC Member Comment	Applicant Response
Kern County 01 – 7 th Standard Rd – SR 43 Roundabout	
<p>On the KCOG Traffic County Database System (TCDS), the nearest AADT to 7th Standard Rd & SR 43 is 8,581 vehicles per day. Whereas, the annual average two-way daily traffic used in the cost-benefit analysis is 10,300 vehicles per day. Can KCOG point out in the document or provide the study show an AADT of 10,300 vehicles/day?</p>	<p>Please refer to KernCOG staff for answer.</p>
<p>PM10 reductions are typically on a much smaller order of magnitude. Please point out in the document, or provide, the documentation showing how the <i>before emission factor</i> and <i>after emission factor</i> translate to a PM10 reduction of 21.28 kg/day.</p>	<p>This is a re-submittal of Caltrans' 2023 CMAQ application prepared at the request of KernCOG. No data has changed. Contact Caltrans or KernCOG staff for specific details</p>
<p>On pg. 13 of the pdf, under Annual Emissions Reductions, PM10 reductions are weighed against (CMAQ funding x CRF) rather than total annual emissions reduction as prescribed by ARB methods¹.</p> <p>On pg. 16 of the pdf, the emissions reduction calculations do not show PM10 reductions. However, under (14), Daily Emission Reduction (Nox & CO) show a value identical to the above PM10 reductions of 21.28 kg/day.</p> <p>On pg. 16 of the pdf Shouldn't Daily Emission Reduction (Nox & CO) be the sum of Reduction in Nox (10) & Reduction in CO (13)?</p> <p>That sum, 7.68 kg/day, works out to the Annual Emission Reduction (Nox & CO) of 6167 lb/yr reported under (14) after conversions.</p> <p>Using 6167 lb/yr, the cost-effectiveness should be closer to \$91 lb/yr.</p>	<p>Duly noted.</p>

2025 Call for Projects

<p>1. Is the method used for finding the cost-effectiveness of this project for Ride Sharing and Pedestrian Facilities?</p> <p>According to the “Methods to Find the Cost-Effectiveness of Funding Air Quality Projects” document, and in the Automated Cost-Effectiveness Calculation Tool, CO is not typically factored into the total cost-benefit calculation for those types of facilities. See below.</p> <p>Additionally, under “Federal CMAQ Reporting Requirements” in the “Methods to Find the Cost-Effectiveness of Funding Air Quality Projects” document states that,</p> <p>CO emissions should either be omitted or scaled down by a factor of 7, & the total cost-effectiveness for this project to be revised to reflect that. With CO omitted, cost-effectiveness is around \$160 lb/yr</p>	<p>This is a re-submittal of Caltrans’ 2023 CMAQ application prepared at the request of KernCOG. No data has changed. Contact Caltrans or KernCOG staff for specific details.</p>
<p>Kern County 03 – Art Ln Pave Dirt Road</p>	
<p>Art Lane appears classified as “local” via CRS mapping system.</p>	<p>Duly noted.</p>
<p>Kern County 04 – Bernard St and Haley St Roundabout</p>	
<p>Please point out in the document or provide the calculation for the reported VMT reduction of 20,477 annual miles.</p> <p>Is the AADT used for the VMT reduction calculation 16,500 vehicle trips per day (per last study)?</p> <p>Please point out in the document or provide the last study showing the AADT figure.</p>	<p>KC Traffic Division completed a Warrant study of this intersection in 2015 (attached.) ADT was found to be 15,715 vehicles. VMT reduction has been recalculated using this ADT and found to be 19,502.32 mi/yr.</p>
<p>The technical memorandum for this project is over 8 years old and utilizes outdated traffic studies (2107) to carry out the LOS analysis. Shouldn’t this technical memorandum be revised to reflect current or more recent traffic conditions?</p>	<p>Growth is relatively slow in built-out areas and volumes dropped during COVID, skewing traffic data. We went with the worst case scenario (using 15,500 vehicles) which was resulted in a determination of the LOS to be C for this intersection. A new study will not provide any new or meaningful information per our Traffic Engineer since the LOS typically gets worse over time. We will not see improvement until new infrastructure is constructed via traffic signal or roundabout.</p>

2025 Call for Projects

Kern County 05 – Boron Ave Surface Unpaved Shoulders	
1. Prospect Street appears classified as “local” via CRS mapping system.	Duly noted.
Kern County 09 - Gardiner St Surface Unpaved Shoulders	
1. Gardiner appears classified as “local” via CRS mapping system.	Duly noted.
Kern County 15 - Rosedale Hwy Surface Unpaved Shoulders	
1. Portions of this area are planned to be developed (at least from Jenkins to the East). Additionally, shoulders are mostly improved along this segment (AC Paving). If C&G to be installed, does County have a plan for the runoff?	A drainage sump is proposed as part of the project to capture storm drain run-off.

Intersection:	Bernard Street & Haley Street								
	Monday, August 24, 2015								
	Major Street			Minor Street			Grand Total	highest 8 volumes on major	corresponding 8 hours on minor
Street Name:	Bernard Street			Haley Street					
	EB	WB	E/W	NB	SB	N/S			
12-1	57	56	113	24	38	62	174	0	0
1-2	40	10	50	13	47	60	111	0	0
2-3	21	16	36	12	13	25	61	0	0
3-4	23	30	52	20	17	37	89	0	0
4-5	56	38	94	18	27	46	140	0	0
5-6	73	52	125	35	43	79	204	0	0
6-7	118	78	196	62	92	153	349	0	0
7-8	281	248	530	72	186	258	788	0	0
8-9	306	210	516	86	223	309	825	0	0
9-10	231	200	431	94	202	296	727	0	0
10-11	248	271	519	96	215	310	830	0	0
11-12	269	276	545	113	285	398	943	545	398
12-1	285	269	554	140	229	369	923	554	369
1-2	281	309	590	141	247	389	979	590	389
2-3	337	373	710	127	280	407	1117	710	407
3-4	392	361	754	158	372	530	1284	754	530
4-5	316	304	620	117	280	397	1017	620	397
5-6	375	386	761	165	334	499	1259	761	499
6-7	321	339	660	105	316	420	1080	660	420
7-8	243	292	535	102	221	323	858	0	0
8-9	231	238	469	93	194	287	756	0	0
9-10	200	189	389	73	140	213	602	0	0
10-11	101	97	198	30	123	153	351	0	0
11-12	108	45	153	26	69	96	248	0	0
Sum	4913	4687	9600	1922	4193	6115	15715	5194	3409

2025 Call for Projects

McFarland KCOG – Summary of Comments and Responses

The following is a summarized list of information requests or comments made by the Kern COG staff. A response is requested.

KCOG Staff Comment	Applicant Response
McFarland 01 – Park and Ride NOT ELIGIBLE	
<p>1. # 2 Project Eligibility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Application packet is incomplete. The three-year fleet conversion plan was not provided. Not eligible for ranking this cycle. b. CMAQ funds cannot be used to demolish existing infrastructure. Google maps shows a block wall and sidewalks for the three driveways to the park and ride shown on pg.7. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Please see attached document below. 3 Year Fleet Conversion Plan was originally not factored as it would not necessarily affect the intent of the project, to provide for a safe place for secure vehicle parking. (b) The wall was installed by the previous landowner and has remained in place to avoid extension of liability by people trespassing. The city will incur all removal costs of wall. All sidewalks will remain intact with the exception of any curb-cuts necessary to achieve drive approaches and ADA accessibility.
<p>2. #3 Project Background: When will development of city owned facilities at the site be built?</p>	<p>The city will be breaking ground before the close of 2025 calendar year. This project will run concurrently with the development of the park and ride facility.</p>
<p>3. #5 Project Description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Please note the project description has been revised. McFarland: Intersection of Taylor Ave and Mast Ave; Construct Park and Ride facility with 31 parking spaces, ADA stalls, EV chargers, and transit stop accommodations. b. Describe transit stop accommodations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) We acknowledge this change. (b) The transit stop for the park and ride location will be adjacent to the future city services building/police facility. This site was selected to combine efforts to ensure public safety remains paramount with reduction in green house gas emissions.
<p>4. #6 Funding: Application is missing PE and R/W costs as shown in pg. 8 Cost Estimate.</p>	<p>Please see attached document below. We have provided the proper numbers in every section. We wanted to ensure that the minimum financial match for this project was met.</p>
<p>5. #7 Programming Year for R/W:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the project require utility relocation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) No utilities currently onsite therefore no relocation will be needed. The project will include new utilities to be ran to the

2025 Call for Projects

<ul style="list-style-type: none">b. If so, who is funding the relocation?c. What is the schedule for utility relocation?	site including electrical, drainage, water, and irrigation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">6. #8, #10, #11, #12, #14: Emission Reductions<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Staff is not able to replicate Emission Reductions. Please provide supporting documentation for Emission Reductionsb. Staff is not able to replicate PM 10 emission factors. Please provide supporting documentation.	Annual Auto VMT reduced Equation was revised. Resulting in a VMT reduction. See attached revised calculations. As vehicle miles traveled (VMT) changed, the associated emissions reductions and Cost-Effectiveness were also affected. Please refer to the attached calculations for details and revised project application. Please see attached document.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">7. #15 Livability and Safety:<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Safety #5 Not eligible for points.b. Safety #6 Not eligible for points.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) We acknowledge this update.(b) We acknowledge this update.

2025 Call for Projects

McFarland TTAC – Summary of Comments and Responses

The following is a summarized list of information requests or comments made by the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee members. A response is requested.

TTAC Member Comment	Applicant Response
McFarland 01 – Park and Ride	
1. McFarland received funding for a Park and Ride facility on the Eastside of McFarland with the same amenities, such as EV chargers. What is the demand for this type of facility? What are the utilization rates for the Eastside project? Has the city coordinated with Kern Transit to relocate their stop? Have other funding options been consider such as TIRCP/ZETCP Funds?	There is no current Park and Ride Facility in the City. Our EV Charging Station is utilized as charging only and there are currently no transit routes designated to this site. Due to this, we do not have any utilization rates available. As such, we have identified this need for a Park and Ride facility in a safe and controlled environment to encourage ride sharing and in turn reduce greenhouse gas emissions. By utilizing Placer.AI, we have distinguished frequently travelled routes from McFarland to Delano and believe in a significantly more substantial impact in greenhouse gas emissions reductions by providing this alternative transportation. We have coordinated with Nelson Nygaard, which is a consultant working on the Kern Transporation Development Plan with KernCOG, addressing a possible Kern Transit relocation. We have not received a response. We have looked at other funding sources. The funds available under TIRCP/ZETCP have been allocated toward a transit focused maintenance facility. We have also identified that a Park and Ride Facility would be useful on both the sides (east and west) of McFarland.

2025 Call for Projects

Ridgecrest KCOG – Summary of Comments and Responses

The following is a summarized list of information requests or comments made by the Kern COG staff. A response is requested.

KCOG Staff Comment	Applicant Response
Ridgecrest 01 – Electric Bus	
1. #5 Project Description: Please note the project description has been revised to include the full project scope. In Ridgecrest: Purchase One Replacement Battery Electric Cutaway Bus for Transit Fleet	#5 Project description was revised to match as requested within CMAQ Application.
2. # 8 VMT Reduction is incorrect. 20,000 miles is VMT, not VMT reduction. Not eligible for points.	VMT has been revised to show no change as this is a replacement for an existing bus within our fleet. However, with a “green” replacement it will reduce emissions.
3. #10 NOx reduction is incorrect. 0.39 is NOx emission factor not emission reduction. NOx reduction is 0.02 kg/day.	#10 has been revised as it was determined that the weight of the original bus was not accurate.
4. #11 PM 10 reduction is incorrect. 0.07 is PM 2.5 emission factor not PM 10 emission reduction. Not eligible for points.	#11 has been revised as PM10 is not applicable for a vehicle replacement project.
5. #12 PM 2.5 reduction is in lbs/year. Please provide in kg/day.	#12 has been revised (See attached updated CARB on-road results)
6. #13 CO reduction: How was CO reduction calculated? Please provide supporting documentation.	#13 has been revised. Please see attached Cost Effectiveness Table. 6.2 g per mile =.0062 Kg per mile x 20,000 miles per yr =124 Kg per yr / 365 days =.339 Kg per day.
7. #14 Cost-Effectiveness (\$/ lb) could not be replicated in CARB database. Project life is 18 years for an electric bus not 10 years. Please provide revised Cost-Effectiveness.	#14 has been revised (See attached updated CARB on-road results)
8. #22 RACM/BACM: Project is not identified as a RACM/BACM. Not eligible for points.	#22 has been updated to “No”

2025 Call for Projects

9. Pg 5 Cost Estimate: Please replace RSTP/HIP with CMAQ.	Page 5 of the Cost Estimate was revised to show CMAQ.
---	---

2025 Call for Projects

Shafter KCOG – Summary of Comments and Responses

The following is a summarized list of information requests or comments made by the Kern COG staff. A response is requested.

KCOG Staff Comment	Applicant Response
Shafter 01 – Lerdo Hwy Construct Shoulders	
1. #5 Project Description: Please note the project description has been revised. Shafter: E Lerdo Hwy from Beech Ave to Cherry Ave; Pave unpaved shoulders.	No issues with the change in project description.
2. #7 Programming Year for R/W: a. Does the project require utility relocation? b. If so, who is funding the relocation? c. What is the schedule for utility relocation?	No utility relocation will be required on this project. No funding will be utilized in the Right of Way phase.
3. Pg. 4 CMAQ Emission Calculations: Please provide supporting documentation for ADT. Kern COG Traffic Count Database shows an ADT of ~ 9,000 and Caltrans Database shows ~10,000 while application shows 18,000.	<p>The City of Shafter utilized Urban SDK traffic count data to support the CMAQ emission calculations. Urban SDK is a geospatial data platform that leverages continuous GPS and connected vehicle data from motorists to generate, up-to-date traffic volumes and travel patterns. When reported by Urban SDK, the dataset reflects an Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) of 9,000 vehicles per direction, which equates to 18,000 total when combined.</p> <p>In addition, the City collected manual traffic counts in 2022, which totaled approximately 12,100 vehicles. These counts were taken on a summer non-school day, which typically results in lower traffic volumes than average conditions and are 3 years old now. If preferred, the City can revise the PM-10 application/calculation to utilize the 2022 traffic counts collected by the City of Shafter as the basis for the emission calculations.</p>

2025 Call for Projects

Shafter TTAC – Summary of Comments and Responses

The following is a summarized list of information requests or comments made by the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee members. A response is requested.

TTAC Member Comment	Applicant Response
Shafter 01 – Lerdo Hwy Construct Shoulders	
1. Portions of the road shoulder appear to have old asphalt. Caltrans may not consider this project eligible for CMAQ.	The application only factored in the construction of new shoulders along this stretch. While there is a small portion near Beech Avenue that includes shoulder improvements tied to adjacent development, the project limits were clearly defined between Beech and Cherry for both simplicity of definition and environmental clearance. Any other locations that appear to have pavement are the result of years of sand seal build-up, installation of pavement grindings, or minor remnants of asphalt outside the travel lane. These areas do not function as shoulders and are in poor condition, breaking away from the edge of pavement.

2025 Call for Projects

Tehachapi KCOG – Summary of Comments and Responses

The following is a summarized list of information requests or comments made by the Kern COG staff. A response is requested.

KCOG Staff Comment	Applicant Response
Tehachapi 01 – Tehachapi Blvd Shoulder with Bike Lane NOT ELIGIBLE	
1. #1 Resolution: Resolution does not include bike lanes. Not eligible.	Thanks for the feedback. We'll fix this on the revision.
2. #5 Project Description: a. Please note the project description has been revised. Tehachapi: E Tehachapi Blvd from Bailey Ct to Pilot Travel Center; pave southside unpaved shoulders b. Please note there is a bike lane on the north side of E Tehachapi Blvd that has capacity for bi-directional travel. c. Widen road is not CMAQ eligible. Is the project creating another vehicle travel lane?	a. Thank you for letting us know. We are planning on revising our application to include bike lanes. b. We are aware c. No
3. #6 Funding: PE, R/W, and CON ratio is incorrect. Revise funding breakdown to meet the 88.53% federal /11.47% local match requirement.	Thanks for the feedback. We'll fix this on the revision.
4. #7 Programming Year: a. What is the plan to complete PE and R/W in FY 26/27? b. Does the project require utility relocation? c. If so, who is funding the relocation? d. What is the schedule for utility relocation?	a. We have two existing federal on-call contracts with engineering firms, so we should be able to start the PE and R/W very quickly once we get funding. b. Not that we are aware of, we did an initial check where we went out and roughly measured everything. We normally send out emails to local utility company's to confirm, once we are in the design phase. c. It would be the utility owner. d. Currently unknown. As mentioned earlier, we are currently unaware of any utilities that would need to be moved but will confirm.

2025 Call for Projects

5. #15 Livability and Safety: a. Safety #5: not eligible for points. b. Safety #6: not eligible for points.	Thank you for the note. We hired a consultant to do our application; we will review this with them.
6. Pg. 22 CARB Emission report: a. Project life in CARB Emission report should be 15 years b. Emission factors should be from September 2024 emission factor table 3A.	Thank you for the note. We hired a consultant to do our application; we will review this with them.
7. Pg. 23 CMAQ Emission Calculations: Length of project in CMAQ Emission Calculation is inconsistent with length of project in VMT Reduction Calculation (pg. 21)	Thank you for the note. We hired a consultant to do our application; we will review this with them.

2025 Call for Projects

Tehachapi TTAC – Summary of Comments and Responses

The following is a summarized list of information requests or comments made by the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee members. A response is requested.

TTAC Member Comment	Applicant Response
Tehachapi 01 – Tehachapi Blvd Shoulder with Bike Lane	
1. Shoulders appear from google earth sky view to be improved via either rock or asphalt, is that the case? Would the Project intend to increase vehicle capacity of roadway?	I think you are referring to the grindings that we placed just West of the Flying J gas station, those were placed with the intent to discourage illegal U-turns, they do not act as a shoulder. No, the intent is not to increase vehicle capacity.
2. Please clarify if the road will be widened to include an additional lane for vehicle travel and class II bike lanes; <u>or</u> paving a 6' unpaved shoulder area to be utilized in conjunction with class II bike lanes. You do not want to use "widening" language with Caltrans Environmental. Project will not be exempt from NEPA if increased capacity is proposed (via new travel lane.) Caltrans will require an EA which can take over 12 months to complete.	We are "paving a 6' unpaved shoulder area to be utilized in conjunction with class II bike lanes." Thank you for the feedback, that it good to know.
3. A separated Class 1 bike facility exists on the north side of road, where is the conflict? Striping a Class II bike lane would be confusing for bicyclists. Recommend this project be down-graded to a pave shoulder project only.	Thank you for the note. We hired a consultant to do our application; we will review this with them.
4. Road shoulder appears to have been treated with gravel. Caltrans may not consider this project eligible for CMAQ.	I think you are referring to the grindings that we placed just West of the Flying J gas station, those were placed with the intent to discourage illegal U-turns, they do not act as a shoulder. Thanks for letting us know.

2025 Call for Projects

Wasco KCOG – Summary of Comments and Responses

The following is a summarized list of information requests or comments made by the Kern COG staff. A response is requested.

KCOG Staff Comment	Applicant Response
Wasco 01 – CNG Station NOT ELIGIBLE	
1. # 2 Project Eligibility: Application packet is incomplete. The three-year fleet conversion plan was not provided. Not eligible for ranking this cycle.	Please refer to page 2, specifically the last paragraph, for the narrative of the fleet conversion. The existing sanitation fleet consists of 7 CNG-fueled trucks along with a number of diesel fueled trucks of which (4) are over ten years old and will need to be replaced. Likely with diesel if this CNG station isn't built. This proposal recommends building a new slow-fill CNG station to fuel an existing fleet of 7 CNG-powered vehicles and (4) future for sanitation. This project will promote/support the continuation of using CNG and the replacement of at least four existing diesel trucks with CNG-powered ones in the next three years.
2. #3 Project Background: Pg. 3 states CMAQ request is \$680,800. Please revise statement to reflect CMAQ request amount in pg. 1.	Please see revisions.
3. #6 Funding: CON ratio is incorrect. Revise funding breakdown to meet the 88.53% federal /11.47% local match requirement.	Please see the revision.
4. Pg. 6 Project Site Plan: When will development of city owned facilities at the site be built?	The site is currently undergoing a master-plan design for site-layout. Improvements are expected to break ground in 2026 (utilities) with full completion expected to be completed in various phases over the next 5 years.
5. Pg. 7 CMAQ Emission Calculations: Staff was not able to replicate calculations. Please provide supporting documentation.	Staff utilized methodology from the FHWA: Office of Natural Environment's CMAQ Program 2020 Cost-Effectiveness Update document. Pages 88-90 of this document

2025 Call for Projects

	contain the methodology used. (Document attached to email)
Wasco 02 – Griffith Ave Shoulder Stabilization Improvements	
1. # 2 Project Eligibility: This project will be sent to Caltrans Local Assistance for eligibility determination since CRS map lists as local road.	Roadway is classified as Collector in Council-approved circulation map. I understand that the State will typically be ok with it as long as it is classified correctly in a Council-approved document?
2. #5 Project Description: Please note the project description has been revised. Wasco: Griffith Ave from Filburn St to Wasco Union Elementary School District Maintenance, Operations, & Transportation Facility (approximately 0.25 mi); Surface Unpaved East Shoulder, Curb & Gutter, ADA Ramps, Sidewalks, Striping, and Relocate PG&E Power Lines. a. Please confirm that the shoulder is dirt and not gravel.	Existing shoulder is dirt, not gravel.
3. #6 Funding: Revise funding breakdown to meet the 88.53% federal /11.47% local match requirement. a. R/W funding is missing local match. b. CON ratio is incorrect.	Spread match between PE , R/W and CONST. Attached revised application.
4. #7 Programming Year for R/W: a. Please provide fiscal year for R/W phase. b. What is the schedule for utility relocation?	FY26-27 for R/W There is no scheduled utility relocation at this time, but we will work with PG&E early on to ensure timely completion. Typically, 6-8 months.
5. #11 PM 10 Reduction: PM 10 reduction is incorrect. 1.58 is PM 10 after emission factor not emission reduction. PM 10 emission reduction is 0.11 kg/day.	Please see the revision in revised application. Wrong number was carried over from calculation sheet.
6. #15 Livability and Safety: a. Safety #5 No statewide rate provided. Please provide average rate for a similar facility. Wasco area project rate is not provided in required format. Provide before and after accident rate per VMT (accidents/ millions of vehicle miles (MVM)). b. Safety #6 Not eligible for points.	See section 5. In revised application.

2025 Call for Projects

7. Pg. 6 - Red dash line is not the project location. Please confirm that the CMAQ project limits are from Filburn St to MOT	Please see the revised application with new project location map.
8. Pg. 7 - CMAQ cannot be used for road maintenance. Please confirm that the shoulder is dirt and not paved. Grinding existing AC is not CMAQ eligible.	Existing shoulder is dirt.
Wasco 03 – Wasco Ave Shoulder Stabilization Improvements – This Project request has been withdrawn.	

2025 Call for Projects

Wasco TTAC – Summary of Comments and Responses

The following is a summarized list of information requests or comments made by the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee members. A response is requested.

TTAC Member Comment	Applicant Response
Wasco 01 – CNG Station	
1. Four utility poles are within the project limits. Do these need to be moved or will they be protected in-place? PG&E timeline is approx. 12-18 mo. for pole relocations. If so, can you meet the E76 deadline for Dec. 2027?	Yes, the poles will need to be relocated to the East (most likely) and we are confident that we can make the E76 deadline when taking into account the pole relocations.