



# AGENDA

## Technical Advisory Committee

### Committee Members

Shaun Pelletier	City of Aliso Viejo
Rudy Emami	City of Anaheim
Tony Olmos	City of Brea
Nabil S. Henein	City of Buena Park
Raja Sethuraman	City of Costa Mesa
Nardy Khan	County of Orange
Doug Dancs	City of Cypress
Matthew Sinacori	City of Dana Point
Mark Lewis	City of Fountain Valley
Meg McWade	City of Fullerton
William Murray	City of Garden Grove
Travis Hopkins	City of Huntington Beach
Jaimee Bourgeois	City of Irvine
Chris Johansen	City of La Habra
Michael Belknap	City of La Palma
Mark Trestik	City of Laguna Beach
Ken Rosenfield	City of Laguna Hills
Jacki Scott	City of Laguna Niguel
Akram Hindiyeh	City of Laguna Woods
Tom Wheeler	City of Lake Forest
Dave Hunt	City of Los Alamitos
Mark Chagnon	City of Mission Viejo
David Webb	City of Newport Beach
Christopher Cash	City of Orange
Luis Estevez	City of Placentia
Brendan Dugan	City of Rancho Santa Margarita
Tom Bonigut	City of San Clemente
Steve May	City of San Juan Capistrano
William Galvez	City of Santa Ana
Steve Myrter	City of Seal Beach
Guillermo Perez	City of Stanton
Doug Stack	City of Tustin
Akram Hindiyeh	City of Villa Park
Marwan Youssef	City of Westminster
Jaime Lai	City of Yorba Linda
Tiffany Tran	Caltrans

Orange County Transportation Authority  
 550 South Main Street, Room 09  
 Orange, California  
**November 13, 2019 1:30 p.m.**

*Any person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in this meeting should contact the Measure M2 Local Programs section, telephone (714) 560-5372, no less than two (2) business days prior to this meeting to enable OCTA to make reasonable arrangements to assure accessibility to this meeting.*

*Agenda descriptions are intended to give members of the public a general summary of items of business to be transacted or discussed. The posting of the recommended actions does not indicate what action will be taken. The Committee may take any action which it deems to be appropriate on an agenda item and is not limited in any way by the notice of the recommended action.*

*All documents relative to the items referenced in this agenda are available for public inspection at [www.octa.net](http://www.octa.net) or through the Measure M2 Local Programs office at the OCTA Headquarters, 600 South Main Street, Orange, California.*



**Call to Order**

**Self-Introductions**

**Consent Calendar**

*All items on the Consent Calendar are to be approved in one motion unless a Technical Advisory Committee member requests separate action on a specific item.*

**1. Approval of Minutes**

Approval of the Technical Advisory Committee regular meeting minutes of July 24, 2019.

**Regular Items**

**2. September 2019 Semi-Annual Review – Joseph Alcock**

***Overview***

The Orange County Transportation Authority recently completed the September 2019 semi-annual review of projects funded through the Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs. This process reviews the status of Measure M2 grant-funded projects and provides an opportunity for local agencies to update project information and request project modifications. Recommended project adjustments are presented for review and approval.

***Recommendation***

Recommend Board of Directors approval of requested adjustments to Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs projects and Local Fair Share Program funds.

**3. 2020 Technical Steering Committee Membership – Joseph Alcock**

***Overview***

The Orange County Transportation Authority Technical Advisory Committee provides feedback and input on local streets and roads related items. To accomplish this, the committee relies on a Technical Steering Committee made up of nine representatives from local agencies to provide guidance on major technical items. Technical Steering Committee members serve two-year terms, with the exception of one-year terms for the chair and vice chair. This year, five positions are open for consideration, and proposed 2020 Technical Steering Committee membership recommendations are presented for review and approval.



***Recommendation***

Approve proposed 2020 Technical Steering Committee membership recommendations.

**Discussion Items**

**4. Correspondence**

OCTA Board Items of Interest

- **Monday, August 12, 2019**
  - Item 5:* 2020 State Transportation Improvement Program Overview
  - Item 11:* Measure M2 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs – 2020 Annual Call for Projects
  - Item 13:* Measure M2 Community-Based Transit Circulator Program Project V Ridership Report
  - Item 14:* Local Agencies' Interest in Project V Call for Projects
  
- **Monday, September 9, 2019**
  - Item 18:* 2019 Project X – Tier 1 Call for Projects Programming Recommendations
  - Item 19:* Measure M2 Quarterly Progress Report for the Period of April 2019 Through June 2019
  
- **Monday, September 23, 2019**
  - Item 5:* Guidance for the Orange County Transportation Authority Decision-Making When Requested to Lead a Locally Sponsored Capital Project
  - Item 12:* 2020 State Transportation Improvement Program
  
- **Monday, October 14, 2019**
  - Item 6:* Grant Award and Baseline Agreement for Solutions for Congested Corridors Program
  - Item 13:* 2020 Project V Community-Based Transit Circulators Program Guidelines and Call for Projects
  - Item 14:* Programming Recommendations for the City of Laguna Niguel Project V Service
  
- **Monday, October 28, 2019**
  - Item 25:* Measure M2 Next 10 Plan: Market Conditions Key Indicators Analysis and Forecast

Announcements by Email

- July 24, 2019 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda, *sent 7/19/2019*



- July 24, 2019 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Follow Up Materials from Caltrans, *sent 7/25/2019*
- September 2019 Semi-Annual Review, *sent 8/1/2019*
- 2021 Federal Transportation Improvement Program Meetings, *sent 8/5/2019*
- Invitation to Participate in Orange County Safe Routes to School Working Group, *sent 8/5/2019*
- August 14, 2019 Technical Steering Committee Meeting Cancellation Notice, *sent 8/6/2019*
- August 28, 2019 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Cancellation Notice, *sent 8/16/2019*
- Caltrans Releases 20/21 Grant Application Guide and Call-for-Applications, *sent 8/19/2019*
- 2020 Call for Projects – Now Open; Regional Capacity Program (RCP) and Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization (RTSSP), *sent 8/26/2019*
- 2020 Proposed CTFP Guidelines Discussion – Project V Community Based Transit Circulators, *sent 8/28/2019*
- September 2019 Semi-Annual Review: Timely Use of Funds Verification, *sent 8/30/2019*
- Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant – Call for Applications Announcement and Grants Workshop, *sent 9/4/2019*
- September 11, 2019 Technical Steering Committee Meeting Cancellation Notice, *sent 9/5/2019*
- 2020 CTFP (Projects O and P) Call for Projects Deadlines Reminder, *sent 9/9/2019*
- 2019 Draft Congestion Management Program Report-Public Review, *sent 9/10/2019*
- M2 Semi-Annual Review Closes on September 13, 2019, *sent 9/11/2019*
- September 25, 2019 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Cancellation Notice, *sent 9/16/2019*
- Fiscal Year 2018-19 Expenditure Report Submittal Tracker – Local Streets and Roads Funding Program (SB1 RMRA), *sent 9/26/2019*
- October 9, 2019 Technical Steering Committee Meeting Cancellation Notice, *sent 10/9/2019*
- October 23, 2019 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Cancellation Notice, *sent 10/17/2019*
- 2020 M2 Community-Based Circulators (Project V) Call Now Open, *sent 10/22/2019*

## **5. Committee Comments**

Recognition of 2019 TAC Chair

## **6. Local Assistance Update**



- 7. Staff Comments**
- 8. Items for Future Agendas**
- 9. Public Comments**
- 10. Adjournment**

*The Technical Advisory Committee is scheduled to meet monthly on the fourth Wednesday of each month.*



**July 24, 2019**

**Technical Advisory Committee**

**Minutes**



# Minutes

## Technical Advisory Committee Item #1

### **Voting Representatives Present:**

Shaun Pelletier	City of Aliso Viejo
Rudy Emami	City of Anaheim
Tony Olmos	City of Brea
Mina Mikhael	City of Buena Park
Raja Sethuraman	City of Costa Mesa
Nardy Khan	County of Orange
Khalid Bazmi	County of Orange
Mark Lewis	City of Fountain Valley
Temo Galvez	City of Fountain Valley
Tom Herbel	City of Huntington Beach
Jaimee Bourgeois	City of Irvine
Mark Trestik	City of Laguna Beach
Tom Wheeler	City of Lake Forest
Mark Chagnon	City of Mission Viejo
Christopher Cash	City of Orange
Luis Estevez	City of Placentia
Brendan Dugan	City of Rancho Santa Margarita
Tom Bonigut	City of San Clemente
Iris Lee	City of Seal Beach
Doug Stack	City of Tustin
Jake Ngo	City of Westminster
Rick Yee	City of Yorba Linda
Tiffany Tran	Caltrans

Orange County Transportation Authority  
550 S. Main Street, Room 09  
Orange, CA

**July 24, 2019 1:30 PM**

### **Guest Present:**

Oliver Luu, Caltrans  
Carlos Barragan, Caltrans  
Dan Candelaria

### **Staff Present:**

Kia Mortazavi  
Kurt Brotcke  
Joseph Alcock  
Adriann Cardoso  
Tamara Warren  
Louis Zhao  
Harry Thomas  
Cynthia Morales  
Alfonso Hernandez

### **Voting Representatives Absent:**

Nabil S Henein	City of Buena Park
Doug Dancs	City of Cypress
Matthew Sinacori	City of Dana Point
Meg McWade	City of Fullerton
William Murray	City of Garden Grove
Travis Hopkins	City of Huntington Beach
Michael Belknap	City of La Palma
Jacki Scott	City of Laguna Niguel
Akrman Hindiyeh	City of Laguna Woods
Dave Hunt	City of Los Alamitos
David Webb	City of Newport Beach
Steve May	City of San Juan Capistrano
William Galvez	City of Santa Ana
Steve Myrter	City of Seal Beach
Guillermo Perez	City of Stanton
Akram Hindiyeh	City of Villa Park
Marwan Youssef	City of Westminster
Thom Coughran	City of Yorba Linda



*The meeting was called to order by Mr. Lewis at 1:30 p.m.*

**Self-Introductions**

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

**1. The Minutes for the May 22, 2019 meeting were approved.**

Mr. Wheeler motioned to approve the item. The motion was second by Mr. Stack.

**REGULAR ITEMS**

**2. CTFP Guidelines Update – Joseph Alcock**

Mr. Alcock presented an overview of OCTA’s proposed updates to the Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs (CTFP) Guidelines.

Mr. Lewis then provided a brief overview of the Technical Steering Committee’s (TSC) discussion of the proposed CTFP Guidelines changes. Mr. Lewis concluded by noting that the TSC had motioned to approve all of OCTA’s proposed changes, contingent upon OCTA clarifying the Right of Way (ROW) reimbursement process for remnant parcels.

Next, Mr. Sethuraman inquired as to who is responsible for providing back up for California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) labor hours.

Mr. Brotcke responded that for audit purposes all costs need to be fair and reasonable and need to tie back to some sort of back up. Mr. Brotcke suggested this be handled at the front end of a project between the local agency and Caltrans.

Mr. Rosenfield then requested a change to the CTFP Guidelines in the Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (RTSSP) chapter. He requested that CTFP Guidelines language be changed to state that “ADA compliant pedestrian signals or ADA compliant pedestrian signals including but not limited to tactile, audible buttons and count down signal heads be considered eligible expenditures.”

Mr. Lewis responded that this was a reasonable request.

Next, Mr. Wheeler asked to discuss OCTA’s proposed changes on page 9-9 of the CTFP Guidelines. Specifically, he stated that if a local agency has a remnant/surplus parcel and they sell it, the local agency should not have to repay a prorated amount or an appraisal, which may be higher.





Mr. Lewis then interjected and provided a more detailed recap of TSC discussions on this topic. He stated that from a local agency's perspective, if it bought land at \$100 and then sold it for \$80 then the Measure M (M2) program should be reimbursed \$80 and the loss of the \$20 should be considered a cost of doing business. He also stated that if a local agency bought land for \$100 and what is left is now worth \$0 that is also the cost of doing business. He also noted that if a local agency purchased land for \$100 and after project improvements have been completed, the land is then valued at \$120, then \$100 should go back into M2 and the additional \$20 should go to the local agency.

Mrs. Cardoso stated that when OCTA staff met with its right of way (ROW) department manager, he reminded staff that surplus/excess ROW is technically ineligible for M2 funds per the CTFP Guidelines. She stated that going by this definition anything beyond the footprint the Master Plan of Arterial Highways (MPAH) is not eligible for reimbursement under M2 and noted that staff is trying to interpret and manage this requirement, which is why it made the proposed changes to this section of the CTFP Guidelines.

Mr. Wheeler asked where this was stated in the CTFP Guidelines.

Mrs. Cardoso responded by noting that it was listed on page 7-18 of the existing CTFP Guidelines, where it lists ineligible expenditures.

Mr. Wheeler inquired if that is the section that needs to be changed.

Mrs. Cardoso stated there needs to be further discussion with OCTA's ROW department in order to clarify if this statement ties back to the M2 Ordinance.

Mr. Wheeler stated that without knowing this, the TAC should not weigh in on this topic at this point.

Mrs. Cardoso responded that it was staff's understanding, again from OCTA's ROW department, that after having worked on the M2 freeway program and the railroad grade separation projects, that it is leaning toward the language being an ordinance requirement. She also noted, that while it might not say excess ROW, it does state cost "not for this purpose" cannot be reimbursed.

Mr. Lewis countered that comparing the Regional Capacity Program (RCP) to the freeway program and the grade separation program is a bit of an apples to oranges comparison, given that the M2 freeway program and railroad grade separation programs fund themselves. He stated that in those programs, if there is excess ROW no individual agency is harmed. Whereas if a local agency is funding a project, there is a bigger financial burden placed on the local agency, if it is not fully reimbursed for surplus/remnant property.



Mr. Emami stated that what worried him is that if a local agency takes only 25% of a parcel, but it impacts a house on that property, which is valued at \$400,000 (or more), it would be required to buy the full parcel.

Mr. Sethuraman then inquired how a remnant/surplus property that could not be sold, would be handled.

Next Mr. Wheeler asked how OCTA manages funding its own ROW programs when buying needed project components outside of the ROW.

Mr. Cardoso stated that OCTA disposes of those properties and the proceeds go back into the M2 program.

Mr. Wheeler inquired if OCTA pays more money based on a prorated rate or what they actually sold the property for.

Mrs. Cardoso explained if OCTA gets more money back then a proportional share of what it generated goes back into the M2 program.

Mr. Wheeler then asked how OCTA would handle a situation where the parcel sells for less than the original purchase price.

Mrs. Cardoso responded that OCTA puts the lesser amount back into the program.

Mr. Wheeler stated OCTA is asking cities to put back the original price or an appraised value price and the freeway program does not do that.

Mr. Brotcke stated that it seems like the TAC and OCTA need more time to further evaluate this component of the CTFP Guidelines. He stated that the Guidelines as they are right now do need more changes but noted that he would rather defer this specific item for now in order to move forward with an August Regional Planning & Highway Committee and Board of Directors (Board) approval to issue the 2020 call.

Mr. Lewis stated he did not want this one issue to hold up authorization of the 2020 Call for Projects.

Mr. Wheeler concurred and motioned for approval with the condition that Mr. Rosenfield's request with respect to the ADA signal modifications be included in the proposed CTFP Guidelines changes, and that OCTA bring back the remnant/surplus ROW discussion during the next CTFP Guidelines update process for further review and discussion.

The motion was second by Mr. Sethuraman.



**Discussion Items**

**3. Senate Bill 1 (SB1) Update – Louis Zhao**

Mr. Zhao presented a general status update on SB1 implementation

Next, Mr. Lewis provided a recap of an SB1 discussion he presented to the Association of California Cities-Orange County (ACCOC). He stated that the ACCOC recommended that the issues he identified in his presentation, primarily associated with SB1's disproportionate allocation process, be escalated to the city managers working group.

Mr. Bazmi responded by noting that the that the distribution of SB1 funds is an issue that should be raised and discussed more appropriately amongst the city managers working group and requested that future SB1 discussions (on this topic) not be placed on TAC agendas.

**4. Semi-Annual Review Trend Analysis – Joseph Alcock**

Mr. Alcock presented a brief overview of Semi-Annual Review Trends for the March 2018 Semi-Annual Review. The presentation primarily focused upon project delivery trends and findings as well as a general description of typical semi-annual review modification requests.

**5. Guidance to Assist OCTA Decision Making when Requested to Lead Locally Sponsored Projects (Guidance) – Tamara Warren**

Mrs. Warren presented draft Guidance to assist OCTA with decision making when it is requested to lead locally sponsored projects.

Mr. Sethuraman asked what kind of projects the Guidance was anticipated to be used on.

Mrs. Warren responded that the Guidance would be used to support project management efforts on major regional projects.

Mr. Sethuraman asked if the Guidance would apply to the RTSSP program.

Mrs. Warren stated that the Guidance is not envisioned for the RTSSP program.

Mr. Sethuraman stated that he noticed a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation requirement.

Mrs. Warren stated that she also noticed that verbiage and also clarified that this Guidance does not relate to the RTSSP program.



Mrs. Khan inquired if NEPA clearance would still be needed on these types of projects.

Mrs. Warren stated the way the Guidance is written, it is predicated upon the concept that these types of regional projects would require NEPA clearance, unless OCTA and the local agency determine that NEPA is not needed.

Mrs. Khan noted that if there is a NEPA requirement, the local agency cannot necessarily secure that clearance.

Mrs. Cardoso stated that maybe OCTA can look more into that language a bit more, and noted that if the Guidance is requiring NEPA, then the project would need to have federal dollars on it.

Mr. Stack asked if this is just a Guidance document to make sure OCTA and local agencies are all on the same page.

Mrs. Warren responded in affirmative.

Mr. Brotcke stated that this Guidance was designed to facilitate discussions if OCTA is requested in the future to lead locally sponsored projects which require federal funds.

**6. Correspondence – See agenda**

**7. Committee Comments – None**

**8. Local Assistance – Oliver Luu and Carlos Barragan**

Mr. Luu stated that the next round of Active Transportation Program (ATP) progress payments were due on July 31, 2019. He also stated for this quarter's ATP progress payment, Caltrans districts will provide comments to local agencies by August 6<sup>th</sup> and local agencies would then have until August 9<sup>th</sup> to resubmit any corrections.

Mr. Luu also stated that the deadline to submit allocations or time extensions requests to the California Transportation Commission was August 12, 2019.

Mr. Luu then provided an overview of upcoming Caltrans Local Assistance trainings. He stated that on August 7, 2019 the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials would be hosting a national webinar on Local Public Agency Emergency Relief Programs and on September 11, 2019 the Southern California Local Assistance Management Meeting would be held at Caltrans District 12.

Mr. Luu also noted that August 15, 2019 was the deadline for submittal of the annual Equal Employment Opportunity Report (Form -1391) from the Federal Highway Administration. He also stated that all prime contractors as well as subcontractors with subcontracts with over \$10,000 must complete this report. Mr. Luu concluded by stating that the deadline for Earmark Repurposing requests was August 16, 2019.



Next, Mr. Barragan stated as of July 1<sup>st</sup> the Caltrans' website had been updated to be compliant with all Americans' with Disabilities requirements.

Mr. Barragan also mentioned that Title VI of the Civil Rights Act prohibits discrimination by recipients of Federal assistance on the basis of race, color, and national origin. He stated that to in order ensure compliance with Title VI, local agencies need to implement a system of procedures and actions prohibiting discrimination.

Mr. Barragan concluded by stating that August 29, 2019 was the deadline for inactive invoice submittals for the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter.

**9. Staff Comments**

Mr. Alcock stated that OCTA would be sending out a reminder that the September 2019 Semi-Annual Review would be opening on September 1st. He also stated that OCTA staff would be presenting a Project V ridership staff report, and letters of interest from local agencies regarding a potential 2020 Project V Call for projects at the August Board meeting. Mr. Alcock concluded his comments by also noting that OCTA staff would be presenting 2019 Project X Tier I programming recommendations to the OCTA Board in August.

**10. Items for future Agendas – None**

**11. Public Comments – None**

**12. Meeting was adjourned at 2:34 p.m.**



# **September 2019 Semi- Annual Review**



**November 13, 2019**

**To:** Technical Advisory Committee  
**From:** Orange County Transportation Authority Staff  
**Subject:** Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Semi-Annual Review – September 2019

### **Overview**

The Orange County Transportation Authority recently completed the September 2019 semi-annual review of projects funded through the Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs. This process reviews the status of Measure M2 grant-funded projects and provides an opportunity for local agencies to update project information and request project modifications. Recommended project adjustments are presented for review and approval.

### **Recommendation**

Recommend Board of Directors approval of requested adjustments to the Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs projects and Local Fair Share Program funds.

### **Background**

The Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs (CTFP) is the mechanism which the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) uses to administer funding for street, road, signal, transit, and water quality projects. The CTFP contains a variety of funding programs and sources, including Measure M2 (M2) revenues, State-Local Partnership Program funds, and Local Partnership Program funds. The CTFP provides local agencies with a comprehensive set of guidelines for administration and delivery of various transportation funding grants.

Since the inception of M2 OCTA has made approximately \$500 million (including approximately \$38 million in state and federal funds) competitively available to support 670 project phases. As of the publishing of this report, 341 project phases have been completed, 211 project phases are considered currently active, including approximately 86 projects phases which are pending, meaning that work is completed, and final submittals are pending and/or need to be finalized.

---

Twice annually, OCTA meets with representatives from local agencies, as needed, to review the status of all active and pending project phases to review any local agency proposed changes. This process is known as the M2 semi-annual review process and its goals are to review project status, determine the continued viability of projects, address local agency concerns, confirm availability of local match funds, and ensure timely closeout of all projects funded through the CTFP.

***Discussion***

As part of the semi-annual review process, local agencies can request any of the following five types of project adjustments:

- Delays – local agencies can request a one-time delay of up to 24-months to obligate funds,
- Timely Use of Funds Extensions – once obligated, funds expire 36 months from the contract award date. Local agencies can request a one-time extension of up to 24 months,
- Scope Changes – local agencies may request minor scope changes to projects, if they can assure OCTA that project the benefits as committed to in the initial application can still be delivered.
- Transfers – local agencies may request to transfer up to 100 percent of project savings to subsequent project phases within a project so long as the subsequent phase been awarded M2 competitive funds.
- Cancellation – local agencies may request to cancel projects for any reason. Cancelled projects are eligible to reapply for M2 funds upon resolution of the issues that led to the original project cancellation.

During the September 2019 semi-annual review, proposed adjustments included two timely-use of funds extensions for CTFP projects, nine timely-use of funds extensions for the Local Fair Share Program, four scope changes, and one project transfer. Adjustments are itemized in Attachment A and are described further in Attachment B.

Local agencies identified several reasons for this semi-annual review cycle's requested project adjustments, which included the following:

- Extensions (delays in obtaining permits/project complexities and contract phasing coordination),
- Scope changes (enhanced project benefits, equipment changes to better facilitate project delivery, inability to secure timely approvals/permits, and route modifications to enhance efficiency and ridership), and
- Transfers (project savings from an earlier project phase)



---

Based upon review of the September 2019 semi-annual review proposed project adjustments and trends, staff has determined that the proposed changes are consistent with prior semi-annual review requests and are also appropriate from a CTFP administration perspective. As such, Board of Director (Board) approval of these proposed adjustments is recommended. Upon Board approval, staff will monitor the implementation of these proposed changes through both its normal project administration and future semi-annual reviews, which are conducted and reported on to the Board biannually.

***Summary***

During the September 2019 semi-annual review process, OCTA reviewed the status of all active project phases funded through the M2 CTFP and staff is recommending approval of all project adjustments requested by local agencies for this semi-annual review cycle. The next semi-annual review is scheduled for March 2020.

***Attachments***

- A. Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs, September 2019 Semi-Annual Review Adjustment Requests
- B. Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs, September 2019 Semi-Annual Review Adjustment Request Descriptions

**Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs**  
 September 2019 Semi-Annual Review Adjustment Requests

<b>Timely-Use of Funds Extension Requests - Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs*</b>								
Agency	Project Number	Project	Project Title	Phase	Current FY	Current Allocation	Proposed Time Extension (Months)	Proposed Expenditure Deadline
Santa Ana	13-SNTA-ECP-3680 <sup>1</sup>	X	Santa Ana Delhi Channel Diversion	CON	15/16	\$2,572,875	12	12/6/20
Santa Ana	16-SNTA-ICE-3815 <sup>2</sup>	O	Bristol Street and Memory Lane Intersection Widening	ENG	16/17	\$ 67,500	24	2/25/22
<b>Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Timely-Use of Funds Extensions (2) - Total</b>						<b>\$2,640,375</b>		

**Reasons for Project Adjustments**

1. Delays in obtaining necessary permits and project complexities
2. Project phasing coordinatoin

**Acronyms**

- FY - Fiscal Year  
 CON - Construction  
 ENG - Engineering

\*Once obligated Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs funds expire 36 months from the contract award date. Local agencies may request a one-time extension of up to 24 months.

**Timely-Use of Funds Extension Requests - LFS\***

Agency	FY	Disbursement Date	Disbursement	Proposed Extension Amount	Extension Deadline
Brea	16/17	11/15/2016	\$ 148,772	\$ 148,772	11/15/2021
		1/10/2017	\$ 180,151	\$ 180,151	1/10/2022
		3/14/2017	\$ 157,185	\$ 157,185	3/14/2022
		5/23/2017	\$ 138,338	\$ 138,338	5/23/2022
		6/30/2017	\$ 166,743	\$ 166,743	6/30/2022
	17/18	9/12/2017	\$ 145,797	\$ 145,797	9/12/2022
Yorba Linda	16/17	11/15/2016	\$ 157,784	\$ 157,784	11/15/2021
		1/10/2017	\$ 188,632	\$ 188,632	1/10/2022
		3/14/2017	\$ 165,905	\$ 165,905	3/14/2022
<b>LFS Timely-Use of Funds Extensions (14) - Total</b>				<b>\$ 1,449,307</b>	

\*Net revenues received by local jurisdictions through the LFS Program shall be expended or encumbered within three years. An extension may be granted but is limited to a total of five years from the date of receipt of funds. The Orange County Transportation Authority uses the check disbursement date as the date of receipt of funds. Requests for extensions must be submitted as part of the semi-annual review process prior to the end of the third year from the date of receipt of funds and must include a plan of expenditure.

**Acronyms**

- FY - Fiscal Year  
 LFS - Local Fair Share

**Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs**  
September 2019 Semi-Annual Review Adjustment Requests

<b>Scope Change Requests</b>							
Agency	Project Number	Project	Project Title	Phase	Current FY	Current Allocation	Proposed Allocation
Costa Mesa	17-CMSA-TSP-3873 <sup>1</sup>	P	Bear Street Signal Synchronization	IMP	17/18	\$ 467,872	\$ 467,872
OCTA	15-OCTA-TSP-3774 <sup>2</sup>	P	Alicia Parkway Traffic Signal Synchronization Project	IMP	15/16	\$1,754,400	\$1,754,400
OCTA	15-OCTA-TSP-3778 <sup>3</sup>	P	Coast Highway Traffic Signal Synchronization Project	IMP	16/17	\$1,713,770	\$1,713,770
Dana Point	14-DPNT-CBT-3742 <sup>4</sup>	V	Summer Weekend Trolley/Harbor Shuttle	O&M	14/15	\$2,342,591	\$2,342,591
<b>Scope Changes (4) - Total Phase Allocations</b>						<b>\$6,278,633</b>	<b>\$6,278,633</b>

**Reasons for Project Adjustments**

- Enhanced project benefits- design modifications, enhanced communications system, and system modernization.
- Equipment change to accommodate on-site conditions and better facilitate traffic signal coordination and communication
- Cost and challenges in securing appropriate approvals
- Discontinue Harbor Shuttle program and modify Dana Point Trolley routing to support greater efficiency and enhanced ridership.

**Acronyms**

- FY - Fiscal Year
- IMP - Implementation
- O&M - Operations and Maintenance
- RTSSP - Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program

<b>Transfer Requests</b>								
Agency	Project Number	Project	Project Title	Phase	Current FY	Current Allocation	Transfer Amount	Proposed Allocation
Anaheim	14-ANAH-ICE-3713 15-ANAH-ICE-3764	O	Ball Road and Anaheim Boulevard Intersection	ROW	14/15	\$ 1,168,127	\$ (726,346.87)	\$ 441,780.13
				CON	16/17	\$ 2,886,658	\$ 726,346.87	\$ 3,613,004.87
<b>Transfer Requests (1) - Total Project Allocations</b>						<b>\$ 4,054,785</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 4,054,785</b>

**Reasons for Project Adjustment**

- Project savings in earlier phases/years can support work in later awarded phases/years

**Acronyms**

- FY - Fiscal Year
- CON - Construction
- ROW - Right-of-Way

**Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs  
September 2019 Semi-Annual Review Adjustment Request Descriptions**

**Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs (CTFP) Timely-Use of Funds Extensions**

Once obligated, CTFP funds expire 36 months from the contract award date. Local agencies may request a one-time extension of up to 24-months. During this semi-annual review cycle, the following timely-use of funds extension requests were submitted.

The City of Santa Ana is requesting a 12-month timely-use of funds extension for the construction phase of the Santa Ana Delhi Channel Diversion Project (13-SNTA-ECP-3680), from December 2019 to December 2020. Additional time is required due to delays in obtaining necessary permits and project complexities.

The City of Santa Ana is requesting a 24-month timely-use of funds extension for the Engineering phase of the Bristol Street and Memory Lane Intersection Widening Project (16-SNTA-ICE-3815), from February 2020 to February 2022. The extension request will provide additional time for project phasing coordination.

**Local Fair Share (LFS) Timely-Use of Funds Extensions**

Net revenues received by local jurisdictions through the LFS Program shall be expended or encumbered within three years. An extension may be granted but is limited to a total of five years from the date of receipt of funds. The Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) uses the check disbursement date as the date of receipt of funds. Requests for extensions must be submitted as part of the semi-annual review process prior to the end of the third year from the date of receipt of funds and must include a plan of expenditure for the funds.

The City of Brea (Brea) is requesting a 24-month timely-use of funds extension of \$936,986. The funds being considered for extension were disbursed in six separate installments and must be expended by the extension deadlines shown in Attachment A. Brea is proposing to use these funds primarily on its slurry/seal program and alley work.

The City of Yorba Linda (Yorba Linda) is requesting a 24-month timely-use of funds extension of \$512,321. The funds being considered for extension were disbursed in three separate installments and must be expended by the extension deadlines shown in Attachment A. Yorba Linda is proposing to use these funds various improvements including drainage, intersections, traffic signal timing and synchronization, traffic calming and various other local improvements.

## **Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs September 2019 Semi-Annual Review Adjustment Request Descriptions**

### Scope Changes

Agencies may request minor scope changes for CTFP projects if they can assure that project benefits as committed to in the initial application can still be delivered. During this semi-annual review cycle, the following scope change requests were submitted.

The City of Costa Mesa (Costa Mesa) is requesting a scope change for the implementation phase of the Bear Street Signal Synchronization Project (17-CMSA-TSP-3873). The scope change involves providing enhanced project benefits to better facilitate traffic flow, which were identified during the design phase, installation/replacement of old and damaged fiber optic conduit and cables to better facilitate connections to Costa Mesa's communications backbone, and minor field system modernization.

OCTA, as administrative lead, is requesting scope changes for the implementation phases for the following two projects.

- Alicia Parkway Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Project (15-OCTA-TSP-3774). This scope change is comprised of installing new conduit, fiber optic cable, and controllers. These changes will facilitate better communication and connectivity with local agencies' traffic management centers (TMC) and peer to peer operations.
  
- Coast Highway Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Project (15-OCTA-TSP-3778). The scope change involves removing installation of fiber optic cable for intelligent transportation services communications between the City of Laguna Niguel's TMC and City Hall. Installation alternatives were evaluated but proved to be too costly and challenging in terms of securing appropriate approvals.

The City of Dana Point (Dana Point) is requesting a scope change for the operations and maintenance phase of the Summer Weekend Trolley/Harbor Shuttle Project (14-DPNT-CBT-3742). The scope change is comprised of cancellation of the Harbor Shuttle component of the grant, due primarily ridership concerns. Dana Point is proposing to use savings (and the vehicle) from the cancelled Harbor Shuttle to support route restructuring, which would allow the Dana Point Trolley to expand from one route to two (i.e. north and south) routes, which Dana Point believes will support greater efficiency and increased ridership.

## **Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs September 2019 Semi-Annual Review Adjustment Request Descriptions**

### Transfers

The CTFP Guidelines allow agencies to request to transfer 100% of savings of funds between subsequent phases within a project. Funds can only be transferred to a phase that has already been awarded competitive funds. Such requests must be made prior to the acceptance of a final report and submitted as part of the semi-annual review process. During this review cycle, the following transfer request was submitted.

The City of Anaheim is requesting to transfer unused project savings from the Ball Road and Anaheim Boulevard Intersection Project (14-ANAH-ICE-3713) right of way phase to the Ball Road and Anaheim Boulevard Intersection Project (15-ANAH-ICE-3764) construction phase.



# **2020 Technical Steering Committee Membership**



**November 13, 2019**

**To:** Technical Advisory Committee  
**From:** Orange County Transportation Authority Staff  
**Subject:** 2020 Technical Steering Committee Membership

**Overview**

The Orange County Transportation Authority Technical Advisory Committee provides feedback and input on local streets and roads related items. To accomplish this, the committee relies on a Technical Steering Committee made up of nine representatives from local agencies to provide guidance on major technical items. Technical Steering Committee members serve two-year terms, with the exception of one-year terms for the chair and vice chair. This year, five positions are open for consideration, and proposed 2020 Technical Steering Committee membership recommendations are presented for review and approval.

**Recommendation**

Approve proposed 2020 Technical Steering Committee membership recommendations and further recommend Board of Directors approval.

**Background**

The Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) provides input regarding the allocation of Measure M2 competitive grant funds. The TAC also provides technical advice to staff on issues related to streets and roads planning. The TAC is comprised of representatives from all Orange County cities and the County of Orange (County). It also includes non-voting representatives from the California Department of Transportation and the Transportation Corridor Agencies. The TAC uses a Technical Steering Committee (TSC) to vet, review, and discuss major technical items prior to submittal to the TAC for final review and consideration. The chair and vice chair of the TAC also serve as the chair and vice chair of the TSC.



The TSC consists of a total of nine voting members recommended for approval by the TAC and appointed by the OCTA Board of Directors (Board). There is one position for each of Orange County's five supervisorial districts, two at-large positions, and the TSC chair and vice chair positions. The TSC membership selection process is administered by the President of the City Engineers Association of Orange County (CEAOC) and the TAC/TSC chair (with staff support from OCTA), before recommendations are advanced to the full TAC for consideration. In recommending and selecting TSC members, priority is given to maintaining a balance between small and large jurisdictions (small jurisdictions are currently defined as those with populations equal to/or less than 63,542). Balance among supervisorial districts and north/ south Orange County jurisdictions is also evaluated.

### ***Discussion***

In August 2019, OCTA solicited letters of interest from local jurisdictions to fill TSC vacancies for the 2020 calendar year. At that time, it was noted that five of the nine regular TSC positions were open for consideration and appointment. These positions included the Chair, Vice Chair, First District, Fourth District, and one At-Large position. In September, letters of interest from five eligible TAC members were received. In accordance with OCTA procedures for administering the TSC, the president of the CEAOC and the chair of the TSC/TAC reviewed all letters of interest and with input from OCTA, developed 2020 TSC membership recommendations (Attachment A).

Consistent with past practice, the vice chair is recommended to become the 2020 chair. In order to ensure that both north and south Orange County are represented in TSC leadership positions, the current District 4 representative from the City of Anaheim is being recommended for the 2020 vice chair position. If approved, this appointment would result in an opening in the District 4 seat, which is recommended to be filled by a representative from the City of Placentia. The First District position is recommended for reappointment by a representative of the City of Westminster, and the open At-Large position is recommended for reappointment by a representative of the County.

In finalizing these recommendations, the president of the CEAOC and the TSC chair emphasized the need to maintain a strong balance between both small/large and north/south Orange County cities, and their consensus recommendations are now recommended for consideration and approval.

***Summary***

The TSC provides guidance and direction on major technical issues before presentation to the full TAC. Members of the TSC serve two-year terms, with the exception of the chair and vice chair, who serve one-year terms. There are five positions recommended for appointment in the next calendar year. Presented for consideration and approval is a recommended list of 2020 TSC appointments.

***Attachments***

- A. Proposed 2020 Technical Steering Committee Membership List

**Proposed 2020 Technical Steering Committee Membership List†**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>AGENCY</b>	<b>2019* POPULATION</b>	<b>MEDIAN POPULATION SIZE</b>	<b>DISTRICT</b>	<b>NORTH/ SOUTH</b>	<b>SEAT EXPIRES</b>
<b>Tom Wheeler</b>	<b>Lake Forest</b>	<b>86,346</b>	<b>Large</b>	<b>Chair</b>	<b>South</b>	<b>December 31, 2020</b>
<b>Rudy Emami</b>	<b>Anaheim</b>	<b>359,339</b>	<b>Large</b>	<b>Vice Chair</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>December 31, 2020</b>
<b>Marwan Youssef</b>	<b>Westminster</b>	<b>92,610</b>	<b>Large</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>December 31, 2021</b>
Raja Sethuraman	Costa Mesa	115,830	Large	2	North	December 31, 2020
Doug Stack	Tustin	81,369	Large	3	North	December 31, 2020
<b>Luis Estevez</b>	<b>Placentia</b>	<b>52,333</b>	<b>Small</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>North</b>	<b>December 31, 2021</b>
Tom Bonigut	San Clemente	65,405	Large	5	South	December 31, 2020
Matthew Sinacori	Dana Point	34,249	Small	At-Large	South	December 31, 2020
<b>Nardy Khan</b>	<b>County of Orange</b>	<b>3,222,498</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>At-Large</b>	<b>North/ South</b>	<b>December 31, 2021</b>

† Shading indicates positions recommended for consideration for the 2020 Technical Steering Committee.

\* State of California, Department of Finance, *E-1 Population Estimates for cities, counties, and the state with annual percent change — January 1, 2018 and 2019*. Sacramento, California, May 2019.