



AGENDA

Special Meeting - Technical Steering Committee

Committee Members

Ken Rosenfield, Chairman
Tom Wheeler, Vice Chairman
Jim Biery, City of Buena Park
Brad Fowler, City of Dana Point
Manuel Gomez, City of Irvine
Mark Lewis, City of Fountain Valley
E. Maximous, City of Rancho Santa Margarita
Natalie Meeks, City of Anaheim
Marwan Youssef, City of Westminster
Jim Kaufman, Caltrans

Orange County Transportation Authority
600 South Main Street, Room 103/104
Orange, California
February 24, 2016 11:30 a.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) 560-5673, 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 the 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 or through the Measure M2 Local Programs office at the OCTA Headquarters, 600 South Main Street, Orange, California.

Call to Order and Self Introductions

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS

1. **Approval of February 10, 2016 Technical Steering Committee Minutes – pg.3**

REGULAR ITEMS

2. **2016 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Call for Projects – Programming Recommendations - pg. 11**
Sam Kaur

Overview

The Orange County Transportation Authority issued the 2016 annual Measure M2 Regional Capacity Program and Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program call for projects in August 2015. This call for projects made available approximately



AGENDA

Special Meeting - Technical Steering Committee

\$50 million in grant funding for streets and roads projects countywide. A list of projects recommended for funding is presented for review and approval.

Recommendation

- A. Recommend for Board of Directors approval the programming recommendations for the 2016 Regional Capacity Program to fund 13 projects, in an amount totaling \$36.88 million.

- B. Recommend for Board of Directors approval the programming recommendations for the 2016 Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program to fund 7 projects, in an amount totaling \$12.33 million.

3. Committee Comments

4. Public Comments

5. Adjournment

The next regularly scheduled meeting of this Committee will be held at 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, March 9, 2016, at the OCTA Headquarters.



MINUTES for
Technical Steering Committee
February 10, 2016

coCommittee Members	Position	Agency	Attendance
Ken Rosenfield	Chair	Laguna Hills	Present
Tom Wheeler	Vice-Chair	Lake Forest	Present
Marwan Youssef	First District	Westminster	Absent
Mark Lewis	Second District	Fountain Valley	Absent
Manuel Gomez	Third District	Irvine	Present
James Biery	Fourth District	Buena Park	Present
E. Maximous	Fifth District	Rancho Santa Margarita	Absent
Natalie Meeks	At-Large member	Anaheim	Present
Brad Fowler	At-Large member	Dana Point	Present
Jim Kaufman	Ex-Officio	Caltrans	Present

Guest	Affiliation	Guest	Affiliation
Rudy Emami	Anaheim	Jason Gabriel	Santa Ana
Joe Perez	Anaheim	Fred Mansouripour	Santa Ana
Steve Kooyman	Brea	Kenny Nguyen	Santa Ana
Mark Lopez	County of Orange	Sean Thomas	Santa Ana
Joe Sarmiento	County of Orange	Bill Cameron	San Clemente
Don Hoppe	Fullerton	Doug Anderson	Tustin
Dan Candelas	Garden Grove	Krys Saldivar	Tustin
Chris Johansen	La Habra	Doug Stack	Tustin
Paul Rodriguez	Rodriguez Consulting	Bill Zimmerman	W.G. Zimmerman
		Michael Wolfe	Yorba Linda

OCTA Staff Members

Adriann Cardoso	Brandon Bullock	Kameron Altar	Louis Zhao
Anup Kulkarni	Brian Smolke	Kia Mortazavi	May Hout
Archie Tan	Harry Thomas	Kurt Brotcke	Sam Kaur

Meeting was called to order by Mr. Rosenfield at 1:30 p.m. Mr. Rosenfield informed the committee that a quorum was not met, moved the Consent Calendar items to the end of the agenda, and stated that the committee would entertain discussion for the items on the agenda until a quorum is reached.

Self-Introductions

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Bicycle Corridor Improvement Program 2016 Call for Projects

Discussion: Mr. Rosenfield reminded the committee that this item is for discussion only until a quorum is met and no motions or action would be entertained at this time.

Mr. Louis Zhao introduced the item to the committee. Mr. Zhao gave a PowerPoint presentation to the committee to review the 2016 Call for Projects draft guidelines and application process. Mr. Zhao reviewed the background of the Bicycle Corridor Improvement Program (BCIP) with the committee, the goals for the program, the funding for the call for



MINUTES for
Technical Steering Committee
February 10, 2016

projects, eligibility for funding, the proposed changes to the guidelines, and the proposed changes to the application. Mr. Zhao presented an estimated schedule for the call for projects and informed the committee that a review panel will be needed to review the applications.

Mr. Anderson asked if applications required approved resolutions.

Mr. Zhao stated that resolutions could be provided after an application was submitted.

Mr. Rosenfield requested a 90 day application period for future calls for projects.

Mr. Gomez requested to see a year-long schedule of calls for projects.

Mr. Biery agreed and stated that a year-long schedule would help local agencies when looking at budget timelines.

There was no further discussion.

Action on this item was delayed until quorum was reached.

REGULAR ITEMS

A quorum was reached at 1:44 p.m.

2. Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs – 2016 Call for Projects Policy Issues

Discussion: Ms. Sam Kaur introduced the item to the committee and informed the committee that staff requested direction from the Technical Steering Committee to move forward with the 2016 call for projects process. Ms. Kaur reviewed the policy issues related to project applications received for the cycle with the committee including: Fast Track programming, intersection capacity enhancement projects with future assumptions, alternative Level of Service methodologies, appropriate program components, and bifurcation of “corridor” Projects and M2 Participation in excess right of way.

Ms. Kaur began a PowerPoint presentation to review the policy issues with the committee. Ms. Kaur directed attention to the Fast Track Programming issue for Jamboree Road (600’ north of Main to Barranca).

Mr. Gomez stated that the issues may be due to confusion surrounding the guidelines, and that the Technical Steering Committee will be presented with one project that doesn’t fit into the guidelines that are modified the year before .

Mr. Rosenfield requested that the committee consider the schedule commitment that local agencies take on when requesting Fast Track programming.

Mr. Biery asked staff to give an example of a project that would be appropriate for Fast Track programming.



MINUTES for
Technical Steering Committee
February 10, 2016

Ms. Kaur stated that Fast Track projects were funded in the past. An agency had completed the right of way phase before applying for CTFP funds and went into the construction phase eight to nine months after the engineering phase. The agency demonstrated a reason for the funding to be expedited for timely use reasons.

Mr. Rosenfield stated that OCTA staff had reasonable concern and requested more language be added to the CTFP guidelines in the future to make Fast Track programming clearer.

Mr. Wheeler inquired about the recommendation of action for the staff report.

Mr. Brotcke stated that staff would be returning to the committee on February 24, 2016, for a special meeting of the TSC with programming recommendations and wanted to have the discussion about these projects before that meeting.

No direction was provided from the TSC on the policy issue for this project.

Ms. Kaur continued her PowerPoint presentation, directing attention to Intersection Capacity Enhancement Projects. Ms. Kaur asked the City of Irvine to join the presentation for the Sand Canyon at Marine Way project. Ms. Kaur informed the committee that the City of Irvine requested funding for a new intersection to replace the existing intersection. Project readiness is a concern, as this project requires coordination with Caltrans and a final CEQA document was not available. Ms. Kaur stated that staff felt the project was premature and does not meet the application requirements.

Mr. Rosenfield stated that the two issues brought to the committee are in regard to the environmental evaluation and the level of service methodology.

Mr. Gomez stated that there is an agreement with OCTA for the right of way for the portion of the project that impacts the OCTA bus base and the environmental portion of the project is clear from a program level. Mr. Gomez yielded to Ms. Dupuis from the City of Irvine to comment on the project and answers questions from the committee.

Ms. Dupuis reviewed the project with the committee using a map of the intersection to explain the project plan. Ms. Dupuis stated that a project study report with Caltrans for the section of the project near the freeway onramp was underway. Ms. Dupuis explained that the level of service calculations are based on conversations with OCTA modeling staff due to the uniqueness of the project.

Mr. Rosenfield inquired about the timeline for the new Marine Way roadway project.

Mr. Gomez stated that with construction starting at the end of the month on the New Marine Way, the City of Irvine expects the roadway to be open and operational by late summer 2016.

Ms. Dupuis stated that using a level of service from existing Marine Way would not make sense for the project requested in the application because the new roadway and intersection would have different use. Ms. Dupuis stated that OCTA modeling staff calculated the level of service based on the new intersection.

Mr. Rosenfield stated that the level of service numbers can be resolved outside the committee.



MINUTES for
Technical Steering Committee
February 10, 2016

Mr. Brotcke stated that a project study report includes an environmental document and without that document, this project is premature.

Mr. Rosenfield stated that the CEQA document issue can be resolved outside the committee and asked how the project study report would affect the judgment of the project application.

Ms. Kaur stated that it is a project readiness issue. The City of Irvine needs a right of way agreement before utilities can be relocated.

Mr. Gomez stated that the funding request is for a future fiscal year and that the City of Irvine is confident that project milestones will be met.

Mr. Rosenfield stated that there is an issue of tying up funds that could be used for shovel-ready projects.

Mr. Mortazavi clarified that the document between the City of Irvine and OCTA regarding the property off Marine Way is a Memorandum of Understanding and does not include the specific environmental needs required for this program and requires that the City of Irvine and OCTA enter into a cooperative agreement three years before relocation begins. Mr. Mortazavi expressed the importance of coordinating with Caltrans for this project due to the fact that Caltrans property is also necessary for OCTA's bus base relocation.

No direction was provided from the TSC on the policy issue for this project.

Ms. Kaur continued the PowerPoint presentation and addressed that three applications for projects requested special consideration using alternative methodologies. Ms. Kaur asked the City of Tustin to join the presentation for the Red Hill Avenue Widening (Dyer/Barranca to Edinger) and El Camino Real/Jamboree Road Modification, and Newport Avenue and SR-55 Ramps/Del Amo projects.

Mr. Stack introduced Ms. Saldivar to the committee.

Ms. Saldivar explained that the three projects brought before the committee are designed to keep Orange County moving and that the projects do not include right of way issues.

Mr. Rosenfield asked if the methodologies for the alternative level of service calculations were the same for the three projects.

Ms. Saldivar stated that the projects are similar but the methodologies differed. Ms. Saldivar reviewed the Red Hill Avenue Widening alternative approach, which relies upon the conversion of peak hour volume into an ADT value. Ms. Saldivar stated that the roadway has a 30,000 daily count and calculating the level of service per the CTFP guidelines would make the project unqualified for the program. Ms. Saldivar provided a short PowerPoint presentation for the project and showed a video of traffic during peak hours.

Mr. Stack encouraged the committee to view the project as a gap improvement.

Mr. Rosenfield asked if the widening would only occur on the northbound side of the roadway.



***MINUTES for
Technical Steering Committee
February 10, 2016***

Mr. Stack explained that the traffic congestion is only seen on the northbound side of the roadway so the focus will only be in that direction.

Mr. Rosenfield asked if the 30,000 daily count was for both northbound and southbound traffic.

Mr. Wheeler asked if there was a precedent for accepted alternative level of service methodologies.

Ms. Kaur stated that the committee would be setting precedent.

Mr. Fowler inquired about the MPAH for the roadway.

Ms. Saldivar stated that the MPAH is six lanes.

Mr. Fowler stated that the project would change the roadway to four northbound lanes and three southbound lanes.

Mr. Rosenfield asked if the project is on the MPAH as an enhancement.

Mr. Stack stated that the City of Tustin would need to return to the Technical Steering Committee with an answer.

Mr. Gomez expressed appreciation that the Technical Steering Committee sees certain projects on a case by case basis and that there should not be a concern for setting precedent. Mr. Gomez stated that the guidelines encourage applicants to be creative and warned the committee of being critical when local agencies propose alternative methodologies.

Mr. Brotcke stated that alternative methodologies was intended for unique situations. Mr. Brotcke reminded the committee that the city proposed an alternative methodology and staff needs to decide if it is reasonable.

Mr. Wheeler stated that local agencies are not designing for traffic at midnight so it makes sense to try to solve problems in other ways.

Mr. Rosenfield asked if the methodology inflates the future numbers for the roadway.

Ms. Saldivar stated that 11.2 percent was used for future instead of 10 percent because 1 percent was used as part of the alternative methodology.

Mr. Rosenfield asked for the peak hour count and northbound ADT.

Ms. Saldivar stated that the peak hour count is 2,591 and northbound ADT is 18000.

Mr. Wheeler stated that the methodology substituted cars per peak hour for cars per day.

Mr. Rosenfield asked if the comparison was reasonable.



MINUTES for
Technical Steering Committee
February 10, 2016

Mr. Fowler stated that the alternative methodology was concerning but the Technical Steering Committee did not need to make technical decisions as part of the application process. Mr. Fowler stated that ADT was not geared toward one hour a day five days a week types of problems and that the video shown as part of the presentation showed the traffic moving and not traffic congestion.

Ms. Meeks stated that more parameters would be needed in the future because local agencies will become more and more creative with alternative methodologies.

Ms. Saldivar continued with her PowerPoint presentation and introduced the El Camino Real at Jamboree project to the committee. Ms. Saldivar stated that the methodology was based on delay as an ICU equivalent for the intersection.

Mr. Anderson stated that no right of way was needed for the project. The City of Tustin looked into split phasing at the intersection but there was difficulty balancing the traffic flow with the lights.

Mr. Rosenfield asked why the City of Tustin was applying for a minor project.

Mr. Stack reminded the committee that this is a competitive process and minor projects are welcome into that process.

Mr. Brotcke stated that OCTA traffic engineer, Mr. Brian Smolke, looked at this project request and asked Mr. Smolke to report on his findings.

Mr. Smolke reviewed the synchronization sheets and saw that standard practices were done when modeling the intersection, and stated that using delay from one direction instead of the impact on the entire intersection was not recommended as a comparison.

Mr. Rosenfield inquired about the level of service for the intersection.

Ms. Saldivar stated that there is a 0.75 ICU without the proposed second turn lane, and a 0.71 ICU with the proposed eastbound second turn lane.

Mr. Fowler asked if the Technical Steering Committee should be looking at individual applications at this level.

Mr. Rosenfield stated that projects should be looked at a higher level.

Ms. Saldivar continued the PowerPoint presentation and introduced the Newport Avenue and SR-55 Ramps/Del Amo application with the committee. Ms. Saldivar explained that the alternative methodology converts delay of the southbound through lane into an "ICU equivalent" for the intersection.

Mr. Biery asked for the MPAH information for the through lanes.

Mr. Stack stated that the MPAH is for 3 through lanes.

Mr. Biery stated that the project would only leave 2 through lanes.



MINUTES for
Technical Steering Committee
February 10, 2016

Ms. Kaur asked if vehicles were using the through lane as a turning lane.

Ms. Saldivar stated that the police department brought the issue to the City's attention. Drivers are using the through lane as a turning lane.

Ms. Kaur stated that the methodology submitted in the application process is different than what was presented in the PowerPoint presentation.

Ms. Saldivar stated that the City converted delay for ICU.

Mr. Rosenfield did not take issue with the delay analysis.

Mr. Gomez expressed discomfort with the lane analysis.

Ms. Kaur stated that staff will work with the City of Tustin on the application because the numbers in the presentation differed from what was submitted.

Mr. Gomez made a motion to instruct staff to accept the methodology for establishing level of service for the Red Hill Ave Widening. Seconded by Mr. Wheeler. Motion passed 3-2.

No specific action was taken on the Newport Avenue and El Camino Real/Jamboree Road modification project but Mr. Rosenfield directed staff to take the per lane methodology into consideration.

Ms. Kaur continued the PowerPoint presentation and directed attention to the Warner (Main to Oak) project submitted by the City of Santa Ana. Ms. Kaur introduced the project and the policy issues to the committee, stating that a separate ICE application is appropriate for this project due to the right of way request close to the intersection.

Mr. Rosenfield stated that the project could potentially take a large portion of the available funding. Mr. Rosenfield reminded the committee to review the project at a higher level.

Mr. Gabriel from the City of Santa Ana was introduced to the committee. Mr. Gabriel provided the committee with background on the project and the application, stating that the application is under the ACE program. Mr. Gabriel explained that the only improvements are being made on Warner and bifurcating the project could mean potentially not receiving money for one portion of the project. Mr. Gabriel stated that the application was appropriate under the CTFP guidelines.

Mr. Brotcke stated that this application is likely to rank well and raises the issue of funding and start the conversation about funding caps.

Mr. Rosenfield stated that the committee removed the funding cap for M2 projects because small projects were addressed and funded through M1. The committee expected to see larger projects during M2 and a project like the one proposed by the City of Santa Ana is an unintended consequence of lifting the funding caps.



MINUTES for
Technical Steering Committee
February 10, 2016

Mr. Fowler expressed concern over funding for the rest of the county when one proposed project requests a large amount of funding.

Mr. Gabriel encouraged the committee to not make changes to the guidelines at this point and judge the proposed project on those changes because the application was submitted and followed the guidelines.

No direction was provided from the TSC on the policy issue for this project.

Ms. Kaur reviewed the main points of the overall discussion with the committee.

There was no further discussion.

The committee directed staff to move forward with the review process for the 2016 Call for Projects (Meeks/Wheeler)

3. Bicycle Corridor Improvement Program 2016 Call for Projects

Mr. Rosenfield called for a motion on the previously discussed item.

There was no discussion.

The committee approved the revised guidelines for the Bicycle Corridor Improvement Program 2016 Call for Projects and recommended approval by the Technical Advisory Committee. (Wheeler/Meeks)

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS

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

4. Approval of Minutes for January 13, 2016 TSC Meeting (Wheeler/Meeks)

5. Correspondence

- See Agenda

6. Committee Comments

7. Local Assistance Update

8. Staff Comments

- Mr. Brotcke reminded the committee that applications for Project V were due February 29, 2016, and bus service recommendations would go forward to the Board of Directors on February 22, 2016.

9. Items for Future Agendas

- 2016 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs – Call Programming Recommendations



MINUTES for
Technical Steering Committee
February 10, 2016

10. Public Comments

11. Adjourned at 3:38 p.m.

A special Technical Steering Committee meeting will be held on February 24, 2016, at 11:00 a.m. in Conference Room 103/104.

The next regularly scheduled meeting of this Committee will be held at 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, March 9, 2016, at the OCTA Headquarters.



February 24, 2016

To: Technical Steering Committee

From: Orange County Transportation Authority Staff

Subject: Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs - 2016 Call for Projects Programming Recommendations

Overview

The Orange County Transportation Authority issued the 2016 annual Measure M2 Regional Capacity Program and Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program call for projects in August 2015. This call for projects made available approximately \$50 million in grant funding for streets and roads projects countywide. A list of projects recommended for funding is presented for review and approval.

Recommendations

- A. Recommend for Board of Directors approval the programming recommendations for the 2016 Regional Capacity Program to fund 13 projects, in an amount totaling \$36.88 million.
- B. Recommend for Board of Directors approval the programming recommendations for the 2016 Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program to fund 7 projects, in an amount totaling \$12.33 million.

Background

The Regional Capacity Program (RCP), Project O, is the Measure M2 (M2) funding program through which Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) supports streets and roads capital projects. The Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (RTSSP), Project P, is the M2 program which provides funding for multi-jurisdictional signal synchronization projects. Both programs are included in the Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs (CTFP). The CTFP allocates funds through a competitive call based on a common set of guidelines and scoring criteria approved by the OCTA Board of Directors (Board). The CTFP may include state and federal sources as well.

On August 10, 2015, the Board authorized staff to issue a call for projects (call) making available approximately \$38 million in RCP funding and \$12 million in RTSSP funding.

Discussion

On October 23, 2015, OCTA received 27 applications requesting \$80 million in RCP funding and 13 applications requesting \$15.6 million in RTSSP funding. Applications were reviewed for eligibility, consistency, and adherence to guidelines and program objectives. Staff worked with the local agencies to address technical issues related to excess right of way, construction unit costs, and project scopes. Policy issues related to the projects were submitted to the Technical Steering Committee (TSC) for discussion and further direction on February 10, 2016. Recommendations presented in the report are consistent with the direction provided by the TSC for specific policy issues and for other issues where TSC deferred to the staff.

It is recommended to program \$49.21 million for 20 projects. Brief program descriptions are provided below.

Regional Capacity Program

The RCP provides funds for capital improvements to congested streets, roads, intersections and interchanges. The CTFP guidelines require a minimum starting level of service (LOS) of 0.81 for a project to be eligible for consideration, but grant provisional eligibility to projects that have a starting LOS of 0.71, dependent on availability of funding. For the 2016 call, programming capacity is not available to fund projects with an LOS that fell between 0.71 and 0.80. A total of 27 project applications requesting \$80 million were received for this program.

Staff's recommendation is to program approximately \$36.88 million to fund 13 projects through the Arterial Capacity Enhancement and Intersection Capacity Enhancement categories. The details of projects recommended and not recommended for the RCP funding are shown in Attachment A.

The approximately \$1.12 million in remaining programming capacity available as part of the 2016 Call will be carried over to the next call cycle.

Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program

The RTSSP is a significant funding source for multi-agency, corridor-based signal synchronization along Orange County streets and roads. Funding is provided for a three-year period that includes the implementation of signal synchronization,

as well as a limited amount of funding for ongoing maintenance and monitoring to keep the investments in optimal condition. A total of 13 project applications requesting \$15.6 million were received for this program. As noted previously, the Board authorized \$12 million in funding for the 2016 call cycle. Staff recommends programming \$12.33 million to fund the seven highest scoring projects. All of the recommended projects will be implemented in fiscal year (FY) 2016-17. The details of projects recommended for funding for the RTSSP are shown in Attachment B.

The table below provides an overall summary of the funding recommendations:

2016 CTFP Call for Projects Summary (\$ in millions)

	RCP	RTSSP	Total
Number of Applications Recommended for Approval	13	7	20
Amount Recommended for Approval (escalated)	\$36.88	\$12.33	\$49.21

Next Steps

The recommended project programming, if approved by the TSC, will be forwarded to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for consideration. If approved by the TAC, the project programming will go to the Regional Planning and Highways Committee and Board in April for final approval. Once approved, the new projects will be incorporated into the master funding agreement between OCTA and all local agencies. Staff will continue to monitor project status and project delivery through the semi-annual review process.

Summary

Proposed programming recommendations for projects in the Regional Capacity Program and Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program have been developed by staff. Funding for 20 projects totaling \$49.21 million in Measure M2 funds is proposed. Staff is seeking Technical Steering Committee approval of the programming recommendations presented.

Attachments

- A. 2016 Measure M2 Regional Capacity Program Call for Projects – Programming Recommendations

- B. 2016 Measure M2 Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program Call
for Projects – Programming Recommendation

2016 Measure M2 Regional Capacity Program Call for Projects - Programming Recommendations

AGENCY	PROJECT	FUND	ENG	ROW	CON	TOTAL REQUEST	EXISTING LOS	SCORE
Costa Mesa	Newport Boulevard Widening from 19th St to Superior Ave	ACE	281,250			281,250	1.30	69
Orange County	Oso/Antonio Parkway Intersection Improvements	ICE			792,669	792,669	0.81	60
Santa Ana	Warner Ave Improvements and Widening (Main St to Oak St)	ACE		17,790,750		17,790,750	1.01	59
Irvine	University Drive Widening (MacArthur to Campus)	ACE			4,104,971	4,104,971	0.88	58
Anaheim	Lincoln Avenue from Harbor Blvd. to West Street	ACE		10,174,241		10,174,241	1.22	55
Mission Viejo	Alicia Parkway and Marguerite Parkway Intersection	ICE	19,565		252,424	271,989	0.81	53
* Irvine	Jamboree Road Widening (600 feet north of Main to Barranca)	ACE	801,000			801,000	0.88	53
La Palma	La Palma Ave / Del Amo Blvd over Coyote Creek Bridge	ACE	975,000			975,000	1.12	51
Tustin	Newport Ave and SR-55 NB Ramps/Del Amo Avenue Modification	ICE	8,670		108,668	117,338	1.01	51
Irvine	University Dr/Ridgeline Dr/Rosa Drew Ln Intersection Improvements	ICE		127,163		127,163	1.01	50
Santa Ana	Bristol St. and Memory Ln. Intersection Widening	ICE	67,500			67,500	0.88	47
La Habra	Whittier Blvd. and Hacienda Rd. Intersection Improvements	ICE			1,230,548	1,230,548	0.86	43
Mission Viejo	Marguerite Pkwy and Santa Margarita Pkwy Intersection	ICE	10,236		133,062	143,298	0.82	42
						\$ 36,877,718		

* Applicant requested fast track funding for ROW and construction phases. Staff recommends Engineering funding only at this time due to concerns regarding project readiness.

UNFUNDED (Beyond available programming capacity)

Tustin	Red Hill Ave Widening (Dyer Rd/Barranca Pkwy to Edinger Avenue)	ACE			6,000,000	6,000,000	0.84	42
Tustin	El Camino Real/Jamboree Road Modification	ICE	5,362		65,757	71,119	0.97	41
Costa Mesa	Wilson Street Widening from College Av to Fairview Rd	ACE	281,250			281,250	0.96	41
Brea	SR-57 & Lambert Road Interchange Improvements Project	FAST		13,797,000		13,797,000	0.90	41
Santa Ana	Warner Avenue and Flower Street Intersection Improvements	ICE	6,750			6,750	0.83	35
Orange	Tustin/Meats Intersection Right Turn Lane Addition	ICE		1,800,000		1,800,000	0.82	35

UNFUNDED (Below minimum existing congestion threshold)

Mission Viejo	Los Alisos Blvd and Santa Margarita Pkwy Intersection	ICE					0.76	39
Anaheim	Lincoln Avenue Widening - East Street to Evergreen Street	ACE					0.80	33
Costa Mesa	Fairview Road at Wilson Street Intersection Widening RoW	ICE					0.73	25
Laguna Hills	Paseo De Valencia Widening	ACE					0.66	50

UNFUNDED (Project withdrawn by applicant - will repackage and resubmit in future call)

Los Alamitos	Los Alamitos Blvd Gap Closure	ACE						
Newport Beach	Old Newport Blvd and PCH Intersection Improvement	ICE						
Mission Viejo	Felipe Road and Oso Parkway Intersection	ICE						

UNFUNDED (Application materials incomplete - evaluation could not be completed - recommend resubmittal in future call)

Irvine	Sand Canyon/Marine Intersection Improvement	ICE						
--------	---	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--

2016 Measure M2 Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program Call for Projects - Programming Recommendation

AGENCY	PROJECT	FUND	TOTAL REQUEST	SCORE	CUMULATIVE
Anaheim	Brookhurst Street TSS (Commonwealth to PCH)	TSSP	\$ 2,895,884	88	\$ 2,895,884
Anaheim	Magnolia Avenue TSS (Commonwealth to Banning)	TSSP	\$ 2,711,694	83	\$ 5,607,578
* Mission Viejo	Marguerite Parkway Corridor Signal Synchronization	TSSP	\$ 655,752	78	\$ 6,263,330
Costa Mesa	Fairview Road Signal Synchronization	TSSP	\$ 1,695,150	67	\$ 7,958,480
Lake Forest	El Toro Road Traffic Signal Synchronization Project	TSSP	\$ 1,112,447	60	\$ 9,070,927
Irvine	Irvine Center Drive / Edinger Avenue Signal Synchronization	TSSP	\$ 1,824,000	58	\$ 10,894,927
Irvine	Von Karman Ave/Tustin Ranch Rd Signal Synchronization	TSSP	\$ 1,439,980	57	\$ 12,334,907
			\$ 12,334,907		

* Request value reflects removal of off-corridor redundant improvements. Final budget to be revised by Applicant prior to final allocation approval.

UNFUNDED (Beyond available programming capacity)

** Fullerton	Gilbert Street/Idaho Street Corridor RTSSP	TSSP	\$ 1,093,448	50	
Costa Mesa	Fair Drive Signal Synchronization	TSSP	\$ 387,076	37	
Costa Mesa	Bear Street Signal Synchronization	TSSP	\$ 473,522	36	
Mission Viejo	Olympiad RD - Felipe RD Corridor	TSSP	\$ 632,912	30	
San Clemente	Camino Vera Cruz	TSSP	\$ 429,044	29	
Costa Mesa	Anton Boulevard Signal Synchronization	TSSP	\$ 237,752	20	

** Request value reflects removal of corridor improvements that are not part of the MPAH. Formal budget revision pending funding recommendations.