



Citizens Advisory Committee

July 15, 2014

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

600 South Main Street, Orange, California, 92863

Conference Room 103

Agenda

1. **Chairman's Remarks** Leonard Lahtinen, *Vice -Chair, CAC*
2. **Election of Chair/Vice-Chair**
3. **2014-15 OCTA Budget** (20 min)
Presentation Victor Velasquez, *Section Manager, Finance & Administration*
4. **Long Range Transportation Plan**
(10 min) *Update & Action* Greg Nord, *Senior Trans Analyst, Planning*
5. **Suggested Pedestrian Priorities Goals**
(15 min) *Action* Roy Shahbazian, *Chair, Bike/Ped Subcommittee*
6. **OC Bridges Update** (15 min)
Presentation Ross Lew, *Program Manager, Capital Projects*
Tresa Oliveri, *Outreach Mgr, External Affairs*
7. **Update Reports** (5 minutes each)
 - October Service Change Audrey Saller, *Section Manager, Service Planning*
 - Government Affairs Lance Larson, *Exec. Director, Government Rel.*
 - Bicycle/Pedestrian Subcommittee Roy Shahbazian, *Chair, Bike/Ped Subcommittee*
 - Marketing Stella Lin, *Marketing Manager*
 - Staff Liaison Alice Rogan, *Strategic Communications Mgr*
8. **Committee Member Comments**
9. **Public Comments**
10. **Adjournment / Next Meeting:**
October 21, 2014

Agenda Descriptions/Public Comments on Agenda Items

The Agenda descriptions are intended to give notice to members of the public of a general summary of items of business to be transacted or discussed. Members from the public wishing to address the Committee will be recognized by the Chairman at the time the Agenda item is to be considered. A speaker's comments shall be limited to three (3) minutes.

Any person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in this meeting should contact the OCTA at (714) 560-5611, no less than two (2) business days prior to this meeting to enable OCTA to make reasonable arrangements to assure accessibility to this meeting.



**Citizens Advisory Committee
Meeting Notes
April 15, 2014
1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.
At The Orange County Transportation Authority
600 S. Main Street, Orange, Calif.
Conference Room 103/104**

Members Present

Paul Adams, *Fountain Valley Resident*

Phil Bacerra, *Santa Ana Resident*

Vince Buck, *Cal State Fullerton*

Barbara Delgleize, *Huntington Beach Chamber*

John Frankel, *Rancho Santa Margarita Architectural
Review*

Merlin "Bud" Henry, *North Tustin Advisory Committee*

Dan Kalmick, *Huntington Beach Planning Commission*

Leonard Lahtinen, *North O.C. Community College District*

Derek McGregor, *Trabuco Canyon Advisory Committee*

Greg Winterbottom, *OCTA Board Member*

Michael McNally, *UC Irvine*

David Mootchnik, *Southern California Commuters Forum*

Dan Oregel, *Santa Ana Resident*

Pat Pepper, *Anaheim Hills Citizen Coalition*

Jane Reifer, *Transit Advocates of Orange County*

Laurel Reimer, *Orange County Young Planners Group*

Roy Shahbazian, *Transit Advocates of Orange Co.*

Schelly Sustarsic, *Seal Beach Parks & Recreation Comm.*

Jeff Thompson, *Tustin Planning Commission*

Kara Watson, *Yorba Linda Planning Commission*

Members Absent

Hamid Bahadori, *Automobile Club of So. CA*

Dan Bane, *San Clemente Resident*

Ralph Bauer, *Council on Aging & City of Hunt. Bch*

Michael Brandman, *Building Industry Association*

Dr. David Chapel, *O.C. School Boards Assoc*

Doug Davert, *Tustin Resident*

Carla DiCandia, *Mission Hospital*

Tom Garner, *Retired Lieutenant, Laguna Hills*

Dolores Gonzales-Hayes, *Latino Health Access*

James Leach, *OC Taxpayers Association*

Frank Murphy, *Orange Rotary*

Lyle Overby, *Santa Ana Resident*

Greg Smith, *Irvine Resident*

Jacqueline Tran, *Santa Ana Resident*

Craig Young, *Yorba Linda Resident*

1. Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Pat Pepper called the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and welcomed everyone.

2. Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)

Greg Nord, LRTP Project Manager gave an update of the LRTP which was presented to the OCTA Board yesterday.

A committee member said a certain slide showed 20 Metrolink trains. He asked if they linked with the routes shown on the slide? Greg Nord said yes, a number of the routes shown connect to Metrolink service.

A committee member asked if there were local services outside of OCTA like in Irvine that are trying to transport people to Metrolink. Greg Nord said OCTA has its own Station Link service which will expand with the growth of Metrolink.

A committee member asked if there were any plans to do something with the Pacific Electric Right-of-Way. Greg Nord said the LRTP has no plans for the Pacific Electric Right-of-Way, but it may show up in the Bikeway plans.

A committee member asked if there was any hope for a connection from Fountain Valley, Huntington Beach, or Seal Beach to bring them into the center of the County. Greg Nord pointed out some bus lines from those areas which would connect to Metrolink. Greg Nord said there are no easy connections currently planned but it is something OCTA can continue to look at.

The committee member suggested a couple of areas on the Pacific Coast Highway and Beach Blvd. which should be looked at. Greg Nord said OCTA has been receiving suggestions about these areas.

A committee member asked what OCTA's density threshold was in order to get light rail. Greg Nord said OCTA needs to communicate with the local jurisdictions on their land use plans and work together to plan the corridors. Alice Rogan said everything depends on "political will." Ten years ago CenterLine light rail was not built because of the lack of political will.

A committee member asked about the rail from the Fullerton Depot to the University. Greg Nord said this was in the conceptual stage. The City of Fullerton is still looking at the design. The key is the funding for the project and they haven't nailed down this yet.

A committee member asked if there were any deadlines for the cities to submit their circulation element for the LRTP. Greg Nord said ideally they should have done it already, but there still is an opportunity to incorporate additional feedback during the 45 day public review period. It is anticipated the draft document will be out next week.

A committee member asked about a Grade Separation Project in the city of Tustin which has not been confirmed. What would be the consequences if it is not in the final LRTP? Greg Nord said this project is in the conceptual phase and is having problems with funding sources. The current projects in the plan are shelf ready.

There is only so much funding available in the plan and they must go with the projects closest to being ready.

A committee member asked what the operational improvements on the SR-55 at the SR-91 were. Greg Nord said as part of Measure M Project F, there are improvements along the SR-55 from the I-405 to the SR-91. But there are only capacity improvements between I-405 and the SR-22. Operational improvements would involve ramp improvements or auxiliary lanes for merging.

A committee member said he did not hear anything about highway maintenance in the LRTP. Greg Nord said there was a big line item in the LRTP for roadway maintenance; highway maintenance is discussed, but it is not listed under projects in the Plan because it is Caltrans' area to maintain the highways and there is a big shortfall of funds for this. There is a major statewide effort to get the Caltrans program funded. OCTA purposely left it out of the LRTP because they did not want to show a massive shortfall that could not be addressed. They are depending on the State to address the issue. There is approximately \$6 billion during the life of the plan to maintain local streets and roads. A committee member asked if this was enough money. Greg Nord said it should be enough.

A committee member said they were pleased to see there was over 650 miles of bikeways in the preferred plan. Another committee member said he was worried about the cost effectiveness of the bike paths. In his neighborhood a lot of money was spent in new traffic signals and pedestrian crossings for a small bikeway. He liked the plan but worried about the cost effectiveness. Another committee member said this project could have been a grant. Another committee member said if they are to get 32 miles per year done they can't have expensive quarter mile projects.

Alice Rogan said in the past the CAC has attached a letter to the public outreach report that goes to the OCTA Board Chair. They would like to work with the CAC Chair and Vice Chair on the letter.

Greg Nord urged the CAC members to make comments on the Plan and focus on the Action Plan which is where they have the most flexibility to explore new ideas and new opportunities.

3. Measure M Environmental Programs

Leslie Hill, Program Manager, Environmental Mitigation Program gave an overview of the Measure M Environmental Program.

A committee member asked if the Mustard Plant and the Artichoke Thistle are considered weeds. Leslie Hill said yes – they are weeds and they are out competing the native vegetation.

A committee member congratulated OCTA on the property acquisition portion of the Environmental Program. Leslie Hill said OCTA did a good job of avoiding pockets of land; they really wanted to make acquisitions that are connected. Leslie Hill said they looked at the area with a regional approach. OCTA built a strong relationship with the wildlife agencies working on other conservation plans and have a much greater grasp of what is going on with regional perspective. This allowed OCTA to fill in donut holes and produce connectivity.

A committee member asked what the average cost per acre of the acquired property and what is the estimated cost to maintain the property. Dan Phu, Project Development Section Manager, said the cost per acre for the property has varied from \$10,000 to \$38,000 per acre depending where the property is located. Lesley Hill said currently OCTA currently determining what type of management plan each property will need. The conservation plan currently being developed will dictate how much monitoring each preserve will need.

A committee member asked if OCTA was trying to create a bank of owed mitigation credits so as projects came up they could use the credits as needed. Lesley Hill said yes, this is pretty much how it will work. OCTA created a biological base line and used it to determine what they would need and what they had.

A committee member said OCTA has established these preserves of land. Why does the transportation authority have to manage these properties? Isn't there another County agency that could take over the management? Lesley Hill said the acquired properties will only be used for mitigation of the 13 Measure M2 Freeway projects. OCTA has to be comfortable they have enough land to compensate for the environmental impacts caused by freeway construction. OCTA has several interim managers they are partnering with. The Brea property is partnered with the California Department of Parks and Recreation and Orange County Parks is helping us with several other properties. Once the cost of long term management and the size of the endowment are determined they will reach out to who is interested and capable for long term management.

Marissa Espino, Outreach Manager gave an update on the Public Outreach going on for the Environmental Programs.

Alison Army, Senior Transportation Analyst gave an overview of the Water Quality Program.

A committee member asked if Tier 2 funded any other projects besides wetlands and detention basins. Alison Army said recently Tier 2 had funded a Newport Beach project for creek restoration and also Tier 2 has done several bio-swale projects.

4. Upcoming Marketing Campaigns

Stella Lin, Marketing Manager, gave a report on upcoming Marketing Campaigns and focused on the upcoming May Bike Month.

A committee member suggested sending the video links to the Orange County schools, and senior communities. Stella Lin said the next step in the outreach efforts was to work with the Orange County communities to get the information out.

A committee member asked if the information poster would be put up at the bike shops. Stella Lin said the bike shops have been very cooperative in getting the message out and putting posters in their shops.

A committee member asked if bicycle safety is addressed in the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) Handbook. Alice Rogan said bicycle safety is not currently addressed in the DMV Handbook.

A committee member suggested getting the OCTA Government Affairs Department involved. Stella Lin said the Marketing Department is planning on hiring a couple of people and next year OCTA is planning to focus on motorist safety along the bikeways.

A committee member asked what type of partnership existed between the Anaheim Angels and the Angels Express. Stella Lin said every year OCTA pays the Angels \$50,000 and this includes all the advertising and getting the word out through their venues. The Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee (MSRC) provides the funding to operate the special train. Without the MSRC funding, it would cost \$60,000 to wrap the two trains for advertisement purposes.

A committee member asked where the Angels trains ran. Stella Lin said it runs from Laguna Niguel to Anaheim and the other train ran from Los Angeles Union Station to Anaheim. They run on week days only. There is one train that runs on Fridays from the Inland Empire to Anaheim.

A committee member said the Angel trains are missing the whole west side of the county. Stella Lin said they have looked into adding a bus from Goldenwest and MSRC was the only hope they have to fund the special bus service; but OCTA has already used up this funding.

5. Update Reports

Bicycle/Pedestrian Subcommittee: Roy Shahbazian, Chair of the Bike/Ped Subcommittee gave an update on the Subcommittee activities.

Government Affairs: Alice Rogan, Strategic Communications Manager said Lance Larson, Executive Director of Government Relations reported could not make the meeting but wanted to let the CAC know OCTA is starting work on the Legislative Platform. Alice Rogan said they may have a special roundtable to focus on the platform.

June Service Change: Audrey Saller, Service Planning Section Manager gave a report on the June Service change.

Staff Liaison: Alice Rogan reported earlier.

6. Committee Member Comments

There were no further comments from committee members.

7. Public Comments

There were no comments from the public.

8. Adjournment – Next Meeting July 15, 2014

The next CAC meeting will be at the OCTA offices on July 15, 2014 at 1:00 p.m.

**Citizens Advisory Committee
Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Attendance Record**

● = Present

⊙ = Absent

R = Resigned

Member	7/16/13	10/15/13	1/21/14	4/15/14
Adams, Paul	●	⊙	●	●
Bacerra, Phil	⊙	●	⊙	●
Bahadori, Hamid	●	●	●	⊙
Bane, Dan	●	⊙	⊙	⊙
Bauer, Ralph	⊙	●	●	⊙
Brandman, Michael	●	●	●	⊙
Buck, Vince	●	●	⊙	●
Chapel, David	⊙	⊙	●	⊙
Davert, Doug	●	●	●	⊙
Delgleize, Barbara	●	⊙	●	●
DiCandia, Carla	●	⊙	●	⊙
Frankel, John	●	●	●	●
Garner, Tom	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
Gonzales-Hayes, Dolores	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
Henry, Merlin "Bud"	●	●	●	●
Kalmick, Dan	●	●	●	●
Lahtinen, Leonard	●	●	●	●
Leach, James	⊙	●	⊙	⊙
McGregor, Derek	⊙	●	⊙	●
McNally, Michael	●	●	⊙	●
Mootchnick, David	●	●	⊙	●
Murphy, Frank	⊙	●	●	⊙
Oregel, Dan	●	⊙	⊙	●
Overby, Lyle	●	⊙	●	⊙
Pepper, Pat	●	●	●	●
Reifer, Jane	●	●	●	●
Reimer, Laurel	●	⊙	●	●
Shahbazian, Roy	●	●	●	●
Smith, Greg	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
Schelly Sustarsic	●	●	●	●
Thompson, Jeff	⊙	●	●	●
Tran, Jacqueline	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
Watson, Kara	●	●	●	●
Young, Craig	●	●	●	⊙

Action

Items

April 15, 2014

Shawn Nelson, Chairman
Orange County Transportation Authority
P.O. Box 14184
550 South Main Street
Orange, California 92863-1584

Dear Chairman Nelson:

Please accept this letter as testimony of the activities and comments of the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). The CAC has spent the past year providing insight and comments into the development of OCTA's 2014 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

In our CAC meetings, we discussed transportation priorities, changing demographics, key issues and possible solutions. At the CAC roundtable on October 15, 2013, after reviewing future forecasts and baseline information, the members participated in a "blue sky" discussion about potential improvements. Members also took the informal survey that was administered at all the LRTP roundtables. Attachment A summarizes the survey results for the CAC and Attachment B provides a snapshot of the members' transportation priorities. Attachment C gives a summary of the member' comments at each of our meetings during the past year.

The committee members are supportive of rail and bus transit solutions; signal synchronization, filling potholes and inter-county connections continue to be priorities; and they see the need to integrate land use and transportation planning.

The committee members were very engaged in the 2014 LRTP development process and shared some great ideas and comments. We look forward to the implementation of the LRTP.

Sincerely,

Patrick J. Pepper, Chairman
OCTA Citizens Advisory Committee

Long Range Transportation Plan 2014 Survey Results Youth: CAC (n=20)

Questions	Survey Responses (count)			Survey Responses (percentage)		
	Yes	No	Not Sure	Yes	No	Not Sure
Overview						
1) Do you agree Orange County will continue to grow?	20			100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2) Should connections to key destinations outside of Orange County e.g. LAX be a priority for the Long Range Transportation Plan?	12	2	6	60.0%	10.0%	30.0%
3) Do you believe the county will be less auto-centric in the next 30 years?	1	13	6	5.0%	65.0%	30.0%
Streets and Roads						
4) Should major streets have elevated through lanes or interchanges (e.g. Jamboree Road)?	11	3	6	55.0%	15.0%	30.0%
5) Should major street intersections be widened with left and/or right turn lanes and/or through lanes?	15	3	2	75.0%	15.0%	10.0%
6) Should more bike lanes be added in Orange County if it decreases on-street parking?	12	4	4	60.0%	20.0%	20.0%
7) Should traffic signal synchronization be a major priority?	18		2	90.0%	0.0%	10.0%
8) Should filling pot holes and street maintenance be a major priority?	18	1	1	90.0%	5.0%	5.0%
Transit / Non-motorized						
9) Should rail transit service that operates in a dedicated lane on freeways be considered? (e.g. Green Line in LA)	11	6	2	57.9%	31.6%	10.5%
10) Should rail transit service that operates in the same street lanes as automobiles be considered for Orange County? (similar to modern street cars operating in Portland and Europe)	11	6	3	55.0%	30.0%	15.0%
11) Should bus and/or rail transit fares be lowered to encourage ridership?	5	9	6	25.0%	45.0%	30.0%
11a) Should bus and/or rail transit fares be lowered if it means less overall service?	1	18		5.3%	94.7%	0.0%
12) Should rapid, limited-stop bus service be a priority over regular bus service?	9	4	7	45.0%	20.0%	35.0%
13) Would you use transit more if travel time was the same as driving?	14	4	1	73.7%	21.1%	5.3%
14) Should Orange County have more high capacity transit like rapid buses and/or light rail?	13		7	65.0%	0.0%	35.0%
15) Should OCTA continue to lead regional bikeway planning efforts to identify priority bikeway corridors?	13	2	5	65.0%	10.0%	25.0%
16) Once completed, should OCTA hand-off bike planning efforts to local agencies for project implementation?	7	8	5	35.0%	40.0%	25.0%
17) If funding were available, should a countywide bike share (rental) system be launched?	7	3	10	35.0%	15.0%	50.0%
Freeways / Toll						
18) Should freeways continue to be widened even if it results in significant impacts to private property?	6	6	8	30.0%	30.0%	40.0%
19) Should freeway double decking be considered to gain freeway capacity while minimizing the acquisition of homes and businesses (if this would create visual impacts)?	10	7	3	50.0%	35.0%	15.0%
20) Should Orange County develop solutions to improve conditions in the carpool lanes?	16	3	1	80.0%	15.0%	5.0%
21) Should Orange County plan for a managed lane system?	14	5	1	70.0%	25.0%	5.0%
22) Should public transportation funds be invested so carpools, vanpools, and buses could use toll roads for a reduced price or free? (SR-73, SR-241, SR-261)	8	7	3	44.4%	38.9%	16.7%

CAC LRTP Roundtable Transportation Priorities

First Priority	Second Priority	Third Priority
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding what we have • Integrate land use / transportation planning • Reaching LA County line on I-5 North • Improve local bus system frequency • Plan for increased vehicle usage and improved management • Complete 405 Freeway Long Range Plan (all phases) • 241 Extension • Rail and or street cars • More fixed rail transit • Increase rail transit • Freeway capacity enhancements • Light rail tram system to connect west end to county to transit hubs • Freeway improvements (limited widening, enhanced interchanges, improved freeway to freeway connection) • Efficient use of the system • Reduce bottlenecks • Network of rapid bus routes while preserving local bus service 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated network / multimodal planning • Too much Eastbound traffic on SR-91 • Improve boarder-area local bus and rail connections • Look at ways apps can help with traffic management • Synchronize signals on all arterials • Enhance Carpool lane usage • Frequent bus service • More Safe Bicycle options • Improve connectivity between bus & rail transit • Arterial optimization • Focusing on making bus inter-arrival times useful • Freeway carpool lane fix (adding lanes, HOV3+, Managed lanes for toll, etc.) • Transit options where appropriate • Rapid bus & light rail • Perpendicular and signalized intersections at freeway on/off ramps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability - non-motoring • Make bus and rail information more easily available • Develop educational programs to help guide / inform new drivers on alternative means • Increase convenience of existing service • 241 extension • Bike/pedestrian right of way • More Realistic transportation options • Maximize freeway utilization / capacity • Signal Synchronization • Take the lead on implementing technologies for street/car automation; take people out of the picture • Increased mass transit headway & coverage • Regional collaboration • Improve conditions to carpool & managed lane system • College transit passes

Citizens Advisory Committee Meetings Long Range Transportation Plan Discussions

April 16, 2013

- Will transit travel times be incorporated?
- How will the Transit System Study be integrated into the LRTP?
- Will the PEROW be brought into the plan?

July 16, 2013

- Facebook is outdated; potentially use Instagram.
- Outreach to youth should emphasize that the “future is ugly” as a result of projected growth
- Suggest a High School LRTP “road show”
- The key issue is addressing carpool lane congestion. However 3+ will reduce carpool lane congestion but not the number of cars on the road. The perspective is wrong.
- OCTA should look into partnering with the DMV regarding bicycle / pedestrian education
- The issue to increase transit ridership should be included
- Further efficiencies to improve existing systems
- Housing should not be detached from transportation i.e. impact of low-income housing to traffic
- Outreach should be done for low-income seniors who don't drive
- Cap and trade priority is transit services not active transportation

CAC - LRTP Roundtable October 15, 2013

OC Autocentric?

- No because oil is getting too expensive
- More hybrid cars in future and “self-driving” cars
- Aging population is driving longer
- Who is paying for transit?
- US is now #1 energy producer which means there is more pressure for cleaner air
 - o California is too affluent to give up cars
- Rome: overloaded with small cars and scooters which provide flexibility
- Cost of gas still the same percentage of income since 1988
- People use cars to get around “free-market” system;
- Overwhelming need/burden will still be carried by cars
- Need a realistic alternative first
- Plan for using difference modes for different trips

What technology? What systems?

- Should focus on next 5 years (not beyond)
- People like solutions that solve congestion for “other people” – they can use alternate modes
 - o Look at existing ridership data
- Look at assumptions on development: Transit Oriented Development (densities)
 - o Development of transit needs to fit
- Who is traveling in OC?
 - o Look at all traveling needs e.g. tourists
- Choices: need to accommodate
- Complete systems (241)
 - o What does it mean to not complete?
- Focus on bottlenecks e.g. 91 transition west to 55 South
- Technology influences transportation – public sector needs to integrate updates with private sector e.g. how to automate highways
- Most international cities were rebuilt and thus able to accommodate transit
 - o Need rezoning for densities
 - Need transit; West Orange County does not have plans for transit
 - o Bus system is ineffective to get people out of cars (should have reasonable travel times)
 - Public policy to pay for transit?
- Driverless cars; inter-car communication systems (increase capacity)
 - o Leader in setting technology standards!
- Fare collection system is antiquated
- 34 local jurisdictions have competing/diverse interests
 - o Educate cities to make them more aware regionally

Solve congestion on HOV Lanes?

- Focus on air quality instead of speed
- Low emission (LEV) are not cause of degradation
- Managed lanes (like 91 express lanes) are misunderstood
- HOV system is connected to encourage carpooling
 - o Since it is successful we should have more interconnectivity
- Need data to support decisions
 - o Why do people carpool (use of park and ride lots?)
- Look at demographics to make decisions (household communities vs. individuals)
- Look beyond what happens inside county
 - o Must consider regionally (Half of people on 91 not from Orange County)
 - o Talk to other agencies
- Look at success
 - o i.e. 91 managed lanes – started with 91 planning many years ago that builds on success
- Many solutions needed
- Criteria of keeping HOV speeds is irrelevant (wrong federal criteria needs to be tackled)

- 241 needs to go through
- Traffic generated by other counties
 - o Learn more about what Mobility 21 is doing for collaboration

Other

- Facebook is not popular anymore
- Kids living at home longer for youth
- 1984 Olympics Model/techniques - staggered work hours alleviated congestion
- Transit needs more frequency

January 21, 2014

- I-405 congestion not addressed with HOV 3+
- Local bus connectors should be included in inter-county connections narrative
- Bus Rapid Transit with Metrolink connections is a great idea that cities would be receptive to

April 15, 2014

- Transit Connections from West County – expand rail
- Future of transit on PEROW?
- Light rail on Beach (Goldenwest College)
- Rail right-of-way on Gothard [Phoenix - example]
- Rail in Fullerton from Fullerton Transportation Center to Cal State University Fullerton
- Newport Blvd Grade Crossing in Tustin
- Projects to offset removing 241 extension – leaving extension in the Plan may limit other opportunities e.g. rail expansion
- Roadway maintenance not included
- Compare 2010 Baseline to 2035 Preferred
- Does public understand “guideway” term – more conceptual
- Create connections to Metrolink with BRAVO! rapid buses