

ORANGE COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
Ordinance Tracking Matrix - Ordinance No. 3
For Period Ending December 31, 2018

Item	Description	Citation	Division Responsible	Timeframe	Status	Responsible Person (POC)	2018 Response
1.00	Administrative and General Requirements						
2.00	Has a transportation special revenue fund ("Local Transportation Authority Special Revenue Fund") been established to maintain all Revenues?	Sec. 10.1	F & A	One-time, start-up	Done	Sean Murdock	Yes, The LTA Fund (fund 17) was established for this purpose. A discussion of the fund and its purpose can be found in the OCLTA audited financial statements. Please refer to: " OCLTA Annual Financial and Compliance Report " for year ending June 30, 2018, pg. 17 - Notes to the Financial Statements.
3.00	Have the imposition, administration and collection of the tax been done in accordance with all applicable statutes, laws, rules and regulations prescribed and adopted by State Board of Equalization?	Sec. 3	F & A	Recurring	Done to date	Sean Murdock	Yes. See independent auditor's findings related to applying Agreed-Upon Procedures to the Measure M2 Status Report. Please refer to: " OCLTA Report on Agreed-Upon Procedures Applied to Measure M2 Status Report " for year ending June 30, 2018.
4.00	Have Net Revenues been allocated solely for the transportation purposes described in the Ordinance?	Sec. 4	F & A	Recurring	Done to date	Sean Murdock	Yes. See independent auditor's findings related to applying Agreed-Upon Procedures to the Measure M2 Status Report. Please refer to: " OCLTA Report on Agreed-Upon Procedures Applied to Measure M2 Status Report " for year ending June 30, 2018.
5.00	"Pay as you go" financing is the preferred method of financing transportation improvements and operations under the Ordinance. Before issuing bonds, has the Authority determined the scope of expenditures made "pay-as-you-go" financing unfeasible?	Sec. 5	F & A, Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Sean Murdock	Yes. Please refer to the following documents: "Plan of Finance for Early Action Plan Staff Report" , November 9, 2007 (Attachment D) "Renewed Measure M Early Action Plan Review Staff Report" , December 14, 2009 "Paying for M2 - Bond Financing Legal Memo" , March 5, 2012
6.00	Have maintenance of effort (MOE) levels been established for each jurisdiction for fiscal year 2010-2011 pursuant to Ordinance 2?	Sec. 6	Planning	One-time, start-up	Done	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes. The MOE benchmark for each jurisdiction was originally established under Ordinance No. 2. MOE for FY 2010-11 was established and adopted by the OCTA Board as part of the M2 Eligibility Guidelines. Please reference " Measure M2 Local Agency Eligibility Guidelines and Requirements " Staff Report dated January 25, 2010.
7.00	Have city and county MOE levels been adjusted by July 1, 2014 and every three years thereafter using the Caltrans Construction Cost Index?	Sec. 6	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes. The second MOE adjustment was presented to the Board on April 10, 2017. MOE correction for City of San Juan Capistrano was presented to the Board on May 8, 2017. Placentia MOE Benchmark adjustment was presented to the Board with the FY 18-19 M2 Eligibility Guidelines on April 9, 2018 due to a delay in adopting a final CAFR.

							<p>The next MOE benchmark adjustment will be effective July 1, 2020 and will go to the Board in Spring 2020.</p> <p>Please refer to the following Staff Reports: "Fiscal Year 2017-18 Measure M2 Maintenance of Effort Adjustment and Updates to the Eligibility and Local Signal Synchronization Plan Guidelines", Staff Report Dated April 10, 2017</p> <p>"Measure M2 Eligibility Review Recommendations for Fiscal Year 2015-16 Expenditure Reports and City of San Juan Capistrano's Maintenance of Effort Benchmark", Staff Report Dated May 8, 2017.</p> <p>"Fiscal Year 2018-19 Measure M2 Eligibility and Countywide Pavement Management Plan Guidelines and City of Placentia's Maintenance of Effort Benchmark", Staff Report Dated April 8, 2018.</p>
8.00	Have MOE requirements been met annually by each jurisdiction?	Sec. 6	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	<p>Yes. Actual expenditures for all local agencies were approved by the Board most recently on December 10, 2018.</p> <p>Please reference "Fiscal Year 2018-19 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review", Staff Report Dated December 10, 2018</p>
9.00	Have Revenues expended for salaries and benefits of Authority administrative staff remained within the one-percent per year limit?	Sec 7	F & A	Recurring	Action plan in place	Sean Murdock & Ben Torres	<p>Yes. Expenditures were 0.78% for the fiscal year period between July 1, 2017 and June 30, 2018, which was less than the 1% of net revenue requirement. The amount under 1% for the fiscal year was \$715,985. However, program-to-date expenditures are over the 1% limit by \$1,497,884. This amount has been borrowed from the Orange County Unified Transportation Trust and is being paid back when administrative expenditures underrun revenue in any given year of the program.</p> <p>Please reference "OCTA Summary of Measure M2 Administrative Costs From Inception through June 30, 2018".</p>
10.00	Has the Authority, to the extent possible, used existing state, regional and local planning and programming data and expertise to carry out the purposes of the Ordinance?	Sec. 7	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Tamara Warren	<p>Yes, OCTA as appropriate, looks to other existing resources to ensure that work is not duplicative and that expenses are kept to a minimum. In cases where OCTA does not have the expertise available, OCTA contracts with other external agencies. For example, OCTA regularly has cooperative agreements with the California Department of Transportation, local universities, Army Corp of Engineers, and contracts with private sector experts as needed to meet the requirements of the Ordinance.</p>

11.00	Have expenses for administrative staff and for project implementation incurred by the Authority, including contracted expenses, been identified in an annual report pursuant to Ordinance No. 3, Sec. 10.8?	Sec. 7 and Sec. 10.8	External Affairs	Recurring	Done to date	Alice Rogan & Marissa Espino	<p>Yes. These reports identify expenses for administrative staff and for project implementation incurred by the Authority, including contracted expenses. M1 Annual reports from years 2008 - 2011 included minor updates on M2 Early Action Plan progress and funding. All reports are saved in the M2 Document Center. As a one-time courtesy, hyperlinks for all M2 annual reports up to 2015 were provided in the 2015 matrix.</p> <p>For the 2018 M2 report, please refer to: "Measure M Annual Report Infographic - 2017", published in spring April 2018.</p>
12.00	Has the 2006-2007 Authority appropriations limit been set at \$1,123 million?	Sec. 8	F & A	One-time, start-up	Done	Sean Murdock	<p>Yes. Please reference "Board Resolution 2006-32 Establishing LTA Appropriations Limit FY 2006-07", dated June 12, 2006.</p>
13.00	Has the Authority's appropriations limit been adjusted annually?	Sec. 8	F & A	Recurring	Done to date	Sean Murdock	<p>Yes. All Board Resolutions establishing LTA appropriations are saved in the M2 Document Center. As a one-time courtesy, hyperlinks for all resolutions were provided in the 2015 matrix. For the approved 2018 resolution, please refer to page 187: "Board Resolution 2018-055 Establishing LTA Appropriations Limit FY 2018-19"</p>
14.00	Has the County of Orange Auditor-Controller, in the capacity as Chair of the Taxpayer Oversight Committee, annually certified that the Revenues were spent in compliance with the Ordinance?	Sec. 10.2	External Affairs	Recurring	Done to Date	Alice Rogan	<p>Yes. Each year since 2007, subsequent to Measure M Annual Hearings, the County Auditor-Controller has annually certified that revenues were spent in compliance with the Ordinance. For this reporting period, on April 10, 2018, County Auditor-Controller Eric Woolery certified that the revenues were spent in compliance with the Ordinance as noted in the minutes of the TOC meeting on April 10, 2018. All Annual Hearing Compliance Memos are saved in the M2 Document Center. For the most recent confirmation of compliance please reference the "April 10, 2018 meeting minutes" dated June 12, 2018.</p>
15.00	Have receipt, maintenance and expenditure of Net Revenues been distinguishable in each jurisdiction's accounting records from other funding sources, and distinguishable by program or project?	Sec. 10.3	F&A, Internal Audit	Recurring	Action plan in place	Sean Murdock	<p>Yes, local agencies submit expenditure reports annually that distinguish funding sources and tie to accounting records that are subject to audits. Starting with the 2011 version of the annual expenditure report, local jurisdictions' finance directors are also required to attest to this requirement and each year hereafter. Jurisdictions are also subject to audits that cover this requirement. Internal Audit, through contractors, conducts audits of 8-10 jurisdictions per year covering this matter. Expenditure Reports for each city are reviewed by staff and the TOC. The agencies to be audited are selected by the TOC Audit Subcommittee. The TOC approved FY 2016-17 Expenditure Reports on April 10, 2018 for all agencies. Audited agency findings are included in the Agreed-Upon Procedures M2 Reports. Please refer to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. April 10, 2018 Meeting Minutes portion of "TOC Agenda Packet", dated June 12, 2018

							<p>2. “Measure M2 Eligibility Review Recommendations for Fiscal Year 2016-17 Expenditure Reports”, Staff Report dated June 11, 2018</p> <p>3. “OCLTA Report on Agreed-Upon Procedures Applied to Measure M2 Status Report” for year ending June 30, 2018.</p>
16.00	Has interest earned on Net Revenues allocated pursuant to the Ordinance been expended only for those purposes for which Net Revenues were allocated?	Sec. 10.3	F & A	Recurring	Done to date	Sean Murdock	<p>Yes. See independent auditor's findings related to applying Agreed-Upon Procedures to the Measure M2 Status Report.</p> <p>Please refer to: “OCLTA Report on Agreed-Upon Procedures Applied to Measure M2 Status Report” for year ending June 30, 2018.</p>
17.00	Have jurisdictions used Net Revenues only for transportation purposes authorized by the Ordinance?	Sec. 10.4	F&A, Internal Audit	Recurring	Action plan in place	Sean Murdock	Yes. See Item 15 notes.
18.00	If any jurisdiction used Net Revenues for other than transportation purposes, has it fully reimbursed the Authority the Net Revenues misspent and been deemed ineligible to receive Net Revenues for a period of five years?	Sec. 10.4	F & A	Recurring	N.A.	Sean Murdock	Not applicable because there have been no such occurrences to date. Compliance is subject to audits by Internal Audit.
19.00	Has a Taxpayer Oversight Committee been established to provide an enhanced level of accountability for expenditures of Revenues and to help ensure that all voter mandates are carried out as required?	Sec. 10.5	External Affairs	One-time, start-up	Done	Alice Rogan	Yes. The Citizens Oversight Committee established under M1 was transitioned into the Taxpayer Oversight Committee (TOC) in August 2007. The transition was mentioned in the OCTA Staff Update portion of the June 12, 2007 COC Meeting Minutes, included in the August 28, 2007 TOC Meeting Agenda Packet. The TOC has since met regularly to provide an enhanced level of accountability for expenditures of Revenues and to help ensure that all voter mandates are carried out as required. Agenda Packets and Meeting Minutes for each TOC meeting can be found in the Document Center. Please reference: “TOC Agenda Packet 8-28-2007” .
20.00	Have performance assessments to evaluate efficiency, effectiveness, economy and program results been conducted every three years?	Sec. 10.6	PMO	Recurring	Done to Date	Tamara Warren	<p>Yes, to date, three Performance Assessments have been conducted. Currently, the fourth Triennial M2 Performance Assessment, covering 2015-2018 is underway and is anticipated to be complete in early 2019. The most recent performance assessment can be found: “Triennial M2 Performance Assessment 2012-2015”</p> <p>Please refer to the 2016 M2 Ordinance Tracking Matrix or the M2 Document Center for prior M2 Performance Assessments.</p>
21.00	Have the performance assessments been provided to the Taxpayers Oversight Committee?	Sec. 10.6	PMO, External Affairs	Recurring	Done to Date	Tamara Warren & Alice Rogan	<p>Yes, to date, three performance assessments have been provided to the TOC. Please refer to the following agenda packets: “TOC Agenda Packet 20101214”, “TOC Agenda Packet 20130409”, “TOC Agenda Packet 20160614”</p>

22.00	Have quarterly status reports regarding the major projects detailed in the Plan been brought before the Authority in public meetings?	Sec. 10.7	PMO	Recurring	Done to Date	Tamara Warren	Yes, quarterly reports have consistently been brought before the Board. The reports are posted on the OCTA website and saved in the M2 Document Center. These reports can be found by searching for "M2 Quarterly Report". The latest report was presented to the Board on December 10, 2018. Please reference: " M2 Quarterly Report Q1 July through September 2018 "
23.00	Has the Authority published an annual report on how revenues have been spent and on progress toward implementation and publicly reported on the findings?	Sec. 10.8	External Affairs	Recurring	Done to date	Alice Rogan	Yes. These annual reports were prepared and made public since FYs 2010-11. The FY 2017-18 report is underway and will be presented to the Board March 2019. See Item 11 for links to public reports.
24.00	Has the Authority, every ten years, conducted a comprehensive review of all projects and programs implemented under the Plan to evaluate the performance of the overall program?	Sec. 11	PMO	Recurring	Done to date	Tamara Warren	The first comprehensive Ten-Year Review was conducted for the period covering November 8, 2006 through June 30, 2015. The final report was presented to the Board on October 12, 2015. Please reference: " M2 Ten-Year Review Report ".
25.00	If the Authority has amended the Ordinance, including the Plan, has the Authority followed the process and notification requirements in Ordinance No. 3, Sec. 12, including approval by not less than two-thirds vote of the Taxpayer Oversight Committee?	Sec. 12	PMO, External Affairs	Recurring	Done to Date	Tamara Warren & Alice Rogan	Yes. For Amendment #1 (Nov. 9, 2012) to the Plan (Freeway Category), OCTA followed the Plan amendment process and notification requirements (including TOC approval on Oct. 9, 2012). For Amendment #2 (Nov. 25, 2013) to the Ordinance (Attachment C), OCTA followed the Ordinance amendment process and notification requirements (didn't require TOC approval). For Amendment #3 (Dec. 14, 2015, corrected on Mar. 14, 2016) to the Plan (Transit Category) and Ordinance (Attachment B), OCTA followed the Plan amendment process and notification requirements (including TOC approval on Nov. 10, 2015). Please refer to: " TOC M2 Amendment No. 1 Approval Memo ", dated October 9, 2012 " TOC M2 Amendment No. 2 Public Hearing ," Staff Report dated November 25, 2013. " TOC M2 Amendment No. 3 Approval Memo ", dated November 10, 2015.
26.00	General Requirements - Allocation of Net Revenues						
27.00	Have at least five percent of the Net Revenues allocated for Freeway Projects been used to fund Programmatic Mitigation of Freeway Projects, and have these funds derived by pooling funds from the mitigation budgets of individual Freeway Projects?	Att. B, Sec. II.A.5	Planning, F & A	30-year	Done to date	Sean Murdock	Yes. See independent auditor's findings related to applying Agreed-Upon Procedures to the Measure M2 Status Report. Please refer to: " OCLTA Report on Agreed-Upon Procedures Applied to Measure M2 Status Report " for year ending June 30, 2018.

28.00	<p>Has the Authority used Revenues as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - First, paid the State Board of Equalization for services and functions? - Second, paid the administrative costs of the Authority? - Third, satisfied the annual allocation of two percent of Revenues for Environmental Cleanup? - Fourth, satisfied the debt service requirements of all bonds issued pursuant to the Ordinance that are not satisfied out of separate allocations? 	Att. B, Sec. IV.A.1-4	F & A	Recurring	Done to date	Sean Murdock	<p>Yes. See independent auditor's findings related to applying Agreed-Upon Procedures to the Measure M2 Status Report.</p> <p>Please refer to: "OCLTA Report on Agreed-Upon Procedures Applied to Measure M2 Status Report" for year ending June 30, 2018.</p>
29.00	<p>After providing for the use of Revenues as described above, has the Authority allocated Net Revenues as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Freeway Projects - 43%? - Streets and Roads Projects - 32%? - Transit Projects - 25%? 	Att. B, Sec. IV.B.1-3	F & A	Recurring	Done to date	Sean Murdock	<p>Yes. See independent auditor's findings related to applying Agreed-Upon Procedures to the Measure M2 Status Report.</p> <p>Please refer to: "OCLTA Report on Agreed-Upon Procedures Applied to Measure M2 Status Report" for year ending June 30, 2018.</p>
30.00	<p>Has the allocation of the 32 percent for Streets and Roads Projects been made as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional Capacity Program projects - 10% of Net Revenues? - Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program projects - 4% of Net Revenues? - Local Fair Share Program projects - 18% of Net Revenues? 	Att. B, Sec. IV.C.1-3	F & A	Recurring	Done to date	Sean Murdock	<p>Yes. See independent auditor's findings related to applying Agreed-Upon Procedures to the Measure M2 Status Report.</p> <p>Please refer to: "OCLTA Report on Agreed-Upon Procedures Applied to Measure M2 Status Report" for year ending June 30, 2018.</p>
31.00	<p>If the percentage basis of the allocation of Net Revenues in any given year is different than required by Sections B and C (except for Local Fair Share Program projects), have the percentage allocations set forth in Sections B and C been achieved during the duration of the Ordinance?</p>	Att. B, Sec. IV.D	F & A	30-year	Not yet required	Sean Murdock	<p>The percentage basis allocation is not an annual requirement but must be achieved during the duration of the Ordinance.</p>
32.00	<p>Have Net Revenues allocated for the Local Fair Share Program pursuant to Att. B, Sec. IV.C been paid to Eligible Jurisdictions within 60 days of receipt by the Authority?</p>	Att. B, Sec. IV.E	F & A	Recurring	Done to date	Sean Murdock	<p>Yes. See General Accounting payments for Local Fair Share funds for FY 2017-18. Also note that Agreed-Upon Procedures to the Measure M2 Status Report.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2018 Project Q Local Fair Share Payments. 2. "OCLTA Report on Agreed-Upon Procedures Applied to Measure M2 Status Report" for year ending June 30, 2018.
33.00	<p>If the Authority exchanged Net Revenues from a Plan funding category for federal, state or other local funds, has the Authority and the exchanging public agency used the exchanged funds for the same program or project authorized for the use of the funds prior to the exchange, have such federal, state or local funds received by the Authority been allocated to the same Plan funding category that was the source of the exchanged Net Revenues?</p>	Att. B, Sec. IV.F	Planning, F & A	Recurring	Not yet required	Sean Murdock	<p>Not applicable to date because there have been no exchanges.</p>
34.00	<p>Has the Authority followed the requirement that in no event shall an exchange of funds reduce the Net Revenues allocated for Programmatic Mitigation of Freeway Projects?</p>	Att. B, Sec. IV.F	Planning, F & A	Recurring	Not yet required	Sean Murdock	<p>Not applicable to date because there have been no exchanges.</p>

35.00	Has the Authority, upon review and acceptance of any Project Final Report, allocated the balance of Net Revenues, less the interest earned on the Net Revenues allocated for the project?	Att. B, Sec. IV.H	Planning	Recurring	Done to Date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes. As projects are completed, any unused funds from each project are made available for other projects within the same category, as needed (Ordinance Amendments 1 and 3 are examples of this). There have been no reallocations across categories (43% Freeway, 32% Streets and Roads, and 25% Transit), in accordance with overall requirements in Att. B, Sec IV.B.
36.00	Requirements Related to All Freeway Projects						
37.00	Have Freeway Projects been planned, designed and constructed with consideration for their aesthetic, historic and environmental impacts on nearby properties and communities?	Att. A, p. 5 Freeway Projects Overview	Capital Programs - Highways	Recurring	Done to Date	Rose Casey	Yes. Freeway Projects are developed with input from Cities, the public, other stakeholders and various interest groups. For example, landscaping and aesthetics are prepared with input from city representatives and the public to ensure that each city is given an opportunity to include its own "theme" while preserving the overall uniformity on the freeways throughout Orange County. Please reference Environmental Documents for each project. For an example, please refer to the " Historic Resources Compliance Report HRCR " portion of the Project H Environmental Document, dated December 1, 2008.
38.00	Has a Master Agreement for environmental and programmatic mitigation of freeway projects between OCLTA and state and federal resource agencies been executed?	Att. A, p.5 Freeway Projects Overview	Planning	One-time, start-up	Done	Dan Phu	Yes. The Memorandum of Agreement and Planning Agreement executed in January 2010, served as the Master Agreement. As a note, the termination date on the Planning Agreement was extended as it took longer than anticipated to complete the NCCP/HCP and EIR/EIS. Please refer to: " C-9-0278 Agreement, Environmental Mitigation Program MOA ".
39.00	Has the OCLTA made every effort to maximize Orange County's share of state and federal freeway dollars?	Att. B, Sec. II.A.1	Govt Relations, Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Adriann Cardoso	Yes. Since 2006, OCTA has received and programmed the following amounts, for freeway projects included in the M2 Plan: federal - \$511 million, state - \$819 million, other local - \$10 million. OCTA was also successful in receiving a TIFIA loan for \$629 million (of which ~\$154 million will benefit M2) against future toll revenues for the I-405 from SR-73 to I-605 project. Please refer to Attachment B of " Capital Programming Update " Staff Report, dated November 26, 2018.
40.00	Have all major approval actions for Freeway Projects, including project concept, location, and any change in scope, been agreed upon by Caltrans, the Authority, project sponsors, and where appropriate, the FHWA and/or the California Transportation Commission?	Att. B, Sec. II.A.2	Capital Programs - Highways	Recurring	Done to Date	Rose Casey	Yes, coordination with the agencies listed is a constant, and the required approval actions are obtained from the appropriate agencies. Project concept, location and scope are determined when the preferred alternative is selected and identified in the final approved environmental document (FED). The FED is approved by Caltrans, which includes delegated NEPA authority from FHWA. The environmental documents are also provided to the CTC. Scope changes will often require changes to the Cooperative Agreement between OCTA and Caltrans. Design modifications and exceptions to design requirements are coordinated with Caltrans District 12 and Headquarters

							(Sacramento), which has the delegated authority from FHWA to approve design exceptions. Project Change Requests are required to be approved by both OCTA and Caltrans when a change in scope is large enough to warrant a change in project funding. Approval by the California Transportation Commission may also be required if state funds are requested or a baseline agreement amendment is required.
41.00	Has the Authority, prior to allocation of Net Revenues for any Freeway Project, obtained written assurances from the appropriate state agency that after the project is constructed to at least minimum acceptable state standards, the State shall be responsible for maintenance and operation?	Att. B, Sec. II.A.3	Capital Programs - Highways	Recurring	Done to Date	Rose Casey	Yes, construction Cooperative Agreements between OCTA and Caltrans include language that assigns maintenance and operations to Caltrans. For an example, please reference Attachment A, article 31 of the " Cooperative Agreement with the California Department of Transportation for the Interstate 5 HOV Improvement Project Between Avenida Pico and Avenida Vista Hermosa " Staff Report, dated December 9, 2013. This agreement (C-3-2080) was executed on July 5, 2012.
42.00	Have Freeway Projects been built largely within existing rights of way using the latest highway design and safety requirements?	Att. B, Sec. II.A.4	Capital Programs - Highways	Recurring	Done to Date	Rose Casey	Yes, keeping generally within existing Right of Way is one of the largest project parameters. For example, elimination of braided ramps on the I-405 Improvement Project was approved in the final EIR/EIS to reduce the full ROW acquisitions while still ensuring that the design meets Caltrans design and safety standards. Keeping the ROW impacts to some partial acquisitions and primarily temporary construction easements while adding 4 lanes to the 405 is a major accomplishment for a \$1.9 billion project, the largest project in the M2 freeway program, highlighting the importance placed on working within ROW constraints. For an example, please reference " I-405 Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Report/EIS ".
43.00	To the greatest extent possible within the available budget, have Freeway Projects been implemented using Context Sensitive Design? ("Context Sensitive Design features" are further described in the referenced provision.)	Att. B, Sec. II.A.4	Capital Programs - Highways	Recurring	Done to Date	Rose Casey	Yes, freeway projects include many context sensitive design features, from the Planning stages, through Environmental, Design and Construction. The project team, including Public Outreach, coordinates with local cities and other agencies on landscaping, aesthetic and soft/hardscape features. For example, the construction of sound walls requires public input, in the form of a soundwall survey, to determine if soundwalls will be built. Aesthetics of soundwalls, retaining walls and bridges take into account City and community preferences.
44.00	Have Freeway Projects, to the greatest extent possible within the available budget, been planned, designed and constructed using a flexible community-responsive and collaborative approach to balance aesthetic, historic and environmental values with transportation safety, mobility, maintenance and performance goals?	Att. B, Sec. II.A.4	Capital Programs - Highways	Recurring	Done to Date	Rose Casey	Yes, Community Outreach is a constant on all the Freeway Projects. Open Houses, City Council presentations, local agency meetings and other forms of Outreach are deployed in order to obtain community feedback so that modifications are made, where possible, to retain these values. All design features and proposed changes are reviewed and approved by Caltrans to ensure safety, mobility, maintenance and performance goals.
45.00	Have the Net Revenues allocated to Freeway Projects for use in funding Programmatic Mitigation for Freeway Projects been subject to the following:	Att. B, Sec. II.A.5	Planning		Done	Dan Phu	See items 45.01 - 45.09

45.01	Has a Master Environmental Mitigation and Resource Protection Plan and Agreement (Master Agreement) between the Authority and state and federal resources been developed?	Att. B, Sec. II.A.5.a	Planning	One-time, start-up	Done	Dan Phu	<p>Yes. The Memorandum of Agreement and Planning Agreement executed in January 2010, served as the Master Agreement. As a note, the Planning Agreement was extended as it took longer than anticipated to complete the NCCP/HCP and EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Please refer to: "C-9-0278 Agreement, Environmental Mitigation Program MOA".</p>
45.02	Does the Master Agreement include commitments by the Authority to provide programmatic environmental mitigation of Freeway Projects?	Att. B, Sec. II.A.5.a.(i)	Planning	One-time, start-up	Done	Dan Phu	<p>Yes. The Memorandum of Agreement and Planning Agreement executed in January 2010, served as the Master Agreement. See Item 1 within the Agreement which refers to commitments by OCTA to provide programmatic environmental mitigation of Freeway Projects. As a note, an extension of the termination date on the Planning Agreement was required since it took longer than anticipated to complete the NCCP/HCP and EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Please refer to: "C-9-0278 Agreement, Environmental Mitigation Program MOA".</p>
45.03	Does the Master Agreement include commitments by state and federal agencies to reduce project delays associated with permitting and streamline the process for Freeway Projects?	Att. B, Sec. II.A.5.a.(ii)	Planning	One-time, start-up	Done	Dan Phu	<p>Yes. The Memorandum of Agreement and Planning Agreement executed in January 2010, served as the Master Agreement. See Items 6 and 8 within the Agreement as it relates to commitments by state and federal agencies to reduce project delays associated with permitting and streamline the process for Freeway Projects. As a note, an extension of the termination date on the Planning Agreement was required since it took longer than anticipated to complete the NCCP/HCP and EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Please refer to: "C-9-0278 Agreement, Environmental Mitigation Program MOA".</p>
45.04	Does the Master Agreement include an accounting process for mitigation obligations and credits that will document net environmental benefit from regional, programmatic mitigation in exchange for net benefit in the delivery of transportation improvements through streamlined and timely approvals and permitting?	Att. B, Sec. II.A.5.a.(iii)	Planning	One-time, start-up	Done	Dan Phu	<p>Yes. Development of the Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan (NCCP/HCP) set forth the process to meet this provision (Sections 5 and 6). The Final NCCP/HCP was approved by the Board and the Final EIR/EIS was certified by the Board on November 28, 2016. The corresponding state and federal wildlife agency permits were received in June 2017. An accounting process is folded into the NCCP/HCP for mitigation obligations and credits. An annual report is required and will document freeway project level impacts as well as mitigation performed for those freeway projects. The first annual report will be finalized in 2019, and will include activities related to the NCCP/HCP from 2011. The future annual reports will only include one year's activities in relation to the NCCP/HCP. Actual impacts will be compared against assumptions made within the NCCP/HCP. Net environmental benefits from the NCCP/HCP are summarized in Table ES-1 of the NCCP/HCP. Biological permits from the wildlife regulatory agencies were issued in advance, therefore streamlining the delivery of the transportation projects.</p>

							<p>Please refer to: "Final Natural Community Conservation Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan and Associated EIR/EIS", Staff Report dated November 28, 2016.</p> <p>"OCTA M2 NCCP-HCP Implementing Agreement with Fed and State Fish-Wildlife and Caltrans, 6-19-2017."</p>
45.05	Does the Master Agreement include a description of the specific mitigation actions and expenditures to be undertaken and a phasing, implementation, and maintenance plan?	Att. B, Sec. II.A.5.a.(iv)	Planning	One-time, start-up	Done	Dan Phu	<p>Yes, the Memorandum of Agreement and Planning Agreement, executed in January 2010, included this provision.</p> <p>Please refer to: "C-9-0278 Agreement, Environmental Mitigation Program MOA".</p>
45.06	Does the Master Agreement include appointment by the Authority of a Mitigation and Resource Protection Oversight Committee to make recommendations to the Authority on the allocation of Net Revenues for programmatic mitigation and to monitor implementation of the Master Agreement?	Att. B, Sec. II.A.5.a.(v)	Planning	One-time, start-up	Done	Dan Phu	<p>Yes. The Environmental Oversight Committee makes recommendations to the Authority on the allocation of Net Revenues for programmatic mitigation and also monitors the implementation of the Environmental Mitigation Program which is based on the Master Agreement.</p> <p>Please refer to: "C-9-0278 Agreement, Environmental Mitigation Program MOA".</p>
45.07	Was an Environmental Oversight Committee appointed and does it consist of no more than 12 members and is comprised of representatives of the Authority, Caltrans, state and federal resource agencies, non-governmental environmental organizations, the public and the Taxpayer Oversight Committee?	Att. B, Sec. II.A.5.a.(v)	Planning, External Affairs	One-time, start-up	Done	Dan Phu & Marissa Espino	<p>Yes. Creation of the EOC occurred in 2007 with applicant scoring and selection for membership by the Transportation 2020 Committee on October 15, 2007. The first EOC meeting took place on November 13, 2007.</p> <p>Please reference the following documents: "Renewed Measure M Environmental Committees Selection Process" Staff Report dated October 22, 2007 "EOC Minutes" dated November 13, 2007 "Status Report on Renewed Measure M Environmental Programs" Staff Report dated August 25, 2008 "EOC Roster 2018" dated January 18, 2019</p>
45.08	Was the Master Agreement developed as soon as practicable following the approval of the ballot proposition by the electors?	Att. B, Sec. II.A.5.b	Planning	One-time, start-up	Done	Dan Phu	<p>Yes, the Memorandum of Agreement and Planning Agreement process began in early 2008.</p>
45.09	Have the Authority and state and federal resource agencies developed the Master Agreement prior to the implementation of Freeway Projects?	Att. B, Sec. II.A.5.b	Planning	One-time, start-up	Done	Dan Phu	<p>Yes. The Memorandum of Agreement and Planning Agreement process began in early 2008 and was fully executed by OCTA and state and federal resources agencies in January 2010. During this timeframe, the Early Action Plan also authorized the project development processes for various M2 freeway projects, which included preliminary engineering, environmental studies, and final design work. The initiation of this work also maximized OCTA's ability to compete for state and federal funds (i.e., CMIA and federal stimulus). With the exception of the eastbound SR-91 lane addition between SR-241 and SR-71 and the State Route 22 access improvements, the rest of the M2 freeway projects did not begin</p>

							<p>construction until after January 2010. The Eastbound SR-91 lane addition project began construction in late 2009 and utilized primarily American Recover and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) federal stimulus funds and the SR-22 improvements were amended into Measure M1 and completed early in 2007 as a "bonus project" as part of the SR-22 D/B project.</p> <p>Please refer to: "C-9-0278 Agreement, Environmental Mitigation Program MOA".</p>
46.00	Requirements Related to Specific Freeway Projects						
47.00	Project A						
48.00	Have Santa Ana Freeway (I-5) improvements between the Costa Mesa freeway (SR-55) and "Orange Crush" (SR-57) described in Project A been built:	Att. A, p. 7, Project A	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	The design phase of this project was completed in June 2017. As of December 2018, the project was starting construction with a forecasted construction completion date of April 2021.
48.01	At the SR-55/I-5 interchange area between the Fourth Street and Newport Boulevard ramps on I-5?	Att. A, p. 7	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	Not yet, see notes Item 48.00.
48.02	On SR-55 between Fourth Street and Edinger Avenue?	Att. A, p. 7	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	No. Project A improvement limits do not include SR-55 between Fourth Street and Edinger Avenue due to lack of support/consensus between Caltrans and local jurisdictions. There are some improvements included in Project F on SR-55 between I-405 and I-5.
48.03	On I-5 between SR-55 and SR-57?	Att. A, p. 7	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	Not yet, see notes Item 48.00.
49.00	Have the Project A improvements, as built, increased capacity and reduced congestion?	Att. A, p. 7, Project A	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	The forecasted construction completion date is April 2021. The project will add capacity with a second carpool lane and relieve congestion upon construction completion as identified during the environmental phase.
50.00	Project B						
51.00	Have new lanes been built and interchanges improved on the Santa Ana Freeway (I-5) between the Costa Mesa freeway (SR-55) to El Toro "Y"?	Att. A, p. 7, Project B	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	The environmental phase work for the project is underway and, as of December 2018, is expected to be complete by August 2019. The final design and construction schedules have not been set yet, as they are dependent on the allocation of funds for those phases.
52.00	Have the Project B improvements as built increased capacity and reduced congestion?	Att. A, p. 7, Project B	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	See notes Item 51.00. The project will add capacity with one additional general purpose lane in each direction and relieve congestion upon construction completion as identified during the environmental phase.
53.00	Project C						
54.00	Have Santa Ana Freeway (I-5) improvements south of the El Toro "Y" been built with:	Att. A, p. 8, Project C	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	The I-5, Avenida Pico to San Juan Creek Road (including interchange improvement Avenida Pico) was divided into three segments for design and construction. This project added a new HOV lane in both directions of I-5 between PCH and Avenida Pico, reconstruct the Avenida Pico

							<p>Interchange, and reconstructed on and off ramps along the project area. All three segments are now complete.</p> <p>The I-5, SR-73 to El Toro Road project (including interchange improvements at Avery and La Paz) completed the environmental phase in May 2014. This project will add a general-purpose lane in each direction, extend the second HOV lane in both directions from El Toro Rd to Alicia Pkwy, reconstruct the La Paz Road and Avery Pkwy interchanges, and add auxiliary lanes where needed. This project has been divided into three segments for design and construction. The forecasted construction completion date of the last segment is January 2025.</p>
54.01	New lanes from the vicinity of the El Toro Interchange in Lake Forest to the vicinity of SR-73 in Mission Viejo?	Att. A, p. 8, Project C	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	<p>See notes Item 54.00. New lanes will be added upon construction completion.</p> <p>Segment 1, I-5 between SR-73 and Oso Pkwy (including improvements to Avery Pkwy Interchange), completed design in August 2018 and is scheduled to be advertised in September 2019.</p> <p>Segment 2, I-5 between Oso Pkwy and Alicia Pkwy (including improvements to La Paz Interchange) was advertised for construction on November 5, 2018 and bids will be opened on January 16, 2019.</p> <p>Segment 3, I-5 between Alicia Pkwy and El Toro Rd, began design in March 2015 and will complete design in April 2019. Construction is scheduled to begin in March 2019.</p>
54.02	New lanes between Pacific Coast Highway and Avenida Pico?	Att. A, p. 8, Project C	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Done to date	Rose Casey	<p>Yes, new HOV lanes have been added between PCH and Avenida Pico and were broken into three segments. See notes Item 54.00.</p> <p>The I-5, Pico to Vista Hermosa project (including interchange improvements at Pico) began construction in December 2014 and was completed in August 2018. Please refer to: "FC101 Master Schedule Complete," Project Controls Schedule dated October 16, 2018. "Plan Sheets on the Caltrans' website using Contract No. 12-0F96A4, Invitation for Bids dated September 2, 2014.</p> <p>The I-5, Vista Hermosa to PCH project began construction in July 2014 and was completed in July 2017. Please refer to: "FC103 Master Schedule Complete," Project Controls Schedule dated August 17, 2017. "Plan Sheets on the Caltrans' website using Contract No. 12-0F96C4, Invitation for Bids dated February 3, 2014.</p> <p>The I-5, PCH to San Juan Creek Road project started construction in December 2013 and was completed in July 2018. Please refer to:</p>

							"FC104 Master Schedule Complete," Project Controls Schedule dated September 17, 2018. "Plan Sheets on the Caltrans' website using Contract No. 12-0F96E4, Invitation for Bids dated August 19, 2013.
54.03	Major improvements at local interchanges as determined in Project D?	Att. A, p. 8, Project C	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	Avenida Pico, Avery Parkway and La Paz Parkway are incorporated into project C. (See notes Item 54.00 for main item status which includes these interchanges.)
55.00	Have the Project C improvements as built increased capacity and reduced congestion?	Att. A, p. 8, Project C	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	See notes Item 54.00. The I-5 HOV Improvement projects (between PCH and Avenida Pico) increased capacity and reduced congestion as identified during the environmental phase. The additional general purpose lane to be added in each direction from SR-73 to El Toro Road will also reduce congestion once constructed.
56.00	Project D						
57.00	Have key I-5 interchanges such as Avenida Pico, Ortega Highway, Avery Parkway, La Paz Road, El Toro Road, and others been updated and improved to relieve street congestion around older interchanges and on ramps?	Att. A, p. 8, Project D	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	See item 54.00 for status of Pico, Avery and La Paz interchanges. Construction of the I-5/Ortega Highway Interchange project was completed in December 2015. The interchange was opened for public use in fall 2015. Please refer to: " FD101 Master Schedule Complete ", Project Controls Schedule dated February 19, 2016. " FD101 I-5 Ortega, SR-74 Ortega Highway Plans Sheets " which also can be found on Caltrans' website using Contract No. 12-0E3104, Invitation for Bids dated June 4, 2012. The I-5/El Toro Road Interchange has an approved project study report, and the environmental phase began in April 2017. As of December 2018, the environmental phase is forecasted to be completed by November 2019. The design and construction schedules have not been set yet and are dependent on the allocation of funds for those phases.
58.00	Project E						
59.00	Have interchange improvements on the Garden Grove Freeway (SR-22) been constructed at the following interchanges:	Att. A, p. 9, Project E	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Done to Date	Rose Casey	Yes, completed in 2007. Improvements were made to the three interchanges listed below to reduce freeway and street congestion in the area. The project was completed early as a "bonus project" provided by the original Measure M. Please refer to: " F7100 EA 0J9601 SR-22 As Built Plans Approved ", dated November 30, 2006.
59.01	Euclid Street?	Att. A, p. 9, Project E	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Done to Date	Rose Casey	Yes, see notes Item 59.00.
59.02	Brookhurst Street?	Att. A, p. 9, Project E	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Done to Date	Rose Casey	Yes, see notes Item 59.00.

59.03	Harbor Boulevard?	Att. A, p. 9, Project E	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Done to Date	Rose Casey	Yes, see notes Item 59.00.
60.00	Project F						
61.00	Have new lanes, including merging lanes to smooth traffic been added to the Costa Mesa Freeway (SR-55) between SR-22 and I-405 generally constructed within existing ROW?	Att. A, p. 9, Project F	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	<p>The SR-55 project between I-405 and I-5 is currently in the design phase with an expected phase completion by April 2020 when it will be Ready to List for construction in December 2020. As of December 2018, the construction is forecasted to be complete in August 2025. The project will generally be constructed within the existing ROW.</p> <p>The environmental phase for the SR-55 project between I-5 and SR-91 began in January 2017 and as of December 2018 is forecasted to be completed by January 2020. The design and construction schedules are dependent on funding and have not been set yet.</p>
62.00	Have operational improvements been made to the SR-55 between SR-91 and SR-22?	Att. A, p. 9, Project F	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	See notes Item 61.00. Operations will improve upon construction completion.
63.00	Have these improvements increased freeway capacity and reduced congestion?	Att. A, p. 9, Project F	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	See notes Item 61.00. Capacity will increase and congestion will reduce upon construction completion as identified during the environmental phase.
64.00	Project G						
65.00	Have the following improvements been made to the Orange Freeway (SR-57):	Att. A, p. 10, Project G	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	There is a total of five project segments for Project G. Orangewood to Katella, Katella to Lincoln, Orangethorpe to Yorba Linda, Yorba Linda to Lambert and Lambert to the LA County line. Construction of three of the five segments were completed in the 2014 to 2015 timeframe. See below for segment completion date info. The two remaining segments Orangewood to Katella is currently in the environmental phase and Lambert to LA County line will begin environmental next year.
65.01	A new northbound lane between Orangewood Avenue and Lambert Road?	Att. A, p. 10, Project G	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	<p>See notes Item 65.00. Construction of the SR-57 (NB) Katella to Lincoln project was completed in April 2015, and the SR-57 (NB) Orangethorpe to Lambert segments were completed in May 2014 and November 2014. Please refer to:</p> <p>"FG101 Master Schedule Complete", Katella to Lincoln Project Controls Schedule dated May 18, 2015 "FG101 Plans Sheets" which also can be found on Caltrans' website using Contract No. 12-0F0404, Invitation for Bids dated July 18, 2011</p> <p>"FG102 Master Schedule Complete", Orangethorpe to Yorba Linda Project Controls Schedule dated December 15, 2014</p>

							<p>"FG102 SR-57 NB Orangethorpe to Yorba Linda Plans Sheets" which also can be found on Caltrans' website using Contract No. 12-0F0314, Invitation for Bids dated May 10, 2010</p> <p>"FG103 Master Schedule Complete", Yorba Linda to Lambert Project Controls Schedule dated June 17, 2014</p> <p>"FG103 Plans Sheets" which also can be found on Caltrans' website using Contract No. 12-0F0324, Invitation for Bids dated May 24, 2010</p> <p>The environmental phase for the project between Orangewood Avenue and Katella Avenue began in April 2016, with completion scheduled for February 2019. The design and construction schedules are dependent on funding and have not been set.</p>
65.02	Improvements to the Lambert Interchange?	Att. A, p. 10, Project G	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	See notes Item 65.00. The Lambert Road interchange project is moving forward through a city led project and is currently in the Environmental phase. The design and construction schedules are dependent on funding and have not yet been set.
65.03	Addition of a northbound truck climbing lane between Lambert Road and Tonner Canyon?	Att. A, p. 10, Project G	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	See notes Item 65.00. The fifth project on SR-57 include improvements to the Lambert Road interchange (see above – 65.02) and a northbound truck climbing lane between Lambert Road and Tonner Canyon. This project has been included in the proposed 2018 STIP for funding in FY20/21. Environmental is scheduled to begin in July 2020 and complete in January 2023. The design and construction schedules are dependent on funding and have not yet been set.
66.00	Have these improvements increased freeway capacity and reduced congestion?	Att. A, p. 10, Project G	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	The completed 3 segments of NB lanes on SR-57 from Katella to Lincoln and Orangethorpe to Lambert have increased capacity with the addition of a general purpose lane and reduced congestion as identified during the environmental phase. See notes Item 65.00.
67.00	Project H						
68.00	On the Riverside Freeway (SR-91) from the I-5 to the SR-57:	Att. A, p. 11, Project H	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Done to Date	Rose Casey	<p>Implementation of this project provides an additional general purpose lane in the westbound (WB) direction by connecting existing auxiliary lanes through the interchanges within the project limits to create a 4th continuous westbound general purpose lane. WB auxiliary lanes will be placed or added and exit ramps will be modified to 2-lane exit ramps. Construction began on the new westbound lane in February 2013, and construction was completed in June 2016.</p> <p>Please refer to: "FH101Project Master Schedule Complete", Project Controls Schedule dated July 19, 2016</p> <p>"Plan Sheets" on the Caltrans' website using Contract No. 12-0C5704, Invitation for Bids dated October 1, 2012</p> <p>"FH101 Special Provisions"</p>

68.01	Has capacity been added in the westbound direction?	Att. A, p. 11, Project H	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Done to Date	Rose Casey	Yes, capacity was provided. See notes Item 68.00.
68.02	Have operational improvements been provided at on and off ramps?	Att. A, p. 11, Project H	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Done to Date	Rose Casey	Yes, operational improvements were provided at on and off ramps with the addition of auxiliary lanes. See notes Item 68.00.
69.00	Project I						
70.00	On the Riverside Freeway (SR-91) from the SR-57 to the SR-55, has the interchange complex been improved, including nearby local interchanges such as Tustin Avenue and Lakeview?	Att. A, p. 11, Project I	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	There are a total of two project segments for Project I. The portion of the Project I between SR-55 and Tustin Avenue which is complete and the portion from The portion of the Project I from west of State College Blvd to east of Lakeview Avenue provides the SR-91 freeway mainline widening in the EB direction, and modifications to various interchanges, connectors, ramps, and intersections. This project began the environmental phase in January 2015, with an expected phase completion by August 2019.
71.00	On the SR-91, has capacity been added between the SR-55 and the SR-57?	Att. A, p. 11, Project I	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	See notes Item 70.00. The portion of Project I between SR-55 and Tustin Avenue added a westbound auxiliary lane from the WB SR-55/ WB SR-91 connector to Tustin Avenue off-ramp and an exit by-pass lane on WB SR-91 to Tustin Avenue off-ramp. This portion of Project I began construction in November 2013, and completed in July 2016. Please refer to: "FI102 Project Master Schedule Complete" , Project Controls Schedule dated August 16, 2016. "Plan Sheets on the Caltrans' website using Contract No. 12-OC560, Invitation for Bids dated June 17, 2013. The portion of the Project I from west of State College Blvd to east of Lakeview Avenue provides the SR-91 freeway mainline widening in the EB direction, and modifications to various interchanges (including major modifications for the WB SR-91 at both SR-57 and from Lakeview Ave to SR-55), connectors, ramps, and intersections. This project began the environmental phase in January 2015, with an expected phase completion by August 2019. Design is anticipated to start late 2019 using net excess 91 Express Lanes revenue, as the Board had directed staff to set aside for this project on November 14, 2016. The 91 Express Lanes revenue will help accelerate this project and OCTA will save money by reducing the escalation cost. See "Measure M2 Delivery Plan – Next 10" Staff Report dated November 14, 2016.
72.00	Project J						
73.00	Have up to four new lanes on SR- 91 between SR-241 and the Riverside County Line been added?	Att. A, p. 12, Project J	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	There is a total of three project segments for Project J. The first project segment between State Route 241 and SR-71 added one eastbound lane and is complete. The second project segment between SR-55 and SR-241 added two lanes - one in each direction - and is also complete. Please

							<p>refer to: "FJ100 Project Progress Final Report", Project Controls Schedule dated May 6, 2013</p> <p>"FJ100 SR-91, SR-241 to SR-71 Complete Plans Sheets" which also can be found on Caltrans' website using Contract No. 12-OG0404, Invitation for Bids dated June 28, 2009</p> <p>"FJ101 SR-91, SR-55 to SR-241 Weir Canyon Plans Sheets" which also can be found on Caltrans' website using Contract No. 12-OG3304, Invitation for Bids dated February 22, 2011</p> <p>"FJ101 Project Master Schedule Complete", Project Controls Schedule dated April 15, 2013</p> <p>The remaining project segment will add another lane between SR-241 and the County line and will match up with an additional lane to be added by the RCTC from the County line to SR-71. With RCTC's focus on extending the 91 Express Lanes and adding a general purpose lane east of SR-71 (this project broke ground 2013 and was completed in March 2017), construction of the final additional general purpose lane between SR-241 and SR-71 will take place post-2035 to ensure synchronization between the two counties.</p>
74.00	Was the following taken into consideration: Making best use of available freeway property, adding reversible lanes, building elevated sections, and improving connections to SR-241?	Att. A, p. 12, Project J	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	When a project goes through the environmental phase, all viable alternatives are considered, and the best alternative is determined at that time. This is true for this project. OCTA is engaged with the TCA, who is taking the lead on the SR-91/SR-241 direct connector project. The environmental phase is nearly complete.
75.00	Were the projects constructed with similar coordinated improvements in Riverside County extending to I-15 with the funding for those in Riverside county paid for from other sources?	Att. A, p. 12, Project J	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	<p>The 91 Implementation Plan, required by the state legislature to be updated annually, requires coordination between the two counties. Orange County and Riverside County are working cooperatively on all SR-91 projects. Project improvements within Riverside County limits are not paid for by Measure M.</p> <p>Please reference: "2018 SR-91 Implementation Plan", Staff Report dated June 11, 2018.</p>
76.00	Also, was one new lane added in each direction on SR-91 between SR-241 and SR-55 and were the interchanges improved?	Att. A, p. 12, Project J	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Done to Date	Rose Casey	Yes. This project is complete. Improvements to Lakeview Interchange, Imperial Highway and Weir Canyon were included in this project. See Item 73.00 notes.
77.00	Project K						
78.00	Have new lanes been added to the San Diego Freeway (I-405) between the I-605 and the SR-55?	Att. A, p. 13, Project K	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	The environmental phase was completed in May 2015. OCTA is implementing the preferred alternative from the EIR/EIS using the design-build delivery method and will acquire all necessary ROW. The addition of one general purpose lane in each direction is M2 Project K. The addition of a second lane in the median, which when combined with the existing HOV lane, becomes the two-lane Express facility in each direction, will be funded with non-M2 funding sources. The draft and

							final DB RFPs were released in November 2015 and April 2016, respectively. The Board awarded the DB contract in November 2016. Construction began in January 2017 and as of December 2018, construction completion is forecasted for May 2023.
79.00	Has the project made best use of available freeway property, updated interchanges and widened all local overcrossings according to city and regional master plans?	Att. A, p. 13, Project K	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	Yes, 4 new lanes will be added to the 405 with no full property acquisitions identified. The majority of the ROW needed are temporary construction easements and some partial fee acquisitions. Local interchanges and overcrossings will be improved and widened according to city and regional master plans. Design of the local facilities has been closely coordinated with each corridor city.
80.00	Have the improvements been coordinated with other planned I-405 improvements in the I-405/SR-22/I-605 interchange area to the north and I-405/SR-73 improvements to the south?	Att. A, p. 13, Project K	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	Yes, the 405 improvements have been coordinated with the West County Connector improvements at the 405/22/605 interchange that have been completed in construction. There will be a direct connector linking the 405 Express Lanes with SR-73 to the south.
81.00	Have the improvements adhered to recommendations of the Interstate 405 Major Investment Study adopted by the OCTA Board of Directors on October 14, 2005?	Att. A, p. 13, Project K	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	Yes, the improvements will add one general purpose lane in each direction as recommended in the 405 MIS.
82.00	Project L						
83.00	Have new lanes been added to the San Diego Freeway (I-405) between the SR-55 and the I-5?	Att. A, p. 14, Project L	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	A project study report was completed in 2013. The environmental phase began in December 2014 and was completed in August 2018. The design and construction schedules are dependent on funding and have not been set yet.
84.00	Have chokepoints at interchanges been improved and merging lanes added near on/off ramps such as Lake Forest Drive, Irvine Center Drive and SR-133 to improve the overall freeway operations in the I405/I-5 El Toro "Y" area?	Att. A, p. 14, Project L	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	The project includes on and off ramps realignment at various locations, as well as auxiliary lanes between on and off ramps where required. See notes Item 83.00.
85.00	Project M						
86.00	Have freeway access and arterial connections to I-605 serving the communities of Los Alamitos and Cypress been improved?	Att. A, p. 15, Project M	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	The project study report was approved. The environmental phase began in August 2016, and was completed in October 2018. The design and construction schedules are dependent on funding and have not been set yet.
87.00	Has the project been coordinated with other planned improvements to the SR-22 and SR-405?	Att. A, p. 15, Project M	Capital Programs - Highways	30-year	Not yet required	Rose Casey	The project has been coordinated with nearby planned improvements. See note Item 86.00.
88.00	Project N						
89.00	Are basic freeway service patrols available Monday through Friday during peak commute hours?	Att. A, p. 15, Project N	Transit	30-year	Done to date	Patrick Sampson	Yes, FSP service, divided into 10 service areas, is available during peak commute hours on all freeways. Four services areas are under contract through November 20, 2020. Two service areas are under contract through December 3, 2021. Four services areas are under contract through December 1, 2023. M2-funded construction FSP service for the widening of I-405 started in July, 2018. Midday and weekend service

							funded by M2 was approved by the Board on May 14, 2012 and began service on June 2, 2012. An M2 funded CHP dispatch position was filled in May 2013. Benefit/cost analysis of fiscal year 2016-17 service was completed in May 2018 and the results of the study will be incorporated into future service planning. A staff report will be provided to the Board on January 14, 2019
90.00	Requirements for Eligible Jurisdictions						
91.00	In order to be eligible to receive Net Revenues, has each jurisdiction satisfied the following requirements?	Att. B, Sec. III.A	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes, see below for more on each jurisdiction under Item 91.
91.01	Complied with the conditions and requirements of the Orange County Congestion Management Program (CMP)?	Att. B, Sec. III.A.1	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes. Required odd years only. This requirement was submitted to OCTA and was presented to the Board on December 11, 2017 as part of the Annual Eligibility Review. The next submittal is due in 2019. Please reference: " Fiscal Year 2017-18 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review " Staff Report Dated December 11, 2017.
91.02	Assessed traffic impacts of new development and required new development to pay a fair share of improvements attributable to it?	Att. B, pp B-7 to 10, Sec. III.A.2	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes. This is required biennially except when there is an updated mitigation fee program. This requirement was submitted to OCTA and was presented to the Board on December 11, 2017 as part of the Annual Eligibility Review. The next submittal is due in 2019 unless there is an updated mitigation fee program. Please reference: " Fiscal Year 2017-18 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review " Staff Report Dated December 11, 2017.
91.03	Adopted and maintained a Circulation Element of its General Plan consistent with the MPAH?	Att. B, Sec. III.A.3	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes. This is required biennially. This requirement was submitted to OCTA and was presented to the Board on December 11, 2017 as part of the Annual Eligibility Review. The next submittal is due in 2019. Please reference: " Fiscal Year 2017-18 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review " Staff Report Dated December 11, 2017.
91.04	Adopted and updated biennially a Capital Improvement Program that includes all capital transportation projects?	Att. B, Sec. III.A.4	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes. OCTA is requiring an annual 7-year CIP. This requirement was submitted to OCTA and was presented to the Board on December 10, 2018 as part of the Annual Eligibility Review. Please reference: " Fiscal Year 2018-19 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review " Staff Report Dated December 10, 2018.
91.05	Participated in Traffic Forums as described in Attachment B?	Att. B, Sec. III.A.5	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes. This is an annual requirement. Local agencies have to attend at least one traffic forum on an annual basis to remain eligible for M2 net revenues. This requirement was presented to the Board on December 10, 2018 as part of the Annual Eligibility Review. Please reference: " Fiscal Year 2018-19 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review " Staff Report Dated December 10, 2018.

91.06	Adopted and maintained a Local Traffic Signal Synchronization Plan that identifies signalization street routes and signals; a three-year plan showing costs, available funding and phasing of capital, operations and maintenance of the street routes and traffic signals; and included information on how the street routes and signals may be synchronized with signals and routes in adjoining jurisdictions; and is consistent with the Traffic Signal Synchronization Master Plan?	Att. B, Sec. III.A.6	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	<p>Yes. This is required every three years. This requirement was adopted by local agency governing bodies and was presented to the Board on December 11, 2017 as part of the Annual Eligibility Review. The next submittal is due in 2020.</p> <p>Please reference: "Fiscal Year 2017-18 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review" Staff Report Dated December 11, 2017.</p>
91.07	Adopted and updated biennially a Pavement Management Plan (PMP) and issued, using a common format approved by the Authority, a report every two years regarding the status of road pavement conditions and implementation of the Pavement Management Plan?	Att. B, Sec. III.A.7	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	<p>Yes. 14 agencies update PMPs on odd-year cycle, while 21 agencies update on even-year cycle as part of the 2017-18 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review. Odd-year cycle reports were presented to the Board on December 11, 2017. Even-year cycle reports were presented to the Board on December 10, 2018 as part of the Fiscal Year 2018-19 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review. All prior reports to date have been submitted and approved per the requirements and noted in the previous year's tracking matrix.</p> <p>Please reference: "Fiscal Year 2017-18 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review" Staff Report Dated December 11, 2017.</p> <p>And "Fiscal Year 2018-19 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review" Staff Report Dated December 10, 2018.</p>
91.08	<p>Included in its PMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Current status of pavement on roads -Six-year plan for road maintenance and rehabilitation, including projects and funding -Projected road conditions resulting from the maintenance and rehabilitation plan -Alternative strategies and costs necessary to improve road pavement conditions 	Att. B, Sec. III.A.7.b-c	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	<p>Yes, all local agencies have adopted PMPs fully compliant with Att. B, Sec. III. A. 7. a. b. c., inclusive. All prior reports to date have been submitted and approved per the requirements and noted in previous year tracking matrix.</p> <p>Please reference: "Fiscal Year 2017-18 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review" Staff Report Dated December 11, 2017.</p> <p>And "Fiscal Year 2018-19 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review" Staff Report Dated December 10, 2018.</p>
91.09	Adopted an annual Expenditure Report to account for Net Revenues, developer/traffic impact fees, and funds expended by the Eligible Jurisdiction which satisfy the Maintenance of Effort requirements?	Att. B, Sec. III.A.8	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	<p>Yes, the Board was presented with the Annual Expenditure Reports for FY 2015-16 on May 8, 2017, for all 35 local agencies.</p> <p>Please reference: "Measure M2 Eligibility Review Recommendations for FY 2015-16 Expenditure Reports and City of San Juan Capistrano's Maintenance of Effort Benchmark", Staff Report Dated May 8, 2017</p> <p>And "Fiscal Year 2018-19 Measure M2 Eligibility and Countywide Pavement Management Plan Guidelines and City of Placentia's Maintenance of Effort Benchmark" Staff Report dated April 9, 2018.</p>
91.10	Submitted the Expenditure Report by the end of six months following the end of the jurisdiction's fiscal year and included all Net Revenue fund balances and interest earned, and expenditures identified by type and program and project?	Att. B, Sec. III.A.8	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	<p>Yes, all local agencies have submitted the expenditure reports by the end of six months following the end of the jurisdiction's fiscal year. The Board was presented with the Annual Expenditure Reports for FY 2015-16 on May 8, 2017.</p>

							Please reference: " Measure M2 Eligibility Review Recommendations for FY 2015-16 Expenditure Reports and City of San Juan Capistrano's Maintenance of Effort Benchmark ", Staff Report Dated May 8, 2017 And " Fiscal Year 2018-19 Measure M2 Eligibility and Countywide Pavement Management Plan Guidelines and City of Placentia's Maintenance of Effort Benchmark " Staff Report dated April 9, 2018.
91.11	Provided the Authority with a Project Final Report within six months following completion of a project funded with Net Revenues?	Att. B, Sec. III.A.9	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes, an ongoing monitoring report is tracked frequently and uploaded to M2 Document Center. Please reference: " 2.7.18 - M2 Eligibility Compliance - 180 Day Tracking Report ".
91.12	Agreed that Net Revenues for Regional Capacity Program projects and Traffic Signal Synchronization Program projects shall be expended or encumbered no later than the end of the fiscal year for which the Net Revenues are programmed, subject to extensions?	Att. B, Sec. III.A.10.a	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes, net revenues are being expended and encumbered as required. Extension requests as part of the CTFP Semi-Annual Review were approved by the Board on June 11, 2018 and December 10, 2018. Please refer to: " Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Semi-Annual Review – March 2018 ", Staff Report dated June 11, 2018 " Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Semi-Annual Review –September 2018 ", Staff Report dated December 10, 2018
91.13	Any requests for extensions of the encumbrance deadline for no more than 24 months were submitted to the Authority no less than 90 days prior to the deadline?	Att. B, Sec. III.A.10.a	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes, extensions following the deadline rules were approved by the Board on June 11, 2018 and December 10, 2018. Please refer to: " Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Semi-Annual Review – March 2018 ", Staff Report dated June 11, 2018 " Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Semi-Annual Review –September 2018 ", Staff Report dated December 10, 2018
91.14	Agreed that Net Revenues for any program or project other than Regional Capacity Program projects or Traffic Signal Synchronization Program projects shall be expended or encumbered within three years of receipt, subject to extension?	Att. B, Sec. III.A.10.b	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes, extensions following the deadline rules were approved by the Board on June 10, 2018 and December 10, 2018. Please refer to: " Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Semi-Annual Review – March 2018 ", Staff Report dated June 11, 2018 " Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Semi-Annual Review –September 2018 ", Staff Report dated December 10, 2018
91.15	Agreed that if the above time limits were not satisfied, to return to the Authority any retained Net Revenues and interest earned on them to be available for allocation to any project within the same source?	Att. B, Sec. III.A.10.c	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes. Local agencies that did not meet the three year expenditure deadline were not paid for expenditures incurred beyond the expenditure deadline.
91.16	Annually certified Maintenance of Effort requirements of Ordinance No. 3, Sec. 6?	Att. B, Sec. III.A.11	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes, this is required annually. The Board approved Annual Expenditure Reports for FY 2015-16 on May 8, 2017.

							Please reference: " Measure M2 Eligibility Review Recommendations for FY 2015-16 Expenditure Reports and City of San Juan Capistrano's Maintenance of Effort Benchmark ", Staff Report dated May 8, 2017 And " Fiscal Year 2018-19 Measure M2 Eligibility and Countywide Pavement Management Plan Guidelines and City of Placentia's Maintenance of Effort Benchmark " Staff Report dated April 9, 2018.
91.17	Agreed that Net Revenues were not used to supplant developer funding which has or will be committed for any transportation project?	Att. B, Sec. III.A.12	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes. This is required annually. This was presented to the Board for approval on December 10, 2018 as part of the Annual Eligibility Review. Please reference: " Fiscal Year 2018-19 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review " Staff Report Dated December 10, 2018.
91.18	Considered as part of its General Plan, land use planning strategies that accommodate transit and non-motorized transportation?	Att. B, Sec. III.A.13	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes. This is required annually. This was presented to the Board for approval on December 10, 2018 as part of the Annual Eligibility Review. Please reference: " Fiscal Year 2018-19 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review " Staff Report Dated December 10, 2018.
92.00	Has the Authority, in consultation with the Eligible Jurisdictions, defined a countywide management method to inventory, analyze and evaluate road pavement conditions and a common method to measure improvement of road pavement conditions?	Att. B, Sec. III.A.7.a	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes, the Countywide Pavement Management Program Guidelines which implement Att. B, Sec. III. A.7.a. b. and c. were developed by OCTA staff in consultation with the Technical Advisory Committee and approved by the Board of Directors May 24, 2010. The PMP guidelines were last revised and approved by the Board on April 9, 2018. Please reference: " Fiscal Year 2018-19 Measure M2 Eligibility and Countywide Pavement Management Plan Guidelines and City of Placentia's Maintenance of Effort Benchmark " Staff Report dated April 9, 2018.
93.00	Requirements Related to Specific Streets and Roads Projects						
94.00	Project O - Regional Capacity Program						
95.00	Prior to the allocation of Net Revenues for any Street and Road Project, has the Authority, in cooperation with affected agencies, determined the entity(ies) to be responsible for the maintenance and operation thereof, utilizing maintenance and operating agreements with each agency receiving streets and roads funding?	Att. B, Sec. II.C	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes. OCTA relies on California Streets and Highways Code Sections 900-909 and 1800-1813 for Counties and Cities, respectively, which establishes the authority and obligations of local agencies to construct, maintain, and operate local streets and roads. For road projects implemented by OCTA on behalf of local agencies (e.g. select grade separations), OCTA enters cooperative agreements for construction and maintenance prior to implementation.
96.00	Has each eligible jurisdiction contributed local matching funds equal to 50 percent of Project O project or program costs?	Att. A, p. 18, Project O and Att. B, p. B-	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes, except when a match reduction has been approved Project O funding recommendations for 2018 Call for Projects were approved by the Board on June 11, 2018.

		12, Sec. V.A.1					Additional information on each fund source and percentage is available online on OCFUNDTRACKER. Please refer to: "Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs – 2018 Project O and Project P – Call for Projects Programming Recommendations" , Staff Report dated June 11, 2018.
97.00	Alternatively, jurisdictions qualified for a ten- and/or five-percent reductions as provided in Attachment B have met those reduced match levels?	Att. A, p. 18, Project O and Att. B, Sec. V.A.1.a-c	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes. Funding Recommendations for 2018 Call for Projects was approved by the Board on June 11, 2018. Additional information on each fund source and percentage is available online on OCFUNDTRACKER. Please refer to: "Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs – 2018 Project O and Project P – Call for Projects Programming Recommendations" , Staff Report dated June 11, 2018.
98.00	Has a countywide competitive procedure for Project O been adopted by the Authority?	Att. B, Sec. V.A.2	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes. The OCTA Board approved the revised CTFP Guidelines and issued the 2019 CTFP Annual Calls for Projects on August 13, 2018. Please reference: "Measure M2 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs - 2019 Annual Calls for Projects" , Staff Report dated August 13, 2018.
99.00	Have eligible Jurisdictions been consulted by the Authority in establishing criteria for determining priority for Project O allocations?	Att. B, Sec. V.A.2	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommended approval of modifications to the 2019 CTFP Guidelines on June 27, 2018, prior to the Board's action. TAC Meeting Minutes were approved at the following meeting on August 22, 2018: "TAC Meeting Minutes 8.22.18"
100.00	Has funding under Project O been provided for construction of railroad over or underpass grade separations where high volume streets are impacted by freight trains along the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad in northern Orange County?	Att. A, p. 18, Project O	Capital Programs, Planning	30-year	Done	Rose Casey & Adriann Cardoso	Yes, the Board authorized use of \$144.5 million in M2 funds as match for TCIF funding for seven Grade Separation projects. Please refer to: "OC Bridges Railroad Grade Separation Program Cost to Complete Update" , Staff Report dated August 8, 2016. "OC Bridges Railroad Grade Separation Program Funding Plan Update" , Staff Report dated November 14, 2016 All seven grade separations have been opened to traffic and completed. Please refer to: "OC Bridges Railroad Grade Separation Completion" , Staff presentation dated December 11, 2017. And the "Capital Programming Update" Staff Report, dated November 26, 2018.
101.00	Project P - Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program						
102.00	Have the Cities, the County of Orange and Caltrans, as required, worked together to prepare a common Traffic Signal Synchronization Master Plan and the necessary governance and	Att. A, p. 19, Project P and	Planning	One-time, start-up	Done	Anup Kulkarni	Yes. Please reference: "Fiscal Year 2017-18 Measure M2 Maintenance of Effort Adjustment and Updates to the Eligibility and Local Signal Synchronization Plan Guidelines" , Staff Report dated April 10, 2017.

	legal arrangements before receiving funds, and has the Authority adopted and maintained the Master Plan which was a part of the MPAH?	Att. B, Sec. V.B.1					
103.00	Does the Master Plan include synchronization of street routes and traffic signals within and across jurisdictional boundaries and the means of implementing, operating and maintaining the programs and projects including necessary governance and legal arrangements?	Att. A, p. 19, Project P and Att. B,V.B.1	Planning	One-time, start-up	Done	Anup Kulkarni	Yes. Please reference: " Fiscal Year 2017-18 Measure M2 Maintenance of Effort Adjustment and Updates to the Eligibility and Local Signal Synchronization Plan Guidelines ", Staff Report dated April 10, 2017.
104.00	Has a countywide, competitive procedure been adopted by the Authority in consultation with eligible jurisdictions in establishing criteria for determining priority for allocations?	Att. B, Sec. V.B.2.a	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Anup Kulkarni	Yes. Procedures are developed by staff in consultant with the local jurisdictions and then approved by the Board for each Call for Projects with the priority for allocation updated as well. Please refer to: " Measure M2 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs –2019 Annual Call for Projects ," Staff Report dated August 13, 2018, see "Comprehensive Transportation Funding Program Guidelines", chapter 8.
105.00	Has the Authority given priority to programs and projects which include two or more jurisdictions?	Att. B, Sec. V.B.2.b	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Anup Kulkarni	Yes. Please reference: " Measure M2 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs –2019 Annual Call for Projects ," Staff Report dated August 13, 2018, see "Comprehensive Transportation Funding Program Guidelines – 2018 Call for Projects ", chapter 8, page 8-17.
106.00	Has the Authority encouraged the State to participate in the Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program and given priority to use of transportation funds as match for the State's discretionary funds used for implementing Project P?	Att. B, Sec. V.B.2.c	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Anup Kulkarni	Yes. Project P allows state participation and allows for match to be fulfilled with both in-kind and cash. Match beyond 20% (including State discretionary funds) is provided additional priority in the evaluation. Please reference: " Measure M2 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs –2019 Annual Call for Projects ," Staff Report dated August 13, 2018, see "Comprehensive Transportation Funding Program Guidelines – 2018 Call for Projects", chapter 8, page 8-17.
107.00	Has each local jurisdiction contributed matching local funds equal to 20 percent of the program or project cost? (May be satisfied all or in part with in-kind services provided by the Eligible Jurisdiction including salaries and benefits)	Att. A, p. 19, Project P and Att. B,V.B.3	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Anup Kulkarni	Yes. Project P requires a minimum 20% match. Please reference: " Measure M2 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs –2019 Annual Call for Projects ," Staff Report dated August 13, 2018, see "Comprehensive Transportation Funding Program Guidelines – 2018 Call for Projects", chapter 8, page 8-16.
108.00	Has the project provided funding for ongoing maintenance and operation of the synchronization plan?	Att. A, p. 19, Project P	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Anup Kulkarni	Yes. Project P requires ongoing maintenance and monitoring of the synchronization and provides funding for this task. Please reference: " Measure M2 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs –2019 Annual Call for Projects ," Staff Report dated August 13, 2018, see "Comprehensive Transportation Funding Program Guidelines – 2018 Call for Projects", chapter 8, page 8-3.
109.00	Have local jurisdictions publicly reported on the status and performance of their signal synchronization efforts at least every three years?	Att. A, p. 19, Project P and	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Anup Kulkarni	Yes. Status and performance of their signal synchronization efforts were reported in the Local Signal Synchronization Plan Updates that were completed June 30, 2017. The next submittal is due June 2020.

		Att. B, Sec. V.B.4					Please reference: "Fiscal Year 2017-18 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review" , Staff Report dated December 11, 2017
110.00	Has signal equipment to give emergency vehicles priority at intersections been an eligible expense for projects implemented as part of this program?	Att. A, p. 19, Project P	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Anup Kulkarni	Yes. Project P includes signal equipment to give emergency vehicles priority at intersections as an eligible expense. Please reference: "Measure M2 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs –2019 Annual Call for Projects," Staff Report dated August 13, 2018, see "Comprehensive Transportation Funding Program Guidelines – 2018 Call for Projects", chapter 8, page 8-13.
111.00	Have eligible jurisdictions and Caltrans, with the County of Orange and the Orange County Division of League of Cities, established boundaries for Traffic Forums?	Att. B, Sec. III.A.5	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Anup Kulkarni	Yes. See the guidelines for the preparation of the original Local Signal Synchronization Plans that went to the Board on July 26, 2010 and also see the latest annual eligibility guidelines from April, 10, 2017. Please reference: "Guidelines for the Preparation of the Local Signal Synchronization Plans" , Staff Report dated July 26, 2010 and "Fiscal Year 201718 Measure M2 Maintenance of Effort Adjustment and Updates to the Eligibility and Local Signal Synchronization Plan Guidelines" , Staff Report dated April 10, 2017.
112.00	Project Q - Local Fair Share Program						
113.00	Are Local Fair Share funds distributed by a formula that accounts for the following factors and weightings: - Population - 50%? - Street mileage - 25%? - Amount of sales tax collection in each jurisdiction - 25%?	Att. A, p. 20, Project Q Att. B, Sec. 5.C.1-3	Planning, F&A	Recurring	Done to date	Sean Murdock	Yes. See General Accounting payments for Local Fair Share funds for FY 2018. Also see the Agreed-Upon Procedures to the Measure M2 Status Report for FY 2018 related to Local Fair Share disbursements. Please refer to: 1. 2018 Project Q Local Fair Share Payments 2. "OCLTA Report on Agreed-Upon Procedures Applied to Measure M2 Status Report" for FY 2018.
114.00	General Requirements Related to Transit Projects						
115.00	Have Metrolink extensions been evaluated against well-defined and well-known criteria detailed in the Renewed Measure M Transportation Investment Plan?	Att. A, p.23, Project S	Capital Programs – Rail & Planning (for Project S)	Recurring	Done to date	Jennifer Bergener & Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes. The Board approved Project S funding guidelines for fixed guideway projects on September 13, 2010. Project S guidelines for Bus and Station Van Extension projects were approved by the Board on December 12, 2011. Please refer to: "Measure M2 Project S Funding Guidelines for Preliminary Engineering (Guideways Only)" , Staff Report dated September 13, 2010 "Project S 2012 Guidelines for Bus and Station Van Extension Projects" , Staff Report dated December 12, 2011
116.00	Has the Authority made every effort to maximize state and federal transit dollars?	Att. B, Sec. II.B.1	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Adriann Cardoso	Yes. Consistent with Board of Directors approved programming policies, OCTA has maximized state and federal transit dollars for rail capital projects, as well as rail rehab projects. To date, OCTA has programmed \$326 million in state, \$637 million in federal and \$104 million in other local funds which will be used for rail capital projects in place of M2 funds. A regular review of project funding and status occurs monthly and

							<p>all programming actions are made in accordance with the Board policies to maximize state and federal funding.</p> <p>Please refer to the "Capital Programming Update" Staff Report, dated November 26, 2018.</p>
117.00	<p>Prior to the allocation of Net Revenues for a Transit Project, has the Authority obtained a written agreement from the appropriate jurisdiction that the project will be constructed, operated and maintained to minimum standards acceptable to the Authority?</p>	Att. B, Sec. II.B.2	Capital Programs - Rail & Planning (for Project V)	Recurring	Done to date	Jennifer Bergener & Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	<p>Yes. As transit projects are approved for development and/or funding by the OCTA Board to be implemented or in any way augmented by OCTA or OCTA Board-approved funding, or in any way augmented by OCTA or OCTA Board-approved funding, necessary agreements are entered into with each jurisdiction to define roles and responsibilities during project phases as well as post-completion. At any given time, there are multiple agreements in place for projects. At the present time, there are active agreements in place for all funded capital projects. See example such as the Orange Transportation Center Parking Structure contract C-3-2065. Agreements for all transit projects can be found in the M2 Document Center.</p>
118.00	Requirements Related to Specific Transit Projects						
119.00	<p>Has a series of new, well-coordinated, flexible transportation systems, each one customized to the unique transportation vision the station serves, been developed?</p>	Att. A, p. 21 - General Transit, Att. A, p. 23, Project S	Capital Programs - Rail & Planning (for Project S)	30-year	Not yet required	Jennifer Bergener & Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	<p>Yes. The Board approved the Project S funding guidelines on September 13, 2010 and December 12, 2011 (See Item 115 notes). On November 22, 2010, the Board evaluated and awarded Project S funds to the City of Anaheim and the City of Santa Ana for preliminary engineering of fixed-guideway projects. However, on June 27, 2016, the Board approved an amendment to Agreement (C-1-3115) with City of Anaheim to conclude all planning efforts on their fixed-guideway project. The Santa Ana-Garden Grove OC Streetcar project has an executed full Funding Grant Agreement with FTA and is in the construction phase. On July 23, 2012, four rubber-tire projects were approved for the first Call for Projects. Two of the projects have implemented service but as of now only one (in the City of Anaheim) remains in operation.</p> <p>Please refer to: "Measure M2 Project S Programming Recommendations", Staff Report dated November 22, 2010 "Anaheim Rapid Connection and Future Transit Connectivity to OC Streetcar", Staff Report dated June 27, 2016 "Project S Bus and Station Van Extension – 2012 Call for Projects Programming Recommendations", Staff Report dated July 23, 2012 "Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Semi-Annual Review –September 2015", Staff Report dated December 14, 2015.</p>
120.00	Project R - High Frequency Metrolink Service						

121.00	<p>Has Project R increased rail services within the county and provided frequent Metrolink service north of Fullerton to Los Angeles?</p>	Att. A, p. 23, Project R	Capital Programs - Rail	30-year	Done to date	Jennifer Bergener	<p>Yes, through the completion of the MSEP capital activities, additional service has been added, providing more intra-county trains. MSEP improvements have added infrastructure to support as many as 76 trains a day, but the Comprehensive Business Plan currently shows that only 59 are sustainable based on projected revenues and operating funds, and that number has been added over the past several years. Ten intra-county trains and two Inland Empire-OC trains have been added since July 2011. Please refer to the latest MSEP Update to the Board on November 26, 2012.</p> <p>OCTA continues to work with partners at Metrolink, Metro, RCTC, BNSF to advance the discussion of additional train service between Orange County and Los Angeles. Metrolink is currently leading necessary discussions and negotiations with the BNSF to allow for additional train capacity between Fullerton and Los Angeles.</p> <p>Please refer to: "Metrolink Service Expansion Program Update", Staff Report dated November 26, 2012.</p>
122.00	<p>Has Project R provided for track improvements, more trains, and other related needs to accommodate the expanded service?</p>	Att. A, p. 23, Project R	Capital Programs - Rail	30-year	Done to date	Jim Beil	<p>Yes, Project R has made numerous improvements to passenger rail infrastructure, with more on the way. This is an ongoing program of improvements as needed, based on available Project R and state and federal funding. Current projects include track, signal, and rail crossing improvements to enhance rail operations and safety. Projects include completion of CP Fourth Street, beginning of construction of the Laguna Niguel to San Juan Capistrano passing siding, and project development for the replacement of the aging San Juan Creek railroad bridge, and various safety and security improvements including rail right-of-way slope erosion control. It also included implementing 52 grade crossing safety enhancements (OCX) to allow cities to implement quiet zones.</p> <p>For note of OCX completion, please reference: "Capital Programs - Second Quarter Fiscal Year 2011-12 Capital Action Plan Performance Metrics Update", Rail and Station Projects portion of Staff Report dated February 13, 2012.</p> <p>For 2018 status of Project R improvements, please reference: "Capital Programs – First Quarter Fiscal Year 2018-19 Capital Action Plan Performance Metrics", Staff report dated December 10, 2018</p>
123.00	<p>Has the service included upgraded stations and added parking capacity; safety improvements and quiet zones along the tracks; and frequent shuttle service and other means to move arriving passengers to nearby destinations?</p>	Att. A, p. 23, Project R	Capital Programs - Rail	30-year	Done to date	Jim Beil	<p>Yes, 52 grade crossing safety improvements have been completed which has allowed the Cities of Anaheim, Orange, Santa Ana, Tustin, Irvine, San Clemente, San Juan Capistrano and Dana Point to obtain quiet zone status. Parking structures have been completed at the Irvine, Fullerton and Tustin Metrolink stations as well as additional surface parking</p>

							capacity at the Laguna Niguel/Mission Viejo Metrolink station. Additionally, the Orange Metrolink Station parking structure is in construction and is forecasted to be opened in February 2019. Station improvements complete include enhancements to pedestrian access and undercrossing at Laguna Niguel/Mission Viejo (LN/MV), tactile strip replacements at various stations, video surveillance systems at LN/MV, and lighting enhancements at San Clemente Pier. In addition, a new Metrolink station is planned in the City of Placentia, additional passenger platforms and station track at Anaheim Canyon, and improvements to elevators for pedestrian overcrossing in Fullerton.
124.00	Has Project R included funding for improving grade crossings and constructing over or underpasses at high volume streets that cross Metrolink tracks?	Att. A, p. 23, Project R	Capital Programs - Rail	30-year	Done to date	Jason Lee/Jim Beil	Yes. Environmental clearance and supporting engineering efforts through preliminary engineering for the 17th Street grade separation project in Santa Ana were completed in November 2017. Preliminary engineering has been completed on State College in Anaheim. The Sand Canyon grade separation in Irvine is complete. There are 5 other grade separations with PSR or PSR equivalents completed and awaiting funding to proceed further.
125.00	Project S - Transit Extensions to Metrolink						
126.00	Has a competitive program been established for local jurisdictions to broaden the reach of the rail system to other activity centers and communities?	Att. A, p. 23, Project S	Planning	30-year	Done to date	Joe Alcock/Adriann Cardoso	Yes. Project S Guidelines were developed for both fixed guideway and rubber tire projects and are included in OCTA's Comprehensive Funding Program (CTFP) Guidelines which specifies the criteria for projects to be evaluated when competing for funding. The CTFP Guidelines are updated annually, with the last update in August 2018. Please reference: " Measure M2 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs – 2019 Annual Call for Projects ," Staff Report dated August 13, 2018
127.00	Have proposals for extensions been developed and supported by local jurisdictions and evaluated against well-defined and well-known criteria as follows: -Traffic congestion relief? -Project readiness with priority to projects that can be implemented within the first five years of the Plan? -Local funding commitments and the availability of right of way? -Proven ability to attract other financial partners, both public and private? -Cost-effectiveness? -Proximity to jobs and population centers? -Regional as well as local benefits? -Ease and simplicity of connections?	Att. A, p. 23, Project S	Planning	30-year	Done to date	Joe Alcock/Adriann Cardoso	Yes. Following the criteria identified in the Ordinance as well as the guidelines specified for Project S in the CTFP Guidelines adopted by the Board, the first round of applications for fixed guideway funding were evaluated on November 22, 2010. The same process was followed for the Rubber Tire call for projects under Project S. The Board approved the Project S Guidelines for the Bus and Station Extension Projects Linking to the Metrolink Corridor on December 12, 2011. All projects recommended to move forward and not recommended to move forward are presented to the Board as part of Call for Project Programming Recommendations Staff Reports. On June 27, 2016, the Board approved an amendment to Agreement C-1-3115 with City of Anaheim to conclude all planning efforts on their fixed-guideway project.

	<p>-Compatible, approved land uses? -Safe and modern technology? -A sound, long-term operating plan?</p>						<p>Please refer to the following Staff Reports: "Measure M2 Project S Funding Guidelines for Preliminary Engineering (Guideways Only)", dated September 13, 2010 "Project S 2012 Guidelines for Bus and Station Van Extension Projects", dated December 12, 2011 "Santa Ana/Garden Grove Fixed-Guideway Proposed Financial and Implementation Plans" dated August 11, 2014 "Fixed-Guideway Policy Decisions Overview", dated May 23, 2014 "Santa Ana/Garden Grove Fixed-Guideway Project Approval and Memorandum of Understanding", dated July 13, 2015 "Anaheim Rapid Connection and Future Transit Connectivity to OC Streetcar", dated June 27, 2016</p>
127.01	<p>Has Project S, as required, not been used to fund transit routes that are not directly connected to or that would be redundant to the core rail service on the Metrolink corridor?</p>	Att. A, p. 23, Project S	Planning	30-year	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	<p>Yes, any Project S funds that have been approved by the Board have been consistent with the program guidelines and as such have only been made available for guideway projects and rubber tire projects that directly connect to an existing Metrolink station. On August 11, 2014, the Board approved the use of Project S funds for operations of fixed-guideway projects. The OC Streetcar Project funding plan (revised) was approved by the OCTA Board on July 9, 2018.</p> <p>Please refer to the following staff reports for documentation of compliance: "Measure M2 Project S Programming Recommendations", dated November 22, 2010 "M2 Project S Cooperative Agreements with Cities of Anaheim and Santa Ana for Funding the Preliminary Engineering Phase of Proposed Fixed-Guideway Systems", dated March 14, 2011 "Project S Bus and Station Van Extension - 2012 Call for Projects Programming Recommendations", dated July 23, 2012 "Santa Ana/Garden Grove Fixed-Guideway Proposed Financial and Implementation Plans", dated August 11, 2014 "OC Streetcar Project Revised Funding Plan", Staff Report dated July 9, 2018</p>
127.02	<p>Has the emphasis been on expanding access to the core rail system and on establishing connections to communities and major activity centers that are not immediately adjacent to the Metrolink corridor?</p>	Att. A, p. 23, Project S	Planning	30-year	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	<p>Yes. Planning activities completed to date have been done with an emphasis on expanding access to the core rail system and establishing connections to communities and major activity centers. The OC Streetcar alignment fits this criterion. A key aspect of that evaluation includes detailed study on passengers making connections at the existing stations.</p>

127.03	Have multiple transit projects been funded with no single project being awarded all the funding under this project?	Att. A, p. 23, Project S	Planning	30-year	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	<p>Yes, there have been two fixed guideway projects and four rubber tire projects awarded funding by the Board. Currently one fixed guideway project concept is advancing through the program (OC Streetcar), and one rubber tire project (Anaheim Canyon Metrolink Station Bus Connection) is in operation.</p> <p>Please refer to the following staff reports for documentation of compliance: "Measure M2 Project S Programming Recommendations", dated November 22, 2010 "Project S Bus and Station Van Extension - 2012 Call for Projects Programming Recommendations", dated July 23, 2012</p>
128.00	Have Eligible Jurisdictions, in order to be eligible to receive Net Revenues for Transit Extensions, executed written agreements between the Authority and eligible jurisdictions regarding the respective roles and responsibilities pertaining to construction, ownership, operation and maintenance of the Transit Extensions to Metrolink?	Att. B, Sec. VI.A.2	Planning & Capital Programs - Rail	Recurring	Done to date	Jim Beil & Joe Alcock/Adriann Cardoso	<p>Yes, upon each award of funding from the Board, a cooperative agreement has been executed with each agency to define roles, responsibilities and terms of funding.</p> <p>On March 14, 2011, and May 20, 2011, respectively, agreements were executed with the Cities of Anaheim (C-1-2448) and Santa Ana (C-1-2447) to define roles and responsibilities related to funding the preliminary engineering phase of their respective proposed fixed-guideway projects (Anaheim Rapid Connection [ARC] and OC Streetcar).</p> <p>On August 11, 2014, the Board authorized the CEO to negotiate and execute a cooperative agreement with the Cities of Santa Ana and Garden Grove to define roles and responsibilities for project development through construction of the OC Streetcar (Santa Ana/Garden Grove Fixed-Guideway Project). Effective August 1, 2015 and May 9, 2016, OCTA entered into agreements with the cities of Santa Ana (C-5-3583) and Garden Grove (C-5-3807) to define roles for the design phase of the OC Streetcar project. On January 23, 2017 the OCTA Board approved an agreement with the City of Santa Ana (C-6-1433) for use of public right-of-way for the construction, operations and maintenance of the OC Streetcar Project. On March 27, 2017 the OCTA Board approved agreements with the cities of Santa Ana (C-6-1516) and Garden Grove (C-7-1556) to define roles for the construction phase of the OC Streetcar Project. On April 24, 2017, the OCTA Board amended and restated an agreement with the City of Santa Ana (C-94-859) for the Santa Ana Regional Transportation Center and the OC Streetcar.</p> <p>On June 27, 2016, the Board approved an amendment to Anaheim's contract, concluding all planning efforts on the ARC fixed-guideway</p>

							<p>project, and to determine OCTA would serve as the lead agency for any future phases of the project (C-1-3115).</p> <p>For the Rubber Tire Program, Cooperative Agreements have been established with City of Anaheim (C-2-1668) and City of Lake Forest (C-2-1667). As of 2018, only one project in Anaheim is in operation.</p>
129.00	<p>Has a countywide competitive procedure for Project S been prepared in consultation with eligible jurisdictions and adopted by the Authority which included an evaluation process and methodology applied equally to all candidate projects?</p>	Att. B, Sec. VI.B.3	Planning	One-time	Done to date	Joe Alcock/Adriann Cardoso	<p>On September 13, 2010, the Board approved Project S funding guidelines which were developed by staff in consultation with local jurisdictions, and on November 22, 2010, the Board evaluated and awarded Project S funds to Anaheim and Santa Ana for preliminary engineering of fixed-guideway projects.</p> <p>Please refer to: "Measure M2 Project S Funding Guidelines for Preliminary Engineering (Guideways Only)", Staff Report dated September 13, 2010 "Measure M2 Project S Programming Recommendations", Staff Report dated November 22, 2010</p>
130.00	Project T - Convert Metrolink Stations to Regional Gateways						
131.00	<p>Has the program provided local improvements necessary to connect planned future high speed rail systems to stations on the Orange County Metrolink route?</p>	Att. A, p. 24, Project T	Planning & Capital Programs - Rail	30-year	Done to date	Jim Beil & Joe Alcock/Adriann Cardoso	<p>Yes, ARTIC opened in December 2014. ARTIC was designed to accommodate future High Speed rail service and will serve as the southern terminus for the California High Speed Rail Authority's Phase I.</p> <p>Please reference: "Agreement C-9-0448 with City of Anaheim". "TT010 Project Master Schedule Complete 20150101" Project Controls schedule dated January 1, 2015.</p>
132.00	<p>Have eligible Jurisdictions, in order to be eligible to receive Net Revenues, executed written agreements with the Authority regarding the respective roles and responsibilities pertaining to construction, ownership, operation and maintenance of the facilities?</p>	Att. B, Sec. VI.B.2	Capital Programs - Rail	Recurring	Done to date	Jim Beil	<p>Yes, as part of project development, OCTA enters into cooperative agreements with host cities. These agreements define roles and responsibilities for the representative phase as well as ongoing maintenance of improvements.</p> <p>Please reference: "Agreement C-9-0448 with City of Anaheim".</p>
133.00	<p>Has a countywide competitive procedure for Project T been prepared in consultation with eligible jurisdictions and adopted by the Authority which included an evaluation process and methodology applied equally to all candidate projects?</p>	Att. B, Sec. VI.B.3	Planning	One-time	Done	Joe Alcock/Adriann Cardoso	<p>Yes, a Call for Projects was issued in consultation with local jurisdictions and funds were awarded based on OCTA Board-approved criteria on January 26, 2009. Please reference: "Renewed Measure M Project T Funding Guidelines and Attachments", Staff Report dated January 26, 2009. These guidelines were modified on February 14, 2011 (add link). On December 14, 2015, an Ordinance Amendment was approved by the</p>

							Board to closeout Project T. Please reference: Closeout of Project T staff report.
134.00	Project U - Expand Mobility Choices for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities						
135.00	Has one percent of Net Revenues been allocated to the County to augment existing senior non-emergency medical transportation services funded with Tobacco Settlement funds?	Att. B, Sec. VI.C.3.a	F&A	Recurring	Done to date	Sean Murdock & Curt Burlingame	Yes. See General Accounting payments for SNEMT funds for FY 2018. Also see the Agreed-Upon Procedures to the Measure M2 Status Report for FY 2018 related to Senior Non-Emergency Medical Transportation. Please refer to: 1. 2018 Project U SNEMT Payments 2. "OCLTA Report on Agreed-Upon Procedures Applied to Measure M2 Status Report" for FY 2018.
136.00	Has the County continued to fund these services in an amount equal to the same percentage of the total annual Tobacco Settlement funds received by the County?	Att. B, Sec. VI.C.3.a	F&A	Recurring	Done to Date	Sean Murdock & Curt Burlingame	Yes. The County is required to allocate at least 5.27% of Tobacco Settlement Revenue (TSR) funds to meet their MOE obligation under M2. The County allocation for FY 2018 was 5.27%. See supporting documentation from the County showing Measure H Tobacco Settlement Revenues allocated to SNEMT. Please reference: "FY19 SNEMT MOE Verification" , correspondence dated January 10, 2019.
137.00	Have Net Revenues been annually allocated to the County in an amount no less than the Tobacco Settlement funds annually expended by the County for these services and no greater than one percent of Net Revenues plus any accrued interest?	Att. B, Sec. VI.C.3a	F&A	Recurring	Done to date	Sean Murdock & Curt Burlingame	Yes, the M2 SNEMT funding allocation to the County for FY 2018 of \$2,989,266.91 exceeded TSR funding of \$1,678,079. Therefore, the M2 funding is no less than the TSR funding, and no more than 1% of net revenue as required under the Ordinance. Please refer to: "FY19 SNEMT MOE Verification" , correspondence dated January 10, 2019. "2018 M2 Project U SNEMT Payments"
138.00	Has one percent of Net Revenues been allocated to continue and expand the Senior Mobility Program provided by the Authority in 2006 with allocations determined pursuant to criteria and requirements as adopted by the Authority?	Att. B, Sec. VI.C.3.b	F&A, Transit	Recurring	Done to date	Sean Murdock & Curt Burlingame	Yes. See General Accounting payments for SMP funds for FY 2018. Also see the Agreed-Upon Procedures applied to the FY 2018 Measure M2 Status Report. Please reference: 1. 2018 Project U SMP Payments 2. "OCLTA Report on Agreed-Upon Procedures Applied to Measure M2 Status Report" for FY 2018.

139.00	Has one and forty-seven hundreds percent (Ordinance amendment on 12/14/15 to increase allocation from 1% to 1.47%) of Net Revenues been allocated to partially fund bus and ACCESS fares for seniors and persons with disabilities in an amount equal to the percentage of funding as of the effective date of the Ordinance and to partially fund train and other transit fares for seniors and persons with disabilities as determined by the Authority?	Att. B, Sec. VI.C.3.c	F&A, Transit	Recurring	Done to date	Sean Murdock & Curt Burlingame	<p>Yes. See General Accounting Fare Stabilization Revenue Allocation chart. In addition to the 1%, the Board approved an amendment to the M2 Ordinance No. 3 on December 14, 2015 (updated on March 14, 2016), which increased the Fare Stabilization allocation from 1% to 1.47% of Net Revenues.</p> <p>Please refer to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "M2 Fare Stabilization Cash Flow", Attachment A of "Measure M2 Fare Stabilization Update", Staff Report dated June 23, 2014 2. "Measure M2 Fare Stabilization Update", Staff Report dated September 28, 2015 3. "Renewed Measure M Local Transportation Authority Ordinance No. 3 and Transportation Investment Plan Amendment Update", Staff Report dated March 14, 2016 3. 2018 M2 Fare Stabilization Payments
140.00	Project V - Community Based Transit/Circulators						
141.00	Have all such projects [within Project V], in order to be considered for funding, met performance criteria for ridership, connection to bus and rail services, and financial viability?	Att. A, p. 25, Project V	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	<p>Yes. Per the current Project V Guidelines adopted by the OCTA Board on February 12, 2018, performance criteria for ridership, connections to bus and rail services and financial viability are specifically required to be defined as part of the application process prior to competing and receiving funding.</p> <p>Please reference: "2018 Project V Community-Based Transit/Circulators Program Guidelines and Call for Projects", Staff Report dated February 12, 2018.</p>
142.00	Have all such projects been competitively bid?	Att. A, p. 25, Project V	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	<p>Yes. Per the 2013, 2015 and 2018 Project V Guidelines adopted by the OCTA Board on November 26, 2012, November 23, 2015, and February 12, 2018, projects are required to follow competitive procedures including procurement. Local Agencies followed the procedures where applicable to their projects and nature of procurement.</p> <p>Please refer to the most recent Staff Report: "2018 Project V Community-Based Transit/Circulators Program Guidelines and Call for Projects", Staff Report dated February 12, 2018.</p>
143.00	As a condition of being funded, have such projects been determined not to duplicate or compete with existing transit services?	Att. A, p. 25, Project V	Planning, Transit	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	<p>Yes, OCTA staff evaluated all project applications before preparing final recommendations for the Board to ensure that proposed services will either expand or provide new services and not supplant the existing transit services. OCTA Board approved project allocations on June 25, 2018. OCTA staff will continue to monitor the projects to ensure that services funded with Project V do not duplicate existing transit services.</p>

							Please reference the most recent staff report: "2018 Measure M2 Community-Based Transit Circulators (Project V) Call for Projects Programming Recommendations" , Staff Report dated June 25, 2018.
144.00	For any of its projects to be eligible for funding, has the Eligible Jurisdiction executed a written agreement with the Authority regarding the respective roles and responsibilities pertaining to construction, ownership, operation and maintenance of the project?	Att. B, Sec. VI.D.2	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes. OCTA executed Cooperative Funding Agreements with each local agency and identified roles and responsibilities pertaining to operation, construction, maintenance and uses of the facilities and vehicles. All M2 funding agreements and Letter agreements are available in the M2 Document Center. A list of the corresponding contract numbers with Anaheim, Costa Mesa, County of Orange, Dana Point, Huntington Beach, Irvine, La Habra, Lake Forest, Laguna Beach, Mission Viejo, Newport Beach, San Clemente, San Juan Capistrano, and Westminster can be found here in the Document Center. Please reference: "Project V List of Contract Numbers DRAFT" , dated December 31, 2018.
145.00	Have any allocations of Net Revenues to such projects been determined pursuant to a countywide competitive procedure adopted by the Authority?	Att. B, Sec. VI.D.3	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes, OCTA Board approved updated Project V Guidelines on February 12, 2018 and issued the 2018 call for projects. Next potential call may occur in 2020. Please reference: "2018 Project V Community-Based Transit/Circulators Program Guidelines and Call for Projects" , Staff Report dated February 12, 2018.
146.00	Does the competitive procedure include an evaluation process and methodology applied equally to all candidate Community Based Transit/Circulator projects?	Att. B, Sec. VI.D.3	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes. See 2018 Project V Guidelines adopted by the OCTA Board on February 12, 2018. Please reference: "2018 Project V Community-Based Transit/Circulators Program Guidelines and Call for Projects" , Staff Report dated February 12, 2018.
147.00	Have Eligible Jurisdictions been consulted by the Authority in the development of the evaluation process and methodology?	Att. B, Sec. VI.D.3	Planning	One-time	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	Yes, workshops with the local jurisdictions were held for each round and for the most recent, a request for letters of interest was sent to all eligible jurisdictions on November 13, 2017. The response to this request was used to determine the timing for a future call for Project V funding and the type of eligible services.
148.00	Project W - Safe Transit Stops						
149.00	Have amenities been provided at the 100 busiest transit stops across the County? Were they designed to ease transfer between bus lines and provide amenities such as improved shelters, lighting, current information on bus and train timetables and arrival times, and transit ticket vending machines?	Att. A, p. 25, Project W	Planning	30-year	Done to date	Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	The OCTA Board adopted the Project W framework on March 10, 2014 to allocate funds for the Top 100 Busiest Stops in Orange County. On July 14, 2014 OCTA Board approved Project W funds for 51 stops and for OCTA text4next system. Project W funding is eligible for including projects that install new transit shelters at locations where there are no shelters at present, and replace aging shelters, shade, and amenities that have become run down over time. The City of Anaheim was not able to implement the improvements for their 8 projects, leaving the

							<p>remaining 43 projects to move forward and are now complete. In addition, funds for an OCTA-initiated project were approved (July 14, 2014 and updated June 8, 2015) for an OCTA-initiated project to provide funding for mobile ticketing app. The app went system-wide in February 2017 – and provides mobile ticketing to express bus, OC Fair, regular fixed route, college pass, and reduced fare purchases (for seniors and persons with disabilities).</p> <p>Please refer to the following Staff Reports: "Measure M2 Project W Safe Transit Stops", dated March 10, 2014 "Measure M2 Project W Safe Transit Stops – 2014 Programming Recommendations", dated July 14, 2014 "Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Semi-Annual Review – March 2016", dated June 13, 2016 "2019 Project W Safe Stops Call for Projects", dated October 22, 2018.</p>
150.00	Requirements Related to Project X						
151.00	<p>Have Environmental Cleanup funds been used on a countywide, competitive basis to meet federal Clean Water Act standards for controlling transportation-generated pollution as called for in Attachment A?</p>	Att. A, p. 27, Project X	Planning	30-year	Done to date	Dan Phu	<p>Yes, the OCTA Board has authorized several countywide competitive calls for projects for both a Tier 1 and Tier 2 environmental cleanup program providing funding to improve water quality. To date, eight rounds of funding under the Tier 1 grants program have been awarded by the Board. A total of 166 projects in the amount of just over \$22 million have been awarded since 2011. There have been two rounds of funding under the Tier 2 grants program. A total of 22 projects in the amount of \$27.89 million have been awarded by the OCTA Board since 2013. To date, all Orange County cities plus the County of Orange have received funding under this program. The next Tier 1 Call for Projects is anticipated in spring 2019. As OCTA continues coordination efforts with the County to assist local jurisdictions in further developing Tier 2-type projects, it is anticipated that there may be sufficient funds to issues two calls during the next decade (potentially 2021 and 2025).</p> <p>For the most recent Tier 1 and Tier 2 guidelines, please refer to: "Measure M2 Environmental Cleanup Allocation Program - Tier 1 Grant Program Call for Projects", Staff Report dated March 12, 2018 "Measure M2 Environmental Cleanup Allocation Program – Funding Program Guidelines Revisions and Tier 2 Grant Program Call for Projects", Staff Report dated June 10, 2013</p>
152.00	<p>Does the program augment, not replace existing transportation related water quality expenditures and emphasize high impact capital improvements over local operations and maintenance costs?</p>	Att. A, p. 27, Project X	Planning	30-year	Done to date	Dan Phu	<p>Yes. Requirement is specified in Chapter 12 of the Comprehensive Transportation Funding Guidelines. As a note, Chapter 12 of the CTFP guidelines gets periodic updates to improve on the process.</p>

							Please reference: " Measure M2 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs – 2019 Annual Call for Projects ," Staff Report dated August 13, 2018, see attached Guidelines Chapter 12
153.00	Has a comprehensive countywide capital improvement program for transportation related water quality improvements been developed?	Att. A, p. 27, Project X	Planning	One-time, start-up	Done	Dan Phu	<p>Yes, the OCTA Board approved a two-tiered funding program for water quality improvement projects. These guidelines are incorporated into Chapter 12 of the Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs guidelines. To date seven rounds of funding under the Tier 1 program and two rounds under the Tier 2 have been allocated for these purposes.</p> <p>Please reference: See Item 151 for Tier 1 and Tier 2 Guideline Revisions and Call for Projects Staff Reports. "Measure M2 Environmental Cleanup Program – A Two-Tier Grant Funding Approach" Staff Report dated May 24, 2010 "Measure M2 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs – 2019 Annual Call for Projects," Staff Report dated August 13, 2018, see attached Guidelines chapter 12</p>
154.00	Has a competitive grant process to award funds to the highest priority, most cost-effective projects been developed?	Att. A, p. 27, Project X	Planning	One-time, start-up	Done	Dan Phu	<p>Yes. The Tier 1 and Tier 2 project evaluation criteria were adopted by the OCTA Board and integrated as Chapter 12 of the Comprehensive Transportation Funding Guidelines. As a note, Chapter 12 of the CTFP guidelines gets periodic updates to improve on the process.</p> <p>Please reference: "Measure M2 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs – 2019 Annual Call for Projects," Staff Report dated August 13, 2018, see attached Guidelines chapter 12.</p>
155.00	Has a matching requirement to leverage federal, state and local funds for water quality improvement been established?	Att. A, p. 27, Project X	Planning	One-time, start-up	Done	Dan Phu	<p>Yes. The Tier 1 and Tier 2 project evaluation criteria were adopted by the OCTA Board and integrated as Chapter 12 of the Comprehensive Transportation Funding Guidelines. As a note, Chapter 12 of the CTFP guidelines gets periodic updates to improve on the process.</p> <p>Please reference: "Measure M2 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs – 2019 Annual Call for Projects," Staff Report dated August 13, 2018, see attached Guidelines chapter 12.</p>
156.00	Has a maintenance of effort requirement been established to ensure that funds augment, not replace existing water quality programs?	Att. A, p. 27, Project X	Planning	One-time, start-up	Done	Dan Phu	<p>Yes, these are specified in Chapter 12 of the Comprehensive Transportation Funding Guidelines. Also, this becomes part of the evaluation process for candidate projects.</p> <p>Please reference: "Measure M2 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs – 2019 Annual Call for Projects," Staff Report dated August 13, 2018, see attached Guidelines chapter 12.</p>
157.00	Has there been annual reporting on actual expenditures and assessment of water quality benefits provided?	Att. A, p. 27, Project X	Planning, External Affairs	Recurring	Done to date	Dan Phu & Marissa Espino	<p>Yes. Reports have occurred through the Semi-Annual Review Process, which ended in September 2016.</p>

							Please reference: " Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Semi-Annual Review - September 2018 ", Staff Report dated December 10, 2018.
158.00	If there has been any misuse of these funds, have penalties been imposed?	Att. A, p. 27, Project X	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Dan Phu	Not applicable because there has been no finding of misuse of funds to-date. Assessment of appropriate use occurs through the initial and final payment processes and Semi-Annual Review process.
159.00	Has an Environmental Cleanup Allocation Committee (ECAC), including the following 12 voting members, but not including any elected public officer, been established: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One representative of the County of Orange? - Five representatives of cities (one per supervisorial district)? - One representative of the Caltrans? - Two representatives of water or wastewater public entities? - One representative of the development industry? - One representative of private or non-profit organizations involved in water quality protection/enforcement matters? 	Att. B, Sec. VII.B.1.i-vii	Planning, External Affairs	Recurring	Done to date	Dan Phu & Marissa Espino	Yes. Creation of ECAC occurred in 2008. The initial roster was presented to the Board on August 25, 2008 as Attachment B to the Staff Report. ECAC members are recruited following the requirements upon any vacancies. Member rosters for each year are saved in the M2 Document Center. Please refer to: "Status Report on Renewed Measure M Environmental Programs" , Staff Report dated August 25, 2008. "ECAC Roster 2018" dated December 31, 2018
160.00	Does the ECAC also include one representative of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board and one representative of the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board as non-voting members?	Att. B, Sec. VII.B.1.i-vii	Planning, External Affairs	Recurring	Done	Dan Phu	Yes. Creation of ECAC occurred in 2008. The initial roster was presented to the Board on August 25, 2008 as Attachment B to the Staff Report. Member rosters for each year are saved in the M2 Document Center. Please refer to: "Status Report on Renewed Measure M Environmental Programs" , Staff Report dated August 25, 2008. "ECAC Roster 2018" dated December 31, 2018
161.00	Has the Environmental Cleanup Allocation Committee recommended to the Authority for the Authority's adoption the following:	Att. B, Sec. VII.B.2.	Planning	One-time, start-up	Done	Dan Phu	See items 161.01 - 161.04
161.01	A competitive grant process for the allocation of Environmental Cleanup Revenues as set forth in Attachment B.	Att. B, Sec. VII.B.2.a	Planning	One-time, start-up	Done	Dan Phu	Yes, the Environmental Cleanup Allocation Committee (ECAC) created guidelines that were approved by the Board on February 14, 2011. This is also included in Chapter 12 of the CTFP. Please refer to: "Measure M2 Environmental Cleanup Allocation Program - Incorporation into the Comprehensive Transportation Funding Program and Tier 1 Grant Program 2011 Call for Projects" , Staff Report dated February 14, 2011 "Measure M2 Environmental Cleanup Program Tier 1 Grant Program 2019 Call for Projects" , Staff Report dated March 12, 2018, see attached Guidelines chapter 12.

161.02	A process requiring that allocated Environmental Cleanup Revenues supplement and not supplant other applicable funding sources.	Att. B, Sec. VII.B.2.b	Planning	One-time, start-up	Done	Dan Phu	Yes, the ECAC ensures that as part of the application process that projects meet the criteria specified in the Ordinance. This is part of the guidelines which are included in Chapter 12 of the CTFP. Please reference: " Measure M2 Environmental Cleanup Program Tier 1 Grant Program 2019 Call for Projects ", Staff Report dated March 12, 2018, see attached Guidelines chapter 12.
161.03	Allocation of Environmental Cleanup Revenues for proposed projects and programs.	Att. B, Sec. VII.B.2.c	Planning	Recurring	Done to date	Dan Phu	Yes, the ECAC reviews applications and makes recommendations on funding allocation, which is then approved by the Board. Please refer to the latest " Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs – Measure M2 Environmental Cleanup Program Revised 2018 Tier 1 Projects " Staff Report, dated September 10, 2018.
161.04	An annual reporting procedure and method to assess water quality benefits provided by the projects and programs.	Att. B, Sec. VII.B.2.d	Planning, External Affairs	Recurring	Done to date	Dan Phu	Yes, the ECAC has developed a database to estimate the trash removed by the funded Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects to report on benefits of the program. This is an ongoing process. Updates have been provided to the ECAC and then to the Board on December 11, 2017. Please refer to: " ECAC Agenda 12-11-2014 " " OCTA Measure M2 Tier 1 and Tier 2 – Potential Water Resources Benefits of Funded Projects Memo from Geosyntec Consultants 4-22-2015 " " Measure M2 Environmental Cleanup Program Updates and Next Steps ," Staff Report dated December 11, 2017
162.00	Safeguards and Audits						
163.00	The requirements listed in Attachment A page 28-29 are covered in other areas of the matrix as they relate to quarterly and annual reporting.	Att. A, p.28-29					
164.00	Requirements Related to the Taxpayers Oversight Committee (TOC)						
165.00	Was a Taxpayers Oversight Committee established for the purpose of overseeing compliance with the Ordinance as specified in Attachment B, Section IV and organized and convened before any Revenues were collected or spent pursuant to the Ordinance?	Att. C, Sec. I	External Affairs	One-time, start-up	Done	Alice Rogan	Yes. The TOC updated the former procedures from the M1 Citizens Oversight Committee to accommodate additional responsibilities under M2 in August 2007. Please reference: " TOC Agenda Packet ", dated August 28, 2007.
166.00	Has the TOC been governed by its 11 members and the provisions relating to membership (including initial and ongoing appointment, geographic balance, terms, resignation, removal,	Att. C, Secs. II, and III	External Affairs	Recurring	Done to date	Alice Rogan	Yes, the TOC is governed by its 11 members and the provisions relating to membership (including initial and ongoing appointment, geographic

	reappointment, and vacancies) consistent with Attachment C of the Ordinance been followed?						balance, terms, resignation, removal, reappointment, and vacancies), consistent with Attachment C of the Ordinance. Please reference: " TOC Member Terms Roster History (1997-2018) ", dated December 31, 2018.
167.00	Has the Committee carried out the following duties and responsibilities:	Att. C, Sec. IV	External Affairs	Recurring		Alice Rogan	See Items 167.01-167.11 below.
167.01	Did the initial Members of the TOC adopt procedural rules and regulations as are necessary to govern the conduct of Committee meetings as described in Attachment C?	Att. C, Sec. IV.A	External Affairs	One-time, start-up	Done	Alice Rogan	Yes. The TOC updated the former procedures from the M1 Citizens Oversight Committee to accommodate additional responsibilities under M2 in August 2007. Please reference: " TOC Agenda Packet ", dated August 28, 2007. On June 14, 2016, the TOC updated the committee's Mission Statement and Policies and Procedures to remove responsibilities due to the close-out of M1. Please reference TOC Meeting Minutes in " TOC Agenda Packet " dated August 9, 2016.
167.02	Did the Committee approve by a vote of not less than 2/3 of all Committee members, any amendments to the Plan which changed the funding category, programs or projects identified on page 31 of the Plan?	Att. C, Sec. IV.B	External Affairs	Recurring	Done to date	Alice Rogan	Yes. The TOC approved the first amendment to the M2 Transportation Investment Plan on October 9, 2012 and the third amendment on November 10, 2015. The second amendment did not require TOC approval. Please refer to: " TOC M2 Amendment No. 1 Approval Memo ", dated October 9, 2012 " TOC M2 Amendment No. 2 Public Hearing ," Staff Report dated November 25, 2013. " TOC M2 Amendment No. 3 Approval Memo ", dated November 10, 2015
167.03	Did the TOC receive and review, as a condition of eligibility for M2 funds, from each jurisdiction the following documents as defined in Att. B, Sec. I?	Att. C, Sec. IV.C and	Planning, External Affairs	Recurring	Done to date	Alice Rogan & Joe Alcock	The Annual Eligibility Review Subcommittee reviewed applicable eligibility requirements on September 20, 2018, and the full TOC approved them on October 10, 2017. Also see Items 167.04-167.08 below. Please refer to: " TOC Agenda Packet ", dated October 9, 2018.
167.04	Congestion Management Program?	Att. C, Sec. IV.C.1 and Att. B, Sec. III.A.1	Planning, External Affairs	Recurring	Done to date	Alice Rogan & Joe Alcock	This is required on odd numbered years. The TOC reviewed the Congestion Management Program on October 10, 2017. Eligibility determination was presented to the Board on December 11, 2017 as part of the Fiscal Year 2017-18 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review. The next submittal is due in 2019. Please refer to: Fiscal Year 2017-18 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review , Staff Report dated December 11, 2017 " TOC Agenda Packet ", dated October 10, 2017.

167.05	Mitigation Fee Program?	Att. C, Sec. IV.C.2 and Att. B, Sec. III.A.2	Planning, External Affairs	Recurring	Done to date	Alice Rogan & Joe Alcock	<p>This is required on a biennial basis. The TOC reviewed the Mitigation Fee Program on October 10, 2017. Eligibility determination was presented to the Board on December 11, 2017 as part of the Fiscal Year 2017-18 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review. The next submittal is due in 2019.</p> <p>Please refer to: Fiscal Year 2017-18 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review, Staff Report dated December 11, 2017 "TOC Agenda Packet", dated October 10, 2017.</p>
167.06	Expenditure Report?	Att. C, Sec. IV.C.3 and Att. B, Sec. III.8	Finance and Administration, External Affairs	Recurring	Done to date	Alice Rogan & Sean Murdock	<p>Yes. The TOC reviewed the FY 2016-17 Expenditure Reports on June 12, 2018 for all 35 local agencies. Eligibility determination will be presented to the Board of Directors upon final submittal of expenditure reports by local jurisdictions. Please reference: June 12, 2018 Meeting Minutes portion of "TOC Agenda Packet", dated August 14, 2018.</p>
167.07	Local Traffic Synchronization Plan?	Att. C, Sec. IV.C.4 and Att. B, Sec. III.A.6	Planning, External Affairs	Recurring	Done to date	Alice Rogan & Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	<p>This is required every three years. The last Local Signal Synchronization Plan review was received and reviewed by the TOC on October 10, 2017, and presented to the Board on December 11, 2017, as part of the Fiscal Year 2017-18 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review. The next submittal is due in 2020.</p> <p>Please reference: "Fiscal Year 2017-18 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review", Staff Report dated December 11, 2017 "TOC Agenda Packet", dated October 10, 2017.</p>
167.08	Pavement Management Plan?	Att. C, Sec. IV.C.5 and Att. B, Sec. III.7	Planning, External Affairs	Recurring	Done to date	Alice Rogan & Joe Alcock/ Adriann Cardoso	<p>Yes. 14 agencies update PMPs on odd-year cycle, while 21 agencies update on even-year cycle as part of the Annual Eligibility Review. The TOC reviewed the Pavement Management Plans for odd year agencies on October 10, 2017. Eligibility determination was presented to the Board on December 11, 2017 as part of the Fiscal Year 2017-18 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review. The TOC reviewed the Pavement Management Plans for even-year agencies on October 9, 2018. Even-year cycle reports were presented to the Board on December 10, 2018 as part of the Fiscal Year 2018-19 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review.</p>

							<p>Next approval for agencies on the odd year cycle will be considered for TOC review in October 2019 and Board approval by December 2019.</p> <p>Please reference: "Fiscal Year 2017-18 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review" Staff Report Dated December 11, 2017. "Fiscal Year 2018-19 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review" Staff Report Dated December 10, 2018. "TOC Agenda Packet", dated October 10, 2017. "TOC Agenda Packet", dated October 9, 2018</p>
167.09	Has the Committee reviewed yearly audits and held an annual hearing to determine whether the Authority is proceeding in accordance with the Plan?	Att. C, Sec. IV.D	External Affairs	Recurring	Done to date	Alice Rogan	<p>Yes. The last Annual Hearing and Compliance Review was completed on April 10, 2018. Please reference: "TOC Agenda Packet", dated April 10, 2018.</p>
167.10	Has the Chair annually certified whether the Revenues have been spent in compliance with the Plan?	Att. C, Sec. IV.D	External Affairs	Recurring	Done to date	Alice Rogan	<p>Yes. The last Annual Hearing and Compliance Review was completed on April 10, 2018. A memo from the TOC Chairman was presented to the Board on April 10, 2018.</p> <p>Please reference page 272 of the Board of Directors Agenda Packet titled: "Taxpayer Oversight Committee Measure M Annual Public Hearing Results and Compliance Findings", Staff Report dated April 23, 2018.</p>
167.11	Has the Committee received and reviewed the performance assessment conducted by the Authority at least once every three years to review the performance of the Authority in carrying out the purposes of the Ordinance?	Att. C, Sec. IV.E	External Affairs	Recurring	Done to date	Alice Rogan	<p>Yes. The TOC has received and reviewed the performance assessments conducted by the Authority at least once every three years to review the performance of the Authority in carrying out the purposes of the Ordinance. Assessments have been reviewed by the TOC on December 14, 2010, April 9, 2013, and June 14, 2016.</p> <p>Please refer to: "TOC Agenda Packet", dated December 14, 2010 "TOC Agenda Packet", dated April 9, 2013 "TOC Agenda Packet", dated June 14, 2016</p>