



# AGENDA

*Technical Steering Committee*

---

## **2020 Committee Members**

*Tom Wheeler, Chair  
Rudy Emami, Vice Chair  
Marwan Youssef, District 1  
Raja Sethuraman, District 2  
Doug Stack, District 3  
Luis Estevez, District 4  
Tom Bonigut, District 5  
Matthew Sinacori, At-Large  
Nardy Khan, At-Large*

*Orange County Transportation Authority  
550 South Main Street  
Orange, California  
April 8, 2020 1:30 PM*

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

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

*All documents relative to the items referenced in this agenda are available for public inspection at [www.octa.net](http://www.octa.net).*

## **Guidance for Public Access to the Technical Steering Committee (TSC) Meeting**

On March 12, 2020 and March 18, 2020, Governor Gavin Newsom enacted Executive Orders N-25-20 and N-29-20 authorizing a local legislative body to hold public meetings via teleconferencing and make public meetings accessible telephonically or electronically to all members of the public to promote social distancing due to the state and local State of Emergency resulting from the threat of Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19).

In accordance with Executive Order N2920, and in order to ensure the safety of Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) staff and for the purposes of limiting the risk of COVID19, in person public participation at public meetings of the OCTA will not be allowed during the time period covered by the above referenced Executive Orders.

Instead, members of the public can listen to AUDIO live streaming of the TSC meeting by clicking the below link:

<http://www.octa.net/About-OCTA/Who-We-Are/Board-of-Directors/Live-and-Archived-Audio/>



Public comments may be submitted for the upcoming TSC meeting by emailing them to [cmorales@octa.net](mailto:cmorales@octa.net)

If you wish to comment on a specific agenda Item please identify the Item number in your email. General public comments will be addressed during the general public comment item on the agenda and read into the record. In order to ensure that staff has the ability to provide comments to the TSC Members in a timely manner, please submit your public comments by 12:30 p.m. Wednesday, April 8, 2020.

## **Call to Order**

### **Self-Introductions**

#### **1. Approval of Minutes**

Approval of the Technical Steering Committee regular meeting minutes of July 10, 2019.

### **Regular Items**

#### **2. Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs – 2020 Call for Projects Programming Recommendations – Alfonso Hernandez**

##### ***Overview***

The Orange County Transportation Authority issued the 2020 annual Measure M2 Regional Capacity Program and Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program call for projects in August 2019. This call for projects made available up to \$40 million in M2 competitive grant funding for regional roadway capacity and signal synchronization projects countywide. A list of projects recommended for funding is presented for review and approval.

##### ***Recommendations***

- A. Recommend for Board of Directors Approval the award of \$23.4 million in 2020 Regional Capacity (Project O) funds to eight local agency projects.
- B. Recommend for Board of Directors Approval the award of \$12.1 million in 2020 Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (Project P) funds to six local agency projects.

### **Discussion Items**

There are no discussion items.



# AGENDA

*Technical Steering Committee*

---

## **3. Correspondence**

OCTA Board Items of Interest - Please see Attachment A.  
Announcements by Email – Please see Attachment B.

## **4. Committee Comments**

## **5. Local Assistance**

## **6. Staff Comments**

## **7. Items for Future Agendas**

## **8. Public Comments**

## **9. Adjournment**

*The Technical Steering Committee is scheduled to convene on the second Wednesday of each month, at 1:30 p.m., at OCTA Headquarters*



# **July 10, 2019 Minutes**



# Minutes

Technical Steering Committee

Item #1

---

## Voting Representative Present:

Mark Lewis, Chair                      City of Fountain Valley  
Tom Wheeler, Vice Chair              City of Lake Forest  
Raja Sethuraman, District 2        City of Cost Mesa  
Doug Stack, District 3                City of Tustin  
Nardy Kahn, At-Large                County of Orange  
Matthew Sinacori, At-Large        City of Dana Point

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

**July 10, 2019 1:30 PM**

## Voting Representatives Absent:

Marwan Youssef, District 1        City of Westminster  
Rudy Emami, District 4              City of Anaheim  
Tom Bonigut, District 5              City of San Clemente

## Guest Present:

Oliver Luu                                Caltrans  
Todd Broussard                        City of Huntington Beach  
Dan Candelaria                        City of Garden Grove  
Mark Chagnon                         City of Mission Viejo  
Manuel Gomez                         Interwest Consulting  
Brandon Dugan                         City of Rancho Santa Margarita  
Rick Yee                                 City of Yorba Linda  
Mark Trestik                             City of Laguna Beach

## Staff Present:

Joe Alcock  
Cynthia Morales  
Amy Tran  
Alfonso Hernandez  
Christina Perez  
Kurt Brotcke  
Adriann Cardoso



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

## **Self-Introductions**

### **CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS**

#### **1. Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Wheeler motioned to approve the minutes.

Mr. Stack seconded the motion.

The Minutes were approved there was no further discussion.

### **REGULAR ITEMS**

#### **2. 2019 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs (CTFP) Guidelines Update – Joseph Alcock**

Mr. Alcock presented Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) staff's proposed 2019 CTFP Guidelines revisions.

Mr. Lewis asked for clarification on the terms "eligibility" and "ineligibility" with respect to grading.

Mr. Alcock stated that the proposed CTFP Guidelines change was to the grading requirements and noted that the change went from "should" to "shall."

Mr. Lewis stated this change in grading does not directly address the issue of grading on private property when a street is being widened. Mr. Lewis also stated that in his opinion this should be considered an eligible expense.

Mr. Brotcke responded that the challenge is adjacent grading, where it is difficult to segment the grading for development versus grading for the roadway project.

Mr. Sethuraman asked if page 7-18 of the CTFP Guidelines applied to the Regional Capacity Program (RCP).

Mr. Lewis asked if similar language from page 7-44 under ineligible products will be added to page 7-18.



# Minutes

*Technical Steering Committee*

*Item #1*

---

Mrs. Khan inquired if other competitive categories/programs could be added to the CTFP, specifically to provide for non-arterial widening arterial enhancements.

Mr. Alcock stated the Measure M2 (M2) ordinance lays out these specific funding programs and stated that there is very little flexibility to add other funding categories.

Mrs. Khan asked if the M2 ordinance could be amended.

Mr. Brotcke stated that adding a funding category would be a major change to the M2 ordinance, which is an onerous process. He also stated there is a Local Fair Share Program for cities to participate in, which does provide flexible transportation funding to local agencies.

Mr. Lewis stated there were several more funding categories under Measure M.

Mr. Brotcke concurred that Measure M had more funding categories.

Mr. Lewis asked if the RCP is a combination of previous Measure M programs.

Mr. Brotcke stated this was correct.

Mr. Lewis stated that hopefully in future calls for projects, OCTA will receive more applications.

Mr. Brotcke stated that he believed that OCTA would see more CTFP applications in coming years.

Mr. Wheeler asked why there was a proposed change to the Right-of-Way (ROW) requirements.

Mr. Alcock replied that ROW is a big portion of RCP expenditures and also mentioned that there is concern with the way the process is currently structured, specifically with respect to excess ROW. Mr. Alcock also stated that OCTA needs to get out of the back-end appraisal process, especially since it has been receiving appraisals at extremely low values and as a result it is taking longer and longer to dispose of excess parcels, which in turn prevents M2 funds from being used on other projects.



# Minutes

*Technical Steering Committee*

*Item #1*

---

Mr. Wheeler responded that if projects are delivered slower cities would be required to front the money and risk would be involved. He also stated that there is risk on cities' part when required to purchase full parcels of land when only a small percentage of the parcel is required.

Mr. Sethuraman mentioned a ROW project that occurred years ago on Victoria Street, in Costa Mesa, in which a whole house was acquired in order to complete the project and now there is a lot of excess ROW that is of no value.

Mr. Stack asked if OCTA is not going fund a ROW acquisition if a project requires full acquisition. Mr. Stack added that if a project requires full acquisition, the remnant parcels that are not worth anything are the cost of doing business. He also asked what if a local agency's policy is to acquire a full parcel even if only a small part of it is needed.

Mr. Sinacori added that if local agencies are required to acquire a full building, then the local agency would be left holding the bag, in terms of cost.

Mr. Wheeler stated that if M2 does not help pay for excess ROW, this can become a huge risk for local agencies to maintain. He also stated that cities should not profit or lose money in these situations.

Mr. Lewis stated that his concern was having excess ROW deemed ineligible. He also stated that depending upon the remaining value of the excess ROW, this could become a significant frontloaded cost burden that local agencies would be required to absorb.

Mr. Brotcke acknowledged Mr. Lewis' comment, but noted that the value that comes back to M2 is much less. He also stated that cities can increase value through appraisals based on zoning codes. He stated that Mr. Alcock's point is that OCTA is getting into disputes on appraisals, which make it hard to move forward in the disposal process and getting funds repaid to the M2 program, in order to support other projects.

Mr. Sethuraman asked if the city acquires a large parcel of land and is left with an usable parcel, would the city have to buy it back.

Mr. Brotcke stated that excess ROW can be used in low income housing or other non-transportation uses, meaning that you might not see any return to M2 or the city. Mr. Brotcke noted that OCTA is really working to try and find a balance on these issues.



# Minutes

## Technical Steering Committee

### Item #1

---

Mr. Lewis stated that there are front-end and back-end challenges with ROW and noted that the eligibility aspect of it gets complicated on the back-end. He also stated that if a local agency needs 10 feet of ROW to do a roadway improvement, but must acquire 30 feet, it is not fair for the local agency to absorb the cost of the remaining 20 feet, when the project required the entire parcel.

Mr. Stack stated that he agreed but if the policy was acquired because of a local policy, then he disagreed.

Mr. Lewis stated that a can local agency rezone excess ROW to add more value even if takes a couple of years, and it can ask for a reimbursement of their costs now, as a response to the concern about cities having to front-load costs.

Mr. Stack responded that the process should be repaid.

Mr. Brotcke asked if the Technical Steering Committee (TSC) would support front-end costs being deemed eligible on the front-end for advancements of 75% or 90%, but with respect to the disposal process, there would be upfront statements that excess ROW would be valued at the same price as it was acquired.

Mr. Lewis replied no, not necessarily.

Mr. Sethuraman stated only if its usable property.

Mr. Lewis asked for a definition of excess ROW and then stated that if you bought 30 feet at \$50 and only needed 15 feet, upfront, the whole 30 feet is eligible at \$50, and if the remaining 15 feet is usable, you get reimbursed but if its unusable, the city would own it.

Mr. Sinacori then stated that at the end of a project, the excess parcel would not be worth the same \$50 that it was worth when it was not an excess parcel, so wouldn't an appraisal of the property at that time be a driver for what is reimbursed by the city.

Mr. Lewis stated that OCTA has been receiving lower appraisals by cities.

Mr. Wheeler asked if there is an easy formula to use. He also stated that it should be a choice between two parties concerning ROW, but this becomes complicated when there is disagreement, in which by default, you can try to make a formula. He stated that it is a lot of risk on the cities to front-load ROW costs when they do not know how it is going to work out in the end, especially if it is a lengthy project.



# Minutes

*Technical Steering Committee*

*Item #1*

---

Mr. Lewis stated that we do not want M2 to pay for something and not get reimbursed for it, nor do we want the cities to be left with unusable land.

Mr. Stack stated that it will be the cities who will have to sell the parcel and whatever that remnant sale is, M2 should be reimbursed the amount it valued that acquisition for. He also stated that if the cities sell the remnant lower than the highest-and-best use value, the cities need to match the difference in the M2 reimbursement.

Mr. Wheeler stated that you are asking the city to pay outside of the project system, which then makes it a cost to the city to do a project.

Mr. Lewis stated that OCTA wants out of the back-end and in order to do so, when there is a ROW acquisition along with dealing with surplus land, there needs to be a closeout or resolution of the value that has to be returned to M2, which needs to be done by a licensed professional along with local agencies ensuring that the process is legitimate.

Mr. Brotcke stated this is also frequently about the dispute on the value of remaining excess parcels.

Ms. Cardoso described a scenario in which a local agency has a remnant parcel that is 5,600 square feet and per set-back requirements in the City, the appraisal comes back at \$1 per square foot. She asked if this sounds reasonable and if M2 should have to absorb that cost? She also stated if there are solutions for these types of scenarios, it would be great and OCTA is open to suggestions from the TSC.

Mr. Lewis responded that if the parcel becomes excess with no development ability, then a value of \$1 per square foot is appropriate. He also stated that it potentially takes a city a long time, from 1 to 20 years, to potentially rezone the parcel.

Mr. Wheeler responded by stating that this is like OCTA saying that if OCTA changes its standards, then five years from now it will be worth more.

Mr. Stack stated that if the parcel is truly a remnant, then this is collateral damage of the improvement, and it should be considered the cost of doing business.

Mr. Wheeler asked how much of an issue this is.



# Minutes

*Technical Steering Committee*

*Item #1*

---

Mr. Alcock stated that it is becoming more of an issue.

Mr. Sethuraman asked about the possibility of a provision being placed when the rezoning is not fair.

Mr. Wheeler stated maybe the TSC should do something like that, if it is a real issue.

Ms. Cardoso stated that OCTA is trying to get in front of this issue and OCTA is looking for TSC advisement on the issue.

Mr. Wheeler stated complex ROW transactions cannot be oversimplified.

Mr. Lewis stated that if a local agency holds excess ROW appraised at \$1 per square foot and the land is now unusable, the local agency can potentially change its zoning requirements to make the parcel more valuable. He also mentioned that if the City's sells the property for a higher value than it was purchased at, then the city should return the value of M2 funds spent on the property to M2 and the city should keep the difference. He also mentioned that if the city sells the excess ROW for a lower value, the city should return all of this value to M2, since M2 was the purchaser.

Mr. Sethuraman how such an approach would be implemented (i.e. through deed restrictions)? Mr. Sinacori interjected that he wanted to make a motion to approve all of the contents of the changes to the CTFP Guidelines, that Mr. Alcock recommended, but replacing the proposed language in the Excess ROW section to state, that

“Property that is acquired through the ROW acquisition process that is not required for construction (provided an appraisal is prepared by the local agency) within two years of project completion and a value is identified, shall be considered excess property and a value shall be returned to OCTA. If the excess property is ever sold by the local agency, the local agency shall return the value of the property as determined in the original acquisition to OCTA.”

Mr. Lewis added that “up to but not more” should also be included in the proposed language.

Ms. Cardoso responded that adding “a proportional share” language should also be included in the recommendation.



# Minutes

*Technical Steering Committee*

*Item #1*

---

Mr. Lewis responded that this sounded like a good start to something OCTA staff could further develop for TAC consideration.

Mr. Brotcke stated that he thought this proposal moved in the right direction. However, he noted that there were some additional issues that still needed to be resolved.

Mr. Lewis concurred and stated that the proposal was a great start.

Mr. Brotcke stated he thought the proposal helped to resolve many of the issues that were identified during the meeting.

Mr. Lewis asked for a motion to approve changes in the CTFP Guidelines with the suggested framework language for excess ROW.

Mr. Stack seconded the motion and the motion was approved.

Mr. Chagnon interjected, stating that the City of Mission Viejo had an issue with the CTFP Guidelines language regarding communication systems on page 8-10 (in the Project P Chapter). He stated that with respect to the eligibility of fiber optic cable there is too much subjectivity regarding the number of strands deemed eligible. He also requested consideration that this number be listed and agreed on, so that the CTFP Guidelines are clear on this issue.

Mr. Brotcke replied that the amount of fiber optic cable required depended on the specifics of project and that he did not recall any projects that required that many strands.

Ms. Tran stated that up until recently OCTA had never had any agency ask for more than 96 strands. However, recently OCTA had increased the number up to 120 strands because it was more readily available in the marketplace.

Mr. Chagnon stated if there is consensus that 120 strands is a reasonable limit for fiber optic cable, then that should be specified in the CTFP Guidelines. He also stated that in a recent project, the City applied for and were approved for 288 strands and during the project, OCTA staff told them that this many strands was ineligible. He stated all this should have been vetted in the application and once approved, there should not be any ability for staff to subjectively change it after the fact. He stated if OCTA is going set a 120-strand limit, then it should be identified in the CTFP Guidelines so that it is agreed upon by the TAC.

Mr. Lewis asked if the use of 120 strands is a standard or a practice?



Mr. Chagnon replied that if you put in a certain amount now, and if you ultimately end up needing more because the technology has changed, a local agency would spend more M2 fund pulling out old strands than putting in new ones. He also stated that there should be consensus on 120 strands, and if there is consensus, it should be listed in the CTFP Guidelines.

Mr. Brotcke replied that M2 cannot fund excess fiber optic capacity, which would potentially be used for other purposes, but noted that Mr. Chagnon raised a fair point.

Mr. Lewis stated that staff can put a reasonable limit on fiber optic capacity, and present at it at the next Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting since the TSC had already motioned and approved the item.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

3. There were no items for discussion.

### **4. Correspondence**

- OCTA Board Items of Interest – See Agenda
- Announcements Sent by Email – See Agenda

### **5. Committee Comments**

Mr. Lewis stated that he was asked (and did) present to the Association of California Cities – Orange County Finance Subcommittee meeting on the topic of Senate Bill (SB) 1 allocations to cities and counties. He stated that there were four or five elected officials at the meeting from various cities as well as Bruce Channing, a recently retired CEO from Laguna Hills. Mr. Lewis noted that this topic was new to many of the elected officials, but noted that he saw interest from them. He also stated, that there was a recommendation for Mr. Channing to discuss the topic with other city managers before potentially considering legislation on the issue.

Mr. Sethuraman then stated that he kept hearing different things about SB 743 and that cities needing to have something adopted by summer 2020. He also asked if any TSC member cities were doing SB 743 project specific work in the next year.

Mr. Lewis concluded the discussion by stating that it is required for California Environmental Quality Act evaluation.



## 6. Local Assistance

Mr. Luu stated that the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) headquarters recently updated Caltrans' website to be ADA compliant.

Mr. Luu also stated that Active Transportation Program progress reports were due on July 21<sup>st</sup> with core reports being submitted through "Calsmart." He also mentioned that the deadline to submit an allocation or time extension for the October CTC meeting was August 12. He also stated that a new invoice form was available at the Caltrans' website and would be deemed mandatory after October 1, 2019.

Mr. Luu concluded by stating that new inactive invoice forms recently began being used on July 1 and noted that these forms needed to be submitted immediately or funding could be jeopardized, if, a local agency has an inactive invoice. He also stated that Caltrans District 12 would be holding training in September for the new invoice form and would also be holding a Southern California Local Assistance Management Meeting on September 11th, and that Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) and Americans' with Disabilities Act forms were due July 30. He also mentioned that local agencies were required to comply with all Title VI requirements.

Mr. Lewis inquired if a local agency, which currently does not have a federally funded project, still need to submit the ADA and DBE forms.

Mr. Luu replied in the affirmative noting that all local agencies are required to submit these forms every year.

## 7. Staff Comments

Mr. Brotcke stated for the next TAC meeting, OCTA would come back with a policy framework for OCTA led capacity projects.

## 8. Items for Future Agendas – None

## 9. Public Comments – None

## 10. Adjournment – Meeting adjourned at 2:46 p.m.



# **2020 CTFP Project O & P Programming Recommendations**



*April 8, 2020*

**To:** Technical Steering Committee

**From:** Orange County Transportation Authority Staff

**Subject:** Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs – 2020 Call for Projects Programming Recommendations

### **Overview**

The Orange County Transportation Authority issued the 2020 annual Measure M2 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs - Regional Capacity Program and Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program call for projects in August 2019. This call for projects made available up to \$40 million in M2 competitive grant funding for regional roadway capacity and signal synchronization projects countywide. A list of projects recommended for funding is presented for review and approval.

### **Recommendations**

- A. Recommend for Board of Directors Approval the award of \$23.4 million in 2020 Regional Capacity (Project O) funds to eight local agency projects.
- B. Recommend for Board of Directors Approval the award of \$12.1 million in 2020 Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (Project P) funds to six local agency projects.

### **Background**

The Regional Capacity Program (RCP), Project O, is the Measure M2 (M2) competitive funding program through which the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) supports streets and roads capital projects. The Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (RTSSP), Project P, is the M2 competitive program which provides funding for signal synchronization projects. Both programs are included in the Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs (CTFP). The CTFP allocates funds through an annual competitive call for projects (call) based on a common set of guidelines and scoring criteria that are developed in collaboration with the OCTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), which includes representatives of all of Orange County's 35 local

---

agencies and is ultimately approved by the OCTA Board of Directors (Board). The guidelines for the 2020 call were approved by the Board on August 12, 2019. At that meeting, the Board also authorized issuance of the current call, making available up to \$40 million in M2 competitive funds available to support regional roadway capacity and signal synchronization projects throughout Orange County.

***Discussion***

RCP

As of the call due date (October 24, 2019), OCTA received eight applications requesting a total of \$26.6 million in RCP funding (see Attachment A). All applications were reviewed for eligibility, consistency, adherence to the guidelines, and compliance with M2 program objectives. Applications were evaluated and ranked as per the scoring criteria identified in the approved program guidelines, and during the review process, staff worked with local agencies to address technical issues such as application scoring corrections, scope clarifications, and refinement of final project funding requests.

Based upon these reviews, Attachment B includes programming recommendations per the 2020 CTFP Guidelines. This recommendation provides \$23.4 million (with inflationary adjustments as appropriate) in programming to support eight RCP project applications in the Cities of Irvine, Mission Viejo, Newport Beach, San Juan Capistrano, Santa Ana, and Yorba Linda.

Of the eight recommended projects, six will provide arterial capacity improvement benefits (with construction and/or engineering phase allocations) and two projects will provide support for future intersection capacity enhancements primarily with engineering phase allocations. Implementation of these projects in aggregate, is anticipated to produce notable congestion reducing benefits in the County, especially in the near-term.

It should also be noted that while the overall programming recommendation for this call is substantially higher than the previous year's programming recommendation, it still remains under the total \$32 million which was authorized by the Board to support this year's RCP call. While the reasons identified as supporting the low call volume during the last call cycle are likely still valid (i.e. the influence of Senate Bill 1 and the overall timing of current project development in the County), it does appear that support for capacity enhancing transportation projects is increasing. Staff will continue to monitor trends in

---

transportation project delivery and periodically report back to the TSC and TAC; especially considering emerging COVID-19 related trends.

### RTSSP

With respect to the RTSSP program, OCTA received seven applications requesting \$15.0 million in funding (see Attachment A). All RTSSP applications were reviewed for eligibility, consistency, and adherence to guidelines and overall program objectives. Staff worked with the local agencies to address technical issues primarily related to construction unit cost refinements as well as project scope clarifications and Attachment C includes programming recommendations per the 2020 CTFP Guidelines.

This recommendation provides \$12.1 million in programming to support six RTSSP project applications. Together these projects will improve regional throughput on nine key arterial roadways in the cities of Costa Mesa, Huntington Beach, Irvine, La Habra, Orange, Seal Beach, as well as in several immediately adjacent cities.

It should also be noted that the project in the City of Costa Mesa is a grid project, and if awarded, would be the first grid network awarded Project P funds. As such, OCTA is highly interested to see how this project turns out in order to ascertain whether funding for grid network concepts will be something that can potentially be expanded and/or modified as appropriate in the future.

As Attachment C shows, one RTSSP project was deemed ineligible for this call cycle because components of its application were not found to be consistent with CTFP Guidelines requirements, specifically with respect to having timely Average Daily Traffic (ADT) count information. The CTFP Guidelines require that ADT data be based upon actual count information taken within the thirty-six months preceding the application date. ADT data satisfying this request was not provided after requests for it. Instead, the applicant responded that they thought that the original submittal met the requirement; and noted that with the emergence of COVID-19 their ability to collect and provide accurate information to OCTA in a timely manner is highly compromised; and as a result the applicant has requested special consideration of this issue. As the administrator of the CTFP and because the project sponsor could not meet the program requirements, staff is recommending that this project should not be funded during the current call cycle. However, given the unique context associated with the impacts of COVID-19, staff felt it best to refer the issue to the TSC for further discussion. As such, staff is seeking TSC feedback on this matter.

Finally, the following table provides an overall summary of staff's proposed funding recommendations:

2020 CTFP Call Summary (\$ in millions)			
	RCP	RTSSP	Total
Number of Recommended Applications	8	6	14
Amount Recommended for Approval (escalated)	\$23.4	\$12.1	\$35.5

Recommendations presented in this staff report are consistent with the 2020 Guidelines approved by the Board. As such, staff recommends programming \$35.5 million for 14 projects under the RCP and RTSSP programs.

If approved by the Technical Steering Committee, Technical Advisory Committee, and OCTA Board, these new projects will be incorporated into master funding agreements between OCTA and the appropriate local agencies; and as these projects advance staff will continue to monitor their status and project delivery through the semi-annual review process.

***Summary***

Proposed programming recommendations for projects in the RCP and RTSSP have been developed by staff. Funding for 14 projects totaling \$35.5 million in M2 funds is proposed to support the implementation of capacity widening and signal synchronization improvements throughout Orange County. Staff is seeking Technical Steering Committee approval to advance these programming recommendations to the OCTA TAC for further consideration and approval.

***Attachments***

- A. 2020 Measure M2 Regional Capacity Program (Project O) and Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (Project P) Call for Projects – Applications Received
- B. 2020 Measure M2 Regional Capacity Program Call for Projects – Programming Recommendations
- C. 2020 Measure M2 RTSSP Call for Projects – Programming Recommendation

**2020 Measure M2 Regional Capacity Program (Project O) and Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (Project P)  
Call for Projects - Applications Received**

Regional Capacity (Project O) Applications							
Agency	Project	Fund	Phase	Match Rate	Match	Total M2 Request	Total Cost
Irvine	University Drive Widening from Ridgeline Drive to I-405	ACE	C	25%	\$ 843,438	\$ 2,530,313	\$ 3,373,750
Mission Viejo	Marguerite Parkway & Jeronimo Road Intersection Capacity Enhancement Project	ICE	ENG, C	25%	\$ 156,270	\$ 468,810	\$ 625,080
Newport Beach	West Coast Highway and Superior Avenue/Balboa Boulevard Intersection Improvements (Phase 2)	ICE	ENG	35%	\$ 420,000	\$ 780,000	\$ 1,200,000
San Juan Capistrano	Ortega Highway Widening Improvements Project (PS&E Phase)	ACE	ENG	25%	\$ 1,750,000	\$ 5,250,000	\$ 7,000,000
Santa Ana	Bristol Street Improvements Phase 3A - Civic Center Drive to Washington Avenue	ACE	C	25%	\$ 1,264,250	\$ 3,792,750	\$ 5,057,000
Santa Ana	Bristol Street Improvements Phase 4 - Warner Avenue to St. Andrew Place	ACE	C	25%	\$ 2,811,500	\$ 8,434,500	\$ 11,246,000
Yorba Linda	Bastanchury Road Improvements	ACE	C	25%	\$ 1,237,432	\$ 3,712,297	\$ 4,949,729
Yorba Linda	Yorba Linda Boulevard Widening	ACE	ENG	25%	\$ 545,500	\$ 1,636,500	\$ 2,182,000
<b>REQUESTED TOTALS</b>					<b>\$ 9,028,390</b>	<b>\$ 26,605,170</b>	<b>\$ 35,633,559</b>

Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (Project P) Applications							
Agency	Project	Fund	Signals	Match Rate	Match	Total M2 Request	Total Cost
Costa Mesa	Baker Street/Victoria Street/19th Street TSSP	RTSSP	41	20%	\$ 487,114	\$ 1,948,456	\$ 2,435,570
Dana Point	Pacific Coast Highway/Niguel Road/St. of the Golden Lantern Grid RTSSP	RTSSP	40	20%	\$ 535,709	\$ 2,142,838	\$ 2,678,547
Huntington Beach	Bolsa Chica Street TSSP (Chapman Avenue to Warner Avenue)	RTSSP	22	20%	\$ 374,280	\$ 1,497,120	\$ 1,871,400
Irvine	Barranca Parkway Traffic Signal Synchronization Project	RTSSP	65	20%	\$ 936,209	\$ 3,744,834	\$ 4,681,043
La Habra	Lambert Road Corridor	RTSSP	25	20%	\$ 466,993	\$ 1,867,974	\$ 2,334,967
Orange	Tustin Avenue - Rose Drive RTSSP	RTSSP	54	20%	\$ 787,168	\$ 3,148,670	\$ 3,935,838
Seal Beach	Seal Beach Blvd Signal Synchronizations and ATC Controller Upgrades	RTSSP	16	25%	\$ 228,300	\$ 673,200	\$ 901,500
<b>REQUESTED TOTALS</b>					<b>\$ 3,815,773</b>	<b>\$ 15,023,092</b>	<b>\$ 18,838,865</b>

Acronyms:

- I-405 - Interstate 405
- ACE - Arterial Capacity Enhancements
- C - Construction
- ICE - Intersection Capacity Enhancements
- ENG - Engineering
- PS&E - Plans, Specifications and Engineer
- TSSP - Traffic Signal Synchronization Program
- RTSSP - Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program
- ATC - Advanced Transportation Controller

**2020 Measure M2 Regional Capacity Program Call for Projects-  
Programming Recommendations**

Agency	Fiscal Year	Project	Fund	Phase	M2 Amount - Engineering	M2 Amount - Construction*	Total M2 Amount	Match	Totals	Match Rate
Irvine	20/21	University Drive Widening from Ridgeline Drive to I-405	ACE	C	\$ -	\$ 1,833,901	\$ 1,833,901	\$ 611,253	\$ 2,445,154	25%
Mission Viejo	20/21	Marguerite Parkway & Jeronimo Road Intersection Capacity Enhancement Project	ICE	ENG	\$ 37,500	\$ -	\$ 37,500	\$ 12,500	\$ 50,000	25%
	21/22			C	\$ -	\$ 444,249	\$ 444,249	\$ 148,083	\$ 592,332	25%
Newport Beach	20/21	West Coast Highway and Superior Avenue/Balboa Boulevard Intersection Improvements (Phase 2)	ICE	ENG	\$ 780,000	\$ -	\$ 780,000	\$ 420,000	\$ 1,200,000	35%
San Juan Capistrano	20/21	Ortega Highway Widening Improvements Project (PS&E Phase)	ACE	ENG	\$ 5,250,000	\$ -	\$ 5,250,000	\$ 1,750,000	\$ 7,000,000	25%
Santa Ana	20/21	Bristol Street Improvements Phase 3A - Civic Center Drive to Washington Avenue	ACE	C	\$ -	\$ 3,273,573	\$ 3,273,573	\$ 1,091,191	\$ 4,364,764	25%
Santa Ana	20/21	Bristol Street Improvements Phase 4 - Warner Avenue to St. Andrew Place	ACE	C	\$ -	\$ 7,501,206	\$ 7,501,206	\$ 2,500,402	\$ 10,001,608	25%
Yorba Linda	22/23	Bastanchury Road Improvements	ACE	C	\$ -	\$ 2,651,605	\$ 2,651,605	\$ 2,651,605	\$ 5,303,210	50%
Yorba Linda	20/21	Yorba Linda Boulevard Widening	ACE	ENG	\$ 1,636,500	\$ -	\$ 1,636,500	\$ 545,500	\$ 2,182,000	25%
<b>PROGRAMMING TOTALS</b>					<b>\$ 7,704,000</b>	<b>\$ 15,704,534</b>	<b>\$ 23,408,534</b>	<b>\$ 9,730,534</b>	<b>\$ 33,139,068</b>	

Acronyms:

I-405 - Interstate 405

ACE - Arterial Capacity Enhancements

C - Construction

ICE - Intersection Capacity Enhancements

ENG - Engineering

PS&E - Plans, Specifications and Engineer

*\*Includes escalation amounts for applicable construction projects.*

**2020 Measure M2 RTSSP Call for Projects-  
Programming Recommendation**

Agency	Fiscal Year	Project	M2 Amount - Primary Implementation	M2 Amount - Operations & Maintenance	Total M2 Amount	Match	Total	Match Rate
Costa Mesa	20/21	Baker Street/Victoria Street/19th Street TSSP	\$ 1,593,244	\$ 179,712	\$ 1,772,956	\$ 443,239	\$ 2,216,195	20%
Huntington Beach	20/21	Bolsa Chica Street TSSP (Chapman Avenue to Warner Avenue)	\$ 1,446,240	\$ 42,240	\$ 1,488,480	\$ 372,120	\$ 1,860,600	20%
Irvine	20/21	Barranca Parkway Traffic Signal Synchronization Project	\$ 3,513,548	\$ 126,720	\$ 3,640,268	\$ 935,068	\$ 4,575,336	20%
La Habra	20/21	Lambert Road Corridor	\$ 1,813,074	\$ 60,000	\$ 1,873,074	\$ 468,193	\$ 2,341,267	20%
Orange	20/21	Tustin Avenue - Rose Drive RTSSP	\$ 2,663,153	\$ 103,680	\$ 2,766,833	\$ 704,230	\$ 3,471,063	20%
Seal Beach	20/21	Seal Beach Blvd Signal Synchronizations and ATC Controller Upgrades	\$ 546,750	\$ -	\$ 546,750	\$ 230,250	\$ 777,000	30%
<b>TOTALS</b>			<b>\$ 11,576,009</b>	<b>\$ 512,352</b>	<b>\$ 12,088,361</b>	<b>\$ 3,153,100</b>	<b>\$ 15,241,461</b>	

Projects Not Eligible	Fiscal Year	Project	M2 Amount - Primary Implementation	M2 Amount - Operations & Maintenance	Total M2 Amount	Match	Total	Match Rate
Dana Point*	20/21	Pacific Coast Highway/Niguel Road/Street of the Golden Lantern Grid RTSSP	\$ 2,117,038	\$ 76,800	\$ 2,193,838	\$ 548,460	\$ 2,742,298	20%
<b>TOTALS</b>			<b>\$ 2,117,038</b>	<b>\$ 76,800</b>	<b>\$ 2,193,838</b>	<b>\$ 548,460</b>	<b>\$ 2,742,298</b>	

Acronyms:

TSSP - Traffic Signal Synchronization Program  
 RTSSP - Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program  
 ATC - Advanced Transportation Controller

\*Dana Point is not being recommended for programming at this time due to not complying with the CTFP Guidelines requirements, specifically with respect to having timely Average Daily Traffic count information.



# Correspondence



# Agenda

Technical Steering Committee

Item #3

---

## **Item 3, Attachment A: OCTA Board Items of Interest**

- **Monday, June 24, 2019**  
*Item 13: Measure M2 Project W Safe Transit Stop – 2019 Programming Recommendations*
- **Monday, July 8, 2019**  
*Item 5: Grant Acceptance for the Safe Travels Education Program and the Freeway Bus Rapid Transit Concept Study*  
*Item 7: Measure M2 Eligibility Review Recommendations of Fiscal Year 2017-18 Expenditure Reports*
- **Monday, August 12, 2019**  
*Item 5: 2020 State Transportation Improvement Program Overview*  
*Item 6: SB 1 (Chapter 5, Statutes of 2017) State of Good Repair Program Recommendations for Fiscal Year 2019-20 Funds*  
*Item 11: Measure M2 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs – 2020 Annual Call for Projects*  
*Item 13: Measure M2 Community-Based Transit Circulators Programs Project V Ridership Report*  
*Item 14: Local Agencies' Interest in Project V Call for Projects*
- **Monday, September 9, 2019**  
*Item 18: 2019 Project X – Tire 1 Call for Projects Programming Recommendations*  
*Item 19: Measure M2 Quarterly Progress Report for the Period of April 2019 Through June 2019*
- **Monday, September 23, 2019**  
*Item 5: Guidance for the Orange County Transportation Authority Decision-Making When Requested to Lead a Locally-Sponsored Capital Program*  
*Item 7: Fiscal Year 2018-19 Low Carbon Transit Operations Program Update*  
*Item 12: 2020 State Transportation Improvement Program*
- **Monday, October 14, 2019**  
*Item 6: Grant Award and Baseline Agreement for Solutions for Congested Corridors Program*  
*Item 8: Federal Transit Administration Sections 5307, 5310, 5337 and 5339 Program of Projects for Federal Fiscal Year 2019-20*  
*Item 13: 2020 Project V Community-Based Transit Circulators Program Guidelines and Call for Projects*



# Agenda

Technical Steering Committee

Item #3

---

*Item 14: Programming Recommendations for the City of Laguna Niguel Project V Service*

- **Monday, December 9, 2019**

*Item 7: 2020 Technical Steering Committee Membership*

*Item 15: Measure M2 Quarterly Progress Report for the Period of July 2019 through September 2019*

*Item 17: Fiscal Year 2019-20 Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review*

*Item 18: Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Semi-Annual Review-September 2019*

- **Monday, January 13, 2020**

*Item 14: Orange County Transportation Authority State and Federal Grant Programs – Update and Recommendations*

*Item 15: 2021 Federal Transportation Improvement and Financial Plan*

*Item 21: Capital Programming Update*

*Item 22: Measure M2 Community-Based Transit Circulators Program Project V Ridership Report*

- **Monday, March 9, 2020**

*Item 15: Measure M2 Quarterly Progress Report for the Period of October 2019 Through December 2019*

*Item 16: Measure M2 Environmental Cleanup Program – Project X Tier 1 Grant Program Call for Projects*

- **Monday, March 23, 2020**

*Item 3: Low Carbon Transit Operations Program Recommendations for Fiscal Year 2019-20 Funds*



# Agenda

Technical Steering Committee

Item #3

---

## **Item 3, Attachment B: Announcements by Email**

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



# Agenda

Technical Steering Committee

Item #3

---

- October 9, 2019 Technical Steering Committee Meeting Cancellation Notice, *sent 10/9/2019*
- October 23, 2019 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Cancellation Notice, *sent 10/17/2019*
- 2020 M2 Community-Based Transit Circulators (Project V) Call Now Open, *sent 10/22/2019*
- November TAC Meeting rescheduled to November 13 at 1:30pm, *sent 11/6/2019*
- RSVP Pavement Distress Training, *sent 11/6/2019*
- November 13, 2019 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda, *sent 11/8/2019*
- November 13, 2019 TAC Meeting Follow-Up Materials – Power Point from Caltrans, *sent 11/14/2019*
- December 11, 2019 Technical Steering Committee Meeting Cancellation Notice, *sent 12/9/2019*
- December 25, 2019 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Cancellation Notice, *sent 12/19/2019*
- January 8, 2020 Technical Steering Committee Meeting Cancellation Notice, *sent 1/6/2020*
- January 22, 2020 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Cancellation Notice, *sent 1/16/2020*
- March 2020 CTFP Semi-Annual Review, *sent 2/3/2020*
- February 12, 2020 Technical Steering Committee Meeting Cancellation Notice, *sent 2/6/2020*
- Message from the California Transportation Commission – Eligibility for Fiscal Year 2021 Local Streets and Roads Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA) SB1 Funding, *sent 2/10/2020*
- February 26, 2020 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Cancellation Notice, *sent 2/19/2020*
- OCTA Hosting Two ATP Workshops in March, *sent 2/25/2020*
- March 2020 Semi-Annual Review: Timely Use of Funds Verification, *sent 2/26/2020*
- Reminder: March 2020 CTFP Semi-Annual Review, *sent 2/28/2020*
- Caltrans Draft VMT – Focused Transportation Impact Study Guide (TSIG), *sent 3/2/2020*
- March 11, 2020 Technical Steering Committee Meeting Cancellation Notice, *sent 3/3/2020*



# Agenda

*Technical Steering Committee*

*Item #3*

---

- Reminder: March 2020 CTFP Semi-Annual Review, Due March 13<sup>th</sup>, *sent 3/11/2020*
- ATP Orange County Application Workshop 3/18 - Cancelled until Further Notice, *sent 3/13/2020*
- March 25, 2020 Technical Advisory Committee Cancellation Notice, *sent 3/17/2020*
- ATP Application Workshop scheduled for March 18th is cancelled, *sent 3/18/2020*
- Local Streets and Roads Survey Progress Report, *sent 3/25/2020*
- ATP Cycle 5 Call for Projects is Now Open, *sent 3/26/2020*
- OCTA REOPENING: March 2020 CTFP Semi-Annual Review, Action Required By April 1<sup>st</sup>, *sent 3/27/2020*