



Measure M
Taxpayers Oversight Committee
at the Orange County Transportation Authority
600 S. Main Street, Orange CA
August 28, 2007
6:00 p.m.



AGENDA

- 1. Welcome**
- 2. Pledge of Allegiance**
- 3. Approval of June Minutes/Attendance Report**
- 4. Chairman's Report**
- 5. Presentation Items**
 - A. Taxpayers Oversight Committee Overview
Presentation – Ellen Burton, Executive Director of External Affairs
 - B. Renewed Measure M Early Action Plan Update
Presentation – Monte Ward, Director of Special Projects
 - C. Proposed Freeway Program Amendment Overview
Presentation – Monte Ward, Director of Special Projects
- 6. Action Items**
 - A. Orange County Local Transportation Authority Ordinance No. 2
None
 - B. Orange County Local Transportation Authority Ordinance No. 3
None
- 7. Receive and File Items**
 - A. None
- 8. Growth Management Subcommittee Report**
- 9. Audit Subcommittee Report**
- 10. Committee Member Reports**
- 11. OCTA Staff Update**
- 12. Public Comments***
- 13. Adjournment**

*Public Comments: At this time, members of the public may address the Taxpayers Oversight Committee (TOC.) regarding any items within the subject matter jurisdiction of the TOC provided that no action may be taken on off-agenda items unless authorized by law. Comments shall be limited to five (5) minutes per person and 20 minutes for all comments, unless different time limits are set by the Chairman, subject to the approval of the TOC. Any person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in this meeting should contact the OCTA Clerk of the Board, telephone (714) 560-5676, no less than two business days prior to this meeting to enable OCTA to make reasonable arrangements to assure accessibility to this meeting.

Measure M Citizens Oversight Committee

June 12, 2007

Meeting Minutes

Committee Members Present:

David Sundstrom, County Auditor-Controller, Chairman
Ed Wylie, First District Representative, Co-Chairman
Brooks Corbin, Second District Representative
Gilbert Ishizu, Second District Representative
James Kelly, Fifth District Representative
Gene Rodriguez, Fifth District Representative
Merlin Henry, Third District Representative
Greg Moore, Third District Representative

Committee Members Absent:

Frederick Von Coelin, Fourth District Representative

Orange County Transportation Authority Staff Present:

Monte Ward
Ken Phipps
Kia Mortazavi
Charlie Guess
Jeanne Spinner LaMar
Alice Rogan
Sarah Swensson
Jennifer Bergener
Tresa Oliveri
Nora Yeretzian

Members of the Public

None.

1. Welcome by Chairman Sundstrom

Chairman David Sundstrom called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was performed.

3. Approval of Minutes

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes for the April 10, 2007 meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Chairman's Report

None to report.

5. Co-Chair Election

Brooks Corbin was nominated and unanimously voted Co-Chairman of the COC.

6. Subcommittee Selection

COC members were asked to state their preference for a subcommittee they would like to serve on. Members chose to remain in their existing subcommittees.

7. Presentation Items

A. I-5 Gateway Project Update

Charlie Guess, I-5 Gateway Project Program Manager, presented an update on the I-5 Gateway Project Program. He discussed the reconstruction of the Western Ave. bridge. He showed how the railroad is being reconfigured to accommodate the bridge expansion. The contractor is 24 percent complete with the project and is on schedule. There is an aggressive outreach program going directed by Alice Rogan. As a safety measure, construction is done during off-peak hours, not during rush hour.

Merlin Henry asked if Los Angeles County was doing anything to increase their lanes from three to six, as OCTA was doing. Charlie said they were about 1 ½ to 2 years behind OCTA with their projects. D. Sundstrom said Los Angeles County was not happy about what OCTA was doing because the difference will be so dramatic.

Gene Rodriguez asked if we would have project information at outreach events. Alice said we had been distributing information at events, such as Silverado Days.

David Sundstrom asked if we were on budget. Charlie said yes. He also said that we have been going out and informing the public about closings and what would be coming up next.

Brooks Corbin asked how much time it took and how we closed the roads. Charlie said Caltrans had closures every night and had the assistance of the county police to close the roads.

Gene Rodriguez asked how well the detours were working. Charlie said that we have a wonderful detour in place and that it was working very well.

B. Anaheim Regional Transportation Center Project (ARTIC) Overview

Jeanne Spinner LaMar, Program Manager, gave an overview of the Anaheim Regional Transportation Center Project (ARTIC). She discussed the parcel that OCTA purchased with Measure M money, which is approximately 13 ½ acres. Jeanne explained how the vision for ARTIC is that of a central hub for all forms of transportation. The concept that was adopted by OCTA's Board of Directors consists of three phases. Phase I (2007 – 2015) will connect what we currently have. Phase II (2015 – 2020) consists of making new connections. Commercial development will be done by the private sector. It is anticipated that the high speed train will be coming in. Phase III (2020 – 2030) is considered the "dream" phase. It is a forecast of such things as the super speed train, high speed rail, completion of commercial build out, etc. By the end of this year, OCTA will have a conference with Anaheim and present a rough draft of the concepts and costs.

Greg Moore asked how this concept will be funded. Jeanne said it would be funded with Measure M money. David Sundstrom asked what was happening to the roads around the stadium in Anaheim. Jeanne said that the roads will be widened.

Merlin Henry asked about the super speed train and where it would go. Jeanne said it would go through the states of California and Nevada. M. Henry stated that he does not think the train should go to the airport because he does not believe people would carry luggage around. Jeanne said there would be check-in areas for luggage to avoid this problem.

Gene Rodriguez asked about the passenger path in Phase I. Jeanne said it would be a bike/pedestrian path extending south and north along the river. The concept is to have an outdoor gathering area, like a concert center, at the end of the river.

Greg Moore asked if the commercial building will bring in funding. Jeanne said yes, it would. Gilbert Ishizu asked if there was money earmarked for this, Jeanne replied that there was none yet.

James Kelly stated that there is an amount of \$450,000 on the addendum. He inquired why we were hurrying if it is a long term project. Jeanne responded that we need property for parking due to outgrowing the current Anaheim Metrolink location.

8. Receive and File Items

Motion was made to receive and file the Measure M Quarterly Revenue and Expenditure Report and passed unanimously.

9. Growth Management Subcommittee Report

Gene Rodriguez asked if the Growth Management Subcommittee had plans. Tresa Oliveri said that there would be upcoming action.

10. Audit Subcommittee Report

David Sundstrom briefly discussed the Audit Subcommittee meeting he attended and said they talked about Measure M.

11. Committee Member Reports

None.

12. OCTA Staff Update

Monte Ward said the upcoming COC meeting on August 28 would outline the future amendment to Measure M in regards to the Early Action Plan. He briefly discussed how the pre-construction cost of \$22 million for an M2 project on State Route 57 could be funded from the current Measure M to help get the project started and that it will help the transition from M1 to M2 and meeting the closeout percentage for M1.

Monte said there are two projects that need to close out, I-5 and SR-22. OCTA is also seeking to allocate \$10m from freeway side to Phase II of the SR-22 project. Funding for the project will come from CMAQ but OCTA is only reimbursed after

expenditures are made, so we need the money up front he noted. OCTA may get reimbursed up to \$7m for the M1 dollars SR-22 Phase II, pending discussion with the Federal government.

Greg Moore asked if state funds are for construction only. Monte said yes, that's why we need to have projects ready to go.

Merlin Henry asked what the reasons were for a decrease in revenues this year. Monte said he wasn't sure but it could be that people weren't able to take out equity from their homes and are spending less.

James Kelly asked if there was money put aside in Measure M for freeway projects and maintenance. Monte said that Caltrans does most of this work, and cities maintain their streets and roads. Transit operations and maintenance are funded through Measure M and we currently have enough money to fund it.

Greg Moore asked if lower revenues will affect the I-5 project. Monte said no because we have strong reserves that had previously been forecasted.

Alice Rogan, Community Relations Officer, announced the departure of two committee members: Ed Wylie and Gene Rodriguez. She said that there will be no meeting in July, but that the new member orientation will be held on July 24. There will be four new members, two of which will be replacing Ed Wylie and Gene Rodriguez. The next meeting is scheduled for August 28 and it will no longer be the COC but will now be the Taxpayers Oversight Committee (TOC). The TOC will grown from a nine member committee to an 11 member committee. There will another meeting on September 11. James Kelly asked to identify upcoming meeting dates in an email.

Alice reported back on OCTA's Disaster Recovery (DR) backup systems. She said that OCTA has a backup system, but that the photos taken of the committee members were put on the S drive and that drive is a temporary one that is not backed-up.

Alice reminded the committee that the I-5 Gateway tour will be next Wednesday, June 20. The bus will pick up at 11:30 am at OCTA's 550 building in Orange.

13. Public Comments

None to report.

14. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:25 pm.



MEASURE M

Citizens Oversight Committee

Fiscal Year 2006-2007

Attendance Record

X = Present E = Excused Absence * = Absence Pending Approval U = Unexcused Absence -- = Resigned

Meeting Date	11-Jul	8-Aug	12-Sep	10-Oct	14-Nov	12-Dec	9-Jan	13-Feb	13-Mar	10-Apr	8-May	12-Jun
Brooks Corbin		X		E		X		X		X		X
Merlin L. Henry		X		E		E		X		X		X
Gilbert Ishizu		X		X		X		X		X		X
James Kelly		X		X		X		X		X		X
Greg Moore		X		X		E		X		X		X
Gene Rodriguez		X		X		X		X		X		X
David Sundstrom		X		X		X		X		X		X
Frederick von Coelin		X		X		X		X		X		*
Ed Wylie		E		X		X		X		X		X

Absences Pending Approval

Meeting Date

June 12, 2007

Name

Frederick von Coelin

Reason

Out of town

Presentation

Items



August 28, 2007

To: Members of the Taxpayers Oversight Committee
From: Monte Ward, Director of Special Projects
Subject: Proposed Amendments to Measure M Expenditure Plan

Overview

On August 13, 2007, the Orange County Transportation Authority Board of Directors approved the Renewed Measure M (M2) Draft Early Action Plan and directed staff to proceed with the necessary actions to implement. The plan anticipates two proposed amendments to the original Measure M (M1) to advance work related to two projects within the Freeway Projects element of the Measure M (M1) Expenditure Plan. The Taxpayer Oversight Committee has jurisdiction over proposed amendments to Measure M (M1). Staff seeks their review and an action to advance the adoption of the proposed amendments.

Recommendation

- A. Approve the proposed amendments to the Measure M (M1) Expenditure Plan to:
1. Modify the description of the Orange Freeway (State Route 57) project, consistent with Project G in the Renewed Measure M Transportation Investment Plan, and increase the funding allocation by \$22 million.
 2. Expand the limits of the Garden Grove Freeway (State Route 22) project to include the West County Connection improvements and increase the funding allocation by \$10 million

Background

As Measure M (M1) approaches its sunset on April 30, 2011, and the renewed Measure M (M2) approaches its sunrise, the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) Board of Directors (BOD) has approved a Renewed Measure M (M2) Early Action Plan (EAP) (Attachment A). The EAP provides a

framework for activities from 2007 to 2012 and defines the criteria for project delivery of M2 projects.

A lesson learned from M1 was the cost savings realized due to the acceleration of freeway projects. The accelerated schedule provided sufficient cost savings to taxpayers so that an additional project, the Garden Grove Freeway (State Route 22) Project Phase I, was able to be funded within the freeway mode of the expenditure plan. The advancement of the EAP is the first step in repeating that success.

Discussion

OCTA has existing commitments to M1- and CMIA-funded freeway projects that must be addressed in the short term. This includes providing a match for CMIA funds that are available only for construction on the M2 Orange Freeway (State Route 57) project (Project G), and the completion of existing M1 freeway projects on Interstate 5 (I-5) and State Route 22 (SR-22). Fact sheets with maps for the SR-22 Phase II and the SR-57 project are included (Attachment B).

In addition, the SR-22 Phase II West County Connections Project (not part of M2) is funded with a combination of federal Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds (available only via reimbursement), and state CMIA funds (available only for construction). Working capital is needed on this project for initial investment in design and right-of-way (Attachment C).

Currently, the M1 freeway mode is projected to have an ending unspent balance of \$172 million. It is recommended that two amendments to the M1 Expenditure Plan be initiated as follows:

1. Allocate \$22 million of the unprogrammed funds in the M1 freeway mode to pay for preconstruction costs on the M2 State Route 57 (SR-57) widening (Project G).
2. Allocate \$10 million from unprogrammed funds in the M1 freeway mode as working capital for design and right-of-way on the SR-22 Phase II West County Connections with the San Gabriel Freeway (Interstate 605) and the San Diego Freeway (Interstate 405).

This would leave an estimated projected balance of \$140 million in the M1 freeway mode as a prudent reserve for economic uncertainties and project closeout costs.

Within the Measure M (M1) ordinance is a process with which to amend the Expenditure Plan. The Policy Resolution No. 1 Citizens Oversight Committee contains the following language under Section V, subsection B:

“The Citizens Committee shall approve, by a 2/3 vote, any material amendments to the Expenditure Plan or any portions of the Plan proposed by the Authority which change the funding categories, programs or projects identified on page 18 of the Plan.”

Staff has prepared the following schedule for review and adoption of the proposed amendments:

Actions	Date (2007)
OCTA Transportation 2020 Committee recommendation to initiate amendments and set public hearing	July 16
OCTA Board of Directors initiates amendment and sets public hearing date	August 13
Proposed amendment sent to local agencies (at least 30 days prior to public hearing)	August 16
Taxpayers Oversight Committee hears first reading of proposed amendments.	August 28
Taxpayers Oversight Committee has second meeting to consider/acts on proposed amendments (requires 2/3 vote)	September 11
Public hearing on amendments and roll call vote by Board of Directors	September 24
Amendments transmitted to local agencies	September 24
Amendments effective 45 days following transmittal to local agencies	November 8

The schedule anticipates two meetings of the Taxpayers Oversight Committee for consideration. One on August 28 to receive the presentation and discuss the proposed amendments, and a second meeting on September 11 to take an action. The TOC at its discretion may also consider the amendment and take action at the August 28 meeting.

The actual text of the proposed amendments is shown as Attachment D.

In support of the proposed amendment a revised page 18 of the Expenditure Plan is included for your consideration (Attachment E).

Next Steps

As outlined above, the next action for the TOC is to act on a recommendation to approve the proposed amendments. Once approved, the TOC will notify the OCTA BOD of its action. If the proposed amendments are approved by the TOC, the OCTA BOD will move forward with the public hearing scheduled for September 24, 2007.

Summary

Two proposed amendments regarding freeway projects of the Expenditure Plan are presented for consideration by the Taxpayers Oversight Committee.

Attachments

- A. Final Renewed Measure M Early Action Plan
- B. Fact Sheets of SR-22/405/605 and SR-57 NB
- C. Summary of CTC CMIA Recommendations
- D. Proposed Measure M Expenditure Plan Amendments
- E. August 2007 Revised Expenditure Plan



Orange County Transportation Authority

Renewed Measure M Early Action Plan



Renewed Measure M Early Action Plan Table of Contents

Introduction	Pages	1-7
Summary of Outreach	Pages	8-10
Freeway Projects		
Overview Map	Page	11
Freeway Timeline	Page	12
Early Action Projects Timeline	Page	13
Project Descriptions	Pages	14-19
Streets and Roads Program		
Early Action Program Timeline	Page	20
Requirements for Eligible Jurisdictions	Page	21
M2 Precursors for Funding Eligibility	Page	22
Program Descriptions	Pages	23-25
Transit Programs		
Early Action Program Timeline	Page	26
Program Descriptions	Pages	27-36
Environmental Cleanup and Water Quality		
Early Action Program Timeline	Page	37
Program Descriptions	Pages	38-39

RENEWED

Introduction

Renewed Measure M Early Action Plan (EAP)

Introduction

On November 7, 2006, Orange County voters, by a vote of 69.7 percent, approved the renewal of the Measure M one-half cent sales tax for transportation improvements. Measure M was originally passed in 1990 (M1) with a sunset in 2011. With the approval of the Renewed Measure M, the voters agreed to continued investment of local tax dollars in Orange County's transportation infrastructure for another 30 years to 2041.

A primary reason for the voters' willingness to renew Measure M (M2) was that they saw and experienced tangible results. Since 1990, most of Orange County's freeway system has been improved, including a major overhaul of the I-5 right through the heart of the County; major roads and local streets have been upgraded; and a new Metrolink commuter rail system has been added, linking Orange County with jobs and housing in the surrounding counties.

Owing to careful stewardship and strategic early action, Orange County has also been able to meet the promises made to the voters in M1, and then some. Completing the bulk of the freeway program within ten years contributed to the ability to add an entirely new project – widening the Garden Grove Freeway (State Route 22) – to the list of accomplishments.

Although both M1 and M2 express a strong preference for pay-as-you-go project financing, they both also permit debt financing under the proper conditions. In the case of the M1 freeway program, the benefits of early action are obvious and tangible – projects cost less, traffic relief was delivered sooner and, the opportunity was created for additional projects to be delivered.

The Transportation 2020 Committee directed the preparation of a five-year plan, covering the years 2007 to 2012, to advance the implementation of M2. A Draft Early Action Plan outlining the projects and programs that could be advanced along with anticipated schedules and major milestones was approved by the Board of Directors and released on May 29, 2007. Input was actively sought from city officials and key stakeholders, and recommendations on financing and budget needs were added before approval of the Final Early Action Plan by the Board of Directors on August 13, 2007.

Key Objectives

The renewal of Measure M offers the opportunity to replicate, and perhaps exceed, the performance in delivering on the original. This report presents a blueprint for early action on the Renewed Measure M Transportation Investment Plan for the five-year period from 2007 to 2012. That blueprint commits to meeting the following nine objectives in the next five years:

1. Complete the first major milestone – conceptual engineering -- for every freeway project in the Plan; ensuring that all projects are eligible for matching funds and ready to enter into environmental review, design and construction.
2. Start construction on five major M2 freeway projects on SR-91, SR-57 and I-5 valued at \$445 million. Two other projects will also be under construction at the I-405/SR-22 and I-405/I-605 interchanges, valued at \$400 million and paid for by Proposition 1B and federal funds.
3. Enable every Orange County city and the County to meet eligibility requirements for M2 funds, including new pavement management and signal synchronization programs.
4. Award up to \$165 million to cities and the County for signal synchronization and road upgrades.
5. Implement high-frequency Metrolink service within Orange County with associated railroad crossing safety and quiet zone improvements completed or under construction. Begin project development for at least five major grade separation projects.
6. Award up to \$200 million in competitive funding for transit projects.
7. Complete development work and allocate funds for transit fare discounts and improved services for seniors and persons with disabilities.
8. Complete an agreement between OCTA and resource agencies detailing environmental mitigation of freeway improvements and commitments for project permitting. Begin allocation of funds for mitigation.
9. Complete program development for road runoff/water quality improvements; Begin allocation of funds to water quality projects.

In all, more than \$1.6 billion in transportation improvements, promised to the voters in M2 could be underway by 2012.

To put the magnitude of this effort in perspective, two M1 freeway projects were under construction within the two years after revenues began to be collected in 1991. The EAP will enable five M2 projects to be under construction before revenues begin to be collected in 2011.

Oversight and Safeguards

Early action on M2 will take place with the full oversight and regular reporting promised to the voters. Beginning in August 2007, the independent Taxpayers Oversight Committee will be appointed and begin its job of monitoring and reviewing all M1 and M2 expenditures. In addition, updated accounting, auditing and reporting protocols will be implemented. Before the end of the 2007 calendar year, new systems for document controls, archiving and public access to documents will be in place so that public access to original records and information regarding M2 can be assured.

Subsequent to the Board adoption of the EAP, more specific strategic implementation plans for the freeway and transit components of M2 will be prepared. These will provide detailed plans for the delivery of each project and/or program, including project or program scope, sequencing, milestones, cost estimates, cash flow and funding allocation. It is anticipated that the Freeway Strategic Plan could be completed by Fall 2007 and the Transit Strategic Plan by late 2007. These strategic plans will guide resource needs and allocation and provide the means to measure project and/or program development progress against established benchmarks.

Beginning in Fall 2007, regular progress reports on implementing the EAP will be incorporated into the Measure M Quarterly Report that is prepared for the Taxpayers Oversight Committee and the Board of Directors. To improve accessibility and transparency of the information, the quarterly progress report will be presented principally in a web-based on-line form, showing progress on all projects and programs against the timelines and benchmarks in the Action Plan and associated strategic plans. Contact information for the OCTA staff member responsible for each program or project will be included.

Some Risks

Early action of this magnitude is not without risks. Similar efforts in surrounding counties as well as implementation of recently passed State infrastructure and other spending measures (Propositions 1A-1E and 84) will likely result in increased regional competition and costs for the human and capital resources needed to design and implement transportation projects. Global competition from rapid development and infrastructure spending in countries like India and China has already impacted the costs of construction and is also expected to continue to be a factor.

OCTA will undertake a market analysis/risk management study in the next fiscal year to assess the competitive environment for labor and materials, refine the model for project cost estimates and develop strategies to manage project cost risks.

Also, the impacts of multiple construction projects on traffic operations, the traveling public, and adjacent businesses and residents must be carefully evaluated and managed. Project phasing and implementation must be planned to avoid concurrent impacts on alternate routes or parallel facilities and to minimize extended disruption to businesses and residents.

Project scheduling and phasing to manage local impacts will be specifically addressed as part of the proposed freeway and transit strategic plans.

Another key concern is the capacity of local jurisdictions, OCTA and Caltrans and federal agencies to effectively manage the work that needs to be done. Over the

next five years, a significant increase in program development, planning, environmental, design, oversight and construction management work will be overlaid on the ongoing responsibilities of operating, maintaining, and improving the existing road, highway and transit network. Project planning and phasing will need to account for this increased workload and the capacity of staff and the private sector to respond. OCTA will need to review and rethink its procurement, contract management, project management, staffing and training needs to make best use of and to avoid overburdening the available public and private resources.

An organizational review, conducted by an external, objective third party, will be undertaken in FY 2007-08 to ensure that OCTA management and staff are well positioned and prepared to meet the challenges of the Plan.

Funding and Financing

The fact that the voters approved a renewal of Measure M nearly four and one-half years before the revenues become available is both an opportunity and a challenge. This lead-time enables significant project development work to be undertaken and projects to be delivered early, but only if sufficient funding is made available in a timely manner. Pay-as-you-go project funding is de-facto not possible for any M2 projects until after April 1, 2011. However, early action on M2 projects prior to April 1, 2011 can be undertaken using some combination of four principal funding sources:

1. Federal, State and local grants and/or matching funds
2. Unallocated M1 funds, in excess of what is needed to complete the M1 Expenditure Plan
3. Internal loans of qualifying non-M funds held by OCTA
4. Debt financing repaid by future M2 revenues

These funding sources all have certain qualifying requirements in order to be available for M2 purposes. Grants and matching funds must generally be won through a competitive application or eligibility process, or through an earmarked appropriation. Allocation of M1 funds requires approval of the Board of Directors to amend the M1 Expenditure Plan, with concurrence by the Taxpayers Oversight Committee, and in some cases the voters. Internal loans require that the funds are not otherwise needed over the short term and payment of interest. Debt financing can be used only if pay-as-you-go is deemed infeasible, and if the costs of financing do not imperil delivery of the balance of the voter-approved M2 Investment Plan.

The EAP has a strong funding foundation of matching state, federal and local funds that have already been committed. For example, approximately \$267 million, principally from Proposition 1B Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds, are currently available for M2 EAP freeway projects. Nearly all of the M2 transit, roads and environmental programs have matching requirements, which will eventually leverage additional funds to deliver the EAP.

Beyond these known commitments and requirements, there are three steps that must be taken to complete the funding and financing picture for the EAP.

Step 1: Near Term Commitments

OCTA has existing commitments to M1 and CMIA funded freeway projects that must be addressed in the short term. This includes providing a match for CMIA funds that are available only for construction on the M2 SR-57 project (Project G), and the completion of existing M1 freeway projects on I-5 and SR-22. In addition, the SR-22 Phase II Project (not part of M2) is funded with a combination of federal Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds (available only via reimbursement), and state CMIA funds (available only for construction). Working capital is needed on this project for initial investment in design and right of way.

Currently the M1 freeway mode is projected to have an ending unspent balance of \$172 million. It is recommended that two amendments to the M1 Expenditure Plan freeway mode be approved as follows:

1. Allocate \$22 million of the un-programmed funds in the M1 freeway mode to pay for pre-construction costs on the M2 SR-57 widening (Project G).
2. Allocate \$10 million from un-programmed funds in the M1 freeway mode as working capital on the SR-22 Phase II design and right of way.

This leaves an estimated balance of \$140 million in the M1 freeway mode as a prudent reserve for economic uncertainties and project closeout costs.

Step 2: Costs Since the Election

Costs already incurred for M2 project and program development must be funded. Project and program development activities have been underway since the November 7, 2006 election. These costs are estimated at \$3 million, for the period beginning November 8, 2006 through the end of the current fiscal year. This includes contracts for conceptual engineering on SR-55 (Project F); conceptual engineering and environmental studies on SR-91 (Projects J and H), and the development of the EAP.

It is recommended that these M2 project and program development activities be funded from the Orange County Unified Transportation Trust (OCUTT) fund to be reimbursed with interest by M2 when funds become available in 2011. OCUTT funds can be used for any transportation purpose as designated by the Board of Directors. The current OCUTT fund balance is approximately \$10 million.

Step 3: Plan of Finance

A plan of finance is needed to ensure that the cash flow requirements from FY 2007-08 through FY 2011-12 for the EAP are met. Significant expenditures are anticipated for highway project development, design, right-of-way, and construction and the programming of road, transit and environmental funds. Detailed year-by-year cash flow needs for all of these elements are still being compiled and refined, but the aggregate financing needed to deliver the EAP is currently estimated to be less than \$500 million.

It is recommended that a plan of finance for the EAP be prepared and presented to the Transportation 2020 Committee and the Board of Directors for review and approval. This can be completed within 90 days.

The plan of finance will consist of the following:

- Best available cost estimates for each EAP project and program, including annual cash flow estimates;
- Adjustment of all cost and revenue estimates to year-of-expenditure values;
- Refinement of revenue estimates for state, federal and other non-M2 revenue sources;
- Analysis of financing options, including major risk factors, and recommendation of a preferred strategy.

The plan of finance will not be a static document. Project costs and schedules and revenue estimates will be continuously monitored. The financing strategy will be refined and adjustments brought back to the Board of Directors for action as circumstances change.

Financing Policy Guidelines

Following are the recommended policies to guide the preparation and maintenance of the plan of finance:

1. Aggressively seek and utilize first all available local, state and federal matching funds and grants.

2. Annually review and recommend the level of M1 reserves needed to assure the completion of all M1 projects. First priority for M1 funds not needed for reserves should be to fund eligible M2 projects.
3. Utilize internal borrowing to the extent that it is the lowest cost option and does not jeopardize other non-M funding commitments.
4. Utilize debt financing subject to the following conditions:
 - Conservative, independently validated assumptions and projections indicate the ability to deliver the full 30-year M2 plan is not compromised.
 - Debt financing can be shown to be either the lowest cost option, or the only available option, to meet the need.
 - Financing costs accrue appropriately to the M2 project or program for which borrowing occurs.
5. Investigate the opportunities and the potential benefits of interest rate management strategies.

Staffing and Resources

Recommendations for staffing and resources needed to implement the EAP in fiscal year 2007-08 are made in a separate report to the Board of Directors. A budget adjustment of approximately \$20 million and addition of eleven positions is recommended.

Next Steps

Subsequent to adoption by the Board of Directors, the EAP will be distributed to local jurisdictions and key stakeholders. The new Taxpayers Oversight Committee will begin meeting in July 2007. Quarterly status reports on implementation of the Plan will be integrated with the Measure M Quarterly Report beginning in the Fall 2007. Also in the Fall, the plan of finance for the EAP will be presented for review and adoption.

By the end of calendar year 2007, detailed strategic plans outlining scope, sequencing, milestones, cost estimates, cash flow and funding allocation for the freeway and transit programs will be completed. On the same timetable, upgrades to the OCTA website will be phased in to improve the accessibility and transparency of information available to stakeholders and the public.

Renewed Measure M Early Action Plan Outreach Summary

OCTA began outreach to local government and community stakeholders involved in the development of the Renewed Measure M Investment Plan (M2) shortly after its approval by the voters in November 2007. The principal message of these briefings was the need to plan for the increased workload that accompanied the close out of the current M1, what the passage of M2 meant for Orange County as well as the development of the M2 Early Action Plan.

In January 2007, OCTA staff began meeting with city and community groups, including city councils, chambers of commerce and transportation, business and development/engineering associations. All stakeholders were encouraged to provide suggestions and comments on the Early Action Plan.

Upon the Board's approval of the Draft Early Action Plan in late May, the Plan was distributed to over 400 stakeholders including:

- Mayors, city managers and public works directors of all Orange County cities
- State Legislative Delegation
- County of Orange
- League of Cities' Executive Steering Committee
- Water District Boards of Directors
- Orange County Business Council
- Building Industry Association
- OCTA Citizen's Advisory Committee
- OCTA Technical Advisory Committee and Technical Steering Committee
- Environmental Organizations
- Various Business Organizations

Accompanying the Early Action Plan was a transmittal memo that provided stakeholders the opportunity to provide feedback on the Plan as well as information to request that OCTA make a presentation to their organization. Since January, 67 presentations to city councils and community/business organizations have been completed and, as of preparation of this report, two more are scheduled. In addition to presentations, the Early Action Plan was also posted on the OCTA website with a field for the public to provide comments on the Plan. This effort continued through the Board's approval of the Plan and will now transition from presentations seeking input to informing stakeholders about what is included in the Final Early Action Plan.

In addition, significant upgrades are planned for the OCTA website to provide improved access to status and progress on implementing Renewed Measure M and the Early Action Plan.

The following chart depicts all organizations that received briefings on the Renewed Measure M Early Action Plan:

M2 Early Action Plan Outreach Summary January – August 2007

<u>Date</u>	<u>Organization</u>
January	Irvine Chamber of Commerce Orange County Business Council Infrastructure Committee Women in Transportation Seminar American Society of Civil Engineers League of Cities' Executive Steering Committee Santa Ana ComLink National Association of Industrial Office Properties Tustin Chamber of Commerce
February	Building Industry Association Infrastructure Committee League Newly Elected Officials seminar Irvine City Council Orange County Association of Realtors Orange County Taxpayers Association South Orange County Regional Chambers of Commerce
March	GMA 7&8 Elected Officials Orange County City Managers Association National Association of Industrial Office Properties Cypress City Council Santa Ana Kiwanis Newport City Council Huntington Beach Kiwanis Brea City Council Aliso Viejo City Council Construction Management Association of America Consulting Engineers and Land Surveyors of OC Orange City Council Garden Grove City Council Villa Park City Council Dana Point Mayor
April	Costa Mesa City Council Los Alamitos City Council Placentia City Council Women in Transportation Seminar Costa Mesa Leadership Tomorrow Orange County Planning Director Association
May	Yorba Linda City Council Fountain Valley Mayor's Meeting Laguna Hills Mayor

May 29 Adoption of Draft Renewed M Early Action Plan
--

June Mission Viejo City Council
 GMA 2 Elected Officials
 League of Cities' Executive Steering Committee
 South County Technical Advisory Committee Workshop
 San Juan Capistrano Chamber of Commerce
 Orange County Council of Governments
 American Society of Civil Engineers, Transportation Technical Committee
 OCTA Citizens' Advisory Committee
 OCTA Technical Advisory Committee
 Orange County Business Council, Infrastructure Committee

July Laguna Hills City Council
 Anaheim City Council
 La Palma City Council
 Los Alamitos City Council
 Seal Beach City Council
 Cypress City Council
 Stanton City Council
 Irvine Mayor
 Santa Ana Environmental and Transportation Advisory Committee
 South Orange County Mayor's Association
 OCTA Special Needs in Transit Advisory Committee

August Orange County City Managers Association
 La Habra City Council
 Buena Park City Council
 San Juan Capistrano City Council
 Tustin City Council
 Placentia City Council
 Orange County Council of Governments Technical Advisory Committee
 Santa Margarita Water District

Scheduled

Huntington Beach Planning Commission
Orange County Taxpayers Association

Total Meetings*: 69


* Current as of August 2007

RENEWED

Freeway Projects

EARLY ACTION PROJECTS 2007-2012

Freeways



Project Descriptions

Early Action Projects


- C** SR-91/405 Interchange
- D** SR-91/405 Interchange
- G** SR-91/405 Interchange
- H** SR-91/405 Interchange
- J** SR-91/405 Interchange
- K** SR-91/405 Interchange

Conceptual Engineering Projects

- 1** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 2** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 3** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 4** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 5** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 6** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 7** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 8** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 9** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 10** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 11** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 12** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 13** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 14** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 15** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 16** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 17** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 18** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 19** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 20** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 21** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 22** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 23** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 24** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 25** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 26** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 27** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 28** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 29** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 30** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 31** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 32** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 33** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 34** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 35** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 36** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 37** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 38** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 39** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 40** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 41** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 42** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 43** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 44** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 45** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 46** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 47** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 48** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 49** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 50** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 51** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 52** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 53** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 54** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 55** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 56** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 57** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 58** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 59** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 60** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 61** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 62** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 63** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 64** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 65** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 66** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 67** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 68** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 69** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 70** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 71** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 72** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 73** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 74** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 75** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 76** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 77** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 78** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 79** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 80** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 81** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 82** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 83** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 84** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 85** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 86** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 87** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 88** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 89** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 90** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 91** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 92** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 93** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 94** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 95** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 96** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 97** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 98** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 99** SR-91/405 Interchange
- 100** SR-91/405 Interchange

Programs

2004|2005|2006|2007|2008|2009|2010|2011|2012|2013|2014|2015|2016|2017|2018|2019|2020|2021



The remaining freeway projects listed below will be implemented subsequent to the 2007-2012 Early Action Plan period. Priorities, schedules and project phasing will be presented for Committee and Board of Directors' action as conceptual engineering is completed and more information is known about each project.

- | | | | | | | | |
|----------|-------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|----------|---|----------|---------------------------|
| A | I-5, SR-57 to SR-55 | D | South OC Freeway Interchanges | G | SR-57 NB, Lambert to CL | L | I-405, SR-55 to I-5 |
| B | I-5, SR-55 to El Toro Y | E | SR-22 Access Improvements | I | SR-91, SR-57 to SR-55 | M | I-605 Access Improvements |
| C | I-5, El Toro Y to SR-73 | F | SR-55, SR-22 to I-405 | J | SR-91, SR-241 to County line (OCTA Project) | | |

EARLY ACTION PROJECTS TIMELINE

Freeways

Projects	Category	Start*	End*
G SR-57, Orangethorpe to Lambert	Environmental	June 05	Dec 07
	Design/Engineering	Dec 07	June 10
	Right of Way & Utilities	June 08	June 10
	Construction	June 10	July 14
J SR-91, SR-55 to SR-241	Environmental	July 07	July 09
	Design/Engineering	Jan 09	Dec 11
	Right of Way & Utilities	July 09	Dec 11
	Construction	Dec 11	Dec 14
U SR-91 EB, SR-241 to SR-71	Environmental	May 04	Dec 07
	Design/Engineering	July 07	Aug 09
	Right of Way & Utilities	Jan 08	Aug 09
	Construction	Aug 09	Sep 11
H SR-91 WB, I-5 to SR-57	Environmental	July 07	June 10
	Design/Engineering	June 10	June 13
	Right of Way & Utilities	Dec 10	June 13
	Construction	June 13	June 16
B SR-57 NB, Katella to Lincoln	Environmental	Oct 07	July 09
	Design/Engineering	June 08	May 11
	Right of Way & Utilities	Dec 08	May 11
	Construction	May 11	Jan 15
K I-405, SR-55 to I-605	Environmental	July 08	June 11
	Design/Engineering	June 11	June 14
	Right of Way & Utilities	Jan 12	June 14
	Construction	June 14	June 18
D I-5/Ortega Interchange	Environmental	Jan 06	Nov 08
	Design/Engineering	Nov 08	Nov 11
	Right of Way & Utilities	May 09	Nov 11
	Construction	Nov 11	Nov 14
C I-5, PCH to Pico	Environmental	Dec 08	Dec 11
	Design/Engineering	Dec 11	Dec 14
	Right of Way & Utilities	June 12	Dec 14
	Construction	Dec 14	Dec 17
J SR-91, SR-241 to County Line (RCTC Project)	Environmental	July 07	Apr 12
	Design/Engineering	Apr 12	Apr 15
	Right of Way & Utilities	Oct 12	Apr 15
	Construction	Apr 15	Apr 18

*The dates shown here are preliminary and represent typical or average durations for the various project stages. As the projects progress, better information will be available, leading to refinements and changes in the timelines and completion dates.

C. San Diego Freeway (I-5) Improvements South of the El Toro "Y"

Description:

Add new lanes to I-5 from the vicinity of the El Toro Interchange in Lake Forest to the vicinity of SR-73 in Mission Viejo. Also add new lanes on I-5 between Coast Highway and Avenida Pico interchanges to reduce freeway congestion in San Clemente. Regional plans also include construction of a new freeway access point between Crown Valley Parkway and Avery Parkway as well as new off-ramps at Stonehill Drive using federal and state funds.

Status:

Project Study Report under way now for Coast Highway to Avenida Pico section (Caltrans lead). Analysis to date has focused on this segment as an HOV lane. Initiate Project Study Report for El Toro Interchange to SR-73 area by 2011 contingent upon funding availability and future Board action following completion of the South Orange County Major Investment Study (SOCMIS).

Present Day Congestion:

Today, I-5 near the El Toro "Y" carries about 342,000 vehicles per day and has about 5,300 daily vehicle hours of delay. Segments of the freeway currently operate at level of service "F" (over capacity) in the mornings and afternoons. On-ramps are significantly congested in the mornings at Crown Valley and Oso Parkways.

Benefits:

The project will increase freeway capacity and reduce congestion. Travel volumes are expected to increase in the future by 35 percent (118,000 vehicles), bringing it up to 460,000 vehicles per day in the future.

Cost (2005 \$):
\$627.0 million.

Issues:

Contingent on findings from Project Study Reports (estimated 2008 completion for Coast Highway to Pico section).

External Funding:

Potential linkages to non-Measure M funded local interchange projects such as Crown Valley Parkway area.

Risks:

Limited right-of-way in certain sections may require non-standard shoulder and lane widths to minimize right-of-way acquisition. Major Investment Study currently under way may modify proposed plans. Major interchange improvements (Project D) will need to be integrated into the mainline widening.

Related Projects:

I-5 local interchange improvements (Project D); new freeway access point between Crown Valley Parkway and Avery Parkway.

Involved Agencies:

Caltrans, Laguna Hills, Mission Viejo, Laguna Niguel, San Juan Capistrano, Dana Point, San Clemente, Lake Forest, TCA

References:

Caltrans District 12 Proposed Projects (2004)

D. Santa Ana Freeway / San Diego Freeway (I-5) Local Interchange Upgrades

Description:

Update and improve key I-5 interchanges such as Avenida Pico, Ortega Highway, Avery Parkway, La Paz Road, El Toro Road, and others to relieve street congestion around older interchanges and on ramps. In addition to the project described above, regional plans also include improvements to the local interchanges at Camino Capistrano, Oso Parkway, Alicia Parkway and Barranca Parkway using federal and state funds.

Status:

Projects at various stages. Ortega Highway EIR under way.

Present Day Congestion:

Varies by location. Each local interchange suffers from high, recurrent congestion in morning and afternoon peak periods.

Benefits:

Varies by location. Each local interchange offers community benefits including congestion relief and improved freeway access.

Cost (2005 \$):

\$258.0 million.

Issues:

Contingent on findings from Project Study Reports (estimated 2008 to 2012 completion).

External Funding:

Potential linkages to non-Measure M funded local interchange projects such as Culver Drive and Ortega Highway.

Risks:

Limited right-of-way in certain locations may require right-of-way acquisition. Major Investment Study currently underway may modify proposed plans. Project C needs to be integrated with the local interchange upgrades.

Related Projects:


I-5 widening, south of the El Toro "Y"

Involved Agencies:

Caltrans, Irvine, Laguna Hills, Mission Viejo, Laguna Niguel, San Juan Capistrano, San Clemente, Lake Forest, TCA

References:

Caltrans District 12 Proposed Projects (2004); 2006 Long Range Transportation Plan; I-5/SR-74 PSR



G. Orange Freeway (SR-57) Improvements

Description:

Build a new northbound lane between Orangewood Avenue and Lambert Road. Other projects include improvements to the Lambert interchange and the addition of a northbound truck-climbing lane between Lambert and the county line. In addition to the project described above, regional plans include new carpool ramps at Cerritos Avenue using federal and state funds.

Status:

Environmental document under way from Orangethorpe to Lambert with expected completion by 2008. Initiate Project Report for Orangewood to Orangethorpe segment by 2008 contingent upon funding availability and future Board action. Initiate environmental document for northbound truck climbing lane between Lambert and Tonner Canyon Road by 2011.

Present Day Congestion:

Today, this segment of SR-57 carries about 315,000 vehicles and has about 3,300 daily vehicle hours of delay in the northbound direction. High, recurrent congestion southbound in the morning and northbound in the evening.

Benefits:

The project will increase freeway capacity and reduce congestion. By 2030, this volume will increase by 15 percent, bringing it up to 363,000 vehicles per day.

Cost (2005 \$):

\$258.7 million.

Issues:

Contingent on findings from environmental documents. Coordination with local interchange projects such as

Lambert, and ARTIC related freeway access improvements.

External Funding:

CMIA, possible Measure M1

Risks:

Limited right-of-way in certain sections may require non-standard shoulder and lane widths to minimize right-of-way acquisition.

Related Projects:


SR-91 improvements, SR-57 to I-5; SR-57 to SR-55

Involved Agencies:

Caltrans, Orange, Anaheim, Placentia, Fullerton, Brea

References:

Orangethorpe to Lambert PSR (2004); Katella to Lincoln PSR (2003); Caltrans District 12 Proposed Projects (2004); Lambert interchange PSR; 2006 Long-Range Transportation Plan



H. Riverside Freeway (SR-91) Improvements from the Santa Ana Freeway (I-5) to the Orange Freeway (SR-57)

Description:

Add capacity in the westbound direction and provide operational improvements at on and off ramps to the SR-91 between I-5 and the Orange Freeway (SR-57).

Status:

Initiate environmental document by summer 2007.

Present Day Congestion:

Today, this segment of SR-91 carries about 256,000 vehicles and has about 3,800 daily vehicle hours of delay.

Benefits:

The project will increase freeway capacity and reduce congestion. By 2030, this volume is expected to increase by nearly 13 percent, bringing it up to 289,900 vehicles per day.

Cost (2005 \$):

\$140.0 million.

Issues:

Contingent on findings from environmental document (estimated 2010 completion).

External Funding:

None at this time.

Risks:

Limited right-of-way in certain sections may require non-standard shoulder and lane widths to minimize right-of-way acquisition.

Related Projects:


N/A

Involved Agencies:

Caltrans, Anaheim, Fullerton

References:

Caltrans District 12 Proposed Projects (2004); 2006 Long Range Transportation Plan; SR-91 westbound lane PSR (I-5 to SR-57)



J. Riverside Freeway (SR-91) Improvements from Costa Mesa Freeway (SR-55) to the Orange/ Riverside County Line

Description:

This project adds capacity on SR-91 beginning at SR-55 and extending to I-15 in Riverside County. The first priority will be to improve the segment of SR-91 east of SR-241. The goal is to provide up to four new lanes of capacity between SR-241 and Riverside County Line by making best use of available freeway property, adding reversible lanes, building elevated sections and improving connections to SR-241. This project also includes improvements to the segment of SR-91 between SR-241 and SR-55. The concept is to generally add one new lane in each direction and improve the interchanges.

Status:

Environmental document under way for new eastbound lane east of SR-241. Initiate study of ultimate improvements between SR-241 and Riverside County Line by Fall 2007. PSR for added lanes from SR-55 to SR-241 completed in May 2004.

Present Day Congestion:

Today, this freeway carries about 314,000 vehicles every day and has about 5,500 daily vehicle hours of delay.

Benefits:

The project will increase freeway capacity and reduce congestion. Traffic volumes are expected to increase by 36 percent, bringing it up to 426,000 vehicles by 2030.

Cost (2005 \$):

\$925.0 million.

Issues:

Contingent on findings from EIR for new eastbound lane (estimated 2007 completion). Other environmental issues contingent on future Project Study Reports. Improvements east of SR-241 are coordinated with SR-91/SR-241 interchange improvements (non-Measure M funded) and Riverside County's Measure A widening of SR-91.

External Funding:

CMIA and potential 2006 STIP funding

Risks:

Limited right-of-way in certain sections may require non-standard shoulder and lane widths to minimize right-of-way acquisition.

Related Projects:

EB auxiliary lane, SR-241 to SR-71; Riverside County Measure A 5th lane (SR-241 to I-15)

Involved Agencies:

Caltrans, RCTC, Anaheim, Yorba Linda

References:

Caltrans District 12 Proposed Projects (2004); 2006 Long Range Transportation Plan; 5th lane SR-55 to SR-241 PSR, SR-91 implementation plan

K. San Diego Freeway (I-405) Improvements between the I-605 Freeway in Los Alamitos area and Costa Mesa Freeway (SR-55)

Description:

Add new lanes to the San Diego Freeway between I-605 and SR-55. The project will make best use of available freeway property, update interchanges and widen all local overcrossings according to city and regional master plans. The improvements will be 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. Near-term regional plans also include the improvements to the I-405/ SR-73 interchange as well as a new carpool interchange at Bear Street using federal and state funds.

Status:

Complete the draft Project Study Report by 2008.

Present Day Congestion:

Today, I-405 carries about 430,000 vehicles daily and has about 11,400 daily vehicle hours of delay. Segments of the freeway operate at level of service "F" (over capacity) in the morning and afternoon.

Benefits:

The project will increase freeway capacity and reduce congestion. Traffic volumes are expected to increase by nearly 23 percent, bringing it up to 528,000 vehicles daily by 2030.

Cost (2005 \$):
\$500 million.

Issues:

Contingent on findings from Project Study Report (estimated 2008).

External Funding:

Federal funds have been earmarked for improvements to the Beach Boulevard interchange that will need to be coordinated with this project.

Risks:

Limited right-of-way in certain sections may require non-standard shoulder and lane widths to minimize right-of-way acquisition. Re-building local interchanges may require right-of-way to accommodate existing and future traffic.

Related Projects:


SR-22 west, Valley View to I-605, Bear street HOV ramps, I-405/SR-73 HOV direct connectors

Involved Agencies:

Caltrans, Seal Beach, Los Alamitos, Garden Grove, Westminster, Huntington Beach, Fountain Valley, Costa Mesa

References:

Caltrans District 12 Proposed Projects (2004); 2006 Long Range Transportation Plan; I-405 MIS






RENEWED

Streets and Roads Program

STREETS & ROADS PROGRAM TIMELINE



Requirements for Eligible Jurisdictions

M1 and M2

	M1 Eligibility Requirements	M2 Eligibility Requirements
1	Comply with M1 Growth Management Plan (GMP) requirements generally based on maintaining certain traffic level of service standards	Comply with State requirements for Orange County Congestion Management Program (CMP) generally based on maintaining certain traffic level of service standards
2	Institute development mitigation as part of GMP to ensure new development pays its share of the associated costs	Require new development to pay a fair share of needed transportation improvements
3	Adopt a General Plan Circulation Element consistent with the Master Plan of Arterial Highways (MPAH)	Adopt a General Plan Circulation Element consistent with the Master Plan of Arterial Highways (MPAH)
4	Adopt a 7-Year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) that includes all M1 funds	Adopt a 6-Year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) that includes all M2 funds
5	Participate in Growth Management Area (GMA) interjurisdictional forums	Participate in Traffic Forums
6	Adopt a local Transportation Demand (TDM) program/ordinance or alternative mitigation to reduce single occupancy vehicle travel	Adopt a local Signal Synchronization Plan consistent with a countywide Master Plan
7	Adopt a local Pavement Management Plan and adequately fund the same	Adopt a local Pavement Management Plan; measure pavement conditions against a standard and show or maintain improvement of pavement condition
8	No comparable requirement	Provide an annual Expenditure Report of all M2 spending
9	No comparable requirement	Provide a Project Final Report for all completed M2 projects
10	Agree to spend all M1 revenues within 3 years	Agree to time limits for expenditures; generally 3 years
11	Meet Maintenance of Effort (MOE) standard	Meet Maintenance of Effort (MOE) standard with a Construction Cost Index (CCI) escalation every three years
12	No supplanting of private developer funding	No supplanting of private developer funding
13	Address jobs/housing balance as part of GMP	Consider land use planning strategies that accommodate transit and non-motorized transportation

1.2 Precursors for Local Funding Eligibility and Allocations

1. **Traffic Forums:** Eligible Jurisdictions and Caltrans, in participation with County of Orange and the Orange County Division of League of Cities shall establish boundaries for Traffic Forums.
2. **Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program:** OCTA, in consultation with Eligible Jurisdictions and Caltrans, shall adopt and maintain a Traffic Signal Synchronization Master Plan that shall be part of the Master Plan of Arterial Highways (MPAH).
3. **Local Traffic Signal Synchronization Plan:** Eligible Jurisdictions shall adopt and maintain a Local Traffic Signal Synchronization Plan consistent with the Traffic Signal Synchronization Master Plan. The Signal Synchronization Plan must be part of the General Plan Circulation Element.
4. **Pavement Management:** OCTA, in consultation with Eligible Jurisdictions, shall define a countywide management method to inventory, analyze and evaluate road pavement conditions, and a common method to measure improvement of road pavement conditions.
5. **Pavement Management Plan:** Eligible Jurisdictions shall biennially adopt and update a Pavement Management Plan, using a common format approved by OCTA, and issue a report every two years regarding status of pavement conditions and implementation of the Plan.
6. **Capital Improvement Program:** Eligible Jurisdictions shall develop a 6-Year Capital Improvement Program that includes all proposed M2 expenditures, including Signal Synchronization and Pavement Management.
7. **Competitive Procedures:** OCTA, in consultation with Eligible Jurisdictions, shall develop competitive procedures for allocation of funds for Regional Capacity (Project O), Signal Synchronization (Project P), Metrolink Extensions (Project S), Metrolink Gateways (Project T), and Community Based Transit/Circulators (Project V).
8. **Environmental Cleanup/Water Quality:** OCTA shall appoint an Environmental Cleanup/Water Quality Allocation Committee as specified in M2 Ordinance #3. The Committee shall recommend to OCTA a competitive grant process; maintenance of effort provisions; annual reporting and benefit assessment methods; and funding allocations for M2 Environmental Cleanup revenues.

O. Regional Capacity Program

Description:

This program, in combination with local matching funds, provides a funding source to complete the Orange County Master Plan of Arterial Highways (MPAH). The program also provides for intersection improvements and other projects to help improve street operations and reduce congestion. This program also provides funding for construction of railroad grade separations where high volume streets are impacted by freight trains along the Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad in northern Orange County. The program allocates funds through a competitive process and targets projects that help traffic the most by considering factors such as degree of congestion relief, cost effectiveness, and project readiness.

Cost (2005 \$):

\$1,132.8 million.

Status:

Initiate development of program procedures, guidelines and eligibility requirements by 2007. Call for projects estimated by 2009.

Present Day:

Roughly 1,000 miles of new street lanes remain to be completed, mostly in the form of widening existing streets to their ultimate planned width. Completion of the system will result in a more even traffic flow and efficient system.

Benefits:

Improvements to be funded by this program, when combined with local arterial projects, are projected to improve peak period arterial speeds by

nearly 27% by 2030 compared to not constructing those projects.

Issues:

Right-of-way may be difficult to obtain for widening projects in some older, more densely developed sections of the county.

External Funding:

A local jurisdiction match equivalent to 50% of project costs is required to qualify for Measure M funding. Match can be reduced contingent on participation in pavement and signal synchronization programs as well as use of non-Measure M funds for local match and developer contributions.

Risks:

Jurisdictions must meet eligibility requirements to receive funding.

Related Projects:

Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program; Local Fair Share Program

Involved Agencies:

All local jurisdictions (cities and the County)

References:

2006 Long Range Transportation Plan;
Orange County Master Plan of Arterial Highways

P. Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program

Description:

This program targets over 2,000 signalized intersections across the County for coordinated operation. The goal is to improve the flow of traffic by developing and implementing regional signal coordination programs that cross jurisdictional boundaries. The goal is development of a coordinated signal system that is corridor based rather than just city or agency based.

Cost (2005 \$):

\$453.1 million

Status:

The development of a county-wide Signal Master Plan and local signal plans will be initiated by the end of 2007. Goal is to have call for projects by 2009.

Present Day:

Most traffic signal synchronization programs today are limited to segments of roads within individual cities or under the control of specific agencies, such as Caltrans agencies. For example, signals at intersections of freeways with arterial streets are controlled by Caltrans, while nearby signals at local street intersections are under the control of cities.

Benefits:

The projects in this program will maximize the effectiveness of the existing arterial system and will improve arterial corridor speeds. When completed, this project can increase the capacity of the street grid and reduce the delay by over six million hours annually.

Issues:

Some cities may be reluctant to give up local control of signals. Requires development of local signal synchronization plans and coordination with area traffic forums.

External Funding:

Local jurisdiction match equivalent to 20% of project costs is required to qualify for this program.

Risks:

Jurisdictions must meet eligibility requirements to receive funding. This includes a local signal synchronization plan and participation in traffic forums to resolve traffic operations issues with neighboring jurisdictions.

Related Projects:

Regional Capacity Program; Local Fair Share Program

Involved Agencies:

All local jurisdictions (cities and the County); Caltrans

References:

2006 Long Range Transportation Plan;
2006 Orange County Traffic Signal Coordination Program

Q. Local Fair Share Program

Description:

This element of the program will provide flexible funding to help cities and the County of Orange keep up with the rising cost of repairing the aging street system. In addition, cities can use these funds for other local transportation needs such as residential street projects, traffic and pedestrian safety near schools, signal priority for emergency vehicles, etc.

This program is intended to augment, rather than replace, existing transportation expenditures and therefore cities must meet specific eligibility requirements to receive the funds.

Cost (2005 \$):

\$2,039.1 million.

Status:

Initiate development of program procedures, guidelines and eligibility requirements by 2007.

Present Day:

This program is a continuation of the existing Measure M "turnback" program.

Benefits:

This program provides an augmentation to local general fund monies used for transportation purposes that will not be sufficient alone to maintain streets and improve local/residential streets.

Issues:

Eligibility requirements include local jurisdiction consistency with the MPAH, developer impact fees, Pavement Management Plan, Signal Synchronization Plan, participation in

traffic forums, compliance with CMP requirements and annual reporting of expenditures in addition to maintenance of effort requirements.

External Funding:

Local jurisdictions must maintain current general fund level of effort for transportation. Maintenance of effort to be increased annually to keep pace with inflation.

Risks:

Jurisdictions must meet eligibility requirements to receive funds.

Related Projects:

Regional Capacity Program; Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program

Involved Agencies:

All local jurisdictions (cities and the County)

References:

2006 Long Range Transportation Plan

RENEWED

Transit Programs

TRANSIT PROGRAM TIMELINE



R. High Frequency Metrolink Service

Description:

This project will increase rail services within the county and provide frequent Metrolink service north of Fullerton to Los Angeles. The project will provide for track improvements, more trains, and other related needs to accommodate the expanded service.

This project is designed to build on the successes of Metrolink and complement service expansion made possible by the current Measure M. The service will include 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.

The project also includes funding for improving grade crossings and constructing over or underpasses at high volume arterial streets that cross the Metrolink tracks.

Cost (2005 \$):

\$1,014.1 million

Status:

- Operations cost for service through 2041 is currently being developed
- Quiet Zone policy development underway
- Grade Separation prioritization to commence in 2007/08

Present Day:

Three Metrolink lines serve Orange County today, providing 44 daily trains

and carrying more than 3.5 million annual riders.

Benefits:

High frequency Metrolink service will allow for additional capacity parallel to I-5 (Orange County Line) and SR-91 (Inland Empire-Orange County Line and 91 Line). Frequent service 7 days per week, throughout the day will allow for more flexible home to work trips as well as other non-commuter hour trips.

Issues:

- Funding continued operation of Metrolink service developed and funded under Measure M1 must be a top priority.
- Coordination with Los Angeles and Riverside Counties on inter-county priorities.
- Relationship to goods movement policies.
- Role of Metrolink in South Orange County

External Funding:

State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ), and Federal New Starts funds are eligible for commuter rail capital improvements.

Risks:

Moderate risk associated with expansion on OCTA owned rail right-of-ways. Significantly more risk associated with Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad owned right-of-way.

Goods Movement related capacity and mitigation programs may impact service

expansion plans north and east of Fullerton.

Program Development:
2007-2010

Program Implementation:
2010 and beyond

Related Projects:
Metrolink Expansion Plan (Measure M1 funded)

Project "S" – Transit Extensions to Metrolink

Project "T" – Convert Metrolink Station(s) to Regional Gateways that connect Orange County with High-Speed Rail Systems.

Project "V" – Community Based Transit Circulators

California High Speed Rail Authority Project

Involved Agencies:
Metrolink, Caltrans, California High Speed Rail Authority, BNSF, Buena Park, Fullerton, Anaheim, Orange, Santa Ana, Tustin, Irvine, Laguna Niguel, Mission Viejo, San Juan Capistrano, Dana Point, San Clemente.

S. Transit Extensions to Metrolink

Description:

Frequent service in the Metrolink corridor provides a high capacity transit system linking communities within the central core of Orange County. This project will establish a competitive program for local jurisdictions to broaden the reach of the rail system to other activity centers and communities. Proposals for extensions must be developed and supported by local jurisdictions and will be evaluated against well-defined and well-known criteria as follows:

- Traffic congestion relief
- Project readiness, with priority given 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
- Compatible, approved land uses
- Safe and modern technology
- A sound, long-term operating plan

This project shall not be 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. The emphasis shall be 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. It is intended that multiple transit projects be funded through a competitive process and no single project may be awarded all of the funds under this program.

These connections may include a variety of transit technologies such as conventional bus, bus rapid transit or high capacity rail transit systems as long as they can be fully integrated and provide seamless transition for the users.

Cost (2005 \$):
\$1,000.0 million.

Status:

Step 1* of this program is underway with \$3.4 million in Measure M1 grants made available to cities to study options for connections to Metrolink.

Step 2* of this program is expected to begin in 2008. \$26.6 million in Measure M1 funds have been approved for Step 2.

*Go Local Program funded by M1.

Present Day:

Connections to and from Metrolink stations are provided by OCTA operated "Station link" bus service and OCTA operated fixed route bus service.

Benefits:

The goal of this program is to make Metrolink more convenient to more people in Orange County. The program also seeks to provide traffic congestion relief, and access to job and population centers.

The program is expected to build upon the baseline improvements provided

under the Measure M1 funded Metrolink Expansion Plan as well as Project "R", High Frequency Metrolink Service.

Individual project benefits will be established in Step 1 and 2 of the program.

Issues:

Coordination and consistency with Step 1 and Step 2 of the program funded under Measure M1.

Coordination with Metrolink Expansion Plan and Project "R"

Coordination with Project "V" – Community Based Transit Circulators

External Funding:

Potential capital funding from the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ), Federal New Starts funds and state bond funds (Proposition 116).

Risks:

Risk associated with 34 separate local transit plans and proposals.

Potential risk associated with selection of most promising projects.

Need to fully understand operating costs and plans of proposed systems.

Program Development:

Go Local Studies 2006-2009

Program Development 2007-2009

Program Implementation:

2010 and beyond

Related Projects:

Metrolink Expansion Plan (Measure M 1 funded)

Project "R" – High Frequency Metrolink Service

Project "T" – Convert Metrolink Station(s) to Regional Gateways that connect Orange County with High-Speed Rail Systems.

Project "V" – Community Based Transit Circulators

California High Speed Rail Authority Project

Involved Agencies:

All Orange County cities, Federal Transit Administration, Caltrans, California Transportation Commission

T. Convert Metrolink Station(s) to Regional Gateways that Connect Orange County with High-Speed Rail Systems

Description:

This program will provide the local improvements that are necessary to connect planned future high-speed rail systems to stations on the Orange County Metrolink route.

The State of California is currently planning a high-speed rail system linking northern and southern California. One line is planned to terminate in Orange County. In addition, several magnetic levitation (MAGLEV) systems that would connect Orange County to Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties, including a link from Anaheim to Ontario airport, are also being planned or proposed by other agencies.

Cost (2005 \$):

\$226.6 million.

Status:

The California High Speed Rail Authority (CAHSRA) is currently in the project level Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement phase of a planned high-speed rail system that will connect Southern California to the San Francisco Bay Area and Sacramento.

The CAHSRA and OCTA have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding that provides \$7 million in Measure M1 funds towards this effort. The Los Angeles to Orange County segment is anticipated to follow the existing Metrolink alignment and terminate in Anaheim.

OCTA has recently purchased 13.5 acres in the City of Anaheim next to the railroad right-of-way. This site is planned for future transportation use as the Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center (ARTIC). Preliminary planning is currently underway for this site.

Present Day:

Currently there are not any high-speed rail systems operating in California. Existing rail service consists of Metrolink and Amtrak.

Benefits:

When high-speed rail systems develop, Orange County will need a gateway station or stations so that residents of Orange County will have convenient access. Future connections will be made by Metrolink, Amtrak, local bus, and automobile. The high-speed rail system(s) is planned to relieve freeway congestion, airport congestion and allow for fast, frequent service throughout the state.

Issues:

Coordination with Metrolink Expansion Plan and Project "R"

Coordination with Project "V" – Community Based Transit Circulators

External Funding:

Potential funding from the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ), and Federal New Starts funds.

Risks:

Coordination with multiple agencies,
many outside the County.

Long term operating costs of facilities.

Program Development:

2007-2009

Program Implementation:

2010 and beyond

Related Projects:

Metrolink Expansion Plan (Measure M 1
funded)

Project "R" – High Frequency Metrolink
Service

Project "S" – Transit Extensions to
Metrolink

Project "V" – Community Based Transit
Circulators

California High Speed Rail Authority
Project

Involved Agencies:

All Orange County cities, Federal
Transit Administration, Caltrans,
California Transportation Commission

U. Expand Mobility Choices for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities

Description:

This project will provide services and programs to meet the growing transportation needs of seniors and persons with disabilities as follows:

- One percent of net revenues will stabilize fares and provide fare discounts for bus services, specialized ACCESS services and future rail services
- One percent of net revenues will be available to continue and expand local community van service for seniors through the existing Senior Mobility Program
- One percent will supplement existing countywide senior non-emergency medical transportation services
- Over the next 30 years, the population age 65 and over is projected to increase by 93 percent. Demand for transit and specialized transportation services for seniors and persons with disabilities is expected to increase proportionately.

Cost (2005 \$):
\$339.8 million.

Status:
Program Development Needed

Present Day:
A similar program currently exists under Measure M 1 (elderly and handicapped fare stabilization). The Senior Mobility Program and non-emergency medical

transportation services currently exist as well.

Benefits:

This program is expected to provide assistance to seniors and persons with disabilities through fare discounts, a senior mobility van program, and senior non-emergency transportation services. Can divert trips from more expensive ACCESS paratransit services.

External Funding:
None

Risks:
Future demand for senior and disabled transportation could exceed program revenues

Program Development:
2010-2011

Program Implementation:
2011 and beyond

Related Projects:
Measure M 1 program for elderly and handicapped fare stabilization

OCTA Senior Mobility Program

County of Orange non-emergency medical transportation

Metrolink Expansion Plan (Measure M 1 funded)

Project "R" – High Frequency Metrolink Service

Project "S" – Transit Extensions to Metrolink

Project "V" – Community Based Transit
Circulators

Involved Agencies:

All Orange County cities, Federal
Transit Administration, Local Agencies

V. Community Based Transit/Circulators

Description:

This project will establish a competitive program for local jurisdictions to develop local bus transit services such as community based circulators, shuttles and bus trolleys that complement regional bus and rail services, and meet needs in areas not adequately served by regional transit. Projects will need to meet performance criteria for ridership, connection to bus and rail services, and financial viability to be considered for funding. All projects must be competitively bid, and they cannot duplicate or compete with existing transit services.

Cost (2005 \$):

\$226.5 million

Status:

Program Development Needed

Present Day:

Some Orange County cities have studied and / or expressed interest in the development of local transit circulators. About half of the cities operate local senior mobility services.

Benefits:

This program is expected to provide local access to activity and employment centers. Reductions in localized traffic congestion is an anticipated benefit.

External Funding:

Potential Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds.

Risks:

Moderate – associated with ridership and operating costs forecasting.

Program Development:

2008-2010

Program Implementation:

2011 and beyond

Related Projects:

Metrolink Expansion Plan (Measure M 1 funded)

Planned Bus Rapid Transit Program

Project "R" – High Frequency Metrolink Service

Project "S" – Transit Extensions to Metrolink

Involved Agencies:

All Orange County cities, Federal Transit Administration

W. Safe Transit Stops

Description:

This project provides for passenger amenities at 100 of the busiest transit stops across the County. The stops will be designed to ease transfer between bus lines and provide passenger amenities such as improved shelters, lighting, current information on bus and train timetables and arrival times, and transit ticket vending machines.

Cost (2005 \$):

\$25 million

Status:

Program Development Needed

Present Day:

The Bus Stop Accessibility Program (BSAP) is nearing completion (2007). 6,500 bus stops were enhanced through this program.

Benefits:

This program is expected to provide significantly enhanced transit stops at the most heavily used transit stops in the OCTA system. A focus will be placed on intermodal connections, transfers and integration with the planned Bus Rapid Transit program.

External Funding:

Potential Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds.

Risks:

Low risk associated with this program. Some risk associated with potential local right-of-way needs for enhanced transit stops.

Program Development:

2009-2010

Program Implementation:

2010 and beyond

Related Projects:

Metrolink Expansion Plan (Measure M 1 funded)

Planned Bus Rapid Transit Program

Project "R" – High Frequency Metrolink Service

Project "S" – Transit Extensions to Metrolink

Involved Agencies:


All Orange County cities, Federal Transit Administration



RENEWED

Environmental Cleanup

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM TIMELINE



Freeway Mitigation Master Agreement

Description:

Subject to a Master Agreement negotiated between OCTA and federal and state resource agencies, provide for high-value environmental benefits such as habitat protection and resource preservation, in exchange for streamlined project approvals for the freeway program as a whole.

Cost:

A minimum of 5 percent of total Freeway expenditures (\$243.5 million)

Status:

Renewed Measure M Ordinance #3 calls for development of the Master Agreement "as soon as practicable" following approval by the voters. Negotiations can commence upon Board of Directors authorization of an Early Action Plan.

Benefits:

The project has the potential to minimize or reduce regulatory delays in the implementation of freeway projects and to result in greater environmental benefits than could be achieved through traditional project-by-project mitigation.

Issues:

The Board must appoint a Mitigation and Resource Protection Program Oversight Committee. An application and selection process will be needed. Freeway impacts and mitigation opportunities must be inventoried and assessed, in some cases prior to completion of environmental documents. Resource agencies will need to make commitments in advance of permit issuance.

External Funding:

Potential for matching funds from state bonds.

Risks:

Over time, mitigation opportunities can be lost and costs can increase. Competing conservation/mitigation priorities may make reaching agreement more difficult. Resource agencies may have difficulty making necessary commitments.

Related Projects:

Can benefit all freeway projects. Some mitigation opportunities may mesh with those under Project X – Environmental Cleanup funds for road runoff.

Involved Agencies:

Caltrans, Corps of Engineers, Fish and Wildlife, Fish and Game, FHWA

References:

Renewed Measure M Transportation Investment Plan
Orange County Local Transportation Authority Ordinance No. 3

X. Environmental Cleanup

Description:

Competitive grant process designed to clean up highway and street runoff and to supplement current road runoff efforts. Program will help local agencies meet Clean Water Act standards.

Cost:

\$ 237.2 million

Status:

Work is underway by local agencies to develop scope/cost to meet standards. Program policies and guidelines must be developed.

Benefits:

The program enables larger-scale, high impact projects. Early implementation could result in more benefits at lower cost. Funds may be used for water quality improvements related to both existing and new transportation infrastructure.

Issues:

The OCTA Board must appoint an Allocation Committee. Allocation committee will recommend a competitive grant process for the allocation of environmental cleanup revenues. The recommended process should give priority to cost-effective projects and programs that offer opportunities to leverage other funds. An application and selection process will be needed to fill the Allocation Committee.

External Funding:

Matching requirements can leverage other funds.

Risks:

Projects and programs that are recommended for funding may not be equitably distributed geographically. Potential for conflicting geographic and jurisdictional interests. Water quality standards and best practices can change rapidly.

Related Projects:

Existing and new transportation infrastructure may benefit from this program. May also work with Freeway Mitigation Master Agreement.

Involved Agencies:

County, cities, Caltrans, Regional Water Quality Control Boards, scientific/academia, private/non-profit.

References:

Renewed Measure M Transportation Investment Plan
Orange County Local Transportation Authority Ordinance No. 3

SR-22/405/605 HOV Connectors

Project Description:

This project proposes to construct direct HOV connectors from SR-22 to I-405 (between Seal Beach Blvd. and Valley View St.) and from I-405 to I-605 (between Katella Ave. and Seal Beach Blvd.) with a second HOV lane in each direction on I-405 between the two direct connectors. This project is Phase II of the SR-22/WOCC widening project. Phase I added an HOV on SR-22 between Glassell Avenue in the City of Orange and Valley View Street in the City of Garden Grove, plus auxiliary lanes between SR-55 and Valley View Street.

Corridor Description:

State Route 22 (SR-22) is an east-west transportation corridor that provides connections to five major Interstate 5, 405 and 605, and State Routes 55 and 57 and that crosses most of the major north-south arterial corridors in Central Orange County.


Funding:

Total project Cost:	\$400,000
CMIA Funds Recommended:	\$200,000
Local Match:	\$200,000

Project Schedule:

Ready for advertisement:	Mid 2009
Construction award:	Early 2010
Construction complete:	Mid 2012

Project Map:



SR-57 NB Widen from SR-91 to Lambert Road

Project Description:

This project will add one general purpose lane on NB SR-57 from the SR-91 to Lambert Road for a total length of 5.1 miles. This segment of the freeway experiences heavy traffic congestion in the NB direction, particularly in the PM peak period.

Corridor Description:

SR-57 is the principal corridor connecting central Orange County to eastern Los Angeles County and western San Bernardino County. This freeway serves both as the primary commuter route between these areas as well as a major goods movement corridor. SR-57 provides a north-south connection between I-5 in the south and I-10 and I-210 to the north.


Funding:

Total project Cost:	\$140,000
CMIA Funds Recommended:	\$70,000
Local Match:	\$70,000

Project Schedule:

Ready for advertisement:	Early 2010
Construction award:	Mid 2010
Construction complete:	Mid 2014

Project Map:



**Summary of CTC
CMIA Recommendations**

Freeway Corridor	Project Title	Total Project Cost	CMIA Requested	Approved CMIA Share	Local Share	Local Share Source	Estimated Construction Start
(\$1,000's)							
Recommended for Funding							
I-405/I-605/SR-22	HOV Connectors 405/22 & 405/605, 2nd HOV lane on I-405 from SR-22 to I-605	400,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	Federal Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality Funds	March 2010
SR-91	Eastbound lane from SR-241 to SR-71	80,500	73,800	71,440	9,060	Riverside County Transportation Commission and Toll Revenues	August 2009
SR-91	Add 1 lane each direction from SR-55 to Gypsum Canyon Road	96,000	48,000	22,000	74,000	State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)	February 2012
SR-57	Northbound lanes from Katella to SR-91 Connector	41,000	20,086	20,086	20,914	1990 Measure M Fwy Program Savings	May 2011
SR-57	Northbound lanes from Orangethorpe to Lambert	140,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	1990 Measure M Fwy Program Savings	June 2010
	TOTAL	757,500	411,886	383,526	373,974		

**Garden Grove Freeway (State Route 22) from State Route 55 to Valley View Street
Interstate 605 including West County Connection improvements**

Description:

State Route 22 is the last major freeway in Orange County slated for Measure M-funded improvements. In 2000, over 174,000 vehicles a day traveled on this freeway and forecasts show demand increasing to over 212,000 daily. At the west end, SR-22 connects with Interstate 405 and Interstate 605 - "West County Connection." This freeway segment carries over 430,000 cars today and future demand is projected to reach 526,000. Plans call for the addition of carpool lanes in each direction along with auxiliary lanes, freeway-to-freeway carpool connectors, interchange improvements, and environmental mitigation.

Costs:

The Measure M contribution for this project shall not exceed \$243.303 million in 1988 dollars. These funds will leverage existing Federal, State, and Local sources that are providing over \$235 million for improvements. In 2007, an additional \$400 million of new state and federal funds were made available to the West County Connection.

Implementation:

Design of the project will begin immediately. Construction is targeted to begin by 2004. Sales Tax revenues would be used to augment funding from other sources. Design of the West County Connection improvements will begin in 2007 and construction is scheduled to begin on 2009.

References:

State Route 22/West County Connection Project Report, Caltrans, March 2003.

Orange Freeway (SR 57) from the Los Angeles County Line to Interstate 5

Description:

The 20-Year Master Plan for Transportation Improvements calls for the addition of one carpool lane in each direction to the Orange Freeway for its entire length within Orange County. This covers a distance of about 12 miles. In addition, soundwalls and other environmental amenities will be added. In 1988, this freeway carried over 210,000 vehicles per day and forecasts estimate this demand to grow to over 280,000 daily. Los Angeles County plans for additional lanes that extend the improvements north to Route 60 in Diamond Bar.

The 2007 Renewed Measure M Transportation Investment Plan lists additional improvements for this corridor under "Project G - Orange Freeway Improvements." Use of available Measure M funds will enable Orange County to leverage state funds and deliver the improvements earlier.

Costs:

The 1988 capital cost estimate for this improvement is \$22 million. The cost of pre construction work on early action Renewed Measure M improvements on the Orange Freeway is \$13 million (in 1988 dollars).

Implementation:

The current schedule slates the Orange Freeway improvements for the first five-year period of the plan. Design of the early action Orange Freeway improvements will begin in 2007 and construction is scheduled to begin in 2010.

References:

1. Renewed Measure M Transportation Investment Plan, July 2006
2. Renewed Measure M Early Action Plan, Draft Report, Orange County Transportation Authority, July 16, 2007

Project Description	June 2007	1988 Dollars
I-5 between I-405 (San Diego Fwy) and I-605 (San Gabriel Fwy)	\$ 1,022,179	\$ 734,198
I-5 between I-5/I-405 Interchange and San Clemente	72,396	52,000
I-5/I-405 Interchange	91,888	66,000
S.R. 55 (Costa Mesa Fwy) between I-5 and S.R. 91 (Riverside Fwy)	61,258	44,000
S.R. 57 (Orange Fwy) between I-5 and Lambert Road	52,629	37,802
S.R. 91 (Riverside Fwy) between Riverside Co. line & Los Angeles Co. line	132,263	95,000
S.R. 22 (Garden Grove Fwy) between S.R. 55 and Valley View St.	412,103	296,000
	\$ 1,844,716	\$ 1,325,000