AGENDA

Technical Advisory Committee

Committee Members
Ken Rosenfield, Chair
Tom Wheeler, Vice-Chair
Nasser Abbaszadeh, City of Laguna Niguel
George Alvarez, City of San Juan Capistrano
Vacant, City of Buena Park
Khalid Bazmi, County of Orange
Michael Belknap, City of La Palma
Mark Chagnon, City of Mission Viejo
Bill Cameron, City of San Clemente
Stephanie Camorlinga, City of Stanton
Doug Dancs, City of Cypress
Joe DeFrancesco, City of Orange
Luis Estevez, City of Placentia
Brad Fowler, City of Dana Point
William Galvez, City of Santa Ana
Manuel Gomez, City of Irvine
Travis Hopkins, City of Huntington Beach
Don Hoppe, City of Fullerton
Dave Hunt, City of Los Alamitos
Michael Ho, City of Seal Beach
Akram Hindiyeh, City of Villa Park
Chris Johansen, City of La Habra
Mark Lewis, City of Fountain Valley
Raul Lising, City of Brea
E. Maximous, City of Rancho Santa Margarita
Vacant, City of Anaheim
Ernesto Munoz, City of Costa Mesa
William Murray, City of Garden Grove
Shaun Pelletier, City of Aliso Viejo
Vacant, City of Laguna Woods
Doug Stack, City of Tustin
Christina Templeton, City of Laguna Beach
David Webb, City of Newport Beach
Rick Yee, City of Yorba Linda
Marwan Youssef, City of Westminster

Orange County Transportation Authority
600 South Main Street, Room 103/104
Orange, California
May 25, 2016 1:30 p.m.

Any person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in this meeting should contact the Measure M2 Local Programs section, telephone (714) 560-5673, no less than two (2) business days prior to this meeting to enable OCTA to make reasonable arrangements to assure accessibility to this meeting.

Agenda descriptions are intended to give members of the public a general summary of items of business to be transacted or discussed. The posting of the recommended actions does not indicate what action will be taken. The Committee may take any action which it deems

to be appropriate on the agenda item and is not limited in any way by the notice of the recommended action.

All documents relative to the items referenced in this agenda are available for public inspection at www.octa.net or through the Measure M2 Local Programs office at the OCTA Headquarters, 600 South Main Street, Orange, California.

Call to Order and Self Introductions

Consent Calendar Items

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

1. **Approval of April 27, 2016 Technical Advisory Committee Minutes** – pg. 5

Discussion Items

2. **Measure M2 Sales Tax Forecast**
   Kurt Brotcke, Sean Murdock

   Overview

   Staff will provide an update on recent changes to the sales tax forecasting methodologies.

3. **Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Guidelines Modifications** – pg. 11
   Sam Kaur

   Overview

   Measure M2 allocates net revenues for the development of various competitive programs which will provide funding for local streets and roads, environmental cleanup, and transit projects. These programs include the Regional Capacity Program (Project O), the Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (Project P), the Environmental Cleanup Program (Project X), the Community Based Transit Circulators (Project V), and Safe Transit Stops (Project W). OCTA staff will be updating the guidelines for Project O and Project P to facilitate the administration of the next call for projects. This staff report provides another opportunity to discuss policy issues that emerged out of the 2016 call for projects for RCP and RTSSP programs and discussions at the committee meeting held in April 2016.

Regular Items

4. Proposed 2016 Technical Steering Committee Membership
pg. 15
Sam Kaur

Overview

The Orange County Transportation Authority Technical Advisory Committee provides feedback and input on many local streets and roads related items and relies on the Technical Steering Committee to provide guidance on major technical issues. Technical Steering Committee members serve two-year terms, with the exception of one-year terms for the chairman and vice-chairman. This year, two positions became available, as Mr. James Biery and Ms. Natalie Meeks retired. Presented is the 2016 roster for review and approval to fill the positions from District 4 and At-Large members.

Recommendation

Approve the proposed 2016 Technical Steering Committee membership roster.

5. 2016 Measure M2 Community-Based Transit Circulators (Project V) Call for Projects Programming Recommendations for Capital and Planning Grants –
pg. 17
Sam Kaur

Overview

The Orange County Transportation Authority issued the 2016 Measure M2 Project V call for projects for Community-Based Transit Circulators in November 2015. Applications have been received and scored consistent with the Project V Guidelines. Projects recommended for funding are presented for review and approval.

Recommendation

A. Recommend for the Board of Directors approval the programming recommendations for Project V funding, in an amount not-to-exceed $26,711,659, plus inflationary adjustments for 17 local agency projects submitted under the capital and operating reserve categories.

B. Recommend for the Board of Directors approval the programming recommendations for Project V funding, in an amount not-to-exceed $323,780, for seven local agency projects submitted under the planning category.

6. Correspondence

OCTA Board Items of Interest

- Monday, May 9, 2016
  http://atb.octa.net/AgendaPDF/4419.pdf
  Item 9: Freeway Retrofit Soundwall Program Update
  Item 10: Regional Planning Update
  Item 23: Measure M2 Eligibility Review Recommendation for Fiscal Year 2014-15 Expenditure Reports
  Item 24: Contract Amendments for On-Call Traffic Engineering Services

Announcements by Email

- SSARP Phase 2 Call and HSIP Cycle 8 Webinar – *sent May 10, 2016*
- May 11, 2016 Technical Steering Committee Meeting NOTICE – *sent May 11, 2016*
- NEW RSVP Link: Attend the ATP Cycle 3 Workshop – *sent May 11, 2016*

7. Committee Comments

8. Local Assistance Update

9. Staff Comments

10. Items for Future Agendas

11. Public Comments

12. Adjournment

The next regularly scheduled meeting of this Committee will be held at 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, June 22, 2016, at the OCTA Headquarters.

MINUTES
Technical Advisory Committee
April 27, 2016

Voting Representatives Present:		Guests Present:
Shawn Pelletier	*City of Aliso Viejo*	*Doug Anderson, City of Tustin*
Natalie Meeks	*City of Anaheim*	*Rudi Emami, City of Anaheim*
Steve Kooyman	*City of Brea*	*Juanita Martinez, Nicols Consulting Group*
	City of Buena Park	*Paul Rodriguez, Rodriguez Consulting*
Raja Sethuraman	*City of Costa Mesa*	*Armando Salis, City of Stanton*
	City of Cypress	*Jean Thomas, City of Santa Ana*
	County of Orange	
Brad Fowler	*City of Dana Point*	
Mark Lewis	*City of Fountain Valley*	
Don Hoppe	*City of Fullerton*	
Dan Candelaria	*City of Garden Grove*	
Tom Herbel	*City of Huntington Beach*	
Manuel Gomez	*City of Irvine*	
Chris Johansen	*City of La Habra*	
Kanwal Singh	*City of La Palma*	
	City of Laguna Beach	
Ken Rosenfield	*City of Laguna Hills*	**Staff Present:**
Nasser Abbaszadeh	*City of Laguna Niguel*	*Kurt Brotcke*
	City of Laguna Woods	*Sam Kaur*
	City of Lake Forest	*Adriann Cardoso*
	City of Los Alamitos	*May Hout*
	City of Mission Viejo	*Richard Bacigualpo*
Mark Vukojevic	*City of Newport Beach*	*Ben Ku*
Frank Sun	*City of Orange*	*Dave Simpson*
	City of Placentia	*Kameron Altar*
E. Maximous	*City of Rancho Santa Margarita*	
Tom Frank	*City of San Clemente*	
	City of San Juan Capistrano	
William Galvez	*City of Santa Ana*	
	City of Seal Beach	
	City of Stanton	
	City of Tustin	
	City of Villa Park	
Marwan Youssef	*City of Westminster*	
Michael Wolfe	*City of Yorba Linda*	
Jim Kaufman	*Caltrans*	

MINUTES
Technical Advisory Committee
April 27, 2016

Meeting was called to order by Mr. Ken Rosenfield at 1:30 p.m.

Self-Introductions

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS

1. **Approval of Minutes for February 24, 2016** *(Gomez/Meeks)*

2. **2016 Grant Funding Opportunities** *(Gomez/Meeks)*

REGULAR ITEMS

Mr. Rosenfield informed the committee that Ms. Sam Kaur requested that agenda item 5 be moved to before items 3 and 4.

3. **March 2016 Semi-Annual Review**

   Ms. Kaur provided background for the semi-annual review process and highlited the Local Fair Share timely-use of funds extensions process that was included through the semi-annual review. Ms. Kaur stated that the March 2016 semi-annual review was launched in February 2016 to allow for additional time as requested by local agencies. Ms. Kaur stated that the project updates and local agency requests were reviewed, and recommended for approval as identified in Attachment A and described in Attachment B. Ms. Kaur reminded the committee that transfer requests must be submitted prior to filing close-out for the previous phase.

   Mr. Sethuraman inquired about the placement of monies from project cancellations, and asked if those monies go to the next call for projects.

   Mr. Brotcke stated that the monies from project cancellations are considered in the revenue forecast, and that the placement of those monies are dependent upon what the revenue forecast is for the next and subsequent call for projects. Mr. Brotcke reminded the committee that the forecasting methodology was recently revised, and stated that OCTA staff is working on a new forecast for the 2017 call for projects, concluding that the projects cancelled in the March 2016 Semi-Annual Review will be considered in the forecast for the 2017 call for projects.

   Mr. Gomez requested clarification on the difference between a delay request and in timely-use of funds extension.

   Ms. Kaur explained the delay request in accordance with the procedures identified in the CTFP Guidelines providing the example that if an agency is not able to award the primary contract within the same fiscal year as the CTFP funds are programmed then agency can request to delay the funds upto 24 months and OCTA will move the programming of the funds to the requested fiscal year. Ms. Kaur explained timely-use of funds extension in accordance with the procedures identified in the CTFP Guidelines clarifying that agencies have up to 36 months from the contract award date to expend Mesaure M2 funds and complete the project. If more time is needed, then agency can request timely-use of funds extension of upto 24 months to expend the funds and complete the project.

Mr. Gomez referred to the timely-use of funds extenstion requests in Attachment A and confirmed that the listed projects have been awarded. Mr. Gomez inquiried if the monies awarded have been spent.

Ms. Kaur clarified that it is not until a final payment request has been submitted to OCTA and at that time actual expenditures can be determined.

Mr. Vukojevic asked that if an agency requests a delay of 24 months however can award within 12 months instead of 24 months, if there is an easier process to advance projects instead of waiting for another semi-annual review.

Ms. Kaur clarified that if an agnecy requested a delay request for up to 24 months, and was able to award the contract within 12 months, then it is not an advance and will not need to be processed through semi-annual review. Local agency can notify OCTA staff that they were able to award the contract early. Ms. Kaur differentiated that if it was the agency's initial allocation and project was programmed in the outer years and is ready to award early then OCTA will need to process advance through the semi-annaul review. Ms. Kaur concluded that this keeps the incentive for agencies to deliver early.

There was no further discussion.

The committee approved the proposed adjustments to the Comprehensive Transportation Funding Program project allocations. (Gomez/Meeks)

DISCUSSION ITEMS

4. Fixing America's Surface Transportation ACT

Mr. Ku presented the item which comprised of the core programs of the 2015 ACT, expected apportionments, and the differences in implementation from the previous MAP-21 legislation. Mr. Ku highlited that while MAP-21 provided programming capacity on a short-term basis, the FAST Act will fund projects for 5 years, from fiscal year 15/16 to 19/20. Mr. Ku provided a break down of $305 billion, notating that there are two portions of OCTA's interest. The Federal Highway Administration (FHA) which receives $226.3 billion, and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) which receives $61.1 billion. Mr. Ku notated further that when those funds get broken down, it is shown that about $207.4 billion can go towards apportioned programs. Mr. Ku provided a break down of the $207.4 billion and presented California's portion of $19 billion. Mr. Ku went over the National Highway Performance Program (NHPP), Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) previously known as Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), Transportation Altervatives, Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program (CMAQ), National Highway Freight Program, National Significant Freight and Highway Projects, Tolling/HOV, and The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Delegation.

Mr. Bacigalupo confirmed that the FAST Act is a needed legislation and one that could be relied on in particular for the extended projects. Mr. Bacigalupo continued coverage with regard to the FTA portion stating that the entire transit program will grow from $8.5 billion in 2015 to $10.1 billion in 2020. Mr. Bacigalupo stated that more importantly with regard to MAP-21 and with the redistribution of funds from the Bus to the transit side called State of Good Repair which OCTA did not benefit from. Now with OCTA's efforts in Washington a Bus Discrectionary program was added which is a competitive program and OCTA will be eligibel to apply. Mr. Bacigalupo noted that these funds can be used for a

much borader purposes. Mr. Bacigalupo went over the ideas for discussion that OCTA will go over with the state on the application for a waiver on the degradation imrpovement under the FAST Act.

Mr. Rosenfield asked if the California Transportation Commission (CTC) would be implementing the rules for the new program.

Ms. Cardoso explained that in the past there has been a traditional 60/40 split between the state and local agencies. Sixty percent of the funds go to state programs, and forty percent of the funds go out to local agencies through local assistance proagrams. Caltrans has indicated that they believe this 60/40 split can be mainatained. There is a proposed legislation specific to the forumula for the National Highway Freight Program. Regional Agencies may be in support of a formula that would distribute the funds out to regions the same way that the Trade Corridors Improvement Fund (TCIF) were distributed. Regions are asking Caltrans to keep the formula program for the National Highway Freight Program out of the 60/40 split because it complicates everying else that falls under the program. Ms. Cardoso clarified that only ten percent of the funds can be used toward port or grade separation, so ninety percent of the funds are assumed to be used on the state and highway system, therefore the 90/10 split on the surface looks like more RSTP funds would be available

Mr. Abbaszadeh inquired about the NEPA delegation and if a pilot program is expected.

Ms. Cardoso stated that a cooperative committee at the state level is working on that program and to establish a process to deploy it.

There was no further discussion.

The item was received and filed by the committee.

5. Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Guidelines Modifications

Mr. Rosenfield explained to the committee that input on the item has been requested from staff.

Mr. Brotcke reviewed the issues that came up during the last call for projects including; program balance, project readiness and delivery, and technical concerns. Mr. Brotcke encouraged the committee to keep the goal of the program in mind as they reccommended modifications. Mr. Brotcke encouraged the committee to review the alternative level of service (LOS) concern that was brought before the committee at a previous meeting and have a solution that is anchored in standard practice.

Ms. Kaur expalined the potential options to help OCTA manage the call for projects and local agencies to deliver current and future CTFP committements. Ms. Kaur explained that potentional options include project level caps as it realtes to the scale of the program, project readiness to assure timely delivery of the Mesaure M dollars, project delivery to address local agnecies concerns of limited resources and removal or clarification of the alternative methodology to determine level of service.

Mr. Rosenfield opened the floor to comments on the proposed modifications. Mr. Rosenfield started the discussion by stating there was support made in the past in regards to the alternative LOS and suggested convening a working group to work on a solution.

Mr. Galvez speaking to project level caps reminded the committee that right-of-way (ROW) is expensive and if project level funding caps are going to be considered it may rule out larger projects that may have the regional impact.

Mr. Gomez cautioned the committee from reacting to issues from one call for projects, and instead encouraged the committee to wait for one more cycle to get a better idea of the modifications that can be made to address all concerns and issues.

Mr. Rosenfield stated that a funding percentage may be an alternative to a funding cap.

Mr. Lewis expressed concern over phased arterial projects that only receive funding for some phases and not other phases.

Ms. Kaur clarified that current CTFP guidelines address limits under the Intersection Capacity Enhacements (ICE) category explaining that an angecy can include improvements up to 600' from the center of the intersection. Ms. Kaur stated that OCTA does not currently have any limits identified under the Arterial Capacity Enhacmenets (ACE) category . Ms. Kaur stated that this options can help to split large scale ACE and ICE projects into two applications and provide for a better methodology to measure project cost effectiveness and related benefits.

Ms. Meeks announced that she needed to leave the meeting. Ms. Meeks thanked the committee for their continued work and explained that this was her last time sitting on the Technical Advisory Committee since she is retiring next month.

Mr. Rosenfield thanked Ms. Meeks for her contributions to the committee and the county as a whole.

Mr. Gomez stated that additional information needs to be included in the guidelines regarding the lifespan of environmental documents. Mr. Gomez emphasized the importance of timing for application cycles, if local agencies are required to have a local match, they need enough time to build that into the yearly budget.

Mr. Emami inquired about applying for different phases for funding because construction and ROW phases can overlap.

Ms. Kaur reminded the committee that the M2 ordinance is very specific about funding time frames to ensure project delivery.

Mr. Rosenfield suggested that a working group be tasked with reviewing the issues around the alternative methodology for LOS.

Mr. Brotcke stated that an email can be sent to the local agencies requesting volunteers, and that staff will bring back the guideline modifications to the committee after that time. Mr. Brotcke informed the committee that the current schedule shows an August 2016 release for the next call for projects.

There was no further discussion.

The item was received and filed by the committee.

6. Correspondence

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

7. Committee Comments

8. Local Assistance Update

- Mr. Kaufman informed the committee that Cycle 1 for the Systemic Saftey Analysis Report Program (SSARP) is closed but funded projects are yet to be announced. Cycle 2 applications are due May 27, 2016, and any applications that were not approved in Cycle 1 would be automatically rolled into Cycle 2. Cycle 8 of the HSIP is expected to open in May 2016 with approximetly $150 million funding available statewide. Cycle 1 of ATP is coming to an end, with the June CTC meeting the deadline for funding requests. Cycle 2 is starting up shortly after.

9. Staff Comments

- Mr. Brotcke reminded the committee of vacancies on the Technical Steering Committee.

10. Items for Future Agendas

11. Public Comments

No Public Comments.

12. Adjournment at 3:06 p.m.

OCTA

May 25, 2016

To: Technical Advisory Committee

From: Orange County Transportation Authority Staff

Subject: Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Guidelines Modifications

Overview

Measure M2 allocates net revenues for the development of various competitive programs which will provide funding for local streets and roads, environmental cleanup, and transit projects. These programs include the Regional Capacity Program (Project O), the Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (Project P), the Environmental Cleanup Program (Project X), the Community Based Transit Circulators (Project V), and Safe Transit Stops (Project W). OCTA staff will be updating the guidelines for Project O and Project P to facilitate the administration of the next call for projects. This staff report provides another opportunity to discuss policy issues that emerged out of the 2016 call for projects for RCP and RTSSP programs and discussions at the committee meeting held in April 2016.

Recommendation

Discuss modifications to the 2017 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs guidelines.

Background

The Regional Capacity Program (RCP) provides funding for improvements to 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. The Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (RTSSP) provides funding for multi-agency, corridor-based signal synchronization throughout Orange County. These programs allocate funds through a competitive process and target projects that improve traffic by considering factors such as degree of congestion relief, cost effectiveness, and project readiness. The Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs (CTFP) serves as the mechanism the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) uses to administer the RCP and RTSSP, as well as the competitive

transit (Projects S, T, and V) and environmental cleanup programs (Project X). The CTFP guidelines provide the procedures necessary for Orange County agencies to apply for funding and seek reimbursement for projects following award of funds. These guidelines were originally approved by the OCTA Board of Directors (Board) on March 22, 2010, and were most recently updated and approved in August 2015.

Discussion

The CTFP guidelines originally approved by the OCTA Board in 2010 included the provision to modify and adjust the guidelines as needed. Some of the policy issues that emerged from the 2016 Call for Projects were discussed with the committee at the April Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting. After the initial discussion and considering the feedback received from TAC members, staff is proposing modifications to the guidelines for 2017 call.

The primary areas of discussion under the policy level issues include Project Level Caps, Project Readiness, Payments for Right-of-Way (R/W) Phase and Alternative Methodologies for Level of Service (LOS).

1. *Project Level Caps:* Based on the discussion from April TAC meeting, modifications at this time will not include a cap for the R/W or construction, as suggested by some TAC members. Staff is proposing to split the RCP program into small and large projects category. The program will have a 60-40 split with the 60% of the funds set aside for CTFP requests less than or equal to $2 million and 40% of the funds set aside for CTFP requests above $2 million. The small and large dollar request amount and split percentage is based on the number and magnitude of projects currently funded through the CTFP. Should the funds remain in a category after initial recommendations, these funds can be moved to the other category for eligible projects.

2. *Project Readiness:* In order to apply for R/W and/or construction phase, a project must have all project level environmental clearances including California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) clearance (NEPA is only applicable to federally funded projects).

3. *Payments for Right-of-Way Phase:* Local agencies can request initial payments for ROW after having a signed ROW agreement with the

property owners and/or City Council adoption of the Resolution of Condemnation as applicable.

4. *Alternative Methodology for Level of Service (LOS):* OCTA staff sent out an email asking volunteers to serve on the working group to discuss the alternate methodologies for determining LOS or clearly define specific alternative methodologies, consistent with the traffic engineering practices. Working group recommendations may be incorporated into the guidelines as appropriate.

Next Steps

OCTA staff is currently working on updating the guidelines and will provide draft guidelines to the TSC and TAC in July 2016 for review and approval. The Draft guidelines will include changes based on the discussions today and additional changes as needed for clarification and administrative purpose.

Summary

The CTFP serves as the mechanism OCTA uses to administer the RCP and RTSSP. In anticipation of the 2017 annual call for projects, staff is discussing potential modifications to the guidelines.

Proposed 2016 Technical Steering Committee Membership List						
NAME	**AGENCY**	**2014* POPULATION**	**MEDIAN POPULATION SIZE**	**DISTRICT**	**NORTH/ SOUTH**	**SEAT EXPIRES**
Ken Rosenfield	Laguna Hills	30,994	Small	Chair	South	December 31, 2016
Tom Wheeler	Lake Forest	80,070	Large	Vice-Chair	South	December 31, 2016
Marwan Youssef	Westminster	92,106	Large	1	North	December 31, 2017
Mark Lewis	Fountain Valley	57,201	Small	2	North	December 31, 2016
Manuel Gomez	Irvine	250,384	Large	3	South	December 31, 2017
Don Hoppe	***Fullerton***	***141,407***	***Large***	***4***	***North***	***December 31, 2016***
E. Maximous	Rancho Santa Margarita	49,125	Small	5	South	December 31, 2017
Brad Fowler	Dana Point	34,208	Small	At-Large	South	December 31, 2016
Rudy Emami	***Anaheim***	***351,433***	***Large***	***At-Large***	***North***	***December 31, 2017***

Note: Shading indicates positions recommended for consideration for the 2016 Technical Steering Committee roster.

* State of California, Department of Finance, *E-1 Population Estimates for cities, counties, and the state with annual percent change — January 1, 2014 and 2015.* Sacramento, California, May 2015.

May 25, 2016

To: Technical Advisory Committee

From: Orange County Transportation Authority Staff

Subject: Proposed 2016 Technical Steering Committee Membership

Overview

The Orange County Transportation Authority Technical Advisory Committee provides feedback and input on many local streets and roads related items and relies on the Technical Steering Committee to provide guidance on major technical issues. Technical Steering Committee members serve two-year terms, with the exception of one-year terms for the chairman and vice-chairman. This year, two positions became available, as Mr. James Biery and Ms. Natalie Meeks retired. Staff is presenting the 2016 roster for review and approval to fill the positions from District 4 and At-Large members.

Recommendation

Approve the proposed 2016 Technical Steering Committee membership roster.

Background

The Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was established under enabling legislation for the former Orange County Transportation Commission. The TAC provides technical advice on issues related to streets and roads funding programs. The TAC also provides input regarding the allocation of Measure M2 (M2) competitive grant funds. The TAC is comprised of representatives from all Orange County cities, the County of Orange, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and the Transportation Corridor Agencies. The TAC uses a Technical Steering Committee (TSC) to review and discuss major technical issues prior to the full TAC.

The TSC consists of nine voting members nominated by the TAC and approved by the OCTA Board of Directors (Board), as well as one ex-officio member appointed by the Caltrans District Director. There is one position for each of Orange County's five supervisorial districts, two at-large positions, and the TAC chair and vice-chair.

TSC membership process is coordinated through the City Engineers Association of Orange County, the TAC chair, and reviewed by the TAC. In selecting TSC members, priority is given to maintaining a balance between small and large jurisdictions (small jurisdictions currently defined as those with populations less than 64,836), as well as consideration for a balance among supervisorial districts. Balance between north and south Orange County jurisdictions is considered to the extent possible.

During the past year, the TSC provided guidance and policy direction on a number of issues related to the annual call for projects for the M2 Regional Capacity Program and Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program. The input of the TSC is essential for the M2 call for projects and project selection.

Discussion

In April 2016, OCTA solicited letters of interest from local jurisdictions to fill the vacancies left by Mr. Biery and Ms. Meeks to serve their remaining terms on the committee. Mr. Biery's term expires in December 2016 and Ms. Natalie Meeks' term will expire in December 2017. The candidates recommended to fill respective positions will serve for the remaining term vacated by exiting members.

In accordance with the OCTA Board-approved guidelines for administering the TSC, the president of the City Engineers Association of Orange County and the chair of the TAC reviewed three candidate letters of interest and recommended the new TSC members shown in Attachment A. The recommended roster strikes a balance between both the small/large as well as north/south cities.

Summary

The Technical Steering Committee provides guidance and direction on major technical issues before presentation to the full Technical Advisory Committee. The Technical Steering Committee members serve two-year terms with the exception of the chair and vice-chair (one-year terms). There are two positions that need to be filled for the remaining term. Staff is presenting a recommended roster of the 2016 Technical Steering Committee for approval.

Attachment

A. 2016 Proposed Technical Steering Committee Membership List

May 25, 2016

To: Technical Advisory Committee

From: Orange County Transportation Authority Staff

Subject: 2016 Measure M2 Community-Based Transit Circulators (Project V) Call for Projects Programming Recommendations for Capital and Planning Grants

Overview

The Orange County Transportation Authority issued the 2016 Measure M2 Project V call for projects for Community-Based Transit Circulators in November 2015. Applications have been received and scored consistent with the Project V Guidelines. Projects recommended for funding are presented for review and approval.

Recommendations

A. Recommend for the Board of Directors approval the programming recommendations for Project V funding, in an amount not-to-exceed $26,711,659, plus inflationary adjustments for 17 local agency projects submitted under the capital and operating reserve categories.

B. Recommend for the Board of Directors approval the programming recommendations for Project V funding, in an amount not-to-exceed $323,780, for seven local agency projects submitted under the planning category.

Background

Community-Based Transit/Circulators Program (Project V) is a competitive program under Measure M2 (M2) that provides funding to develop and implement local bus transit services, such as community-based circulators, shuttles, and bus trolleys that complement regional bus and rail services, and meet local needs in areas not adequately served by regional transit. This is a competitive program that provides funding for bus and vehicle leases/purchases, associated bus stop improvements, maintenance facilities for new service, seasonal and special event services, as well as parking leases for seasonal and special event services.

On November 23, 2015, the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) Board of Directors (Board) approved the revised Project V Guidelines and directed staff to issue a call for projects (call). In addition to the capital cost and operating reserves, the revised guidelines also included funding for planning category. The planning grants will help local agencies explore transit demand, determine feasibility, ridership and prepare service plans to provide local transit services in future.

The programming period for this call for project is from Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-17 to FY 2022-23, spanning seven years, which corresponds to the useful life of the typical community circulator vehicle. Through 2023, approximately $65 million of Project V proportional M2 revenue is available after deducting $9 million in commitments provided in the 2013 call for projects.

Discussion

On February 29, 2016, 14 local agencies submitted 17 applications requesting $29,157,409, under the capital and operating reserve category to provide Project V services including special events, weekend, seasonal, and year-round services. In addition, OCTA received seven applications under the planning grants category for local agency projects to explore options for local transit services. Applications were reviewed for eligibility, consistency, and adherence to the guidelines and program objectives.

All the project submittals meet intent of the Project V program. Therefore, in order to maximize the benefits of community-based transit services, staff is recommending that the Board of Directors (Board) approve all projects submitted under the 2016 call. An exception to the seven-year grant period is the City of San Clemente's (City's) innovative demand-responsive rideshare proposal that is further described below.

The City submitted an application to provide demand-responsive rideshare services for the existing customers of OCTA routes 191 and 193. As included in the 2016 OC Bus Service Plan, Routes 191 and 193 will be terminated in October 2016. The City requested $3,360,150 to operate this service for seven years. Since this is the first time for funding and deployment of a transit project of this nature in Orange County, staff is recommending to support this concept as a pilot program for two years providing $914,400 in M2 funds plus City matching funds. OCTA staff will work with the City staff to establish the performance measures and scope of services for this project. Depending on the success of this program, staff will provide a report to the OCTA Board and make recommendations to continue or discontinue this pilot program in future.

The cities of Irvine, La Habra, Mission Viejo, and Westminster requested OCTA to operate the service. OCTA staff is recommending that the Board of Directors (Board) authorize the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate and execute cooperative agreements with the local agencies and purchase and service provider agreements with the vendors as necessary.

The local agencies are required to provide a minimum of ten percent local match. All projects are competitive and are being recommended for funding as outlined in Attachment A and Attachment B.

Staff is recommending $26,711,659, plus inflationary adjustments for capital and operating reserve category, and $323,780 for planning grants. Funds identified under the operating reserve category (Attachment A) are subject to the minimum performance requirements identified in the guidelines, including quarterly reporting of ridership performance and productivity. Participation in the operating reserve is limited to the useful life of the capital purchase with Project V funds.

Summary

Proposed programming recommendations for projects in the Project V Program have been developed by staff. Funding for 17 projects, up to $26,711,659, plus inflationary adjustments for capital grants, and $323,780 for planning grants in M2 funds is being recommended.

Attachments

A. 2016 Measure M2 Community-Based Transit Circulators (Project V) Call for Projects - Programming Recommendations for Capital Grants
B. 2016 Measure M2 Community-Based Transit Circulators (Project V) Call for Projects - Programming Recommendations for Planning Grants

2016 Measure M2 Community-Based Transit Circulators (Project V) Call for Projects
Programming Recommendations for Capital Grants

Agency	Project	Capital	Operating Reserve	Total Allocation	Score	Match Rate
Dana Point	Dana Point PCH Trolley	$ -	$ 905,968.00	$ 905,968.00	72	11%
Irvine	Irvine iShuttle Route W - Tustin Station - IBC West	$ 543,345.00	$ 2,168,913.00	$ 2,712,258.00	66	11%
La Habra	La Habra Special Event Shuttle Service	$ -	$ 96,810.00	$ 96,810.00	65	10%
Newport Beach	Balboa Peninsula Trolley	$ 507,871.00	$ 177,583.00	$ 685,454.00	64	12%
Irvine	Irvine iShuttle Route E - Irvine Station - East	$ 543,345.00	$ 2,162,639.00	$ 2,705,984.00	64	11%
San Clemente	San Clemente Summer Trolley	$ 525,100.00	$ 656,293.00	$ 1,181,393.00	62	11%
Anaheim	ARTIC/Center - City Anaheim Circulator	$ 193,600.00	$ 951,756.00	$ 1,145,356.00	62	11%
Cost Mesa	Local Circulator from Costa Mesa to Anaheim	$ 201,737.00	$ 2,588,901.00	$ 2,790,638.00	61	10%
Huntington Beach	Seasonal Local Transit Service	$ 145,739.00	$ 772,031.00	$ 917,770.00	55	10%
Orange County	Orange County RanchRide	$ -	$ 2,041,547.00	$ 2,041,547.00	52	10%
Laguna Beach	Residential Trolley Service	$ 373,500.00	$ 1,593,900.00	$ 1,967,400.00	51	10%
San Clemente	San Clemente Rideshare Services		$ 914,400.00	$ 914,400.00	49	10%
Mission Viejo	Mission Viejo Local Transit Circulator	$ 475,300.00	$ 2,857,579.00	$ 3,332,879.00	49	14%
Westminster	Little Saigon Local Circulator	$ 550,000.00	$ 3,138,214.00	$ 3,688,214.00	42	10%
Lake Forest	Shuttle Service between train station and Panasonic	$ -	$ 1,226,862.00	$ 1,226,862.00	40	10%
San Juan Capistrano	Summer Trolley Service	$ 49,522.00	$ 45,964.00	$ 95,486.00	37	38%
Lake Forest	Shuttle Service between train Station and Oakley	$ -	$ 303,240.00	$ 303,240.00	28	24%
Total Allocation				**$ 26,711,659**		

PCH - Pacific Coast Highway
IBC - Irvine Business Center
ARTIC - Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center

ATTACHMENT A

2016 Measure M2 Community-Based Transit Circulators (Project V) Call for Projects
Programming Recommendations for Planning Grants

Agency	Project	Amount	Match Rate
Fountain Valley	Planning study to determine feasibility of implementing a transit circulator within the City of Fountain Valley using Go-Local Step Two Study.	$ 45,000.00	10%
Garden Grove	Planning study to determine ridership demand and feasibility for expansion of Westminster Little Saigon Circulator.	$ 49,280.00	12%
Laguna Niguel	Planning study to determine number of vehicles and service required to provide local transit circulator.	$ 49,500.00	10%
Mission Viejo	Planning for two routes connecting to senior centers, activity centers, Metrolink Station, and other locations.	$ 45,000.00	10%
Placentia	Planning study to determine feasibility to operate special event and a transit circulator within the City of Placentia.	$ 45,000.00	10%
Rancho Santa Margarita	Planning study to explore options for Antonio Parkway Circulator.	$ 45,000.00	10%
Tustin	Planning study to determine feasibility of implementing a transit circulator within the City of Tustin.	$ 45,000.00	10%
Total Allocation		**$ 323,780.00**	

ATTACHMENT B