



# Go Local Fixed-Guideway Future Project Delivery Options



#### **Staff Recommendations**



- Federal Grant Recipient Relationship: OCTA serve as grantee, cities serve as sub-recipients
- Enter into memorandum of understanding (MOU) with cities of Anaheim and Santa Ana to identify roles/ responsibilities
- Upon formalizing roles, pursue consideration of the Anaheim and Santa Ana/Garden Grove fixed-guideway projects for New Starts funding from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
- Return with recommendations on operations and maintenance

# Background



- Need to pursue federal funds as a result of:
  - Decline in Measure M2 sales forecasts
  - Capital costs of fixed-guideway program
  - Need to maximize local dollars
- Prior planning work prepared consistent with FTA New Starts planning requirements and consistent communication with FTA to ensure eligibility and competitiveness

### **New/Small Starts**



- Proven model for assessing merit of a fixed-guideway project
- FTA evaluates project at various stages prior to advancement into next phase of development
- New Starts > \$250 million capital cost
- Small Starts < \$ 250 million capital cost</li>
- Technically rigorous, 6-12 years development
- Demand exceeds availability of funds

## **Grant Recipient Requirements**



- First step of New Starts programs: Establish a grant recipient reporting relationship to FTA
- Grantee responsible for administering and managing federal grant in accordance with federal requirements
- Grantee must demonstrate the legal, financial, and technical capacity to deliver project on time and on budget
- Clear lines of authority/responsibility is critical



Options for Grantee Role		
Options	Pros/Benefits	Ris
1. OCTA as Grantee	<ul> <li>OCTA has proven success with FTA in administering federal funds and</li> </ul>	• Ne mar

sks/Challenges eed to supplement project

Lose full potential of city leadership

Cities are unproven entities for

delivering highway/transit projects

Time and money associated with

Potential organizational risk with

but cities manage contracts

OCTA responsible for project delivery,

managing federal funds and

establishing a new grantee

•FTA unlikely to recognize new grantees, OCTA minimal control

delivering highway and transit projects

2. Cities as Grantees

3. OCTA as Grantee

Cities as Sub-

recipients

nagement staff •OCTA assumes all liability for project delivery, management of contracts, coordinating with stakeholders

Cities assumes all risk

Cities would have full control and

liability of project design and delivery

•OCTA contributes technical capacity,

OCTA input into scope and design

assumes overall responsibility

Cities manage contracts and

coordinate with stakeholders

•Realize potential of city buy-in

# **Next Steps**



- Return in fall with MOU with cities of Anaheim and Santa Ana to serve as sub-recipients
- Return in fall with options for operations and maintenance of fixed-guideway projects
- Pursue FTA consideration to enter New Starts upon projects' entry into preliminary engineering (March 2012 and January 2013)