



AGENDA

Technical Advisory Committee

Committee Members

Tom Wheeler, Chair	<i>City of Lake Forest</i>
Iris Lee, Vice Chair	<i>City of Seal Beach</i>
Quang Le	<i>City of Aliso Viejo</i>
Rudy Emami	<i>City of Anaheim</i>
Michael Ho	<i>City of Brea</i>
Mina Mikhael	<i>City of Buena Park</i>
Raja Sethuraman	<i>City of Costa Mesa</i>
Nick Mangkalakiri	<i>City of Cypress</i>
Matthew Kunk	<i>City of Dana Point</i>
Temo Galvez	<i>City of Fountain Valley</i>
Stephen Bise	<i>City of Fullerton</i>
Dan Candelaria	<i>City of Garden Grove</i>
Chau Vu	<i>City of Huntington Beach</i>
Luis Estevez	<i>City of Irvine</i>
Albert Mendoza	<i>City of La Habra</i>
Kanwal Singh	<i>City of La Palma</i>
Mark McAvoy	<i>City of Laguna Beach</i>
Joe Ames	<i>City of Laguna Hills</i>
Jacki Scott	<i>City of Laguna Niguel</i>
Gerald Tom	<i>City of Laguna Woods</i>
Chris Kelley	<i>City of Los Alamitos</i>
Mark Chagnon	<i>City of Mission Viejo</i>
Jim Houlihan	<i>City of Newport Beach</i>
Christopher Cash	<i>City of Orange</i>
Christopher Tanio	<i>City of Placentia</i>
Joe Parco	<i>City of Rancho Santa Margarita</i>
David Rebensdorf	<i>City of San Clemente</i>
Nardy Khan	<i>City of San Juan Capistrano</i>
Nabil Saba	<i>City of Santa Ana</i>
Cesar Rangel	<i>City of Stanton</i>
Kenny Nguyen	<i>City of Tustin</i>
Mahrooz Ilkhanipour	<i>City of Villa Park</i>
Jake Ngo	<i>City of Westminster</i>
Jamie Lai	<i>City of Yorba Linda</i>
Robert McLean	<i>County of Orange</i>
Jonathan Lawhead	<i>Caltrans Ex-Officio</i>

Orange County Transportation Authority
550 South Main Street, Room 08 & 09
Orange, California
February 26, 2025, 1:30 p.m.

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



AGENDA

Technical Advisory Committee

Agenda Descriptions

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.

Public Availability of Agenda Materials

All documents relative to the items referenced in this agenda are available for public inspection at www.octa.net or through the Clerk of the Board's office at: OCTA Headquarters, 600 South Main Street, Orange, California.

In-Person Comment

Members of the public may attend in-person and address the Committee regarding any item within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Orange County Transportation Authority. Speakers will be recognized by the Chair at the time the agenda item is to be considered.

Written Comment

Written public comments may also be submitted by emailing them to rocchipinti@octa.net, and must be sent at least 90 minutes prior to the start time of the meeting. If you wish to comment on a specific agenda item, please identify the item number in your email. All public comments that are timely received will be part of the public record and distributed to the Committee. Public comments will be made available to the public upon request.



Call to Order

Self-Introductions

1. Approval of Minutes

Approval of Technical Advisory Committee regular meeting minutes from the October 23, 2024 meeting.

Regular Items

2. Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs – 2025 Call for Projects Programming Recommendations – Charvalen Alacar

Overview

The Orange County Transportation Authority issued the 2025 annual Measure M2 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Regional Capacity Program and Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program call for projects in August 2024. This call for projects makes grant funding available for regional roadway capacity and signal synchronization projects countywide. A list of projects recommended for funding is presented for review and approval.

Recommendations

- A. Recommend for Board of Directors approval the award of \$25.71 million in 2025 Regional Capacity Program (Project O) funds to nine local agency projects.
- B. Recommend for Board of Directors approval the award of \$11.99 million in 2025 Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (Project P) funds to six local agency projects.

Discussion Items

3. Correspondence

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

4. Committee Comments

5. Staff Comments

- Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Payment Process Streamlining Update – Adriann Cardoso



AGENDA

Technical Advisory Committee

- Federal Fiscal Year 2026-2027 & 2027-2028 Surface Transportation Block Grant / Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program Call for Projects Nominations – Ben Ku
- Recognition for Kia Mortazavi – TAC Chair

6. Items for Future Agendas

7. Caltrans Local Assistance Update

8. Public Comments

9. Adjournment

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



October 23, 2024 Minutes



AGENDA

Technical Advisory Committee

Item #1

Voting Representatives Present:

Shaun Pelletier	City of Aliso Viejo
Michael Ho	City of Brea
Mina Mikhael	City of Buena Park
Raja Sethuraman	City of Costa Mesa
Nick Mangkalakiri	City of Cypress
Matthew Sinacori	City of Dana Point
Temo Galvez	City of Fountain Valley
David Grantham	City of Fullerton
Chau Vu	City of Huntington Beach
Kerwin Lau	City of Irvine
Albert Mendoza	City of La Habra
Jacki Scott	City of Laguna Woods
Doug Erdman	City of Lake Forest
Andy Ramirez	City of La Palma
Chris Kelley	City of Los Alamitos
Jim Houlihan	City of Newport Beach
Frank Sun	City of Orange
Christopher Tanio	City of Placentia
Joe Parco	City of Rancho Santa Margarita
Zak Ponsen	City of San Clemente
Tom Toman	City of San Juan Capistrano
Nabil Saba	City of Santa Ana
Kathryne Cho	City of Seal Beach
Cesar Rangel	City of Stanton
Kenny Nguyen	City of Tustin
Mahrooz Ilkhanipour	City of Villa Park
Jamie Lai	City of Yorba Linda
Robert McLean	County of Orange

Voting Representatives Absent:

Rudy Emami	City of Anaheim
Dan Candelaria	City of Garden Grove
Mark Trestik	City of Laguna Beach
Joe Ames	City of Laguna Hills
Mark Chagnon	City of Mission Viejo
Chris Cash	City of Orange
Jake Ngo	City of Westminster

Orange County Transportation Authority
 550 S. Main Street, Room 09
 Orange, California
October 23, 2024, 1:30 p.m.

Guests Present:

Sonica Kohli, County of Orange
 Kanwal Singh, City of La Palma
 Nichole Squirrel, City of Dana Point
 Matthew Kunk, City of Dana Point
 Nardy Khan, City of San Juan Capistrano
 Jonathan Lawhead, Caltrans
 Kathleen Nguyen, Caltrans
 Paul Lee, Caltrans

Staff Present:

Kia Mortazavi
 Adriann Cardoso
 Charvalen Alacar
 Alicia Yang
 Francesa Ching
 Steve Hossack
 Nylinne Nguyen
 Chris Boucly
 Stephanie Mooney
 Chance Groom
 Kristopher Martinez



This meeting was called to order by Chair Lai at 1:30pm.

Self-Introductions

Consent Calendar

1. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Sethuraman motioned to approve the Minutes of the October 23, 2024 Technical Advisory Committee regular meeting.

Mr. Galvez seconded the motion.

The Minutes were approved with no further discussion.

Regular Items

2. Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs (CTFP) Semi-Annual Review – Charvalen Alacar

Ms. Alacar explained that the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) conducts a semi-annual review of the CTFP every six months to allow local agencies and OCTA to evaluate the status of all active project phases. She stated that these reviews serve to assess project viability, confirm funding availability, address local agency concerns, and ensure compliance with Measure M2 (M2) Ordinance requirements.

Ms. Alacar explained that over a six-week period, OCTA collaborates with local agencies to review project progress and process any necessary adjustments. She stated that local agencies may request six types of project adjustments, depending on their specific needs.

The first type of adjustment is a delay, which allows agencies up to 24 additional months to award funds. The second type is a Timely Use of Funds Extension, which provides agencies with up to 24 months to spend CTFP funding. The third type is a Scope Change, which permits agencies to modify project elements as long as the original project benefits are preserved.

The fourth type of adjustment is a Transfer of Savings, which allows agencies to transfer up to 100% of project savings to a subsequently awarded project phase. The fifth type is a cancellation, which enables agencies to withdraw a project for any reason. The sixth type of adjustment is an advance, which allows agencies to move a project forward by one or more fiscal years.



AGENDA

Technical Advisory Committee

Item #1

Ms. Alacar emphasized that all adjustment requests must align with CTFP guidelines and require OCTA review and approval before implementation.

Ms. Alacar reported that the September 2024 semi-annual review opened on August 6 and closed on September 13. OCTA reviewed 316 active project phases and received 11 project adjustment requests from local agencies. OCTA initiated one technical correction to a previously approved scope change.

Ms. Alacar outlined the 12 project adjustments recommended by staff, which included: one project cancellation from the City of Yorba Linda; five timely use of funds extensions for projects in the cities of Costa Mesa and Mission Viejo, and three OCTA-led signal synchronization projects; two scope change requests, one from the City of Brea and another for an OCTA-led signal synchronization project; three project savings transfers, for the cities of Anaheim and San Clemente and an OCTA-led project; and one technical correction initiated by OCTA, which corrected a previously approved scope change for a City of Santa Ana project.

Ms. Alacar requested committee approval for these proposed project adjustments to move forward for OCTA Board of Directors (Board) approval, stating that they were necessary and appropriate for efficient CTFP administration.

Ms. Scott requested clarification regarding a scope change request from the City of Brea. She stated that many cities have expressed interest in incorporating pavement rehabilitation into their projects and asked how the City of Brea's request differed from previous scope change requests.

Ms. Cardoso responded that the City of Brea's project is unique because the project was originally awarded through the CTFP and then the Board approved a separate cooperative agreement for the project to define funding and construction phase deliverables, given its significant state and federal funding sources. She explained that the project was originally managed by Caltrans, and its scope originally included pavement rehabilitation. However, when Caltrans put the project out to bid, they removed the pavement rehabilitation component, with the intention of adding it back later as a change order. She stated that due to increased project costs, the change order was never executed.

Ms. Cardoso added that the current cooperative agreement transfers the pavement rehabilitation responsibility from Caltrans to the City of Brea. She stated that while the scope has shifted, the funding remains available under the original agreement. She further explained that this situation is different from typical scope changes because it was originally a freeway interchange and bridge project managed by Caltrans that was later merged with a local city project.

Mr. Houlihan inquired whether the project had originally been entirely funded by Caltrans, and if so, why Measure M2 funds were now being allocated to it.



AGENDA

Technical Advisory Committee

Item #1

Ms. Cardoso responded that the City of Brea had applied for an M2 grant, which contributed to the project's funding. In addition to M2 funding, the project also received SB1 Trade Corridor Enhancement Program funds and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds. She explained that M2's contribution was relatively small compared to the overall funding mix.

Mr. Sethuraman asked whether the rehabilitation work in question was being conducted on a freeway or a local street.

Ms. Cardoso confirmed that the pavement rehabilitation work was for a local street, rather than a freeway. She explained that damage to the street was caused by the Caltrans project, which led to additional deterioration of the local roadway system.

Mr. Ho with the City of Brea stated that the total project budget was \$80 million, with only \$10 million coming from M2 funds.

Mr. Sethuraman asked whether this change in project responsibility was expected to take effect in the next funding cycle.

Ms. Cardoso responded that although the project was originally awarded funding through the CTFP, the cooperative agreement shifted project oversight away from the CTFP process; however, scope changes still come to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for review and approval, prior to Board action.

Ms. Scott inquired whether there was an opportunity for South County cities to request additional funds to cover pavement rehabilitation caused by Caltrans freeway projects. She stated that some cities had not received funds for repairing roads damaged by state highway construction and inquired whether additional funding could be secured.

Ms. Cardoso responded that she was not aware of a formal process for requesting such funds but suggested that cities consult Caltrans directly. She stated that in many cases, agreements are established at the beginning of a project to define what mitigation efforts will be provided for local streets and roads. She noted that she would follow up with OCTA's project management team to determine whether there were additional funding opportunities available.

Ms. Scott stated that she was unaware of any previous agreements allowing South County cities to request funding for pavement rehabilitation and requested additional background on the process.

Chair Lai asked for a motion to approve.

Motion was formally made by Mr. Houlihan

Mr. Sethuraman seconded the motion.

The motion was approved.



3. Technical Steering Committee Membership – Charvalen Alacar

Ms. Alacar outlined the process for appointing members to the Technical Steering Committee (TSC). She emphasized the importance of balancing representation among different regions and city sizes.

Ms. Alacar reported that OCTA received eight letters of interest from eligible TAC members and that a selection committee, consisting of TAC leadership, OCTA staff, and the City Engineers Association of Orange County (CEAOC) President, reviewed the letters and made the following recommendations for the seven open positions:

Position	Appointed Member	Affiliation
Chair	Tom Wheeler	City of Lake Forest
Vice-Chair	Iris Lee	City of Seal Beach
District 1 Representative	Temo Galvez	City of Fountain Valley
District 2 Representative	Nabil Saba	City of Santa Ana
District 3 Representative	Jamie Lai	City of Yorba Linda
District 5 Representative	Joe Ames	City of Laguna Hills
At-Large Representative	Jackie Scott	City of Laguna Niguel

A motion was made by Chair Lai.

Motion was approved by Ms. Cho.

Mr. Sethuraman seconded the motion.

The motion was approved.

Discussion Items

4. Measure M2 Program Overview – Kia Mortazavi

Mr. Mortazavi provided an overview of the development, implementation, and ongoing management of Measure M, including its history, financial structure, accountability mechanisms, and future considerations. He stated that he has been involved in the planning and execution of both Measure M1 and Measure M2 and explained that Measure M1 (M1) was in effect from 1990 to 2011, while Measure M2 spans from 2011 to 2041.

Mr. Mortazavi explained that passing a local sales tax measure such as M2 requires a two-thirds voter approval because it is classified as a special tax. This high threshold makes the passage of sales tax measures particularly challenging and requires extensive public outreach and education efforts. Securing voter support for a tax measure necessitates a multi-faceted approach, which includes conducting thorough



AGENDA

Technical Advisory Committee

Item #1

polling to determine voter priorities, working closely with city public works directors and city managers to gain local government backing, and developing a comprehensive public education campaign to ensure that residents understand the benefits of the measure.

Mr. Mortazavi stated that the success of Measure M was largely due to the trust that the public placed in OCTA and local agencies. A key lesson learned from M1 was that maintaining credibility through the principle of "Promises Made, Promises Kept" was critical in securing voter approval. M1 initially required three attempts before gaining voter approval, whereas M2 passed on its first attempt, reflecting an increased level of public confidence in the program. He remarked that Orange County is widely recognized for having one of the best freeway systems and highest pavement quality in the state, largely due to the successful implementation of Measure M projects.

Mr. Mortazavi provided a breakdown of the structure of the Renewed Measure M (M2), explaining that its purpose is to address both current and future transportation needs in Orange County while ensuring regional consensus among local jurisdictions. The M2 funding structure is divided into several key allocations with 2% of the total revenue allocated for water quality improvements and 1% reserved for administrative costs. The remaining net funds are distributed as follows:

- 43% for freeway improvements
- 32% for local streets and roads
- 25% for transit projects

One of the most important aspects of M2 was the development of a comprehensive expenditure plan, which was critical in securing public trust by ensuring transparency and accountability regarding how the funds would be used.

Mr. Mortazavi discussed the freeway program under M2, stating that it includes 13 major projects, which have been divided into 30 segments for better project management and competitive bidding. He highlighted the importance of the Environmental Mitigation Program, which receives 5% of freeway funding and is designed to streamline the permitting process while preserving natural habitats. He explained that the program was developed to secure environmental approvals in advance, reducing project delays and cost overruns. The program successfully garnered the support of 32 environmental groups, which played a crucial role in ensuring the smooth implementation of M2 projects.

Mr. Mortazavi discussed the Local Streets and Roads Program under M2, explaining that it is structured to provide funding to local agencies while maintaining flexibility in its use. M1 had limitations in how local funds could be used, whereas M2 introduced broader eligibility to include transit-related projects. The restructuring of local streets and roads funding simplified the competitive process, consolidating several smaller



AGENDA

Technical Advisory Committee

Item #1

programs into two main funding categories: one for capacity improvements such as freeway interchanges and arterial expansions and the second for traffic operations and signal synchronization projects. The signal synchronization program has been one of the most successful aspects of M2, with widespread positive feedback from local jurisdictions.

Mr. Mortazavi described the transit programs funded by M2, stating that 25% of M2 net revenue supports public transportation projects, including Metrolink operations and expansions, community-based circulators, bus stop enhancements, and senior mobility programs. M2 funding is used to both maintain and expand transit services, with a focus on increasing connectivity and accessibility throughout Orange County. A significant portion of the transit funding is dedicated to Metrolink improvements, particularly expanding service areas and enhancing station facilities.

Mr. Mortazavi discussed the measures put in place to ensure accountability and safeguard M2 funds. A key component of the Measure M program is the establishment of strict oversight mechanisms, which include reviews conducted by the Taxpayer Oversight Committee (TOC), reviews by OCTA's Internal Auditor, and regular public reporting on fund expenditures. These measures were designed to maintain transparency and public trust while ensuring that all M2 funds are used in accordance with the voter-approved expenditure plan.

Mr. Mortazavi outlined the planning and prioritization process for M2 projects, explaining that OCTA follows a structured approach that includes several phases. The Early Action Plan (EAP) was implemented in 2007, four years before M2 went into effect, to prepare for the transition from M1. This early planning phase allowed OCTA to ensure that local agencies were eligible for funding on day one of M2 implementation. He then described the development of the 2020 Plan, which prioritized projects based on their readiness and potential to leverage external funding sources. More recently, OCTA has adopted a rolling ten-year Next 10 Plan, which is updated annually to ensure that projects are delivered efficiently and effectively. He reported that OCTA is on track to complete 90% of the planned freeway projects by 2030, well ahead of the 2041 sunset date for M2.

Mr. Mortazavi addressed future funding challenges and the potential need for adjustments to M2 allocations. He stated that revenue forecasts for the program have fluctuated, with the 30-year estimate declining from \$14.8 billion to \$14 billion, necessitating careful budget management. He stated that while some funding categories such as environmental mitigation have legally mandated minimum allocations, other areas may have more flexibility. OCTA continually assesses if funds can be reallocated to meet emerging transportation needs. The upcoming ten-year review of M2, scheduled for 2025, will provide an opportunity to reassess funding



AGENDA

Technical Advisory Committee

Item #1

priorities and determine if adjustments or M2 Ordinance amendments may be necessary.

Mr. Mortazavi concluded the presentation by reiterating that M2 has been a successful model for local transportation funding, built on transparency, accountability, and regional collaboration. He emphasized that the continued success of the Measure M program depends on maintaining public trust and delivering projects as promised. He stated that OCTA will continue to monitor transportation trends and funding needs to ensure that M2 remains effective in addressing the county's mobility challenges.

Ms. Vu asked if there would be consideration in recommending an M2 Ordinance amendment to potentially reallocate M2 funds between categories if certain funding areas had surpluses while others remained underfunded.

Mr. Mortazavi responded that while there may be balances in some program categories, there are also still planned projects that require those funds. He explained that, for example, the Environmental Mitigation Program requires that no less than 5% of the freeway program funds be dedicated to environmental mitigation. He stated that approximately 40% of this allocation has been spent, with a significant portion used for property acquisitions and another portion being set aside for a long-term endowment to maintain the preserved land in perpetuity.

Mr. Mortazavi added that an estimated \$140 million remains allocated to the Environmental Mitigation Program, which must still be used exclusively for environmental purposes. He explained that any decision to increase environmental mitigation investments would need to be balanced with additional transportation infrastructure investments and that the OCTA Board has consistently held the position that environmental investments should have a direct transportation nexus.

Mr. Mortazavi stated that for other funding programs, such as Local Fair Share (LFS) and the Regional Capacity Program (RCP), there is a long-standing commitment to ensuring that all funds are fully expended. He continued that under M1, all allocated funds were utilized, and the same approach is expected for M2. He stated that the LFS program is expected to be fully spent, and the funds designated for competitive programs such as signal synchronization and arterial improvements will continue to be allocated based on demand.

Mr. Mortazavi stated that while revenue projections fluctuate, the current trend shows a decrease in anticipated revenues. He added that the 30-year forecast has been adjusted downward by almost \$1 billion, emphasizing the need for prudent financial planning. While the funding allocations are not planned to the exact dollar, as the program approaches its later years, OCTA will work to ensure that all funds are directed toward eligible and needed projects.



AGENDA

Technical Advisory Committee

Item #1

Mr. Mortazavi concluded that OCTA is considering increasing the level of grants for local streets and roads as M2 nears its expiration to allow time for jurisdictions to complete projects before the M2 ends. He explained that call for projects (call) trends will be monitored to ensure that funding levels align with project demand. He noted that in the most recent funding cycle, there was a noticeable number of construction project cancellations due to higher-than-anticipated cost estimates, and some agencies have indicated that they will resubmit their projects in future calls.

Ms. Scott thanked Mr. Mortazavi for the detailed explanation and stated that the historical perspective provided a valuable context for understanding how M2 funding has evolved. She asked whether there is an opportunity in the future to expand eligible improvements under the RCP to accommodate changing transportation demands. She noted that many cities are experiencing shifts in travel patterns, including increased bicycle use and pedestrian mobility, which may require modifications to the types of projects that qualify for M2 funding.

Ms. Scott referenced the City of Costa Mesa as an example, where the city has implemented enhanced bike lanes to respond to the growing demand for bicycle transportation. She asked whether there is an opportunity to allow similar multimodal transportation improvements under the RCP and whether the program could be expanded to include projects that are not solely vehicle focused.

Mr. Mortazavi responded that the possibility of expanding eligible projects would be evaluated as part of the upcoming ten-year review of M2. He noted that OCTA conducts public opinion surveys to assess transportation priorities and that there is sometimes a difference between what local jurisdictions are experiencing and what the broader voting population supports. He stated that in recent surveys, likely voters have ranked bike facilities lower in priority compared to other transportation improvements; however, this does not mean bike lanes are unimportant, but rather, changes to program eligibility must align with overall voter priorities.

Ms. Scott inquired whether the current M2 Ordinance allows for flexibility in redefining the types of projects that qualify under the RCP.

Mr. Mortazavi stated that significant changes to the program structure would require an amendment to the M2 Ordinance. He explained that modifying the definition of an RCP project would require approval from two-thirds of the OCTA Board and two-thirds of the TOC. He noted that this requirement is embedded in the original plan to ensure that modifications align with the intent of the voters who approved M2.

Ms. Scott asked whether the ten-year review scheduled for the upcoming year would include an analysis of potential program modifications.



AGENDA

Technical Advisory Committee

Item #1

Mr. Mortazavi stated that the ten-year review process is expected to be conducted between now and next summer and would include an evaluation of whether certain program definitions should be expanded or adjusted.

Ms. Scott shared that she looks forward to the review process and believes it will provide an opportunity to align M2 investments with the evolving transportation needs of Orange County.

Mr. Sethuraman stated that he was unsure when the public opinion survey referenced earlier was conducted and requested clarification on its methodology. He noted that survey results can sometimes be influenced by the way questions are framed, particularly when discussing safety concerns. He stated that if respondents were asked whether they support achieving "zero deaths or zero injuries" in transportation, the overwhelming majority would likely answer affirmatively, regardless of the broader implications. He emphasized that the phrasing of survey questions could impact how transportation priorities are ranked and that he would like additional information on how the survey was structured.

Mr. Mortazavi stated that additional details about the survey methodology would be provided in the next presentation. He acknowledged that surveys can be framed in different ways and that the way questions are presented can influence public responses. He stated that in conducting long-term planning for M2, it is important to balance public opinion with technical data and transportation planning principles.

Mr. Mortazavi explained that the challenge in planning for future investments lies in distinguishing between the general public, who experience transportation on a day-to-day basis, and voters, who ultimately decide on funding measures. He stated that while public input is valuable in shaping transportation policies, it is equally important to consider what will resonate with voters when funding decisions are placed on the ballot. He noted that this balance must be carefully maintained to ensure that M2 remains effective in addressing Orange County's transportation needs.

Ms. Scott stated that in her city, there has been a noticeable increase in bicycle usage, and with that, a rise in reported accidents between cyclists and motor vehicles. She emphasized that bicycle safety is not just a transportation issue but also a public safety concern that needs to be addressed. As more residents shift towards alternative modes of transportation, local governments must ensure that roadways are safe for all users. Multimodal improvements should be considered in future transportation funding allocations, particularly in high-traffic areas where bicycles and vehicles frequently interact.

Mr. Mortazavi acknowledged that bicycle safety is a significant issue and stated that OCTA recognizes the importance of enhancing roadway safety for all users. He stated that while M2 was not originally designed to address all multimodal transportation



concerns, OCTA has worked to incorporate safety improvements where feasible. He added that while engineering solutions such as improved bike lanes can help address safety concerns, enforcement and education also play critical roles in ensuring the safety of cyclists and pedestrians.

Mr. Mortazavi stated that OCTA has invested in Complete Streets initiatives and has allocated approximately \$80 million across multiple funding sources in the last year to support local agencies in implementing pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements. He stated that while demand for these continues to grow, OCTA has made efforts to fund as many projects as possible. He noted that in the most recent round of funding, nearly all eligible projects were funded, with only two requests unfunded.

Mr. Mortazavi emphasized that while OCTA aims to support multimodal transportation where possible, it must also balance funding allocations with the overall voter-approved expenditure plan. He stated that there are various funding sources available for local agencies to address bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, and OCTA will continue to work with jurisdictions to identify opportunities for additional funding.

Ms. Scott stated that she appreciates OCTA's commitment to funding multimodal projects and that continued collaboration with local agencies will be essential in addressing evolving transportation needs.

5. Measure M2 10 Year Comprehensive Review Survey – Chris Boucly

Mr. Boucly, OCTA Public Outreach representative, stated that he had worked with several TAC members over the years and that his role was to share the results of a survey conducted as part of the 10-year comprehensive review of M2.

He stated that this survey was one element of the larger review process and that OCTA would be conducting extensive public outreach over the next several months. He stated that representatives from OCTA would be reaching out to city officials between January and June of the following year to gather additional input on M2's performance and future priorities.

Mr. Boucly explained that the 10-year comprehensive review requires an analysis of changes in public support for the M2 Transportation Investment Plan (M2 Plan). The survey was designed to measure voter perception of the county's transportation network, assess awareness of OCTA and its projects, and identify priorities for current and future M2 investments.

Mr. Boucly discussed the survey methodology, stating that because M2 was approved by voters, it made sense to focus the survey on likely voters. The survey was timed to



AGENDA

Technical Advisory Committee

Item #1

align with the upcoming November 2024 presidential election, which was expected to have the highest voter turnout in a four-year cycle. This approach provided a broad and representative sample of the electorate.

Mr. Boucly stated that a random sample of likely voters was developed based on various demographic factors, including age, gender, political affiliation, and geographic location. This methodology ensured a well-balanced sample that reflected the diversity of Orange County's electorate.

Mr. Boucly stated that one of the first questions asked in the survey was about the overall quality of life in Orange County. Respondents were asked to rate their quality of life on a scale from excellent to very poor. The responses had remained relatively stable over time, with approximately 80% of respondents in 2024 rating their quality of life as excellent or good, similar to the results from previous years.

Mr. Boucly explained that the survey also asked respondents what changes they would make to improve quality of life in the county. This was an open-ended question, meaning that respondents were not given a predefined list of choices but were instead asked to provide their own answers. The responses were grouped into categories, with the top two categories reported as improving public transportation at 15% and addressing homelessness at 14%.

Mr. Boucly stated that the high ranking of public transportation improvements was somewhat surprising. OCTA reviewed the verbatim responses to ensure that respondents were specifically referring to public transit improvements rather than general roadway infrastructure. The responses clearly indicated that there was growing public interest in expanding transit services. He presented sample comments from survey participants, highlighting how many respondents expressed the need for more frequent and reliable public transportation options.

Mr. Boucly discussed the survey's next section, which focused on rating different aspects of the transportation system. Respondents were asked to evaluate various transportation elements in randomized order to prevent bias. He noted that the highest-rated elements included the quality of the 405 Express Lanes, access to paratransit services, and the overall condition of freeways, while Metrolink rail service and other transit programs received lower ratings.

Mr. Boucly stated that one of the survey's key objectives was to identify how voters prioritize transportation investments. Respondents were given a list of potential projects and were asked to rank them as high, medium, or low priority. This approach ensured that respondents did not simply rank everything as important.



AGENDA

Technical Advisory Committee

Item #1

Mr. Boucly reported that the top-ranked priority was fixing potholes and repairing roadways, with 92% of respondents ranking it as a high or medium priority. Other top priorities included synchronizing traffic signals to improve traffic flow, closing gaps in the arterial road network, and reducing congestion on major roads. These results were particularly valuable because they allowed OCTA to track how public priorities have shifted over time. While there were some small changes, the top five priorities in 2024 remained the same as they were in 2015, with only a slight reordering of rankings.

Mr. Boucly presented data on public awareness of OCTA and M2. When likely voters were asked if they had heard of OCTA prior to taking the survey, approximately 83% to 89% of respondents answered yes, a percentage that has remained stable over the past 20 years. While OCTA has strong public awareness, the same could not be said for M2. He reported that only about one-third of respondents had heard of M2, and that awareness was particularly low among voters under 40 and those who had lived in Orange County for less than 15 years. As the county's population changes, it is unlikely that awareness of M2 will increase on its own. Without additional marketing efforts, awareness will continue to decline because the percentage of residents who were present when M2 was approved is shrinking over time.

Mr. Boucly summarized the key takeaways from the survey:

- Top M2 funding priorities largely unchanged since the last major survey
- Increase in priority for Metrolink improvements, open space preservation, and system optimization
- Decline in priority for freeway widening projects and paratransit services.

Mr. Boucly concluded the presentation by stating that public awareness of OCTA remains strong, but awareness of M2 remains relatively low. Likely voter priorities continue to focus on roadway maintenance and congestion relief, but public transit has seen a notable increase in interest.

There were no questions on the presentation.

6. Correspondence

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

7. Committee Comments – None



8. Staff Comments –

- **State and Federal Legislative Updates** - Alexis Carter

Ms. Carter provided an update on the 2025-2026 State and Federal Legislative Platforms for OCTA. She stated that in July, OCTA had reached out to stakeholders via email, soliciting feedback on the legislative platforms in preparation for the upcoming legislative cycle. She explained that this process occurs every two years before the beginning of a new legislative cycle and involves comprehensive outreach to both internal and external partners.

Ms. Carter reported that OCTA had completed an initial draft of the legislative platform, which was presented to the Board earlier in the month. She noted that the Board had provided feedback which OCTA staff was currently working to incorporate into the final draft. She stated that the revised version of the platform would be presented to the Board for approval in November.

Ms. Carter requested that any TAC members who had additional feedback submit their comments within the next few weeks so that they could be considered before the final draft was completed. She stated that the State and Federal Legislative Platforms serve as OCTA's official advocacy documents, guiding interactions with legislators and stakeholders and that having a Board-approved platform ensures that OCTA's legislative efforts align with the agency's priorities and the needs of its stakeholders.

Ms. Carter shared a public suggestion form for TAC members interested in submitting additional comments.

Ms. Carter provided an update on Senate Bill 1216 (SB-1216), a bill introduced by Senator Blakespear, which relates to transportation projects and restrictions on Class 3 bikeways. She stated that SB-1216 defines "sharrows" as pavement markings that indicate bicyclists may use the travel lane. Starting January 1, 2025, the bill prohibits the installation of sharrows on roads with speed limits exceeding 30 miles per hour, with certain exceptions.

Ms. Carter stated that there is an exception that allows sharrows to be installed at or near intersections when connecting Class 1, Class 2, or Class 4 bikeways. Aside from these limited cases, sharrows will no longer be permitted on high-speed roadways.

Ms. Carter advised local agencies that have projects involving Class 3 bikeways to consult their legal counsel for guidance. The legislation does not specify whether projects that are already in the design or approval phases would be allowed to proceed. She recommended that jurisdictions proactively review the status of their projects to ensure compliance with the new law.



AGENDA

Technical Advisory Committee

Item #1

Ms. Carter added that the legislation also impacts funding for Active Transportation Program (ATP) grants. Beginning January 1, 2026, ATP funds can no longer be used for new Class 3 bikeways. She stated that the California Transportation Commission (CTC) will be updating its guidelines to reflect this change and that cities should be aware of the funding restrictions when planning future projects.

There were no questions on this item.

- **Pavement and Pothole Repair Best Practices – Adriann Cardoso**

Ms. Cardoso introduced a discussion on local agency pavement policies and maintenance practices. OCTA had originally intended to hold a robust discussion on best practices for pavement and pothole repairs, but due to time constraints, the discussion would need to be postponed.

Ms. Cardoso explained that the objective is to understand how agencies prioritize pavement projects and utilize existing funds efficiently rather than focusing on additional funding. OCTA is interested in identifying best practices that could be shared amongst local agencies to improve overall pavement management strategies.

Ms. Cardoso stated that instead of conducting a discussion during the meeting, OCTA would be sending out a survey to collect feedback from jurisdictions on their pavement maintenance practices. She encouraged committee members to respond to the survey and provide insights into their approaches to project prioritization, funding allocation, and implementation strategies.

Ms. Cardoso invited any agencies that already have established best practices to share them with OCTA and staff would compile the responses and distribute a summary to all participating agencies. The goal is to ensure that all jurisdictions have access to efficient and effective pavement rehabilitation strategies.

Ms. Cardoso provided an off-topic announcement regarding the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2027-2028 STBG/CMAQ Call for Projects Nominations. SCAG is currently developing new guidelines, which are expected to be released in February 2025.

Ms. Cardoso clarified that OCTA's role in the program is to review and either recommend or not recommend projects from Orange County. In preparation for this, OCTA will be sending out a request for a letter of interest to all local jurisdictions, transit providers, and nonprofit organizations to determine interest in the program.



AGENDA

Technical Advisory Committee

Item #1

Ms. Cardoso stated that since these are federal funds, applicants must be prepared to comply with requirements such as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations, right-of-way acquisition requirements, and the Uniform Relocation Act. She encouraged interested agencies to begin preparing potential project proposals and stated that OCTA would provide additional details on how projects would be prioritized for consideration by the OCTA Board.

Ms. Cardoso concluded by stating that if any committee members had questions, they should reach out to her directly.

There were no questions on this item.

- **Local Programs Updates** – Charvalen Alacar

Ms. Alacar introduced a new OCTA Local Programs staff member, Chance Groom, Senior Transportation Funding Analyst, who will be handling (CTFP) project payments and project closeouts for Project O and Project P.

Ms. Alacar provided an update on the 2025 CTFP M2 Regional Capacity Program (Project O) and the Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (Project P) Call that was issued on August 12, 2024. She thanked agencies that reached out with questions and draft application materials for preliminary review and stated that the deadline for final application submissions is October 24, 2024, at 5:00 PM.

Ms. Alacar stated that after the submission deadline, OCTA staff will review applications and contact project managers with any clarifying questions. She encouraged agencies with questions about the call to contact Stephanie Mooney, Transportation Funding Analyst, or Paul Rodriguez, OCTA Consultant.

Ms. Alacar provided a reminder on M2 Eligibility requirements, stating that local jurisdictions are required to submit expenditure reports detailing the use of M2 funds, developer impact fees, and other maintenance-of-effort expenditures. These reports are due to OCTA by December 31, 2024.

Ms. Alacar reported that 19 agencies had submitted draft expenditure reports, while 16 agencies had not yet submitted draft materials for review. Reminder emails had been sent to agencies that had not yet responded, and they were encouraged to submit their reports on time to maintain M2 eligibility.

Ms. Alacar provided an update on the 2024 Project X Tier 1 and Tier 2 Call. She reported that the OCTA Board awarded \$3.7 million in M2 funds for 11 Tier 1 projects and \$6.9 million for four Tier 2 projects. Local Programs staff is in the process of



drafting letter agreements for the 12 jurisdictions receiving funding. Agencies would be contacted once agreements were finalized. Agencies with questions were advised to contact Kristopher Martinez, who is overseeing the execution of these agreements.

There were no questions on this item.

9. Items for Future Agendas – None

10. Caltrans Local Assistance Update – Jonathan Lawhead

Mr. Lawhead provided an update on various Caltrans District 12 Local Assistance matters and began by stating that the new federal fiscal year commenced in October. He explained that with the start of the new fiscal year, several key administrative reminders and deadlines are approaching for local agencies in order to remain eligible to receive federal and state funds, including:

- the DBE annual submittal forms, including Exhibit 9B and 9C, are due for the 2024-2025 fiscal year. Email reminders would be sent out later in the month to agencies that had not yet submitted their required forms.
- Quality Assurance Program (QAP) certification must be updated if it has not been revised in the past five years.
- DBE information was also due (reminder provided later in the report).
- Several forms within the Local Assistance Procedures Manual (LAPM) have been updated. Use the most recent versions when submitting documentation
- 2025 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) adoption is scheduled for December 2024.
- Next deadline to submit invoices for inactive projects is November 22, 2024. Inactive status may prevent E-76 funding obligations from being processed.

Mr. Lawhead provided an update on the 2025 CTC meeting schedule and noted that the next meeting was scheduled for December 5-6, 2024 in Riverside. He reminded agencies that the deadline to submit funding allocation requests or time extension requests for the January 2025 CTC meeting is December 2, 2024.

For ATP, the scheduled date for the CTC staff recommendation release for the statewide small urban and rural components and the Quick Build Pilot Program is November 1, 2024. To learn more about ATP funding opportunities, agencies should refer to the Active Transportation Resource Center (ATRC) newsletter, which would soon announce training presentations on non-infrastructure and planning projects.

Mr. Lawhead informed agencies that recordings and resources from a recent ATP CalSmart webinar are now available on the CalSmart ATP webpage.



AGENDA

Technical Advisory Committee

Item #1

Mr. Lawhead provided an update on the Highway Bridge Program (HBP) and reminded agencies that Expedited Project Selection Procedures and post-programming requests for hybrid bridge projects would remain closed until April 1, 2025. He stated that agencies planning to submit requests related to the bridge program should contact their area engineer in advance to be placed in a queue, though processing would not resume until April 2025. He referred to agencies to a web link for additional information.

Mr. Lawhead reported that the Clean California Grant Program Cycle 1 project delivery deadline was June 30, 2024, for agencies that did not receive an extension. For agencies that were granted extensions, Caltrans was actively working with them to ensure compliance. The Cycle 2 project delivery deadlines are scheduled for June 30, 2026, and encouraged agencies with active projects in Cycle 2 to remain on track. He referred agencies to the Clean California webpage for additional details.

Mr. Lawhead announced that Caltrans would host several webinars in November to discuss the findings of the Caltrans Disparity Study. Agencies interested in learning more about the study could register for these sessions via the provided link.

Mr. Lawhead provided an update on Project End Date (PED) extensions, stating that Caltrans had introduced a new online intake form for PED extension requests, eliminating the previous manual processing system for E-76 extensions. Agencies could now request PED extensions through the online form, streamlining the process.

Mr. Lawhead reminded agencies that any work conducted after a project's end date is not eligible for reimbursement, making it crucial to request extensions in advance if a project is expected to exceed its timeline. He encouraged agencies to review their project schedules and submit extension requests early to avoid funding ineligibility.

Mr. Lawhead referenced a Title VI compliance slide and noted that Title VI requirements are an essential component of federal aid projects. He stated that agencies should ensure they remain in compliance with Title VI regulations.

Mr. Lawhead presented various training opportunities available, including blogs, Local Assistance Program Guidelines (LAPG), and other online resources.

Mr. Lawhead announced that Caltrans District 12 would be hosting a series of in-person training sessions, which would be free and open to all local agencies. The first scheduled session is an Environmental Compliance Seminar on November 20, 2024, at Caltrans District 12 headquarters from 8:30AM-4:30PM, which will be led by subject matter experts from Caltrans headquarters, who will provide detailed guidance on environmental compliance procedures and best practices.



AGENDA

Technical Advisory Committee

Item #1

Mr. Lawhead encouraged agencies to reach out to him if they had any questions about upcoming training sessions or would like the registration link sent directly to them. He stated that Caltrans District 12 was committed to expanding in-person training opportunities now that most staff had returned to the office.

Mr. Lawhead shared information about recent staffing changes within his team and invited agencies to reach out if they had any questions regarding specific projects or programs. He stated that if any agency felt the need to escalate an issue, they could contact him directly for assistance.

Mr. Lawhead confirmed that all updates and reference materials discussed during the meeting were available for download on the OCTA website. He stated that agencies could also contact him directly if they wanted any materials sent to them via email.

There were no questions on this item.

11. Public comments – None

12. The meeting was adjourned at 3:42 p.m.



AGENDA

Technical Advisory Committee

Item #2

Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs – 2025 Call for Projects Programming Recommendations

February 26, 2025

To: Technical Advisory Committee

From: Orange County Transportation Authority Staff

Subject: Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs – 2025 Call for Projects Programming Recommendations

Overview

The Orange County Transportation Authority approved guidelines and released the 2025 annual Measure M2 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Regional Capacity Program and Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program call for projects in August 2024. This call for projects makes grant funding available for regional roadway capacity and signal synchronization projects countywide. Based on the applications received, a list of projects recommended for funding is presented for review and approval.

Recommendations

- A. Recommend for Board of Directors approval the award of \$25.71 million in 2025 Regional Capacity Program (Project O) funds to nine local agency projects.
- B. Recommend for Board of Directors approval the award of \$11.99 million in 2025 Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (Project P) funds to six local agency projects.

Background

The Regional Capacity Program (RCP), Project O, is the Measure M2 (M2) competitive funding program through which the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) supports capacity improvements for streets and roads that are part of the Orange County Master Plan of Arterial Highways (MPAH). The Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (RTSSP), Project P, is the M2 competitive program which provides funding for regional and corridor-based

signal synchronization projects. Both programs are included in the Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs (CTFP). The CTFP allocates funds through an annual competitive call for projects (call) based on a common set of guidelines and scoring criteria that are developed in collaboration with the OCTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), which is comprised of representatives from the 35 local jurisdictions. The guidelines and the call are ultimately approved for release by the OCTA Board of Directors (Board).

The CTFP guidelines for the 2025 CTFP call were approved by the OCTA Board on August 12, 2024. At that meeting, the Board also authorized the release of the current call. On average, OCTA awards approximately \$40 to \$45 million annually through these funding programs. The deadline to submit projects for consideration for the 2025 CTFP call was October 24, 2024.

Discussion

RCP

Through the RCP program, ten applications were submitted to OCTA from seven local jurisdictions requesting a total of \$33.21 million in RCP funding (see Attachment A). The applications were reviewed for eligibility, consistency, adherence to the guidelines, and overall M2 program objectives. Applications were evaluated and ranked based on the scoring criteria identified in the 2025 CTFP guidelines. Staff worked with local jurisdictions to address technical issues such as application scoring corrections, traffic volume clarifications, and refinement of final project funding requests. During the technical review process, one application was found ineligible to compete in this cycle, due to its current traffic volumes failing to achieve the CTFP Guidelines specified Level of Service for consideration.

Out of the ten applications that were submitted, nine projects are recommended to receive \$25.71 million (inflationary adjustments would be added, as appropriate). The recommended amount differs from what was originally requested due to OCTA's detailed review of costs as listed in the applications. The revised recommended grant amount reflects only the project scope components and costs that, based on the limited information provided at this time, have been determined to be eligible per guidelines. Attachment B provides more detail on the programming recommendations.

The recommended M2 RCP funding will support RCP projects in the cities of Anaheim, Irvine, Mission Viejo, Newport Beach, Santa Ana, Yorba Linda, and the County of Orange. Of the nine recommended projects, six will provide

arterial capacity improvement benefits and three will provide intersection capacity enhancements. Implementation of these projects in aggregate is anticipated to produce notable congestion-reducing benefits in Orange County, while enhancing the arterial system overall.

It should also be noted that the applications submitted by the cities of Irvine and Newport Beach received additional points for providing further details on how the proposed bike facilities identified in their projects will help reduce congestion and improve street operations. As such, OCTA is highly interested in these projects related to potential benefits of complementary bicycle improvements to the MPAH network.

The recommendations were presented to the Technical Steering Committee (TSC) on February 12, 2025, and were endorsed for TAC approval. At the meeting, the TSC also discussed the County of Orange's future funding needs, highlighting concerns over large-scale, higher cost projects such as the Los Patrones Parkway Extension, which is being recommended for final design funding in this call and could require significant funding in future cycles. The TSC discussed the potential impact of these high-cost projects on the CTFP's sustainability, questioning whether other funding sources, such as Senate Bill 1 (SB1) funds, should be utilized instead. Additionally, the idea of implementing a funding cap for agencies within the CTFP Guidelines was raised, with suggestions that a maximum allocation per agency or separate funding limits for engineering, right-of-way, and construction phases could help ensure a more balanced distribution of funds. These questions will be considered with the next set of CTFP guidelines revisions, which would likely be brought to the TAC in the June/July timeframe.

RTSSP

With respect to the RTSSP, OCTA received six applications requesting a total of \$12.03 million in funding. Staff worked with the local jurisdictions to address technical issues related to equipment cost refinements, as well as project scope of work clarifications. Attachment A has more detail on the submitted projects.

Based on the scoring criteria and staff's review of projects costs, all six projects are recommended to receive awards which combined total \$11.99 million. The local jurisdictions have indicated that they anticipate implementing these projects in fiscal year 2025-26. Together these projects will improve throughput on six arterial roadways in the cities of Aliso Viejo, Anaheim, Brea, Costa Mesa, Fullerton, Irvine, Laguna Hills, Laguna Niguel, Mission Viejo, Newport Beach, Orange, and Santa Ana. Additional details on the

recommended signal synchronization projects and the recommended awards are provided in Attachment C.

The table below provides an overall summary of the funding recommendations:

2025 CTFP Call Summary (\$ in millions)			
	RCP	RTSSP	Total
Number of Applications Recommended for Approval	9	6	15
Amount Recommended for Approval (escalated)	\$25.71	\$11.99	\$37.70

Recommendations presented in this staff report are consistent with the 2025 guidelines approved by the Board. As such, \$37.70 million in RCP and RTSSP funding is recommended to support 15 local jurisdiction roadway and signal projects. The RCP applications for the recommended projects demonstrate a future funding need of approximately \$254 million to support right-of-way and construction phases, with \$24 million likely needed within the next three call cycles.

Upon approval by the TSC, TAC, and OCTA Board, these new projects will be incorporated into the master funding agreements between OCTA and the appropriate local jurisdictions; and as these projects advance, staff will continue to monitor their status and project delivery through the semi-annual review process.

Summary

Measure M2 RCP and RTSSP funding of \$37.7 million for 15 projects is recommended for advancement to the OCTA Board for approval.

Attachments

- A. 2025 Measure M2 Call for Projects – Applications Received
- B. 2025 M2 Regional Capacity Program (Project O) Call for Projects – Programming Recommendations
- C. 2025 M2 Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (Project P) Call for Projects – Programming Recommendations

2025 Measure M2 Call for Projects – Applications Received

Regional Capacity Program (Project O) Applications							
Agency	Project	Fund	Phase	Match Rate	Total M2 Request	Match	Total Cost
Anaheim	Lincoln Avenue and Harbor Intersection Improvements	ICE	ROW	25%	\$ 940,812	\$ 313,604	\$ 1,254,416
Anaheim	Lincoln Avenue Improvements (Evergreen Street to State College Boulevard)	ACE	ENG	10%	\$ 432,000	\$ 48,000	\$ 480,000
County of Orange	Los Patrones Parkway Extension – Final Design	ACE	ENG	50%	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 10,000,000
County of Orange	Ranch Canyon, Bucker Way, and Bucker Way Bridge - Design	ACE	ENG	50%	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 14,000,000
Irvine	Campus Drive Arterial Capacity Enhancements (Carlson Avenue to University Drive)	ACE	ENG	25%	\$ 383,250	\$ 127,750	\$ 511,000
Mission Viejo	Alicia Parkway and Olympiad Road Intersection Capacity Enhancement Project	ICE	ENG, CON	25%	\$ 723,577	\$ 241,192	\$ 964,769
Newport Beach	West Coast Highway Improvements at Old Newport Boulevard	ACE	ROW, CON	25%	\$ 4,111,458	\$ 1,370,486	\$ 5,481,944
Santa Ana	Fairview Street Improvements (Monte Carlo Drive to Trask Street)	ACE	ROW	25%	\$ 5,148,290	\$ 1,716,097	\$ 6,864,387
Yorba Linda	Lakeview Avenue Improvements (Bastanchury Road to Oriente Drive)	ACE	CON	25%	\$ 2,567,831	\$ 855,944	\$ 3,423,775
Yorba Linda	Yorba Linda Boulevard/Savi Ranch Parkway Improvements - Construction (Phase 1)	ICE	CON	29%	\$ 6,904,350	\$ 2,873,850	\$ 9,778,200
PROJECT O REQUESTED TOTALS					\$ 33,211,568	\$ 19,233,319	\$ 52,758,491

Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (Project P) Applications							
Agency	Project	Fund	Signals	Match Rate	Total M2 Request	Match	Total Cost
Anaheim	State College Boulevard Corridor (Cliffwood Avenue to Garden Grove Boulevard)	RTSSP	58	20%	\$ 3,750,147	\$ 937,537	\$ 4,687,684
Irvine	Sand Canyon Avenue Corridor (Portola Parkway to I-405 SB ramp)	RTSSP	21	20%	\$ 1,558,806	\$ 389,702	\$ 1,948,508
Laguna Hills	Avenida de Carlota Corridor (Lake Forest Drive to Los Alisos Boulevard)	RTSSP	8	20%	\$ 599,996	\$ 149,999	\$ 749,995
Laguna Niguel	Cabot Road Corridor (La Paz Road to Paseo de Colinas)	RTSSP	12	20%	\$ 881,002	\$ 220,251	\$ 1,101,253
Laguna Niguel	La Paz Road Corridor (Olympiad Road/Felipe Road to Crown Valley Parkway)	RTSSP	23	20%	\$ 1,861,644	\$ 465,411	\$ 2,327,055
Santa Ana	Bristol Street Corridor (SR-22 EB ramp to Jamboree Road)	RTSSP	45	20%	\$ 3,374,926	\$ 843,731	\$ 4,218,657
PROJECT P REQUESTED TOTALS					\$ 12,026,521	\$ 3,006,631	\$ 15,033,152

Acronyms:

- ACE - Arterial Capacity Enhancements
- CON - Construction
- ENG - Engineering
- ICE - Intersection Capacity Enhancements
- M2 - Measure M2
- OCTA - Orange County Transportation Authority
- ROW - Right-of-Way
- RTSSP - Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program
- SR-22 - State Route 22

2025 M2 Regional Capacity Program (Project O) Call for Projects - Programming Recommendations

RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

No	Agency	Fiscal Year	Project	Fund	Phase	Score	M2 Funding Engineering	M2 Funding Right-of-Way	M2 Funding Construction	Total M2 Grant*	Estimated Local Match**	Match Rate	Total Programming
1	Anaheim	25/26	Lincoln Avenue and Harbor Intersection Improvements ¹	ICE	ROW	40		\$ 886,699		\$ 886,699	\$ 295,566	25%	\$ 1,182,265
2	Anaheim	25/26	Lincoln Avenue Improvements (Evergreen Street to State College Boulevard) ²	ACE	ENG	35	\$ 360,000			\$ 360,000	\$ 120,000	25%	\$ 480,000
3	County of Orange	25/26	Los Patrones Parkway Extension – Final Design	ACE	ENG	45	\$ 5,000,000			\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	50%	\$ 10,000,000
4	Irvine	25/26	Campus Drive Arterial Capacity Enhancements (Carlson Avenue to University Drive)	ACE	ENG	62	\$ 383,250			\$ 383,250	\$ 127,750	25%	\$ 511,000
5	Mission Viejo	25/26 [†]	Alicia Parkway and Olympiad Road Intersection Capacity Enhancement Project ³	ICE	ENG	44	\$ 52,500			\$ 52,500	\$ 17,500	25%	\$ 70,000
		26/27 [†]			CON			\$ 615,023	\$ 615,023	\$ 205,008	\$ 820,031		
6	Newport Beach	25/26 [†]	West Coast Highway Widening at Old Newport Boulevard ⁴	ACE	ROW	74		\$ 2,598,759		\$ 2,598,759	\$ 866,254	25%	\$ 3,465,013
		26/27 [†]			CON			\$ 1,760,246	\$ 1,760,246	\$ 586,748	\$ 2,346,994		
7	Santa Ana	25/26 [†]	Fairview Street Improvements (Monte Carlo Drive to Trask Street) ⁵	ACE	ROW	68		\$ 4,914,769		\$ 4,914,769	\$ 1,638,256	25%	\$ 6,553,025
8	Yorba Linda	25/26	Lakeview Avenue Widening (Bastanchury Road to Oriente Drive) ⁶	ACE	CON	43			\$ 2,238,155	\$ 2,238,155	\$ 746,052	25%	\$ 2,984,207
9	Yorba Linda	25/26	Yorba Linda Boulevard/Savi Ranch Parkway Improvements - Construction (Phase 1) ⁷	ICE	CON	47			\$ 6,904,350	\$ 6,904,350	\$ 2,301,450	25%	\$ 9,205,800
PROJECT O PROGRAMMING TOTALS							\$ 5,795,750	\$ 8,400,227	\$ 11,517,774	\$ 25,713,751	\$ 11,904,584		\$ 37,618,335

¹Includes escalation of 1.8% for all construction phases programmed for fiscal year 2026/27.

**Actual match amount is determined by the match rate percentage. Dollar amount is listed for estimate purposes.

[†] Pre-award authority requested.

NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING (Ineligible - Does Not Meet Project O Eligibility Requirements Based Upon Current Traffic Counts)

1	County of Orange	25/26	Ranch Canyon, Bucker Way, and Bucker Way Bridge - Design [†]	ACE	ENG	-	\$ 7,000,000			\$ 7,000,000	\$ 7,000,000	50%	\$ 14,000,000
---	------------------	-------	---	-----	-----	---	--------------	--	--	--------------	--------------	-----	---------------

[†]Project is not recommended for programming due to not complying with CTFP Guidelines requirement, specifically with respect to current traffic volumes meeting a minimum LOS "C" (0.71v/c).

1. Applicant requested additional funding but award is reduced to reflect eligibility of items within project scope and correct match reduction. Total project cost is \$1.25 million. The M2 grant plus local match is listed as \$1.18 million; an additional \$72k to come from local sources.
2. Applicants original request provided only 10% match but 25% match is required. Award amount was reduced and match increased to fully fund the project and to reflect local match requirement of 25%. Total project cost is \$480k.
3. Applicant requested additional funding but award is reduced to reflect eligibility of items within project scope and correct match reduction. Total project cost is \$965k for ENG and CON. The M2 grant plus local match is listed as \$890k for ENG and CON; an additional \$75k to come from local sources.
4. Applicant initially requested less funding but award is increased to reflect eligibility of items within project scope. Total project cost is \$5.77 million for ROW and CON, which is equivalent to the M2 grant plus local match.
5. Applicant requested additional funding but award is reduced to reflect eligibility of items within project scope. Total project cost is \$6.86 million. The M2 grant plus local match is \$6.55 million; an additional \$311k to come from local sources. The recommended grant includes an administrative exception to the CTFP guidelines that would accept the project's categorical CEQA exemption after the October 24, 2024 call for projects application deadline. The notice of exemption was in progress at the time of application submittal and approved by the applicant's city council on February 6, 2025.
6. Applicant requested additional funding but award is reduced to reflect eligibility of items within project scope. Total project cost is \$3.42 million. The M2 grant plus local match is \$2.98 million; an additional \$440k to come from local sources. The recommended grant is a reapplication from prior cycles.
7. The recommended grant includes a minor exception to the CTFP guidelines to allow work within a 600 feet from intersection for the benefit of the MPAH to reach a logical terminus on Mirage Street. This excludes sidewalk improvements on Mirage Street beyond the beginning curb return.

Acronyms:

- ACE - Arterial Capacity Enhancements
- CEQA - California Environmental Quality Act
- CON - Construction
- CTFP - Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs
- ENG - Engineering
- ICE - Intersection Capacity Enhancements
- LOS - Level of Service
- M2 - Measure M2
- ROW - Right-of-Way
- v/c - Volume/Capacity

**2025 M2 Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (Project P) Call for Projects -
Programming Recommendations**

No	Agency	Fiscal Year	Project	Score	M2 Funding Primary Implementation	M2 Funding Operations & Maintenance	Total M2 Grant	Estimated Local Match*	Match Rate	Total Programming
1	Anaheim	25/26	State College Boulevard Corridor (Cliffwood Avenue to Garden Grove Boulevard) ¹	76	\$ 3,493,171	\$ 269,120	\$ 3,762,291	\$ 940,573	20%	\$ 4,702,864
2	Irvine	25/26	Sand Canyon Avenue Corridor (Portola Parkway to I-405 SB ramp) ²	62	\$ 1,398,259	\$ 96,800	\$ 1,495,059	\$ 373,765	20%	\$ 1,868,824
3	Laguna Hills	25/26	Avenida de Carlota Corridor (Lake Forest Drive to Los Alisos Boulevard)	41	\$ 580,412	\$ 19,584	\$ 599,996	\$ 149,999	20%	\$ 749,995
4	Laguna Niguel	25/26	Cabot Road Corridor (La Paz Road to Paseo de Colinas) ³	57	\$ 761,346	\$ 67,680	\$ 829,026	\$ 207,256	20%	\$ 1,036,282
5	Laguna Niguel	25/26	La Paz Road Corridor (Olympiad Road/Felipe Road to Crown Valley Parkway) ⁴	66	\$ 1,809,061	\$ 124,080	\$ 1,933,141	\$ 483,285	20%	\$ 2,416,426
6	Santa Ana	25/26 [†]	Bristol Street Corridor (SR-22 EB Ramp to Jamboree Road)	76	\$ 3,262,926	\$ 112,000	\$ 3,374,926	\$ 843,731	20%	\$ 4,218,657
PROJECT P PROGRAMMING TOTALS					\$ 11,305,174	\$ 689,264	\$ 11,994,438	\$ 2,998,610		\$ 14,993,048

*Actual match amount is determined by the match rate percentage. Dollar amount is listed for estimate purposes.

[†] Pre-award authority requested.

1. Applicant initially requested less funding but award is increased to reflect consistent equipment unit costs. Total project cost is \$4.70 million for IMP and O&M, which is equivalent to the M2 grant plus local match.
2. Applicant requested additional funding but award is reduced to reflect updated cost estimate for Task 2. Total project cost is \$1.56 million. The M2 grant plus local match is listed as \$1.87 million; an additional \$64k to come from local sources.
3. Applicant requested additional funding but award is reduced to reflect revised budget. Total project cost is \$881k. The M2 grant plus local match is listed as \$1.03 million; an additional \$52k to come from local sources.
4. Applicant initially requested less funding but award is increased to reflect one contract with design and CON. Total project cost is \$2.42 million for one contract, which is equivalent to the M2 grant plus local match.

Acronyms:

- EB - Eastbound
- IMP - Implementation
- I-405 - Interstate 405
- M2 - Measure M2
- O&M - Operations and Maintenance
- RTSSP - Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program
- SB - Southbound
- SR-22 - State Route 22



Correspondence



Item 3, Attachment A: OCTA Board Items of Interest

- **Monday, October 28, 2024**

Item #21: Measure M2 Next 10 Delivery Plan: Market Conditions Key Indicators Analysis and Forecast

- **Monday, November 12, 2024**

Item #4: 2024 Board of Directors and Chief Executive Officer Initiatives and Action Plan - Third Quarter Progress Report

Item #5: Regional Planning Update

Item #6: Orange County Transportation Authority Climate Adaptation and Sustainability Plan Follow-Up Activities Update

Item #7: 2025 Active Transportation Program Regional Project Prioritization Point Assignments for Orange County

Item #16: Amendment to Agreement for Regional Modeling-Traffic Operations On-Call Support Staffing Agreement

Item #17: Active Transportation Program Biannual Update

Item #18: Measure M2 2024 Update: Next 10 Delivery Plan

- **Monday, November 25, 2024**

Item #13: Acceptance of Grant Award from Department of the Homeland Security Transit Security Grant Program

Item #14: Low Carbon Transit Operations Program Corrective Action Plans

Item #15: Draft Orange County Human Services Transportation Coordinated Plan

Item #16: Funding Recommendations for the 2024 Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program

- **Monday, December 9, 2024**

Item #12: 2025 Active Transportation Program Regional Project Prioritization Point Assignments for Orange County

Item #13: State and Federal Grant Acceptance for the Coastal Rail Infrastructure Resiliency Project

Item #22: Measure M2 Environmental Mitigation Program Update

Item #23: 2025 Technical Steering Committee Membership

Item #24: Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Semi-Annual Review - September 2024

Item #25: Measure M2 Quarterly Progress Report for the Period July 2024 through September 2024

Item #26: Agreement for Traffic Signal Improvements for Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program Projects

Item #28: 2024 OC Transit Vision Progress Update



AGENDA

Technical Advisory Committee

Item #3

Item #29: Principles for 405 Express Lanes Excess Toll Revenue Policy and Expenditure Plan

- **Monday, January 13, 2025**

Item #10: Proposed New Fare Media

Item #11: Update on Measure M2 Project I

Item #12: Update on Measure M2 Project C and D (Interstate 5 Improvement Project Between State Route 73 and El Toro Road)

- **Monday, January 27, 2025**

Item #3: 2025 Board of Directors and Chief Executive Officer Initiatives and Action Plan

Item #12: Measure M2 Community-Based Transit Circulators Program Project V Ridership Report

Item #13: Cooperative Agreement with the City of Santa Ana for the First Street Multimodal Boulevard Study

Item #14: OC Streetcar Project Quarterly Update

Item #15: Proposed State Route 241/91 Express Connector Update

- **Monday, February 10, 2025**

Item #7: Competitive Grant Programs - Update and Recommendations

Item #10: Measure M2 Annual Eligibility Review

Item #11: Coastal Rail Resiliency Study Update

Item #12: Coastal Rail Stabilization Priority Project Update

Item #13: Update on Measure M2 Project B Interstate 5 Improvement Project Between Interstate 405 and State Route 55

- **Monday, February 24, 2025**

Item #9: State Legislative Status Report

Item #10: Federal Legislative Status Report

Item #15: OC Streetcar Funding and Schedule Update and Amendments to Supporting Agreements

Item #16: Zero-Emission Bus Program Update



Item 3, Attachment B: Announcements by Email

- October 23, 2024 OCTA Technical Advisory Committee Agenda and Meeting Information, *sent on 10/18/2024*
- REMINDER: 2025 Projects O & P Call Applications Due on October 24th at 5:00pm, *sent 10/21/2024*
- November 2024 OCTA Technical Steering Committee (TSC) and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting Cancellation Notices, *sent on 11/8/2024*
- Orange County Transportation Authority Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program, Surface Transportation Block Grant Program Letter of Interest, *sent on 11/14/2024*
- REMINDER: OCTA CMAQ STBG Letters of Interest Due Monday, November 25, *sent on 11/21/2024*
- December 2024 OCTA Technical Steering Committee and Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Cancellation Notices, *sent on 12/4/2024*
- M2 Ten-Year Review: TAC Stakeholder Meeting, *sent on 1/7/2025*
- January 22, 2025 OCTA Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Cancellation Notice, *sent on 1/17/2025*
- REMINDER: M2 Ten-Year Review: TAC Stakeholder Group, *sent on 1/22/2025*
- March 2025 Measure M2 CTFP Semi-Annual Review is Now Open, *sent 1/29/2025*