



AGENDA

Technical Steering Committee

2025 Committee Members

Tom Wheeler, Chair
Iris Lee, Vice Chair
Temo Galvez, District 1
Nabil Saba, District 2
Jamie Lai, District 3
Rudy Emami, District 4
Joe Ames, District 5
Jacki Scott, At-Large
Robert McLean, At-Large

Orange County Transportation Authority
550 South Main Street, Room 09
Orange, California
February 12, 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) 560-5528, 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

The 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. 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 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 Steering Committee regular meeting minutes from the June 12, 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

6. Items for Future Agendas



AGENDA

Technical Steering Committee

7. Public Comments

8. Adjournment

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



June 12, 2024 Minutes



MINUTES

Technical Steering Committee

Item #1

Voting Representatives Present:

Jamie Lai, <i>Chair</i>	City of Yorba Linda
Mark Trestik, <i>Vice Chair</i>	City of Laguna Beach
Iris Lee, <i>District 1</i>	City of Seal Beach
Tom Wheeler, <i>District 3</i>	City of Lake Forest
Rudy Emami, <i>District 4</i>	City of Anaheim
Raja Sethuraman, <i>District 5</i>	City of Costa Mesa
Jacki Scott, <i>At-Large</i>	City of Laguna Niguel

Orange County Transportation Authority
550 South Main Street, Room 07

Orange, California

June 12, 2024, 1:30 p.m.

Voting Representatives Absent:

Nabil Saba, <i>District 2</i>	City of Santa Ana
-------------------------------	-------------------

Guests Present:

Joe Ames	City of Laguna Hills
Jim Houlihan	City of Newport Beach
Paul Rodriguez	Rodriguez Consulting Group

Staff Present:

Kia Mortazavi
Adriann Cardoso
Charvalen Alacar
Alicia Yang
Melanie Masud
Melissa Mungia
Megan Taylor
Nylinne Nguyen
Stephanie Mooney
Kristopher Martinez
Peter Sotherland
Cynthia Morales
Samantha Vu
Dulce Mejicanos



Meeting was called to order by Ms. Lai at 1:30 p.m. on June 12, 2024.

Self-Introductions

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. **The Minutes for the March 19, 2024 Meeting were approved.**

Mr. Wheeler motioned to approve the minutes.

Mr. Emami seconded the motion.

The Minutes were approved; there was no further discussion.

REGULAR ITEMS

2. **2024 Measure M2 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs – Proposed Guidelines Modifications for 2025 Call for Projects** – Charvalen Alacar

Ms. Alacar presented proposed changes to the Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs (CTFP) guidelines for Measure M2's Project O (Regional Capacity Program) and Project P (Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program).

She explained that there were 46 proposed changes, highlighting under Project O, expanded eligibility for pavement rehabilitation and resurfacing within project limits on a case-by-case basis, inclusion of Class 4 bikeway improvements in approved transportation plans, and additional points for detailed quantitative analysis of bike facilities' benefits.

She also detailed stricter guidelines for corridor-based applications under Project P, including a new requirement for origin-destination studies and an increase in points for multi-jurisdictional cooperation.

Ms. Alacar outlined the timeline for the 2025 call for projects (call), stating that the call would be issued on August 12, 2024, with applications due by August 24, 2024. Programming recommendations would be presented to the Technical Steering Committee (TSC) and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in February or March 2025 and to the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) Board of Directors (Board) in the April/May 2025 timeframe.

Ms. Lai thanked staff for accommodating changes on the active transportation side and the notes about Class 1 [facilities].



MINUTES

Technical Steering Committee

Item #1

Ms. Lai stated that there have been discussions regarding Class 1 bikeways that are still ongoing and requested to strike Lines 12 and 15 on the proposed changes list [Attachment A]. She shared concerns about including the Class 1 bikeways language given the ongoing conversations and suggested that references to Class 1 be tabled until there can be a more robust conversation amongst the TAC members to accommodate varying city perspectives.

Ms. Cardoso clarified the distinction between Class 4 and Class 1 bike facilities and emphasized the need for further study and data.

Ms. Scott stated that at the last meeting, the TSC was across the board generally in favor of considering Class 1s especially since the MPAH guidelines support complete streets and that the takeaway was that there would be some discussion and a presentation as to how Class 1 facilities could or could not fit; however, it is not clearly explained as to how we can support why Class 1 facilities do not fit or how the MPAH guidelines can support complete streets while excluding Class 1.

Mr. Sethuraman shared an example on Harbor Boulevard, stating the need to build a Class 1 bike lane within the street right-of-way. He stated that this should be eligible; however, Class 1 projects in parks or similar areas should be treated differently. There should be a clear distinction about which Class 1 projects are eligible.

Mr. Sethuraman suggested a 25 percent limit to construction and stated that projects like Class 2 and Class 4, as well as standalone Class 1 projects, should be eligible.

Ms. Cardoso stated that as the guidelines are currently written, standalone Class 1 projects are not eligible due to Measure M language, which prioritizes arterial highway improvements to reduce congestion.

Mr. Sethuraman stated alternative transportation modes such as bike lanes can reduce car trips and congestion. He stated that these bike facilities should be seen as part of the street system and that they serve an important purpose.

Ms. Cardoso stated that the program's intent has been vehicular congestion reduction and that projects should align with the Master Plan of Arterial Highways (MPAH) requirements before considering bike-related projects.

Mr. Sethuraman stated that adding bike lanes is another method to reduce congestion without needing to widen streets significantly.



MINUTES

Technical Steering Committee

Item #1

Ms. Cardoso stated that OCTA needs strong data to support the impact of standalone bike facilities on reducing congestion. This information is essential before making major changes to eligibility.

Mr. Sethuraman stated that many bike trips are utilitarian, such as school commutes or trips to shops, which contribute to reducing car use and that they should not be dismissed as recreational.

Mr. Sotherland stated that Class 4 bike lanes are easier to justify within the MPAH context and that Class 1 lanes often raise questions about their direct impact on the associated road due to their location and varying distances from the road.

Ms. Lai stated that data collection is crucial, but projects like Class 1 bike lanes adjacent to roadways—functioning similarly to Class 2 lanes—should be considered eligible and that it is worth continuing the discussion.

Ms. Cardoso stated that Class 4 bike lanes appear promising for congestion reduction and safety. She continued that for Class 1 lanes, we need data to demonstrate transportation benefits versus recreational uses.

Mr. Emami stated there is a need to connect bikeways such as the Santa Ana River Trail with road networks to promote consistent bike usage and stated that the data can follow construction to demonstrate the impact on congestion.

Mr. Sotherland stated that the discussions about Project O weigh its responsibility toward the MPAH. He continued that for Class 1 lanes, it is important to consider their location and direct benefits to the associated road. Cases can be made, but we need firm footing to show how they fit within Project O.

Mr. Emami stated that standalone projects in parks or river channels have other funding sources, but for bikeway connections to roadways, while data is essential, we need to build it in order to get the data. He stated that agencies cannot wait indefinitely to build connections to existing bikeways on the roads and that using Project O for such projects could demonstrate and yield the congestion reduction benefits needed.

Mr. Wheeler asked if there is a distinction between Class 1 within the right-of-way and Class 4 and stated that the way the CTFP guidelines are written, Class 1 within the right-of-way might not be eligible.



MINUTES

Technical Steering Committee

Item #1

Ms. Lai asked clarification if the road right-of-way or the public right-of-way was being referenced since a Class 1 lane adjacent to the roadway should be eligible.

Ms. Lai stated the guidelines have gray areas, which need clarification, and stated that approving the current language could close the door on future discussions about Class 1 eligibility.

Mr. Mortazavi stated that bikeways were not part of the consideration when the [Project O section of the M2 Ordinance] was written and that times have changed. He alluded to Ms. Scott's reference of complete streets and emphasized that OCTA supports streets, complete streets and not trails.

Mr. Mortazavi stated that Class 1 supports a network of trails, and that the definition of Class 1 is off-street. Class 4 is on-street but separated, which addresses safety benefits and offers similar Class 1 features.

Mr. Mortazavi stated that separately OCTA has made \$90 million available in active transportation funding; however, with Project O, we have to stay true to Measure M commitments to the voters, which is important for public trust. By allowing for Class 4, we are able to respond to your constituents' requests for a safe and protected bike lane but within the MPAH facility in conjunction with other congestion relief improvements.

Ms. Scott clarified that the TSC comments refer to Class 1 bike trails that are parallel to arterials, tied directly to MPAH roadways, and included on a bikeway master plan. She stated that the TSC is open to a distinction on them being made between a transportation facility and a recreational areas and conferred to the TSC for affirmation.

Mr. Sethuraman asked to include allowing Class 1 projects on their own. He stated that there is other data to prove you have a good network and that bikeways can reduce congestion and provide measurable benefits to improving the MPAH program.

Mr. Wheeler stated that the MPAH may not be consistent since some sections have bike facilities and a couple do not. He suggested a starting point of looking at what the MPAH is supposed to look like in the future and then rebuilding it.

Mr. Trestik stated that there are sections of the MPAH that have not been implemented due to right-of-way constraints and other reasons and that adding bicycle facilities is a way to create a project that improves street operations and reduces congestion.



MINUTES

Technical Steering Committee

Item #1

Mr. Mortazavi stated that bicycle facilities may have different purposes and in terms of the MPAH, the benefits are unclear.

Ms. Lai referenced the MPAH guidelines and stated that the MPAH encourages balanced transportation systems, including bike facilities. She added that Class 1 bike paths adjacent to roadways are what is being requested and should be considered within this framework.

Ms. Cardoso stated Class 4 lanes reduce congestion and enhance safety. Class 1 projects need strong data to demonstrate similar benefits. The current language reflects this cautious approach.

Ms. Lai stated clarifying language in the CTFP guidelines is crucial and is important to ensure flexibility for future discussions and avoid prematurely excluding projects.

Ms. Lai stated guidelines should remain flexible, avoiding strict exclusions that limit project possibilities. Continuing the discussion and gathering data will help refine decisions.

Mr. Mortazavi stressed the importance of adhering to Measure M commitments while adapting to current transportation needs.

Mr. Sethuraman expressed strong advocacy for including Class 1 lanes adjacent to roadways. He argued that such facilities are critical for reducing congestion and promoting alternative transportation modes. He highlighted that many trips made on these facilities are utilitarian, such as commuting to schools or shops, and should not be dismissed as recreational.

Mr. Mortazavi: Supported modernizing the guidelines to include Class 4 lanes, emphasizing their role in improving safety and reducing congestion. He pointed out that times have changed, and the guidelines should reflect current transportation needs, while still maintaining Measure M commitments to public trust and accountability.

Ms. Lai emphasized the importance of aligning bike facilities with transportation purposes and MPAH requirements. She highlighted the distinction between transportation-focused facilities and those intended for recreational use.

Ms. Lai suggested clarifying the language in the guidelines to ensure flexibility. She noted that overly restrictive language could prematurely exclude valuable projects and stifle innovation.



MINUTES

Technical Steering Committee

Item #1

Mr. Sethuraman stated that Class 1 bike lanes should be within the right-of-way to be eligible. He noted that standalone Class 1 projects often resemble glorified sidewalks and questioned why such projects are excluded.

Ms. Cardoso explained that the CTFP guidelines currently focus on roadways and do not cover right-of-way costs outside the roadway and that the challenge is extending eligibility to off-roadway projects.

Mr. Emami asked if standalone projects would be better suited for the Active Transportation Program (ATP) funding rather than Measure M funds.

Mr. Sethuraman responded that ATP funding often has limited availability and is not performing well, with few neighborhoods benefiting over the past five years.

Ms. Cardoso stated that that Project O may not be the right funding program for standalone bike projects. She continued that OCTA has issued multiple calls for bike projects in the past 12 years, which would consider standalone bike projects eligible. Recent calls under the Orange County Complete Streets Program are funding numerous projects, but as of today, we do not have the data to justify changes to Class 1 eligibility. She noted that the MPAH framework does not currently support standalone Class 1 projects.

Mr. Sethuraman pointed out that even Class 2 and Class 4 lanes are not allowed as independent projects, and Class 1 lanes should be treated similarly to ensure consistency.

Ms. Lai summarized the need for further discussion on Class 1 eligibility and emphasized ensuring that the CTFP guidelines remain flexible to accommodate future refinements.

Ms. Lai asked for any public comment on the bike side.

Mr. Ames commented about liking a lot of the language OCTA added about Class 2 and Class 4 bikeways but expressed concerns about the lack of clear specifications and between Class 1 and Class 4 bikeways, noting that they are not significantly different in function. He suggests that clearer diagrams and dimensions be included in project documentation to avoid future debates about whether a bikeway qualifies as Class 1 or Class 4.



MINUTES

Technical Steering Committee

Item #1

Mr. Ames stated concerns with the criteria for determining whether a bikeway is part of a roadway project, particularly when right-of-way is involved and emphasized the need for consistent guidelines to address these concerns.

Mr. Ames highlighted the topic of Class 1 bikeways being deemed ineligible for certain projects and requested consideration for funding to improve Class 1 bikeway crossings over major arterial roads (MPAH facilities), such as through bicycle signals or at-grade intersections. He clarified that full bridges are not being asked for and stated that it would be beneficial to have provisions for improved crossings in such cases.

Ms. Cardoso proposed tying the 25 percent limitation for bike facilities to other existing limitations, such as 10 percent. She asked if there were any concerns or confirmation of the reasonableness of this approach.

Mr. Wheeler stated that 25 percent seemed higher than anticipated for a bike facility, but that he defers to others and would not object if they were to spend that amount.

Mr. Sotherland stated that the 25 percent helps with the higher cost improvements that include curb and gutter.

Mr. Mortazavi agreed with the proposed limitation range but emphasized the importance of balancing bollards and curb and gutter designs to achieve project goals effectively.

Mr. Trestik asked clarification on if pedestrian improvements are included within the 25 percent bike facility limitation.

Ms. Alacar stated that the 25 percent limitation applies solely to bicycle facilities and does not include pedestrian improvements.

Ms. Cardoso asked the group about the need to include limitations on private property acquisition for Class 4, particularly how these could impact certain projects.

Ms. Alacar responded by stating that acquisition related to bike or pedestrian improvements must be incidental to the project and cannot be its sole focus.

Ms. Lee referred to added language [on CTFP Guidelines page 7-14] and stated concerns with the ambiguity of eligible activities and the associated burden placed on applicants to ensure compliance. She shared examples, such as disputes over landscaping reimbursements, which are sometimes questioned during audits.



MINUTES

Technical Steering Committee

Item #1

Mr. Rodriguez stated that there are challenges in determining eligibility of items at the application review stage, which are posed by sequential funding, particularly when designs are at different stages at the time of application such as 35 percent completion for right-of-way applications.

Ms. Cardoso stated the need for clear documentation and local responsibility to prevent reimbursement disputes.

Mr. Emami and Ms. Lai suggested providing additional guidance or processes to ensure applicants understand eligible activities from the beginning, referencing as an example, application pre-meetings hosted by OCTA as a helpful resource.

Ms. Cardoso agreed with the importance of thorough pre-meetings to clarify expectations and prevent future misunderstandings.

Ms. Scott recommended revising the proposed pavement rehabilitation language to allow agencies some discretion to include additional paving within the project area, up to a 10 percent cap, beyond the project's original scope to address failing infrastructure.

Ms. Scott shared experience with incidental pavement costs being removed as ineligible costs during the call application process due to a strict interpretation of the guidelines and stated that the goal of the revised language is to incorporate reassurances into the guidelines that would allow agencies that discretion and not be interpreted out of eligibility as a result of OCTA staff review.

Ms. Cardoso suggested using the revised language recommended by Ms. Scott and tying to it a requirement that the base project paving be identified in the project application, as well as the incidental pavement area in order to provide OCTA with a basis for the 10 percent limitation.

Ms. Scott stated that it would require an extra step but thinks agencies would be amenable to some additional work in the design phase since it is so beneficial to the project. She shared difficulties in tracking and documenting the 10 percent discretionary improvements during the actual implementation due to logistical challenges.

Mr. Wheeler supported the inclusion of a clear 10 percent cap for pavement improvements, noting the two-step approach.



MINUTES

Technical Steering Committee

Item #1

Ms. Scott concluded that local agencies are struggling with the rising costs of paving and the inability to meet these needs and that this guidelines change would go a long way with local agencies to show that OCTA is really listening and cares how these projects turn out.

Ms. Lai asked if there are any other comments on the proposed changes.

Mr. Ames stated that he was surprised about the new text concerning route projects that requires origin-destination (OD) count data. He shared that the City of Laguna Hills previously noted that conducting such a study would cost over \$50,000. Requiring this upfront without clear thresholds for validating the data creates a significant barrier for cities to propose route projects.

Mr. Ames stated that requiring cities to spend money without clear criteria on data validation will discourage projects with more than two corridors and affirmed his opposition to the language, as it could limit potential route projects.

Ms. Yang clarified that Project P started as a regional corridor initiative focused on end-to-end corridors and that over time, it evolved to include grid networks, crossing corridors, and routes. She explained that a route connects corridors, and timing for two linked routes can be inferred from traffic patterns. However, for three linked corridors, OD data becomes necessary to identify traffic flow beyond simple turning movement counts. She noted the lack of comprehensive data to confirm traffic flows from one corridor to a third and emphasized the need for area-specific thresholds.

Ms. Yang continued that OD data could justify creating a route instead of breaking existing ones and suggested that grid networks might be a viable alternative in cases involving three corridors.

Mr. Ames expressed concerns about South County's lack of traditional grid networks, where streets often end at T-intersections. He provided examples from Mission Viejo and Laguna Hills, where zigzagging streets are part of a route. He stated that OD data requirements, which could cost \$50,000, create uncertainty about whether a project will qualify under OCTA standards. He argued that arterial highway projects are not subject to similar analysis and requested consistency in evaluating corridor and route projects.

Ms. Yang responded that OD data is essential for linking corridors and establishing a route, as simulations alone do not provide sufficient evidence. She acknowledged the concerns about costs and reiterated the importance of data to validate projects.



MINUTES

Technical Steering Committee

Item #1

Mr. Sethuraman suggested that traffic models could potentially extract OD data.

Ms. Yang noted that these models rely on the data provided and may not account for complex travel patterns. She reiterated that linking corridors into a route requires more robust evidence than timing a single arterial corridor.

Mr. Ames argued that requiring OD data could disqualify unique South County projects and noted that projects involving multiple jurisdictions, like those in Laguna Hills and surrounding cities, face additional challenges. He requested that OCTA consider lower-cost alternatives, such as Google data, instead of traditional license plate surveys.

Ms. Yang stated that the difficulty in setting thresholds is compounded by the lack of data from previous applications and that the intent of the route program is to ensure corridors are genuinely linked, rather than just connecting them arbitrarily.

Mr. Ames reiterated the high cost of OD count data, equating it to a "license plate survey," and expressed concerns that this will prevent worthwhile projects, especially those in South County with non-traditional street layouts.

Mr. Sethuraman agreed that traffic modeling can be a valid alternative to OD data, as it incorporates the same essential elements needed for OD analysis.

Ms. Yang explained that OD data is vital for simulation models to work properly and that different methods of gathering OD data are available, including the use of services like Optem, which specializes in OD data collection.

Mr. Ames noted the availability of cheaper alternatives for OD data collection, specifically Google data, but worries that it might not be sufficient to guarantee project approval under OCTA's criteria.

Ms. Cardoso proposed modifying the language to allow for alternative forms of OD data, such as Google data, to make the process more affordable for cities.

Mr. Ames supported the proposal to accept more affordable alternatives to traditional OD count data and cautioned that it remains uncertain whether these alternatives will meet OCTA's criteria for project approval.

Ms. Lai encouraged further discussion on the proposed changes and suggested that the committee address comments and concerns at a future meeting. She also noted that the language might not be entirely stricken but revised based on feedback.



MINUTES

Technical Steering Committee

Item #1

Mr. Sethuraman stated that he will not approve the current proposal unless adjustments are made to ensure standalone bike projects are eligible.

Ms. Lai asked for a motion to approve the proposed updates to the CTFP guidelines, including the discussed revisions and additional considerations for Class 4 projects.

A motion was made by Mr. Emami.

Mr. Wheeler seconded the motion.

The motion was approved.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

3. Correspondence

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

4. Committee Comments – None

5. Staff Comments

Ms. Cardoso stated that SCAG approved STBG and CMAQ funding for Complete Streets projects, totaling \$58 million to date, with additional funding expected.

Ms. Cardoso also provided an update that OCTA's internal audit will be in attendance at the upcoming TAC meeting to discuss audits and future plans.

6. Items for Future Agendas

Mr. Mortazavi commented on cities being deemed ineligible due to a lack of understanding of Measure M requirements, often caused by staff turnover. He emphasized the need for clearer communication and awareness of upcoming reviews by the Taxpayers Oversight Committee and auditors.

Mr. Wheeler inquired about OCTA's outreach to finance departments and their role in addressing these issues.

Mr. Larson explained the annual workshops for finance and public works directors, highlighting a case where staff turnover led to an unresolved finding. He shared plans



MINUTES

Technical Steering Committee

Item #1

for proactive communication with city managers and finance directors to ensure compliance before audits.

Mr. Mortazavi reiterates the importance of internal alignment within cities and emphasizes avoiding compliance issues by maintaining proper documentation.

Ms. Lai suggests making annual workshops for finance and public works directors mandatory to prevent gaps in institutional knowledge.

Mr. Larson stated his support for the idea and shared plans to track new hires and ensure knowledge transfer to avoid compliance gaps caused by staff changes.

7. Public Comments – none

8. The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.



AGENDA

Technical Steering Committee

Item #2

2025 CTFP Call for Projects – O and P Programming Recommendations



February 12, 2025

To: Technical Steering Committee

From: Orange County Transportation Authority Staff

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

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.

Background

The Regional Capacity Program (RCP), Project O, is the Measure M2 (M2) competitive funding program through which the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) supports streets and roads capital projects. The Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program (RTSSP), Project P, is the M2 competitive program which provides funding for signal synchronization projects.

Both programs are included in the Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs (CTFP). The CTFP allocates funds through an annual competitive call for projects (call) based on a common set of guidelines and scoring criteria that are developed in collaboration with the OCTA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), which 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 call were approved by the OCTA Board on August 12, 2024. At that meeting, the Board also authorized issuance of the current call. On average, OCTA awards approximately \$30 million through the RCP and \$12 million through the RTSSP annually. The deadline to submit projects for consideration through this 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. Accordingly, this applicant is encouraged to work with OCTA as they develop their proposed project for a future funding 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 appear 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 Master Plan of Arterial Highways (MPAH) network

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 a total of \$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.

If approved by the Technical Steering Committee (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

The proposed programming recommendations for projects in the RCP and RTSSP have been developed by staff. Funding for 15 projects totaling \$37.70 in M2 funds is proposed. Staff is seeking TSC approval to advance these programming recommendations, as presented, to the OCTA TAC for further consideration and ultimately to the 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		\$ 205,008
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		\$ 586,748
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	\$ 2,873,850	29%	\$ 9,778,200
PROJECT O PROGRAMMING TOTALS							\$ 5,795,750	\$ 8,400,227	\$ 11,517,774	\$ 25,713,751	\$ 12,476,984		\$ 38,190,735

*Includes 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, Buckner Way, and Buckner 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" (0.71w/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, June 10, 2024**
 - Item #7: Measure M2 Quarterly Progress Report for the Period of January 2024 through March 2024*
 - Item #8: Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Semi-Annual Review - March 2024*
 - Item #9: Agreement for the Next Safe Travels Education Program*

- **Monday, June 24, 2024**
 - Item #33: August 2024 Bus Service Change*

- **Monday, July 8, 2024**
 - Item #9: 2024 State Transportation Improvement Program Update*
 - Item #10: Master Agreement for State-Funded Projects*
 - Item #11: 2024 Board of Directors and Chief Executive Officer Initiatives and Action Plan - Mid-Year Report*
 - Item #15: Measure M2 Environmental Mitigation Program Update*
 - Item #16: Measure M2 Eligibility Review Recommendations for Fiscal Year 2022-23 Expenditure Reports*
 - Item #17: Draft 2024 State Route 91 Implementation Plan*
 - Item #18: Active Transportation Program Biannual Update*

- **Monday, August 12, 2024**
 - Item #3: Competitive Grant Programs - Update and Recommendations*
 - Item #4: SB 1 (Chapter 5, Statutes of 2017) State of Good Repair Program Recommendations for Fiscal Year 2024-25 and 2025-26*
 - Item #5: SB 125 (Chapter 54, Statutes of 2023) Transit Program Approval*
 - Item #9: Release 2025 Annual Call for Projects for Measure M2 Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs*
 - Item #10: Measure M2 Community-Based Transit Circulators Program Project V Ridership Report*
 - Item #11: South Orange County Transportation Projects Update*

- **Monday, September 9, 2024**
 - Item #9: Amendments to the Master Plan of Arterial Highways*
 - Item #11: Consultant Selection for Preparation of the State Route 73 (Bison Avenue to Interstate 405) Multimodal Corridor Feasibility Study*
 - Item #12: Active Transportation Program Regional Project Selection Process - Orange County Project Prioritization Methodology*
 - Item #14: 2024 Title VI Service Standards, Policies, and Service Monitoring Program*
 - Item #19: Measure M2 Quarterly Progress Report for the Period of April 2024 through June 2024*



AGENDA

Technical Steering Committee

Item #3

Item #20: Cooperative Agreement with the City of Santa Ana for the McFadden Avenue Transit Signal Priority Pilot

Item #21: Annual Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program Update

- **Monday, September 23, 2024**

Item #11: November 2024 Bus Service Change

Item #14: 2024 Measure M2 Community-Based Transit Circulators (Project V) Call for Projects Programming Recommendations

Item #15: Approval to Release Invitation for Bids for Traffic Signal Improvements for Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program Projects

- **Monday, October 14, 2024**

Item #8: Santa Ana River Crossings and 19th Street Reclassification Review and Status Update

Item #9: Federal Transit Administration Program of Projects for Federal Fiscal Year 2023-24

Item #15: Approval to Release Invitation for Bids for Traffic Signal Improvements for Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program Projects

Item #20: Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs - Project X Tier 1 and Tier 2 2024 Calls for Projects Programming Recommendations

Item #22: Measure M2 Ten-Year Review Framework

- **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



AGENDA

Technical Steering Committee

Item #3

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

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



AGENDA

Technical Steering Committee

Item #3

Item 3, Attachment B: Announcements by Email

- August 28, 2024 OCTA Technical Steering Committee Meeting Cancellation Notice, *sent 8/23/2024*
- REMINDER: 2025 CTFP Projects O & P Call Workshop on September 4, *sent 9/3/2024*
- REMINDER: September 2024 Measure M2 CTFP Semi-Annual Review Closes on September 13, 2024, *sent 9/5/2024*
- September 11, 2024 OCTA Technical Steering Committee Meeting Cancellation Notice, *sent on 9/6/2024*
- 2025 Federal Transportation Improvement Program Website Update and Meetings, *sent on 9/9/2024*
- FINAL REMINDER: September 2024 CTFP Semi-Annual Review Closes on September 13, *sent on 9/11/2024*
- September 25, 2024 OCTA Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Cancellation Notice, *sent on 9/19/2024*
- October 9, 2024 OCTA Technical Steering Committee Meeting Cancellation Notice, *sent on 10/4/2024*
- 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*