

## **AGENDA** Technical Advisory Committee

#### **Committee Members**

Shaun Pelletier Rudy Emami **Tony Olmos** Nabil S. Henein Raja Sethuraman Nardy Khan **Doug Dancs** Matthew Sinacori Mark Lewis Meg McWade William Murray **Travis Hopkins** Mark Linsenmayer Chris Johansen Michael Belknap Mark Trestik Ken Rosenfield Jacki Scott Akram Hindiyeh Tom Wheeler Dave Hunt Mark Chagnon David Webb Christopher Cash Luis Estevez Brendan Dugan Tom Bonigut Steve May William Galvez Steve Myrter Guillermo Perez **Doug Stack** Akram Hindiyeh Marwan Youssef Thom Coughran

City of Aliso Viejo City of Anaheim City of Brea City of Buena Park City of Costa Mesa County of Orange City of Cypress City of Dana Point City of Fountain Valley Citv of Fullerton City of Garden Grove City of Huntington Beach City of Irvine City of La Habra City of La Palma City of Laguna Beach City of Laguna Hills City of Laguna Niguel City of Laguna Woods City of Lake Forest City of Los Alamitos City of Mission Viejo City of Newport Beach City of Orange City of Placentia City of Rancho Santa Margarita City of San Clemente City of San Juan Capistrano City of Santa Ana City of Seal Beach City of Stanton City of Tustin City of Villa Park City of Westminster City of Yorba Linda

Orange County Transportation Authority 550 South Main Street, Room 09 Orange, California May 22, 2019 1:30 p.m.

Any person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in this meeting should contact the Measure M2 Local Programs section, telephone (714) 560-5372, 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 descriptions are intended to give members of the public a general summary of items of business to be transacted or discussed. The posting of the recommended actions does not indicate what action will be taken. The Committee may take any action which it deems to be appropriate on the agenda item and is not limited in any way by the notice of the recommended action.

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



## **Call to Order**

## Self-Introductions

## **Consent Calendar**

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

## 1. Approval of Minutes

Approval of the Technical Advisory Committee regular meeting minutes of March 27, 2019.

## **Regular Items**

## 2. March 2019 Semi-Annual Review – Christina Moore

## Overview

The Orange County Transportation Authority recently completed the March 2019 semi-annual review of projects funded through the Comprehensive Transportation Funding Program. This process reviews the status of Measure M2 grant-funded projects and provides an opportunity for local agencies to update project information and request project modifications. Recommended project adjustments are presented for review and approval.

#### Recommendation

Recommend Board of Directors approval of adjustments to Comprehensive Transportation Funding Program projects and Local Fair Share funds.

## **Discussion Items**

## 3. Senate Bill 743 (SB 743) Update - Greg Nord

## 4. Correspondence

OCTA Board Items of Interest

• Monday, April 8, 2019

*Item 9:* Fiscal Year 2019-20 Measure M2 Eligibility Guidelines Update *Item 10:* Measure M2 Community-Based Transit Circulators Program Project V Ridership Report *Item 11:* Consultants Selection for Intelligent Transportation Systems and Traffic Engineering Services for Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Projects

## • Monday, May 13, 2019

*Item 21:* Project V – Mission Viejo Route 182 Update *Item 22:* Measure M2 Eligibility for the City of Stanton



Item 23: Measure M2 Eligibility for the City of Santa Ana

Announcements by Email

- March 27, 2019 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda, sent 3/22/2019
- Reminder: Measure M2 Project X Tier I Call for Projects Workshop, sent 3/28/2019
- April OCTA Technical Steering Committee Meeting Cancellation, sent 4/2/2019
- April OCTA Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Cancellation, sent 4/17/2019
- CTC Communication-Local Streets and Roads Fiscal Year 2019-20 Project Lists and Adopted Resolutions Submittals Due by May 1, 2019,
- May OCTA Technical Steering Committee Meeting Cancellation, sent 5/1/2019

## 5. Committee Comments

- 6. Local Assistance Update
- 7. Staff Comments
- 8. Items for Future Agendas
- 9. Public Comments

#### 10. Adjournment

The Technical Advisory Committee is scheduled to meet monthly on the fourth Wednesday of each month.



# March 27, 2019

# **Technical Advisory Committee**

# **Minutes**



#### Voting Representatives Present:

Shaun Pelletier Quang Le Rudy Emami Tony Olmos Raja Sethuraman Nardv Khan Khalid Bazmi Mark Lewis Meg McWade Tom Herbel Chris Johansen Michael Belknap Mark Trestik Jacki Scott Tom Wheeler Christopher Cash Tom Bonigut **Taig Higgins** Iris Lee Doug Stack Marwan Youssef **Rick Yee** Tiffany Tran

City of Aliso Viejo City of Aliso Viejo City of Anaheim City of Brea City of Costa Mesa County of Orange County of Orange City of Fountain Valley City of Fullerton City of Huntington Beach City of La Habra City of La Palma City of Laguna Beach City of Laguna Niguel City of Lake Forest City of Orange City of San Clemente City of Santa Ana City of Seal Beach City of Tustin City of Westminster City of Yorba Linda Caltrans

Orange County Transportation Authority 550 S. Main Street, Room 09 Orange, CA March 27, 2019 1:30 PM

#### **Guest Present:**

Oliver Luu, Caltrans Carlos Barragan, Caltrans Gilbert Castillo, Santa Ana Michael Ho, Brea

#### **Staff Present:**

Joe Alcock Kurt Brotcke Harry W. Thomas Andrea West Cynthia Morales Paul Rodriguez Adriann Cardoso

## Voting Representatives Absent.

Nabil S. Henein Doug Dancs Matthew Sinacori William (Bill) Murray Mark Linsenmayer Ken Rosenfield Akram Hindiyeh Dave Hunt Mark Chagnon David Webb Luis Estevez Brendan Dugan Steve May William Galvez Guillermo Perez City of Buena Park City of Cypress City of Dana Point City of Garden Grove City of Irvine City of Laguna Hills City of Laguna Woods City of Laguna Woods City of Los Alamitos City of Los Alamitos City of Mission Viejo City of Mission Viejo City of Newport Beach City of Placentia City of Placentia City of Rancho Santa Margarita City of San Juan Capistrano City of Santa Ana City of Stanton



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

## Self-Introductions

## CONSENT CALENDAR

## 1. The Minutes for the March 27, 2019 meeting were approved.

Mr. Wheeler motioned to approve the minutes.

Mr. Sethuraman seconded the monition.

The Minutes were approved, there was no further discussion.

## **REGULAR ITEMS**

#### 2. 2019 CTFP Project O & P Programming Recommendations – Joseph Alcock

Mr. Alcock presented staff's programming recommendations for the 2019 CTFP Call for Projects (call) for M2 Projects O & P.

Mr. Lewis stated there was a healthy discussion at the Technical Steering Committee (TSC) with respect to staff's recommendations. He stated that Laguna Beach and Irvine's applications were the subject of much discussion, given the low funding request for this call cycle for Project O. He noted that while the TSC did consider potential opportunities to fund these projects, it ultimately determined that do so would require a policy exception to the Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Guidelines (CTFP), which he stated was a role not under the purview of TSC or Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). He added that this type of determination remains the jurisdiction of the OCTA Regional Planning & Highways (RP&H) Committee and Board of Directors. Mr. Lewis stated that with this clarification, the TSC unanimously approved staff's programming recommendations.

Mr. Trestik noted that Laguna Beach's (City) application was not recommended for funding because it did not meet the minimum environmental approval threshold required for application consideration (specified in the CTFP Guidelines). He also stated that he believed OCTA's decisions to not fund the City's project is based on a technicality and stated that the project's notice of exemption was going to be updated the following Tuesday, in order to incorporate the portion of the work, which was not included in the original environmental documentation submitted in support of the project. He also stated there were no real changes to traffic circulation as a result of environmentally clearing this additional component of the project and noted that the proposed change was considered exempt. Mr. Tresik also stated that project's design work is complete, and Caltrans is supportive of the project, and concluded by requesting that, given these findings, that the TAC evaluate the possibility of supporting the City's application.



In response Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Alcock how similar situations had been handled in the past.

Mr. Alcock stated the CTFP Guidelines specifically require the submission of all appropriate environmental clearance at the time a project application is submitted to OCTA. Mr. Alcock further stated that from what he understands this issue has been of interest to the TSC and TAC over the years; and the preference has been to prevent projects that do not have all appropriate approvals from applying and then "locking up" M2 funds while they complete approval processes. He also stated that in the past, other CTFP applications have not been funded for the same reason and stated that staff's recommendations are consistent with both the CTFP Guidelines and past TSC and TAC actions. Mr. Alcock asked Mr. Rodriguez if he had summarized past actions on this issue correctly.

Mr. Rodriguez responded that the only thing he would add is that while going through the application review process, in addition to not having secured environmental clearance for a key project feature (i.e. conversion of Ocean Avenue to a one-way street) it also became apparent that the city council, at the time of the application, had also not approved the conversion of Ocean Avenue. He added that historically OCTA has not supported project applications, where a city council has not approved the project's full scope at the time of application submittal.

Mr. Lewis asked if there were any further questions and reiterated that the TSC unanimously approved staff's recommendations. He noted that if staff's recommendations were approved by the TAC they would then be advanced to the RP&H Committee and Board, and that those actions would occur subsequent to the City's proposed action to secure city council approval of the conversion of Ocean Avenue to a one-way street and final environmental clearance. He noted that as such, the final recommendation as to whether this project should be funded would ultimately be a policy decision for the RP&H Committee and Board to consider.

Mrs. Lee inquired if the portion of the City's project that was excluded from the categorical exemption was part of the project submittal, or if it was that part of an application component.

Mr. Rodriguez stated yes.

Mr. Johansen inquired when the next Call would be.

Mr. Brotcke stated that the Projects O and P call typically occurs in the August timeframe. Mr. Brotcke also stated that staff would be back in front of the TAC in the next few months to finalize CTFP Guideline updates for that call.

Mr. Wheeler motioned to approve staff's recommendations.

Mr. Youssef seconded the motion.



Mr. Lewis inquired when item would go to the RP&H Committee.

Mr. Alcock stated May 6, 2019.

The staff recommendations were approved, there was no further discussion

#### **Discussion Item**

## 3. SB – 1 Technical Steering Committee Discussion Summary – Mark Lewis

Mr. Lewis stated that a couple of years ago there was a discussion regarding the amount of state gasoline tax money the County of Orange (County) receives relative to other Orange County cities. He stated there is a significantly larger share of state gasoline tax money going to the County and noted that TSC members voiced an intereste in reengaging in these discussions and now that Proposition 6 had failed.

Ms. Khan responded that the County was open to these discussions but requested that the occur during summer, as right now all local agencies are busy compiling their SB1 lists and budgets.

Mr. Lewis stated that he would re-entertain consideration of this item during the summer.

Mr. Bazmi stated that he would like to encourage cities to review the County's Capital Improvement Program (CIP), which was to be posted on April 23<sup>rd</sup>. He stated that based upon the CIP, there is no remaining state gasoline tax money during the the next seven years. He also stated that the County has been engaged in several regional projects benefitting the entire County. He reminded the group that the County is the only entity that can build large-scale arterial regional projects and that the County would provide the TAC with a report documenting these projects.

Mr. Stack inquired if there is a legal basis for even evaluating whether County gasoline tax funds can be redistributed to the cities? He asked how much SB1 money the County gets?

Ms. Khan stated \$35 million.

Mr. Stack also asked if the County's SB 1 funds are "locked-in" legislatively, can the cities even access the County's share?

Ms. Khan replied thanking Mr. Stack for the comment, noting that's a great question that would have to be answered by the County's legal counsel.



Mr. Stack furthered mentioned that we all see \$35 million going to the County on an annual basis, while SB 1 funds to other local agencies tend to be between about \$2-\$4 million and indicated that he was sure the County has a back log of projects. As such, he indicated that he didn't know if it's worth the TAC's time to look at all the project's the County does. Instead he stated that he thought a more critical path item would be understanding the legislature's intent in allocating SB 1 funds to the County and whether there is any flexibility in that.

Mr. Bonigut stated that he seconded that thought and mentioned that his CIP program is also over prescribed. He noted that he appreciated what the County is doing but this is really an allocation discussion and not a discussion focused on the virtues of the County's 7-year CIP. He asked how the County's SB1 funds will be allocated and inquired if local jurisdictions have any say in this process.

Mr. Wheeler responded that he does not believe the question is legislative but rather more of a cooperative partnership with the Board of Supervisors to deliver projects in their respective districts.

Mr. Stack inquired if the legislature would allow such a partnership.

Mr. Wheeler stated that it does not preclude the County from spending money on local agencies' streets.

Mr. Brotcke stated that OCTA would suggest that the TAC keep this discussion internal to the County. He stated that you do not want to end up with counties pitted against one another in this discussion. He also suggested that the discussion should not focus on the legislative aspects of the apportionment, but rather on what are the needs of the County overall.

Mr. Lewis stated he thought it was fair to keep the dialogue going.

There was no further discussion

## 4. Correspondence

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

## 5. Committee Comments – No comments

#### 6. Caltrans Local Assistance Update

Mr. Luu introduced Carlos Barragan as Caltrans' newest Transportation Planner to the TAC.



Mr. Luu requested that if any local agencies have inactive invoices to please work with Caltrans staff to process them as soon as possible. He also noted that the inactive list available online, via Caltrans' website. He also mentioned that the new inactive quarter begins April 1, 2019 and indicated that Caltrans would probably send formal emails to local agencies around mid-April to remind agencies of current or future inactive invoices.

Mr. Luu also mentioned that the CTC allocation deadline to submit all forms was April 29, 2019 for the June 2019 CTC meeting. He also stated that staff should be aware that the Local Assistance Programs Guidelines Forms 22-N, 22-O, 23-N and 23-O will no longer be accepted for CTC allocations and indicated that they had been replaced by a new form, which is also available on the Caltrans website.

Mr. Luu also described recent changes in Active Transportation Program (ATP) projects progress report process. He stated that local agencies were now responsible for 3 progress reports rather than 2 and mentioned that they would be submitted quarterly through June 2019. Thereafter, they would be submitted on a semiannual basis. He also stated that second quarter completion progress reports were due to Caltrans headquarters within 6 months of construction contract acceptance or the project becoming operable, whichever occurs first. He also noted that a final report is due within 180 days of completion of all remaining project activities. He stated that another major change to the ATP is that it now falls within the SB1 accountability transparency guidelines which means after agencies submit their progress reports and after headquarters reviews them, they will then be sent back to the District for review. The District will then be responsible for reviewing progress reports and sending corrections to local agencies and noted that if the corrections are not made the local agency would risk being deemed non-compliant with the CTC, even if the report is submitted on time.

## 7. Staff Comments

Mr. Brotcke stated OCTA's Finance and Administration Committee met on March 27, 2019 and at that meeting recent audit findings were presented. He stated there were two big issues that came out of that presentation. These included a finding that at least one or more cities had not met their Fiscal Year 17/18 Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirement and stated that in one case a city budgeted right under their MOE level. However, after removal of disallowed expenditures, the City fell below its MOE requirement, and noted that because this is an M2 Eligibility requirement, that City would be found ineligible to receive net M2 revenues. He also mentioned that potential remedies to this finding would be presented to the OCTA Executive Committee on Monday, May 6, 2019. As such, he reiterated to local agencies to be very careful budgeting and documenting how they satisfy M2 MOE requirements. He also noted that there is a state MOE requirement, and local agencies should be aware of this issue both with respect to M2 and SB1.



Mr. Brotcke mentioned that staff will be making changes to the Measure M2 eligibility guidelines to address some of these issues and closed by stating that the audit was available if local agencies wanted to review the document.

Mr. Lewis inquired if this was the first time in all of Measure M, that failure to meet the MOE requirement had occurred.

Mr. Brotcke stated that this finding is the first.

Mr. Lewis advised the TAC, that after hearing this item, now would be a good time to work with local agencies' city managers, in order to make sure that local agencies have enough MOE funding budgeted in order to provide a cushion for any potentially disallowed expenditures.

Mr. Brotcke concluded by stating that OCTA had also sent out a letter to all local agency city managers and the county executive office related to a potential call for projects for Measure M2 Project V. He stated that if local agencies were interested in participating in a potential upcoming Project V call, to submit a letter of interest to OCTA by April 18, 2019.

Mr. Lewis added that the Project X Environmental Cleanup Program Tier I call would be closing on May 9<sup>th</sup>.

There was no further discussion.

#### 8. Public comments – None

## 9. Items for Future Agendas

• SB1 update

## 10. The meeting was adjourned at 2:14 p.m.



# March 2019 Semi-Annual Review



May 22, 2019

- To: Technical Advisory Committee
- *From:* Orange County Transportation Authority Staff
- *Subject:* Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs Semi-Annual Review March 2019

## Overview

The Orange County Transportation Authority recently completed the March 2019 semi-annual review of projects funded through the Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs. This process reviews the status of Measure M2 grant-funded projects and provides an opportunity for local agencies to update project information and request project modifications. Recommended project adjustments are presented for review and approval.

## Recommendation

Recommend Board of Directors approval of adjustments to the Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs projects and Local Fair Share funds.

## Background

The Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs (CTFP) is the mechanism which the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) uses to administer funding for street, road, signal, transit, and water quality projects. The CTFP contains a variety of funding programs and sources, including Measure M2 (M2) revenues, State-Local Partnership Program funds, and Local Partnership Program funds. The CTFP provides local agencies with a comprehensive set of guidelines for administration and delivery of various transportation funding grants.

As needed, OCTA meets with representatives from local agencies to review the status of projects and proposed project changes. This process is known as the semi-annual review. The goals of the semi-annual review are to review project status, determine the continued viability of projects, address local agency concerns, confirm availability of local match funds, and ensure timely closeout of all projects funded through the CTFP.

## Discussion

The March 2019 semi-annual review proposed adjustments include two delays, 14 timely-use of funds extensions for CTFP projects, 14 timely-use of funds extensions for the Local Fair Share Program, six scope changes, one project transfer, and five cancellations. Adjustments are itemized in Attachment A and described in Attachment B.

Local agencies identified several reasons for semi-annual review proposed project adjustments, which included the following:

- Delays (federal funding coordination, utility coordination, and right-of- way coordination),
- Extensions (design issues, project closeout delays, staffing changes, delays in obtaining plan approvals and/or permits, right-of-way issues, and contract amendment timing issues),
- Scope changes (utility coordination, enhanced project benefits, conduit capacity constraints, stakeholder coordination issues, and equipment installed as part of another capital improvement project),
- Transfers (project savings), and
- Cancellations (right-of-way issues, low ridership, design issues, unable to acquire required permits or certifications, and utility coordination issues).

The March 2019 semi-annual review proposed project requests are appropriate from a CTFP administration perspective and most are consistent with prior semiannual review requests. There is one request, from the City of Brea, which is unique due the specific circumstances of the project which is described further in Attachment B. Staff is requesting that the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommend OCTA Board of Directors approval of the semi-annual review adjustments identified in Attachment A. If this recommendation is ultimately approved, staff will monitor the implementation of the proposed changes through future semi-annual reviews, which are conducted and reported on to the TAC biannually.

## Summary

OCTA has recently reviewed the status of 351 active project phases funded through the M2 CTFP. Staff recommends the approval of the project adjustments requested by local agencies for this semi-annual review cycle. The next semi-annual review is scheduled for September 2019.

## Attachments

A. Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs, March 2019 Semi-Annual Review Adjustment Requests

March 2019 Semi-Annual Review Adjustment Requests

|                           |                                  |                  | Delay Request(s)   |                |                |                       |                               |                |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|--|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|
| Agency                    | Project Number                   | Project          | Project Title  | ct Litle Phase |                | Current<br>Allocation | Proposed<br>Delay<br>(Months) | Proposed<br>FY |
| Mission Viejo             | 18-MVJO-ACE-3904 <sup>1</sup>    | 0                | La Paz Bridge and Road Widening from<br>Muirlands to Chrisanta | CON            | 18/19          | \$ 3,300,843          | 12                            | 19/20          |
| Santa Ana                 | 18-SNTA-ACE-3908 <sup>2, 3</sup> | 0                | Warner Avenue Improvements<br>from Main Street to Oak Street   | CON            | 18/19          | \$ 4,629,750          | 24                            | 20/21          |
|                           |                                  |                  | Delays - Tot   | al Phase A     | llocations (2) | \$ 7,930,593          |                               |                |
| Reasons for Project       | Adjustments                      | Acronyms         |  |                |                |                       |                               |                |
| 1. Federal funding coordi | nation                           | FY - Fiscal Year |  |                |                |                       |                               |                |

2. Utility coordination

CON - Construction

3. Right-of-Way coordination

March 2019 Semi-Annual Review Adjustment Requests

| Agency         Project         Project <th< th=""><th colspan="11">Timely-Use of Funds Extension Requests - Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs*</th></th<>   | Timely-Use of Funds Extension Requests - Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs*                               |                               |         |   |       |            |    |                   |    |                                  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|-------------------------------|---------|---|-------|------------|----|-------------------|----|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| LineL   | Agency  | Project Number                | Project | Project Title   | Phase | Current FY | с  | urrent Allocation |    | Proposed<br>Expenditure Deadline |  |  |  |  |
| Interfact on Control       Interfactor on Control <thinterfactor control<="" on="" th="">       Int</thinterfactor>   | Anaheim   | 16-ANAH-ACE-3801 <sup>1</sup> | о       | Lincoln Avenue (Harbor Boulevard to West Street)                  | ROW   | 16/17      | \$ | 10,174,241        | 24 | 10/25/2021                       |  |  |  |  |
| IndexIndexInterfaceInterfaceInterfaceInterfaceInterfaceInvineIndextV-TSP-3791IPInvine Center Drive/Edinger Avenue Traffic Signal SynchronizationIMPInfoit\$1.01.44.500.42.44.24.20.20.20.20.20.20.20.20.20.20.20.20.20.   | Brea  | 14-BREA-TSP-3702 <sup>2</sup> | Р       | Birch Street/Rose Drive Corridor Traffic Signal Synchronization   | O&M   | 16/17      | \$ | 47,120            | 24 | 6/21/2021                        |  |  |  |  |
| Control         Contro <thcontrol< th=""> <thcontrol< th=""> <thco< td=""><td>Costa Mesa</td><td>15-CMSA-ACE-3766 <sup>3</sup></td><td>0</td><td>West 17th Street Widening</td><td>ENG</td><td>15/16</td><td>\$</td><td>262,500</td><td>12</td><td>6/7/2020</td></thco<></thcontrol<></thcontrol<>  | Costa Mesa  | 15-CMSA-ACE-3766 <sup>3</sup> | 0       | West 17th Street Widening   | ENG   | 15/16      | \$ | 262,500           | 12 | 6/7/2020                         |  |  |  |  |
| Initial<br>InformationControl of the information of the inform | Irvine  | 16-IRVN-TSP-3791 <sup>3</sup> | Р       | Irvine Center Drive/Edinger Avenue Traffic Signal Synchronization | IMP   | 16/17      | \$ | 1,714,560         | 24 | 4/24/2022                        |  |  |  |  |
| Initing16-HRVN-TSP-37/82PSynchronizationImperial Highway/State Route 90 Corridor Traffic Signal<br>Synchronization0.8M17/18\$8.86,4002.46.21/202La Habra15-LHAB-TSP-3773 4PImperial Highway/State Route 90 Corridor Traffic Signal<br>SynchronizationIMP15/16\$2.547,9182.245.2/202La Habra15-LHAB-TSP-3773 4PImperial Highway/State Route 90 Corridor Traffic Signal<br>Synchronization0.8M116/17\$2.12.0832.45.2/202La Habra15-LHAB-TSP-3773 4PImperial Highway/State Route 90 Corridor Traffic Signal<br>Synchronization0.8M116/17\$2.12.0832.45.2/202La guna Niguel15-LHAB-TSP-3773 4PImperial Highway/State Route 90 Corridor Traffic Signal<br>Synchronization0.8M16/17\$2.12.0832.46.2/202La guna Niguel15-LHAB-TSP-3778 4PAlicia Parkway Westbound Widening from Interstate 5 to<br>Oce CreekENG15/16\$9.22.0002.44.4/19/202OCTA15-OCTA-TSP-3778 4PAlicia Parkway Traffic Signal SynchronizationIMP15/16\$1.754,4002.46.2/27.02OCTA15-OCTA-TSP-3778 4PWestminster Avenue/17th Street Corridor Traffic SignalIMP15/16\$2.704,9022.46.2/27.02OCTA15-OCTA-TSP-3778 6PWestminster Avenue/17th Street Corridor Traffic SignalIMP15/16\$1.51,102.2,704,9022.46.2/27.02 <tr< td=""><td>Irvine</td><td>16-IRVN-TSP-3791 <sup>3</sup></td><td>Р</td><td>Irvine Center Drive/Edinger Avenue Traffic Signal Synchronization</td><td>O&amp;M</td><td>17/18</td><td>\$</td><td>109,440</td><td>24</td><td>6/21/2023</td></tr<>   | Irvine  | 16-IRVN-TSP-3791 <sup>3</sup> | Р       | Irvine Center Drive/Edinger Avenue Traffic Signal Synchronization | O&M   | 17/18      | \$ | 109,440           | 24 | 6/21/2023                        |  |  |  |  |
| Infune         16-RVN-FISH-3792*         P         Synchronization         COM         17/18         S         86-00         24         62/2022           La Habra         15-LHAB-TSP-3773 <sup>4</sup> P         Imperial Highway/State Route 90 Corridor Traffic Signal         IMP         15/16         S         2.547,918         2.44         5/2/2022           La Habra         15-LHAB-TSP-3773 <sup>4</sup> P         Imperial Highway/State Route 90 Corridor Traffic Signal         0.08M         16/17         S         2.12,083         2.24         5/2/2022           Laguna Niguel         15-LHAB-TSP-3773 <sup>4</sup> P         Imperial Highway/State Route 90 Corridor Traffic Signal         0.08M         16/17         S         2.12,083         2.24         5/2/2022           Laguna Niguel         15-LNIG-ACE-3775 <sup>4,6</sup> O         O         Corceek         ENG         16/17         S         2.12,083         2.44         6/15/202           OCTA         15-OCTA-TSP-377.4 <sup>6</sup> P         Alkia Parkway Traffic Signal Synchronization         IMP         16/17         S         1.713,70         2.44         6/27/202           OCTA         15-OCTA-TSP-378.6 <sup>a</sup> P         Westminister Avenuel/17th Street Corridor Traffic Signal         IMP         15/16         S         1.713,70  | Irvine  | 16-IRVN-TSP-3792 <sup>3</sup> | Р       |   | IMP   | 16/17      | \$ | 1,353,580         | 24 | 4/10/2022                        |  |  |  |  |
| La Habra       15-LHAB-ISP-37/3*       P       Synchronization       IMP       15/16       S       2,34/,9/8       24       5/2/22         La Habra       15-LHAB-ISP-37/3*       P       Imperial Highway/State Route 90 Corridor Traffic Signal<br>Sonchronization       0&M       16/17       S       212.083       24       5/2/202         Laguna Niguel       15-LNIG-ACE-3775 <sup>4,5</sup> O       Crown Valley Parkway Westbound Widening from Interstate 5 to<br>Oso Creek       ENG       15/16       S       922.000       24       4/19/202         OCTA       15-OCTA-TSP-377.4°       P       Alicia Parkway Traffic Signal Synchronization       IMP       15/16       S       1,754,400       24       6/15/202         OCTA       15-OCTA-TSP-377.8°       P       Alicia Parkway Traffic Signal Synchronization       IMP       16/17       S       1,713,770       24       6/25/202         OCTA       15-OCTA-TSP-377.8°       P       Westminster Avenue/17th Street Corridor Traffic Signal       IMP       15/16       S       2,704,902       24       6/25/202         OCTA       15-OCTA-TSP-378.6°       P       Westminster Avenue/17th Street Corridor Traffic Signal       IMP       15/16       S       2,704,902       24       6/25/202         Santa Ana       15-SNTA-ACE-378   | Irvine  | 16-IRVN-TSP-3792 <sup>3</sup> | Р       |   | O&M   | 17/18      | \$ | 86,400            | 24 | 6/21/2023                        |  |  |  |  |
| La Habra         15-L/HAB-15P-37/3 <sup>-1</sup> P         Synchronization         O         Mon         16/17         \$         212,083         24         5/2/2/2           Laguna Niguel         15-L/HAB-15P-3775 <sup>4,5</sup> O         Crown Valley Parkway Westbound Widening from Interstate 5 to<br>Oso Creek         ENG         15/16         \$         922,000         24         4/19/202           OCTA         15-OCTA-TSP-3776 <sup>4</sup> P         Alicia Parkway Traffic Signal Synchronization         IMP         15/16         \$         1,764,400         24         6/15/202           OCTA         15-OCTA-TSP-3778 <sup>4</sup> P         Alicia Parkway Traffic Signal Synchronization         IMP         16/17         \$         1,713,770         24         6/25/202           OCTA         15-OCTA-TSP-378 <sup>6</sup> P         Westminister Avenue/17th Street Corridor Traffic Signal         IMP         16/17         \$         1,713,770         24         6/25/202           OCTA         15-OCTA-TSP-378 <sup>6</sup> P         Westminister Avenue/17th Street Corridor Traffic Signal         IMP         15/16         \$         2,704,902         24         5/15/202           Santa Ana         15-SNTA-ACE-3785 <sup>1</sup> O         Farview Street Widening         ENG         15/16         \$         185,100   | La Habra  | 15-LHAB-TSP-3773 4            | Р       |   | IMP   | 15/16      | \$ | 2,547,918         | 24 | 5/2/2021                         |  |  |  |  |
| Laguna Niguel       15-LNIG-ACE-3775 ***       O       Oso Creek       Color       Oso Creek       ENG       15/16       \$       922.000       24       4/192/24         OCTA       15-OCTA-TSP-3774 **       P       Alicia Parkway Traffic Signal Synchronization       IMP       15/16       \$       1,754,400       24       6/15/202         OCTA       15-OCTA-TSP-3778 **       P       Coast Highway Traffic Signal Synchronization       IMP       16/17       \$       1,713,770       24       6/25/202         OCTA       15-OCTA-TSP-3786 **       P       Westminster Avenue/17th Street Corridor Traffic Signal       IMP       16/17       \$       1,713,770       24       6/25/202         OCTA       15-OCTA-TSP-3786 **       P       Westminster Avenue/17th Street Corridor Traffic Signal       IMP       15/16       \$       2,704,902       24       6/27/202         Santa Ana       15-SNTA-ACE-3785 **       O       Fairwew Street Widening       ENG       15/16       \$       185,100       24       5/15/202         Negative Stor Project Adjust       Acronyms       Free Start Yeer       For Start Yeer       5       23,788,014       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5       5   | La Habra  | 15-LHAB-TSP-3773 4            | Р       |   | O&M   | 16/17      | \$ | 212,083           | 24 | 5/2/2021                         |  |  |  |  |
| Constraint         Constra   | Laguna Niguel   | 15-LNIG-ACE-3775 4, 5         | 0       |   | ENG   | 15/16      | \$ | 922,000           | 24 | 4/19/2021                        |  |  |  |  |
| CCTA15-OCTA-TSP-3786 <sup>6</sup> PWestminster Avenue/17th Street Corridor Traffic Signal<br>SynchronizationIMP15/16\$2,704,902246/27/202Santa Ana15-SNTA-ACE-3785 <sup>1</sup> OFairview Street WideningENG15/16\$185,100245/15/202Compreherstreet Trasportation Funding Programs Timely-Use of Funds Extensions (14) - Total Phase Allocations\$23,788,014Reasons for Project AdjustmentsActonyms1. Design issueFY - Fiscal Year2. Project closeout delaysROW - Operations and Maintenance3. Staffing changesOM - Operations and Maintenance4. Detays in obtaining necessary plan approvals and/or permitsENG - Engineering   | OCTA  | 15-OCTA-TSP-3774 6            | Р       | Alicia Parkway Traffic Signal Synchronization                     | IMP   | 15/16      | \$ | 1,754,400         | 24 | 6/15/2021                        |  |  |  |  |
| OCTA15-OCTA-TSP-3786°PSynchronizationIMP15/16\$ $2,704,902$ $24$ $6/27/202$ Santa Ana $15-SNTA-ACE-3785^1$ OFairview Street WideningENG $15/16$ \$ $185,100$ $24$ $5/15/202$ <b>Easons for Project Adjustments</b> AcronymsThe Seal VearThe Seal VearP - Fiscal VearP - Fiscal VearSuffing changesOdd - Operations and MaintenanceOdd - Operations and MaintenanceAldeas in obtaining necessary plan approvals and/or permitsBIG - EngineeringOdd - SensineeringING - EngineeringOdd - SensineeringING - EngineeringING - Engineer   | ОСТА  | 15-OCTA-TSP-3778 6            | Р       | Coast Highway Traffic Signal Synchronization                      | IMP   | 16/17      | \$ | 1,713,770         | 24 | 6/25/2021                        |  |  |  |  |
| Comprehensive Trnsportation Funding Programs Timely-Use of Funds Extensions (14) - Total Phase Allocations       23,788,014         Reasons for Project Adjustments       Acronyms         1. Design issue       FY - Fiscal Year         2. Project closeout delays       ROW - Right-of-War         3. Staffing changes       O&M - Operations and Maintenance         4. Delays in obtaining necessary plan approvals and/or permits       ENG - Engineering   | ОСТА  | 15-OCTA-TSP-3786 6            | Р       |   | IMP   | 15/16      | \$ | 2,704,902         | 24 | 6/27/2021                        |  |  |  |  |
| Reasons for Project Adjustments     Acronyms       1. Design issue     FY - Fiscal Year       2. Project closeout delays     ROW - Right-of-Way       3. Staffing changes     O&M - Operations and Maintenance       4. Delays in obtaining necessary plan approvals and/or permits     ENG - Engineering   | Santa Ana   | 15-SNTA-ACE-3785 <sup>1</sup> | 0       | Fairview Street Widening  | ENG   | 15/16      | \$ | 185,100           | 24 | 5/15/2021                        |  |  |  |  |
| I. Design issue     FY - Fiscal Year       2. Project closeout delays     ROW - Right-d-Way       3. Staffing changes     O&M - Operations and Maintenance       4. Delays in obtaining necessary plan approvals and/or permits     ENG - Engineering   | Comprehensive Trnsportation Funding Programs Timely-Use of Funds Extensions (14) - Total Phase Allocations \$ 23,788, |                               |         |   |       |            |    | 23,788,014        |    | •                                |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Project closeout delays     ROW - Right-of-Way       3. Staffing changes     O&M - Operations and Maintenance       4. Delays in obtaining necessary plan approvals and/or permits     ENG - Engineering   |   | stments                       | -       |   |       |            |    |                   |    |                                  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Staffing changes     O&M - Operations and Maintenance       4. Delays in obtaining necessary plan approvals and/or permits     ENG - Engineering   | -   |                               |         |   |       |            |    |                   |    |                                  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Delays in obtaining necessary plan approvals and/or permits ENG - Engineering  |   |                               |         |   |       |            |    |                   |    |                                  |  |  |  |  |
|   |   | lan annrovals and/or nermite  |         |   |       |            |    |                   |    |                                  |  |  |  |  |
|   |   | an approvato binaron pormito  |         |   |       |            |    |                   |    |                                  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Contract amendment timing issues OCTA - Orange County Transportation Authority   |   | ues                           |         |   |       |            |    |                   |    |                                  |  |  |  |  |

\*Once obligated Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs funds expire 36 months from the contract award date. Local agencies may request a one-time extension of up to 24 months.

March 2019 Semi-Annual Review Adjustment Requests

| Timely-Use of Funds Extension Requests - LFS* |          |                       |              |           |                |         |             |   |                                       |  |  |  |  |  |                    |
|---|----------|-----------------------|--------------|-----------|----------------|---------|-------------|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--------------------|
| Agency  | FY       | Disbursement Date     | Disbursement |           | JISOUISEMENT . |         | nursement ' |   | Proposed Interest<br>Extension Amount |  |  |  |  |  | Extension Deadline |
|   | 15/16    | 5/17/2016             | \$           | 325,208   | \$             | 325,208 | \$          | - | 5/17/2021                             |  |  |  |  |  |                    |
| Costa Mesa                                    | 15/10    | 6/30/2016             | \$           | 422,051   | \$             | 422,051 | \$          | - | 6/30/2021                             |  |  |  |  |  |                    |
|   | 16/17    | 9/13/2016             | \$           | 408,371   | \$             | 408,371 | \$          | - | 9/13/2021                             |  |  |  |  |  |                    |
|   | 15/16    | 3/16/2016             | \$           | 368,068   | \$             | 368,068 | \$          | - | 3/16/2021                             |  |  |  |  |  |                    |
| Santa Ana                                     | 15/16    | 5/18/2016             | \$           | 626,030   | \$             | 626,030 | \$          | - | 5/18/2021                             |  |  |  |  |  |                    |
|   | 16/17    | 7/13/2016             | \$           | 812,453   | \$             | 812,453 | \$          | - | 7/13/2021                             |  |  |  |  |  |                    |
|   |          | 3/15/2016             | \$           | 67,279    | \$             | 67,279  | \$          | - | 3/15/2020                             |  |  |  |  |  |                    |
| Seal Beach                                    | 15/16    | 5/17/2016             | \$           | 55,317    | \$             | 55,317  | \$          | - | 5/17/2020                             |  |  |  |  |  |                    |
| Sear Deach                                    |          | 6/30/2016             | \$           | 71,789    | \$             | 71,789  | \$          | - | 6/30/2020                             |  |  |  |  |  |                    |
|   | 16/17    | 9/13/2016             | \$           | 64,316    | \$             | 64,316  | \$          | - | 9/13/2020                             |  |  |  |  |  |                    |
|   |          | 3/15/2016             | \$           | 164,702   | \$             | 164,702 | \$          | - | 3/15/2021                             |  |  |  |  |  |                    |
| Yorba Linda                                   | 15/16    | 5/17/2016             | \$           | 135,419   | \$             | 135,419 | \$          | - | 5/17/2021                             |  |  |  |  |  |                    |
| roiba Linua                                   |          | 6/30/2016             | \$           | 175,745   | \$             | 175,745 | \$          | - | 6/30/2021                             |  |  |  |  |  |                    |
|   | 16/17    | 9/13/2016             | \$           | 157,959   | \$             | 157,959 | \$          | - | 9/13/2021                             |  |  |  |  |  |                    |
|   | LFS Time | ely-Use of Funds Exte | \$           | 3,854,707 |                |         |             |   |                                       |  |  |  |  |  |                    |

\*Net revenues received by local jurisdictions through the LFS Program shall be expended or encumbered within three years. An extension may be granted but is limited to a total of five years from the date of receipt of funds. The Orange County Transportation Authority uses the check date as the date of receipt of funds. Requests for extension must be submitted as part of the semi-annual review process prior to the end of the third year from the date of receipt of funds. Requests for extension must be submitted as part of the semi-annual review process prior to the end of the third year from the date of receipt of funds. Requests for extension must be submitted as part of the semi-annual review process prior to the end of the third year from the date of receipt of funds.

March 2019 Semi-Annual Review Adjustment Requests

|                                 | Scope Change Requests          |         |  |                                 |       |                       |                        |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|--|---------------------------------|-------|-----------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Agency                          | Project Number                 | Project | Project Title  | Phase Current FY                |       | Current<br>Allocation | Proposed<br>Allocation |  |  |  |  |
| Brea                            | 16-BREA-FAST-3802 <sup>1</sup> | ο       | State Route 57 and Lambert Road<br>Interchange Improvements Project          | $I = I = R_0 N/I = 17/18 = 1.8$ |       | \$ 5,929,200          | \$ 5,212,800           |  |  |  |  |
| Brea                            | 18-BREA-FAST-3895 <sup>2</sup> | 0       | State Route 57 and Lambert Road<br>Interchange Improvements Project<br>Phase | CON                             | 18/19 | \$ 12,398,178         | \$ 13,114,578          |  |  |  |  |
| Irvine                          | 16-IRVN-TSP-3791 <sup>3</sup>  | Р       | Irvine Center Drive/Edinger Avenue<br>Signal Synchronization Project         | IMP                             | 16/17 | \$ 1,714,560          | \$ 1,714,560           |  |  |  |  |
| Irvine                          | 16-IRVN-TSP-3792 <sup>3</sup>  | Р       | Von Karman Avenue/Tustin Ranch Road<br>Signal Synchronization Project        | IMP                             | 16/17 | \$ 1,353,580          | \$ 1,353,580           |  |  |  |  |
| ОСТА                            | 15-OCTA-TSSP-3778 <sup>4</sup> | Р       | Coast Highway Traffic Signal<br>Synchronization Project                      | O&M                             | 16/17 | \$ 1,713,770          | \$ 1,713,770           |  |  |  |  |
| ОСТА                            | 18-OCTA-TSP-3894 <sup>5</sup>  | Р       | Katella Avenue/Villa Park Road/Santiago<br>Canyon Road RTSSP                 | O&M                             | 18/19 | \$ 1,476,291          | \$ 1,476,291           |  |  |  |  |
|                                 |                                |         | Scope Changes (6) - Total Phase Allocations \$ 24,585,579 \$ 24,585,         |                                 |       |                       |                        |  |  |  |  |
| Reasons for Pro                 | oject Adjustments              |         | Acronyms<br>FY - Fiscal Year   |                                 |       |                       |                        |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Enhanced project benefits    |                                |         | ROW - Right-of-Way   |                                 |       |                       |                        |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Conduit capacity constraints |                                |         | CON - Construction   |                                 |       |                       |                        |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Stakeholder coord            | dination issues                |         | IMP - Implementation   |                                 |       |                       |                        |  |  |  |  |

5. Equipment installed as part of another capital improvement project

RTSSP - Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program

O&M - Operations and Maintenance

March 2019 Semi-Annual Review Adjustment Requests

|                     | Transfer Requests                                 |         |                                  |       |            |    |                       |    |                    |    |                        |  |
|---------------------|---|---------|----------------------------------|-------|------------|----|-----------------------|----|--------------------|----|------------------------|--|
| Agency              | Project Number                                    | Project | Project Title                    | Phase | Current FY |    | Current<br>Allocation |    | Transfer<br>Amount |    | Proposed<br>Allocation |  |
| Orange              | 15-ORNG-ICE-3780 <sup>1</sup>                     | 0       | Tustin Street and Chapman Avenue | ENG   | 15/16      | \$ | 105,000               | \$ | (48,098.77)        | \$ | 56,901.23              |  |
| Orange              | 15-ORING-ICE-3760                                 | 0       | Intersection Widening            | ROW   | 16/17      | \$ | 138,750               | \$ | 48,098.77          | \$ | 186,848.77             |  |
|                     | Transfer Requests (1) - Total Project Allocations |         |                                  |       |            |    |                       | \$ | -                  | \$ | 243,750                |  |
| Reasons for Project | Adjustment  |         | Acronyms                         |       |            |    |                       |    |                    |    |                        |  |

1. Project savings in earlier phases/years can support work in later awarded FY - Fiscal Year

phases/years

ENG - Engineering

ROW - Right-of-Way

March 2019 Semi-Annual Review Adjustment Requests

|                       | Cancellation Requests           |               |   |                  |                |                       |                        |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|---|------------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Agency                | ency Project Number             |               | Project Project Title Ph  |                  | Current FY     | Current<br>Allocation | Proposed<br>Allocation |  |  |  |  |  |
| Costa Mesa            | 16-CMSA-ACE-3804 <sup>1</sup>   | 0             | Wilson Street Widening from College Avenue to Fairview Road       | ENG              | 18/19          | \$ 281,250            | \$-                    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lake Forest           | 16-LFOR-CBT-3830 <sup>2</sup>   | V             | Shuttle Service between train Station and<br>Oakley               | O&M              | 18/19M         | \$ 303,240            | \$-                    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Newport Beach         | 14-NBCH-ECP-3735 3,4            | х             | Corona del Mar Water Quality Improvement<br>and Litter Removal    | CON              | 14/15          | \$ 250,000            | TBD                    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Santa Ana             | 15-SNTA-ACE-3787 4,5            | 0             | Bristol Street Widening - Civic Center Drive to Washington Avenue | CON              | 18/19          | \$ 2,485,597          | \$-                    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Santa Ana             | 15-SNTA-ACE-3788 <sup>4,5</sup> | 0             | Bristol Street Widening - Warner Avenue to<br>Street Andrew Place | CON              | 18/19          | \$ 5,629,845          | \$-                    |  |  |  |  |  |
|                       |                                 |               | Cancellations (5) -   | <b>Total Pha</b> | se Allocations | \$ 8,949,932          | TBD                    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reasons for Project   | Adjustments                     | Acronyms      |   |                  |                |                       |                        |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Right-of-Way Issue |                                 | FY - Fiscal Y | ear   |                  |                |                       |                        |  |  |  |  |  |

1. Right-of-Way Issue

2. Low ridership

3. Design plans no longer feasible nor effective

4. Unable to acquire required permits or certifications CON - Construction

5. Utility coordination issues

TBD - To Be Determined

O&M - Operations and Maintenance

ENG - Engineering

## <u>Delays</u>

Local agencies may request a one-time delay of up to 24-months to obligate funds. During the March 2019 semi-annual review cycle, the following delay requests were submitted.

The City of Mission Viejo (Mission Viejo) is requesting a 12-month delay for the construction (CON) phase of the La Paz Bridge and Road widening from Muirlands to Chrisanta project (18-MVJO-ACE-3904). This project includes federal grant funding and Mission Viejo is requesting a delay due to unforeseen delays in the federal authorization process. The additional time will bring the timing for the Measure M2 (M2) grant funding in line with the federal grant funding.

The City of Santa Ana (Santa Ana) is requesting a 24-month delay for the CON phase of the Warner Avenue Improvements from Main Street to Oak Street project (18-SNTA-ACE-3908). Santa Ana is requesting a delay due to ongoing right-of-way (ROW) negotiations. The additional time will allow Santa Ana to complete negotiations and begin construction once utilities relocations have been completed.

## <u>Comprehensive Transportation Funding Programs (CTFP) Timely-Use of Funds</u> <u>Extensions</u>

Once obligated, CTFP funds expire 36 months from the contract award date. Local agencies may request a one-time extension of up to 24-months. During this semi-annual review cycle, the following timely-use of funds extension requests were submitted.

The City of Anaheim (Anaheim) is requesting a 24-month timely-use of funds extension for the ROW phase of the Lincoln Avenue Widening Improvements from Harbor Boulevard to West Street project (16-ANAH-ACE-3801), from October 2019 to October 2021. Recently, Anaheim received a 24-month time extension approval for the engineering (ENG) phase of this project and additional time is required to coordinate final design plans before completing ROW.

The City of Brea (Brea) is requesting a 24-month timely-use of funds extension for the operations and maintenance (O&M) phase of the Birch Street/Rose Drive Corridor Traffic Signal Synchronization Project (14-BREA-TSP-3702), from June 2019 to June 2021. The additional time will enable Brea to complete outstanding O&M tasks and closeout the project.

The City of Costa Mesa is requesting a 12-month timely-use of funds extension for the ENG phase of the West 17<sup>th</sup> Street Widening project (15-CMSA-ACE-3766), from June 2019 to June 2020. Additional time is required due to staffing changes which delayed the design review process.

The City of Irvine (Irvine) is requesting a 24-month timely-use of funds extension for both the primary implementation (IMP) and ongoing maintenance and monitoring phases of the Irvine Center Drive/Edinger Avenue Traffic Signal Synchronization Project (16-IRVN-TSP-3791), from April 2020 to April 2022, and June 2021 to June 2023, respectively. The request is due to staffing changes that contributed to the protracted length of time for construction.

Irvine is requesting a 24-month timely-use of funds extension for both the IMP and O&M phases of the Von Karman Avenue/Tustin Ranch Road Traffic Signal Synchronization project (16-IRVN-TSP-3792) from April 2020 to April 2022. and June 2021 to June 2023, respectively. The request is due to staffing changes that contributed to the protracted length of time for construction.

The City of La Habra is requesting a 24-month timely-use of funds extension for both the IMP and O&M phases of the Imperial Highway/State Route 90 Corridor Traffic Signal Synchronization Project (15-LHAB-TSP-3773) from May 2019 to May 2021. The extension is being requested to allow sufficient time to comply with state requirements.

The City of Laguna Niguel is requesting a 24-month timely-use of funds extension for the ENG phase of the Crown Valley Parkway Westbound Widening from Interstate 5 to Oso Creek Project (15-LNIG-ACE-3775), from April 2019 to April 2021. The request is due to delays in obtaining necessary approvals from the County of Orange, and delays in establishing and acquiring the ROW needed to construct the project.

The Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA), as administrative lead, is requesting three 24-month timely-use of funds extensions from June 2019 to June 2021, for the IMP phase for the following projects. The request is due to delays in issuing contract amendments.

- Alicia Parkway Traffic Signal Synchronization Project (15-OCTA-TSP-3774).
- Coast Highway Traffic Signal Synchronization Project (15-OCTA-TSP-3778).
- Westminster Avenue/17th Street Traffic Signal Synchronization Project (15-OCTA-TSP-3786).

The City of Santa Ana is requesting a 24-month timely-use of funds extension for the ENG phase of the Fairview Street Widening Project (15-SNTA-ACE-3785), from May 2019 to May 2021. The extension request will provide additional time to complete the environmental process and design phase.

## Local Fair Share Timely-Use of Funds Extensions

The City of Costa Mesa is requesting a 24-month timely-use of funds extension of \$1,155,630. The funds being considered for extension were disbursed in three separate installments and must be expended by the extension deadlines provided in Attachment A.

Santa Ana is requesting a 24-month timely-use of funds extension of \$1,806,551. The funds being considered for extension were disbursed in three separate installments and must be expended by the extension deadlines provided in Attachment A.

The City of Seal Beach is requesting a 12-month timely-use of funds extension of \$258,701. The funds being considered for extension were disbursed in four separate installments and must be expended by the extension deadlines provided in Attachment A.

The City of Yorba Linda is requesting a 24-month timely-use of funds extension of \$633,825. The funds being considered for extension were disbursed in four separate installments and must be expended by the extension deadlines provided in Attachment A.

## Scope Changes

Agencies may request minor scope changes for CTFP projects if they can assure that project benefits as committed to in the initial application can still be delivered. During this semi-annual review cycle, the following scope change requests were submitted.

The City of Brea (Brea) is requesting a scope change for the State Route 57 (SR-57) and Lambert Road Interchange Improvements Project. For the ROW phase (16-BREA-FAST-3802), Brea requests that the utility relocation tasks are removed and re-scoped into the CON phase (18-BREA-FAST-3895) along with the corresponding associated costs as outlined in the application. Under the CTFP Guidelines, this is an eligible activity that can be funded under either the ROW or CON phase. The scope change will enable Brea to complete the utility relocations concurrent with the construction staging efforts.

The CON phase (18-BREA-FAST-3895) was originally approved for Phase I of a planned multi-phase project. Since then, Brea has successfully secured non-M2 funding to enable construction of the complete interchange project. Therefore, Brea is requesting the project description and boundary from the original Phase I be modified to encompass improvements to the entire project.

The Phase I application did not evaluate all aspects of the complete project. The cooperative funding agreement between Brea and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) specifies which activities will utilize state, local, and M2 funds. Most of the identified local and M2 funded activities are eligible under the CTFP subject to certain limitations. It is Brea's desire to utilize the identified local and M2 funded activities as the qualifying match commitment.

Additionally, the CON phase includes costs associated with the landscaping of the project which will be completed subsequent to the CON phase. The CON phase is expected to end in fiscal year (FY) 2022-23 with landscaping completed in FY 2023-24. Therefore, based on timing, Brea is requesting that these costs be separated out into FY 2022-23.

Lastly, considering the complexity of this project, the overmatch that is being provided, and the overall benefit to both the Lambert Road interchange and SR-57, Brea is requesting that M2 funding be administered by OCTA through a separate cooperative agreement that will simplify the review and reimbursement process while maintaining transparency and the requirements of M2.

The City of Irvine (Irvine) is requesting scope changes for IMP phases of the following two projects. These scope changes will enable Irvine to install video detection as proposed in the application.

- Irvine Center Drive/Edinger Avenue Traffic Signal Synchronization Project (16-IRVN-TSP-3791). The scope change involves installing new traffic signal conduits at several project locations along Irvine Center Drive. Additionally, Irvine is requesting to replace existing traffic signal single conductors with new traffic signal cables for Irvine Center Drive at Orange Tree due to conduit capacity constraints.
- Von Karman Avenue/Tustin Ranch Road Traffic Signal Synchronization Project (16-IRVN-TSP-3792). The scope change involves installing new traffic signal conduit at Von Karman Avenue/Morse Avenue due to conduit capacity constraints.

OCTA, as administrative lead, is requesting scope changes for IMP phases the following two projects.

- Coast Highway Traffic Signal Synchronization Project (15-OCTA-TSP-3778). The scope change involves removing the dynamic message sign line item from the project due to coordination issues with Caltrans. The savings from this item is to be repurposed to complete a communications gap closure. This addition will allow communications to the City's of Newport's Traffic Management Center at City Hall and between the Coast Highway and Newport Boulevard sub-network on the Balboa Peninsula.
- Katella Avenue/Villa Park Road/Santiago Canyon Road Traffic Signal Synchronization Project (18-OCTA-TSP-3894). The scope change is comprised of removing equipment such as controllers, cabinets, and fiber-optic enclosures at locations which have already been updated by other city-led projects. The request is to utilize those savings for communications equipment, an extended cabinet foundation, cameras, and video detection which will further enhance the safety and efficiency of the corridor.

## **Transfers**

The CTFP Guidelines allow agencies to request to transfer 100% of savings of funds between subsequent phases within a project. Funds can only be transferred to a phase that has already been awarded competitive funds. Such requests must be made prior to the acceptance of a final report and submitted as part of the semi-annual review. During this review cycle, the following transfer request was submitted.

The City of Orange is requesting a transfer for the Tustin Street and Chapman Avenue Intersection Widening Project (15-ORNG-ICE-3780). The request is to transfer project savings in the amount of \$48,098.77 from the ENG phase to the ROW phase.

## **Cancellations**

Local agencies may request to cancel projects. Cancelled projects are eligible to reapply upon resolution of the issues that led to the original project cancellation. During this review cycle, the following cancellation requests were received.

The City of Costa Mesa is requesting to cancel the ENG phase for the Wilson Street Widening from College Avenue to Fairview Road project (16-CMSA-ACE-3804) due to anticipated ROW issues.

The City of Lake Forest is requesting to cancel the O&M phase due to projected ridership below the minimum performance standard for the Shuttle Service between Train Station and Oakley Project (16-LFOR-CBT-3830).

The City of Newport Beach is requesting to cancel the CON phase for the Corona del Mar Water Quality Improvement and Litter Removal Project (14-NBCH-ECP-3735). The original conceptual design is no longer effective nor feasible. Additionally, obtaining the required Coastal Development Permit has been unsuccessful.

Santa Ana is requesting to cancel the CON phase of the following two projects due to issues coordinating utility underground activities. Utility undergrounding plans will not be ready until the first quarter of 2020. Additionally, a complete ROW certification with Caltrans is required prior to awarding the construction contract as the ROW phase of this project is utilizing federal funds. The utility relocation is part of that ROW certification. Without necessary relocation plans, Caltrans will not approve the certification in the timespan required by the CTFP Guidelines.

- Bristol Street Widening from Civic Center Drive to Washington Avenue Project (15-SNTA-ACE-3787).
- Bristol Street Widening from Warner Avenue to Saint Andrew Place Project (15-SNTA-ACE-3788).