



# **AGENDA**

## ***Executive Committee Meeting***

---

### **Committee Members**

Andrew Do, Chairman  
Mark A. Murphy, Vice Chairman  
Lisa A. Bartlett  
Michael Hennessey  
Steve Jones  
Tim Shaw

Orange County Transportation Authority  
Headquarters  
Conference Room 07  
550 South Main Street  
Orange, California  
**Monday, May 3, 2021 at 9:00 a.m.**

Any person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in this meeting should contact the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) Clerk of the Board, telephone (714) 560-5676, 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](http://www.octa.net) or through the Clerk of the Board's office at the OCTA Headquarters, 600 South Main Street, Orange, California.

### **Guidance for Public Access to the Board of Directors/Committee Meeting**

On March 12, 2020 and March 18, 2020, Governor Gavin Newsom enacted Executive Orders N-25-20 and N-29-20 authorizing a local legislative body to hold public meetings via teleconferencing and make public meetings accessible telephonically or electronically to all members of the public to promote social distancing due to the state and local State of Emergency resulting from the threat of Novel Coronavirus (COVID-19).

In accordance with Executive Order N-29-20, and in order to ensure the safety of the OCTA Board of Directors (Board) and staff and for the purposes of limiting the risk of COVID-19, in-person public participation at public meetings of the OCTA will not be allowed during the time period covered by the above-referenced Executive Orders.

Instead, members of the public can listen to AUDIO live streaming of the Board and Committee meetings by clicking the below link:

<http://www.octa.net/About-OCTA/Who-We-Are/Board-of-Directors/Live-and-Archived-Audio/>



## **Guidance for Public Access to the Board of Directors/Committee Meeting (Continued)**

Public comments may be submitted for the upcoming Board and Committee meetings by emailing them to [ClerkOffice@octa.net](mailto:ClerkOffice@octa.net).

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 Board. Public comments will be made available to the public upon request.

In order to ensure that staff has the ability to provide comments to the Board Members in a timely manner, please submit your public comments **90 minutes prior to the start time of the Board and Committee meeting date.**

### **Call to Order**

### **Roll Call**

### **Pledge of Allegiance**

Director Bartlett

#### **1. Public Comments**

### **Special Calendar**

There are no Special Calendar matters.

### **Consent Calendar (Items 2 and 3)**

All items on the Consent Calendar are to be approved in one motion unless a Committee Member or a member of the public requests separate action or discussion on a specific item.

#### **2. Approval of Minutes**

Approval of the minutes of the Executive Committee meeting of April 5, 2021.



**3. Agreement for System Security Program Review and Update**  
Katrina L. Faulkner/Jennifer L. Bergener

**Overview**

Consultant support services are necessary to provide subject matter expertise and technical support for the review and update of the Security Program for the Orange County Transportation Authority Board of Directors' approval is requested for the selection of a firm to perform the required services.

**Recommendations**

- A. Approve the selection of ADS System Safety Consulting, LLC, as the firm to provide consulting services to review and update the Security Program.
- B. Authorize the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate and execute Agreement No. C-0-2729 between the Orange County Transportation Authority and ADS System Safety Consulting, LLC in the amount of \$345,692 to provide consulting services to review and update the current security program.

**Regular Calendar**

**4. Capital Programs Division - Third Quarter Fiscal Year 2020-21  
Capital Action Plan Performance Metrics**  
James G. Beil

**Overview**

Staff has prepared a quarterly progress report on capital project delivery for the period of January 2021 through March 2021 for review by the Orange County Transportation Authority Board of Directors. This report highlights the Capital Action Plan for project delivery, which is used as a performance metric to assess delivery progress on highway, transit, and rail projects.

**Recommendation**

Receive and file as an information item.



## **Discussion Items**

- 5. Chief Executive Officer's Report**
- 6. Committee Members' Reports**
- 7. Closed Session**

There are no Closed Session items scheduled.

- 8. Adjournment**

The next regularly scheduled meeting of this Committee will be held at **9:00 a.m. on Monday, June 7, 2021**, at the Orange County Transportation Authority Headquarters, Conference Room 07, 550 South Main Street, Orange, California.



# **MINUTES**

## ***Executive Committee Meeting***

---

### **Committee Members Present via Teleconference**

Andre Do, Chairman  
Mark A. Murphy, Vice Chairman  
Lisa Bartlett  
Michael Hennessey  
Steve Jones  
Tim Shaw

### **Staff Present**

Jennifer L. Bergener, Deputy Chief Executive Officer  
Gina Ramirez, Deputy Clerk of the Board  
Allison Cheshire, Interim Deputy Clerk of the Board

### **Via Teleconference**

Darrell E. Johnson, Chief Executive Officer  
Cassie Trapesonian, General Counsel

### **Committee Members Absent**

None

## **Call to Order**

The April 5, 2021 regular meeting of the Executive Committee (Committee) was called to order By Chairman Do at 9:02 a.m.

## **Roll Call**

The Deputy Clerk of the Board conducted an attendance roll call and announced there was a quorum of the Committee.

## **Pledge of Allegiance**

Director Shaw led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

### **1. Public Comments**

There were no Public Comments.

## **Special Calendar**

There are no Special Calendar matters.

## **Consent Calendar (Items 2 and 3)**

### **2. Approval of Minutes - March 29, 2021**

A motion was made by Vice Chairman Murphy, seconded by Director Bartlett, and following a roll call vote, declared passed 6 to 0, to approve the minutes of the Special Executive Committee meeting of March 29, 2021.

### **3. Approval of Minutes - March 1, 2021**

A motion was made by Vice Chairman Murphy, seconded by Director Bartlett, and following a roll call vote, declared passed 6 to 0, to approve the minutes of the Executive Committee meeting of March 1, 2021.

## **Regular Calendar**

### **4. Measure M2 2020 Update: Next 10 Delivery Plan**

Darrell E. Johnson, Chief Operating Officer (CEO), stated this Committee and the Board of Directors (Board) approved this item in December 2020. He noted that staff has continued to monitor sales tax collections and review opportunities to keep the plan on track and refine the work.

Kia Mortazavi, Executive Director of Planning, presented a PowerPoint on this item.

Director Bartlett referenced the timeline on Slide #8 of the PowerPoint and inquired about staff returning to the Committee with an adjusted timeline relative to completing projects sooner or extending project timelines out if the revenue shortfall becomes a reality.

Mr. Mortazavi responded that the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) reviews the plan annually in October and presents the results to the Committee and Board in November or December.

Director Shaw referenced Page 55 of Attachment B and inquired on Project J for the State Route 91 (SR-91) from the State Route 55 (SR-55) to Interstate 15 (I-15) and what the percentage is for both Riverside and Orange Counties.

Mr. Mortazavi stated the project limits should be from SR-241 to SR-71 with only one lane in the eastbound direction. Half of the cost is in Orange County (OC), and the other half in Riverside County. The OC portion of the cost is estimated in the report and does not extend to the I-15 freeway. He stated that staff would correct the language on this report.

Director Shaw inquired if it is possible to use excess toll revenues to alleviate M2 funds.

Mr. Mortazavi stated the plan presented includes 91 Express Lane toll revenues dedicated to improvements on the SR-91.

Mr. Johnson, CEO, stated the Board took action in 2016 or 2017 to dedicate excess toll revenues at around \$740 million to fund Projects I and J, and staff continues to put those dollars aside. Also, if excess toll revenues are stronger or weaker than that, staff would have to come to the Board and adjust a significant portion of The M2 program.

#### **4. (Continued)**

Mr. Johnson, CEO, noted as a follow-up to Director Bartlett's question that in May, the Committee would receive updates on revenues from the three universities, and MuniServices Inc., at Finance and Administration Committee, will update actual and revenue forecasts.

Chairman Do inquired if staff can make the following edits to the document:

- Expand the language on page 86 of Attachment B under Overview, second bullet point to "Riders and commuters first and last-mile connections."
- Expand the language on page 86 of Attachment B under Next 10 Plan Deliverables #4 "To expand transit connections to amplify first and the last-mile for riders and commuters."
- Expand the language on page 86 of Attachment B under Next 10 Plan Deliverables #6: "To maintain successful community circulator projects."

Mr. Mortazavi stated that staff brings specific guidelines for each project to the Board for approval and will incorporate the suggested comments for the next round of approvals.

OCTA updated Project V guidelines to make it easier for cities to participate and ridership requirements per passenger. The subsidy is capped to give cities more flexibility to bring projects back after the pandemic.

Mr. Johnson stated that the specific guidelines for Project R is Metrolink, Project S is the extension of Metrolink into communities and work centers, and Project V is community circulators that do not have a tie to a Metrolink station. In all instances, OCTA cannot use M2 funds to supplement the bus service. This plan lays out the support projects over the next ten years and ties into the Comprehensive Business Plan.

Chairman Do expressed his concern that unless a rider lives near major routes, it is hard to walk to connect to the roads, and more options are needed for first and last-mile connectivity.

**4. (Continued)**

A motion was made by Director Hennessey, seconded by Director Bartlett, and following a roll call vote, declared passed 6 to 0, to:

- A. Adopt the 2020 Measure M2 Next 10 Delivery Plan.
- B. Direct staff to continue to monitor revenue and project cost shifts that could affect the delivery plan and return to the Board of Directors with changes if necessary.

**5. Proposed Amendment to the Orange County Local Transportation Authority Measure M2 Ordinance No. 3**

Adriann Cardoso, Department Manager of Planning, presented a verbal report on this item.

Director Shaw inquired if the cities needed the amendment given the federal stimulus from the Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2021.

Ms. Cardoso responded that staff would need to review this further since OCTA is unsure if the federal stimulus dollars have a specific purpose and might not be allowed for the general fund or discretionary value.

Chairman Do requested that staff continue to monitor the Maintenance of Effort (MOE).

Director Hennessey inquired what mechanism is in place to monitor the MOE.

Ms. Cardoso stated OCTA requires two submittals under eligibility. The City must certify its budget, and at the end of the fiscal year, the City must submit an expenditure report. OCTA reviews the MOE in detail through an audit. OCTA's Internal Audit Department selects a specific number of cities each year to ensure the MOE is accurate. The requirement is on the local agency to qualify

Director Hennessey stated his concerns about lessening the requirement based on the cities impaired financial situation.

Mr. Johnson, CEO, stated that city revenues are in a tough place. He noted OCTA made modifications to close out 2020 and made a one-time adjustment for 2021-2022.

Mr. Johnson, CEO, said OCTA wants to make cities and the County successful in delivering transportation projects and maintaining streets and roads.



**5. (Continued)**

A motion was made by Director Hennessey, seconded by Director Shaw, and following a roll call vote, declared passed 6 to 0, to:

- A. Direct staff to initiate the process to amend the Orange County Local Transportation Authority Measure M2 Ordinance No. 3 to extend the fiscal year 2020 21 revised maintenance of effort requirement into fiscal year 2021 22 to continue assisting local jurisdictions through this period of economic uncertainty.
- B. Direct staff to set a date of May 24, 2021, for a public hearing and Board of Directors' action to consider adoption of the amendment to the Orange County Local Transportation Authority Measure M2 Ordinance No. 3 as it relates to the maintenance of effort requirement.

**Discussion Items**

**6. State of Cyber Security 2021**

Michael Cardoza, Department Manager of Cyber Security, presented a PowerPoint on this item.

Director Bartlett inquired about information on the employee training program and provided comments regarding training at the County.

Mr. Cardoza stated that OCTA has a very similar program to the County program where all new employees go through mandatory cybersecurity training. Each year employees go through regular training, and are provided applicable policies and are sent best practice emails.

Director Bartlett inquired if OCTA checked incoming emails automatically.

Mr. Cardozo stated the exchange server does check emails automatically, and if it is not a known user, a warning is sent to the employee.

Chairman Do inquired if the system learns the email source over time if the recipient continues to open up the email.

Mr. Cardozo responded that the Phish ER system does learn behaviors.



**7. Chief Executive Officer's Report**

Mr. Johnson, CEO, reported on the following:

- On April 7<sup>th</sup> at 4:00 p.m., staff will host a Zoom meeting with the community to update the Interstate 405 Improvement Project and upcoming work on the Ward Street Bridge.

**8. Committee Members' Reports**

There were no Committee Members' Reports.

**9. Closed Session**

There were no Closed Session items scheduled.

**10. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:46 a.m.

The next regularly scheduled meeting of this Committee will be held at **9:00 a.m. on Monday, May 3, 2021**, at the Orange County Transportation Authority Headquarters, Conference Room 07, 550 South Main Street, Orange, California.

ATTEST

---

Andrew Do  
Chairman


---

Gina Ramirez  
Deputy Clerk of the Board



**May 3, 2021**

**To:** Executive Committee

**From:** Darrell E. Johnson, Chief Executive Officer 

**Subject:** Agreement for System Security Program Review and Update

### **Overview**

Consultant support services are necessary to provide subject matter expertise and technical support for the review and update of the Security Program for the Orange County Transportation Authority. Board of Directors' approval is requested for the selection of a firm to perform the required services.

### **Recommendations**

- A. Approve the selection of ADS System Safety Consulting, LLC, as the firm to provide consulting services to review and update the Security Program.
- B. Authorize the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate and execute Agreement No. C-0-2729 between the Orange County Transportation Authority and ADS System Safety Consulting, LLC in the amount of \$345,692 to provide consulting services to review and update the current security program.

### **Discussion**

A review and update of the Orange County Transportation Authority's (OCTA) Security Program is needed to ensure that OCTA continues to practice best industry standards in terms of providing a secure environment for both employees and ridership. This review and update has five major components: review and identification of internal OCTA security functions, review and analysis of OCTA policies and procedures, updating of the current security plan, creating a training plan, and the development of a short- and long-term strategic plan.

The review of internal security functions will include interviewing key personnel in order to validate or identify responsibilities not currently included in OCTA's security plan and a review of job descriptions. Security systems and function performed by employees will then be cross checked against current policies and

procedures for identification of possible gaps. The review process will enable the analysis and development of an updated security plan.

The development of a comprehensive training plan will follow, which will be compliant with the Transportation Security Administration and the Federal Transit Administration regulations. The creation of a training plan will allow for an updated exercise and training schedule ensuring employees are trained on best security practices in a transit environment.

Lastly, a threat and vulnerability assessment will also be included, which will help inform the development of short- and long-term strategic goals as it will include a combination of all the previously outlined reviews and assessments and place them in a priority and logical order. This will allow OCTA to better leverage and maximize financial resources when planning and implementing new or enhanced security features.

Following the tasks noted above, which are estimated to require approximately 24 months to complete, a full-scale exercise, compliant with the Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program, may be required to complete this project.

### ***Procurement Approach***

This procurement was handled in accordance with OCTA's Board of Directors (Board)-approved procedures for professional and technical services. Various factors are considered in an award for professional and technical services. Award is recommended to the firm offering the most comprehensive overall proposal considering such factors as project organization and staffing, prior experience with similar projects, work plan, as well as cost and price.

On January 20, 2021, Request for Proposals (RFP) 0-2729 was issued electronically on CAMM NET. The project was advertised in a newspaper of general circulation on January 20 and 25, 2021. A pre-proposal teleconference was held on January 26, 2021, with 13 attendees representing ten firms. Three addenda were issued to provide a copy of the pre-proposal registration sheet and to respond to questions related to the RFP.

On February 23, 2021, ten proposals were received. An evaluation committee consisting of OCTA staff from Contracts Administration and Materials Management, Security and Emergency Preparedness, Health, Safety and Environmental Compliance, Scheduling and Bus Operations departments, as well as an external evaluator from Superior Court of California, County of Orange, met to review all proposals received.

The proposals were evaluated based on the following evaluation criteria and weightings:

- |                                     |            |
|-------------------------------------|------------|
| • Qualifications of the Firm        | 25 percent |
| • Staffing and Project Organization | 25 percent |
| • Work Plan                         | 30 percent |
| • Cost and Price                    | 20 percent |

Several factors were considered in developing the criteria weightings. Qualifications of the firm was weighted at 25 percent as the firms had to demonstrate experience reviewing, strengthening, and designing comprehensive security programs. Staffing and project organization was weighted at 25 percent as the project team had to demonstrate expertise with project management and planning skills. Work plan was weighted highest at 30 percent because the firm had to present an approach that included a comprehensive review and assessment of existing security policies and procedures with specific recommendations of implementation measures to improve existing security policies and procedures. The project includes a current security program review, security plan development, and development of a multiyear strategic plan. Cost and price were weighted at 20 percent to ensure OCTA receives competitive pricing for the proposed services.

On March 8, 2021, the evaluation committee reviewed all proposals received based on the evaluation criteria and short-listed the two most qualified firms. The two short-listed firms are listed below in alphabetical order:

Firm and Location

ADS System Safety Consulting, LLC (ADS)  
Los Angeles, California

Guidepost Solutions, LLC (Guidepost)  
Los Angeles, California

On March 18, 2021, the evaluation committee interviewed the two short-listed firms. The interviews consisted of a presentation to demonstrate the firms' understanding of OCTA's requirements for this project. The firms' project managers and key team members had an opportunity to present qualifications and respond to the evaluation committee's questions. Questions were asked relative to the firms' experience performing similar services with projects involving security program reviews, the specific challenges in executing the work plan, surveys that would identify security culture, and strategies to ensure high response rates. Additionally, the firms were asked to explain their approach

when creating threat level categories and discuss differences between internal and external forces. Finally, firms were asked to clarify questions related to each firm's proposal.

After considering the responses to the questions asked during the interviews, the evaluation committee reviewed the preliminary rankings and adjusted individual scores; however, the overall ranking of the firms did not change as a result of the interviews.

Based on the evaluation of the written proposals, information obtained from the interviews, as well as cost and price, the evaluation committee recommends ADS for consideration for award. The following is a brief summary of the proposal evaluation results.

#### Qualifications of the Firm

The short-listed firms are qualified and demonstrated experience providing related services.

ADS has provided risk-based system safety and security engineering and consulting service since its founding in 2011 and has 43 employees. ADS has experience working on identical projects with the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Sonoma-Marín Area Rail Transit system, Hampton Roads Transit, District of Columbia Department of Transportation DC streetcar system, and the Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation. ADS' main office is located in the City of Los Angeles. The firm is the primary contractor for the Maryland Transit Administration safety system services, Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority's on-call safety and security management, Metropolitan Transit Authority of Harris County safety support, and the Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon's on-call safety management system consulting services contract.

Guidepost was founded in 2010 as a global investigations and security company with 200 employees, and is located in the City of Los Angeles. The firm has proven experience contracting with transit companies including performing a threat and vulnerability assessment for the Metro Transit District in King County, Washington, in addition to providing a safety and security management plan for the Madison Street G Line bus expansion for King County. The firm created security master plans for the Utah Transit Authority, emergency operations planning for the San Francisco Municipal Railway, security consulting and design for the New York Metropolitan Transit Authority, and on-call security services for select San Bernardino County-owned facilities.

### Staffing and Project Organization

ADS proposed a qualified team with experience related to providing services developing, managing, supporting, and overseeing security programs. The proposed project manager has more than 15 years of system security experience focused on public transportation, and has developed and managed public transit system security and emergency management programs while serving as Security Manager for the Charlotte Area Transit System and Chief Safety and Security Officer of the New Orleans Regional Transit Authority. The proposed system security consultant brings over 20 years of transit safety and security experience and has served as both Deputy and Chief Safety and Security Officer for Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation. The proposed project team demonstrated transportation background and familiarity with federal regulations. During the interview, the project team provided comprehensive responses to the evaluation committee's questions.

Guidepost proposed an experienced team. The proposed project manager has 37 years of experience, as well as demonstrated knowledge and experience in security operations and technology. The project manager has worked on related projects including the City of Los Angeles Civic Center and King County Metro Transit Threat and Vulnerability Assessment. The technical lead has over 40 years of experience with relevant projects that include the King County Metro Master Plan, San Francisco Municipal Railway emergency plans development, and the California Department of Transportation Statewide Assessment. Individuals from the proposed project team responded to questions during the interview, but not all team members participated in the discussions.

### Work Plan

ADS presented a work plan that addressed all elements of the scope of work and its requirements. The firm provided a thorough approach to completing each task and proposed enhancements to the scope of work requirements. The firm clearly identified an approach to identify recommended countermeasures that can be implemented to improve OCTA's overall risk resiliency by identifying risk items at each step of the process and focusing on the risk reduction of assets or practices that are critical to the continuity of operations. The proposed categories will be defined by critical assets, associated risk rating and recommended countermeasures. The proposal cited examples of where the firm has provided training for other transportation agencies and how they would apply that experience and knowledge to OCTA.

Guidepost's work plan demonstrated an understanding of the project requirements. The firm discussed specifics of the scope of work and presented a detailed work plan. Guidepost provided details on the firm's approach to evaluate physical security elements by using principles of natural surveillance, territorial reinforcement and activity, and maintenance. Guidepost also provided examples of similar work performed in King County; however, they only included a few references regarding how the work plan is specific to OCTA.

#### **Cost and Price**

Pricing scores were based on a formula which assigned the highest score to the firm with the lowest firm-fixed price and scored the other proposals' firm-fixed price based on its relation to the lowest firm-fixed price. ADS' firm-fixed price was slightly lower than the price proposed by Guidepost. ADS also proposed a price lower than the OCTA project manager's independent cost estimate. Therefore, ADS' proposed firm-fixed price is deemed fair and reasonable.

#### **Procurement Summary**

Based on the evaluation of the written proposals, the firms' qualifications, and the information obtained from the interviews, as well as pricing, the evaluation committee recommends the selection of ADS as the top-ranked firm to provide consulting services on the review and updating of the current security program. ADS delivered a comprehensive proposal and an interview that was responsive to the requirements of the RFP.

#### **Fiscal Impact**

The project was approved in OCTA's Fiscal Year 2020-21 Budget, Account No. 1316-7519-A0001-OSS and is funded through general funds.

#### **Summary**

Staff is recommending that the Board of Directors authorize the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate and execute Agreement No. C-0-2729 between the Orange County Transportation Authority and ADS System Safety Consulting, LLC in the amount of \$345,692 to provide consulting services to review and update the current security program.



***Attachments***

- A. Review of Proposals, RFP 0-2729 Security Program Review and Update
- B. Proposal Evaluation Criteria Matrix (Short-Listed Firms), RFP 0-2729 Security Program Review and Update
- C. Contract History for the Past Two Years, RFP 0-2729 Security Program Review and Update

**Prepared by:**



Katrina Faulkner  
Manager, Security and Emergency  
Preparedness  
(714) 560-5719

**Approved by:**



Jennifer L. Bergener  
Chief Operating Officer, Operations/  
Deputy Chief Executive Officer  
(714) 560-5462



Pia Veasapen  
Director, Contracts Administration  
and Materials Management  
(714) 560-5619

**Review of Proposals**

**RFP 0-2729 Security Program Review and Update**

Presented to the Executive Committee on May 3, 2021

**10 proposals were received, 2 firms were interviewed, 1 firm is being recommended**

Overall Ranking	Proposal Score	Firm & Location	Sub-Contractors	Evaluation Committee Comments	Firm-Fixed Price Total
1	86	ADS System Safety Consulting, Inc. Los Angeles, California	iParametrics, LLC	<p>The firm has provided risk-based safety and security consulting since 2011.</p> <p>The firm has 43 employees and is located in the City of Los Angeles.</p> <p>The firm has worked on identical projects with the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Sonoma-Marín Area Rail Transit system, Hampton Roads Transit, District of Columbia Department of Transportation DC streetcar system, and the Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation.</p> <p>The proposed project manager has more than 15 years of experience.</p> <p>The systems security consultant brings over 20 years of transit safety and security experience.</p> <p>The firm clearly identified an approach to identify recommended countermeasures that can be implemented to improve OCTA's overall risk resiliency.</p> <p>The comment/response matrix to deconflict the draft Master Safety Plan was notable.</p> <p>The project team provided comprehensive responses to the evaluation committee's questions and all team members participated.</p>	\$345,692
2	82	Guidepost Solutions, LLC Los Angeles, California	Aanko Technologies, Inc.	<p>The firm was founded in 2010 as a global investigations and security company.</p> <p>The firm has 200 employees and is located in the City of Los Angeles.</p> <p>Worked with transit companies providing a threat and vulnerability assessment for the Metro Transit District in King County, additionally provided a Safety and Security Management Plan for the Madison Street G Line in King County.</p> <p>The proposed project manager has 37 years of experience in security operations and technology.</p> <p>The technical lead has over 40 years of experience with relevant projects.</p> <p>Provided good details on how they would evaluate physical security elements by using principles of natural surveillance.</p> <p>The firm responded to all questions during the interview, but not all members participated in the discussions.</p>	\$346,000

**Evaluation Committee**

Internal:

Contracts Administration and Materials Management (1)

Security and Emergency Preparedness (1)

Safety and Environmental (1)

Scheduling and Bus Operations Support (1)

External:

Superior Court of California, County of Orange (1)

**Evaluation Criteria**

Qualifications of the Firm

Staff and Project Organization

Work Plan

Cost and Price

**Weight Factors**

25 percent

25 percent

30 percent

20 percent

ATTACHMENT A

**PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA MATRIX (Short-Listed Firms)**

**RFP 0-2729 SECURITY PROGRAM REVIEW AND UPDATE**

<b>ADS System Safety Consulting, LLC</b>						<b>Weights</b>	<b>Overall Score</b>
<b>Evaluator Number</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>		
Qualifications of Firm	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5	20.0
Staffing/Project Organization	4.50	4.00	4.50	4.50	4.00	5	21.5
Work Plan	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.00	6	24.6
Cost and Price	4.90	4.90	4.90	4.90	4.90	4	19.6
<b>Overall Score</b>	<b>86.1</b>	<b>83.6</b>	<b>86.1</b>	<b>89.1</b>	<b>83.6</b>		<b>86</b>
<b>Guidepost Solutions, LLC</b>						<b>Weights</b>	<b>Overall Score</b>
<b>Evaluator Number</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>		
Qualifications of Firm	4.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	3.50	5	19.0
Staffing/Project Organization	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	5	19.5
Work Plan	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	6	24.0
Cost and Price	4.90	4.90	4.90	4.90	4.90	4	19.6
<b>Overall Score</b>	<b>83.6</b>	<b>81.1</b>	<b>81.1</b>	<b>83.6</b>	<b>81.1</b>		<b>82</b>

Scores for Non-Short-Listed firm is 37 to 76

**CONTRACT HISTORY FOR THE PAST TWO YEARS**

**RFP 0-2729 Security Program Review and Update**

Prime and Subconsultants	Contract No.	Description	Contract Start Date	Contract End Date	Subconsultant Amount	Total Contract Amount
<b>ADS System Safety Consulting, LLC</b>						
Contract Type:		None				
Subconsultants:						
Sub Total						\$0
<b>Guidepost Solutions, LLC</b>						
Contract Type:		None				
Subconsultants						
Sub Total						\$0

ATTACHMENT C



**May 3, 2021**

**To:** Executive Committee

**From:** Darrell E. Johnson, Chief Executive Officer 

**Subject:** Capital Programs Division - Third Quarter Fiscal Year 2020-21  
Capital Action Plan Performance Metrics

### **Overview**

Staff has prepared a quarterly progress report on capital project delivery for the period of January 2021 through March 2021 for review by the Orange County Transportation Authority Board of Directors. This report highlights the Capital Action Plan for project delivery, which is used as a performance metric to assess delivery progress on highway, transit, and rail projects.

### **Recommendation**

Receive and file as an information item.

### **Background**

The Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) delivers highway, transit, rail, and facility projects from the beginning of the environmental approval phase through construction completion. Project delivery milestones are planned carefully with consideration of project scope, costs, schedule, and assessment of risks. The milestones reflected in the Capital Action Plan (CAP) are OCTA's planned and budgeted major project delivery commitments.

This report is a quarterly progress report on the CAP performance metrics, which are a snapshot of the planned CAP project delivery milestones in the budgeted fiscal year (FY).

### **Discussion**

OCTA's objective is to deliver projects on schedule and within the approved project budget. Key project cost and schedule commitments are captured in the CAP, which is regularly updated with project status and any new projects (Attachment A). The CAP is categorized into four key project groupings

of freeway, railroad grade separation, and rail and station projects. Schedule milestones are used as performance indicators of progress in project delivery. The CAP performance metrics report provides a FY snapshot of the milestones targeted for delivery in the FY and provide transparency and performance measurement of capital project delivery.

The CAP project costs represent the total cost across all phases of project delivery, including support costs, right-of-way (ROW), and construction capital costs. Baseline costs, if established, are shown in comparison to either the actual or forecast cost. Baseline costs may be shown as to-be-determined (TBD) if project scoping studies and estimates have not been developed or approved and may be updated as delivery progresses, and milestones are achieved. Projects identified in the Orange County local transportation sales tax Measure M2 (M2) are identified with the corresponding M2 project logo. The CAP status update is also included in the M2 Quarterly Progress Report.

The CAP summarizes the very complex capital project critical path delivery schedules into eight key milestones.

Begin Environmental	The date work on the environmental clearance, project report, or preliminary engineering phase begins.
Complete Environmental	The date environmental clearance and project approval is achieved.
Begin Design	The date final design work begins, or the date when a design-build contract begins.
Complete Design	The date final design work is 100 percent complete and approved.
Construction Ready	The date contract bid documents are ready for advertisement, including certification of ROW, all agreements executed, and contract constraints cleared.
Advertise for Construction	The date a construction contract is advertised for construction bids.
Award Contract	The date the construction contract is awarded.
Construction Complete	The date all construction work is completed, and the project is open to public use.

These delivery milestones reflect progression across the project delivery phases shown below.



Project schedules reflect the planned baseline milestone dates in comparison to the forecast or actual milestone dates. Milestone dates may be shown as TBD if project scoping or approval documents have not been finalized and approved, or if the delivery schedule has not been negotiated with a partnering agency or consultant implementing the specific phase of a project. Planned milestone dates can be revised to reflect new dates from approved baseline schedule changes. Project schedules are reviewed monthly and milestone achievements and updated forecast dates are included to reflect project delivery status.

CAP milestones achieved through the third quarter of FY 2020-21 include:

#### Freeway Projects

- The begin environmental milestone was achieved for the Interstate 5 (I-5) high-occupancy vehicle lane addition between Avenida Pico and the San Diego County Line in the City of San Clemente. The contract to prepare the project report and environmental documentation was executed with Advanced Civil Technologies on February 12, 2021. The project report and environmental document are scheduled to be approved in December 2023.
- The complete construction milestone was achieved for the I-5 widening between State Route 55 (SR-55) and State Route 57 in January 2021.

#### Rail and Station Projects

- The Board of Directors (Board) awarded the construction contract to expand the Anaheim Canyon Metrolink Station to Stacy and Witbeck, Inc., on March 22, 2021. Construction is currently scheduled to be completed by the end of 2022.

The following CAP milestones missed the planned delivery through the third quarter of FY 2020-21:

- The Placentia Metrolink Station construction ready and advertise construction milestones were missed and will not be met this FY. Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway (BNSF) approvals are required to construct the project and are dependent on finalization of a shared-use agreement between Metrolink and BNSF for rail operations on the BNSF rail corridor.

#### Recap of FY 2020-21 Performance Metrics and CAP Updates

The performance metrics snapshot provided at the beginning of FY 2020-21 reflects 15 planned major project delivery milestones to be accomplished, ten of which were planned through the third quarter. The CAP and performance metrics have been updated to reflect milestones achieved and missed through the third quarter of FY 2020-21 (Attachment B). Ten milestones were achieved through the third quarter, including two fourth quarter milestones achieved early, and two milestones missed.

#### CAP updates and FY 2020-21 Risks

The SR-55 widening from Interstate 405 to I-5 is at a critical delivery phase in securing all required ROW to advance the project into the construction phase. Extremely complex ROW negotiations are underway for acquisition of the remaining needed property rights. The working schedule considers potential eminent domain actions through Board action and the courts to gain ROW possession. The target to certify that possession, or a clear path to gaining possession, of all required ROW needed for construction is late August 2021.

In March 2021, the Board approved additional budget of \$15.68 million for OC Streetcar supplemental contingency funding as the overall project contingency has been drawn down quicker than anticipated due to realized risks and unanticipated changes. Staff completed an OC Streetcar project schedule assessment and has forecasted a new revenue service date of July 2023. In addition, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) project management oversight consultant is performing a comprehensive project risk, cost, and schedule assessment to determine new forecast cost and schedule. This new comprehensive assessment considers risks realized to date, and an assessment of future risks, and will be used to update the delivery commitments documented in the OC Streetcar Full Funding Grant Agreement between OCTA and FTA. Staff will bring this complete project update to the Board by November 2021.

Over the last quarter, highway project construction bids in the region continued to reflect a favorable market with a high number of bidders and competitive bids priced below the engineer's estimated cost of bid items. However, recent steel



and lumber product material pricing has increased significantly due to demand, production capacity, and supply chain issues. Staff will continue to monitor market pricing trends and the impacts on heavy civil construction pricing in the region.

***Summary***

Capital project delivery continues to progress and is reflected in the CAP. The planned FY 2020-21 performance metrics created from forecast project schedules are used as a general project delivery performance indicator throughout the FY. Staff will continue to manage project costs and schedules across all project phases to meet project delivery commitments and report quarterly.

***Attachments***

- A. Capital Action Plan, Status Through March 2021
- B. Capital Programs Division, Fiscal Year 2020-21 Performance Metrics Through March 2021

**Prepared by:**
















James G. Beil, P.E.  
Executive Director, Capital Programs  
(714) 560-5646

# Capital Action Plan

Status Through March 2021

Updated: April 15, 2021
















Capital Projects	Cost Baseline/Forecast	Schedule Plan/Forecast							
		Begin Environmental	Complete Environmental	Begin Design	Complete Design	Construction Ready	Advertise Construction	Award Contract	Complete Construction
	(millions)								
<b>Freeway Projects:</b>									
I-5, Pico to San Diego County	TBD	Feb-21	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
	TBD	<b>Feb-21</b>	Dec-23	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
 I-5, Pico to Vista Hermosa	\$113.0	Jun-09	Dec-11	Jun-11	Oct-13	Feb-14	Oct-14	Dec-14	Aug-18
Project C	\$83.6	<b>Jun-09</b>	<b>Oct-11</b>	<b>Jun-11</b>	<b>Oct-13</b>	<b>May-14</b>	<b>Sep-14</b>	<b>Dec-14</b>	<b>Aug-18</b>
 I-5, Vista Hermosa to Pacific Coast Highway	\$75.6	Jun-09	Dec-11	Jun-11	Feb-13	Jun-13	Oct-13	Dec-13	Mar-17
Project C	\$75.2	<b>Jun-09</b>	<b>Oct-11</b>	<b>Jun-11</b>	<b>May-13</b>	<b>Aug-13</b>	<b>Feb-14</b>	<b>Jun-14</b>	<b>Jul-17</b>
 I-5, Pacific Coast Highway to San Juan Creek Road	\$70.7	Jun-09	Dec-11	Jun-11	Jan-13	May-13	Aug-13	Oct-13	Sep-16
Project C	\$74.3	<b>Jun-09</b>	<b>Oct-11</b>	<b>Jun-11</b>	<b>Jan-13</b>	<b>Apr-13</b>	<b>Aug-13</b>	<b>Dec-13</b>	<b>Jul-18</b>
 I-5, I-5/Ortega Interchange	\$90.9	Sep-05	Jun-09	Jan-09	Nov-11	Mar-12	Jun-12	Aug-12	Sep-15
Project D	\$79.8	<b>Sep-05</b>	<b>Jun-09</b>	<b>Jan-09</b>	<b>Dec-11</b>	<b>Apr-12</b>	<b>Jun-12</b>	<b>Aug-12</b>	<b>Jan-16</b>
 I-5, I-5/Ortega Interchange (Landscape)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Project D	N/A	N/A	N/A	<b>Jan-14</b>	<b>Oct-14</b>	<b>Feb-15</b>	<b>Aug-15</b>	<b>Sep-15</b>	<b>Sep-16</b>
 I-5, SR-73 to Oso Parkway	\$151.9	Sep-11	Jun-14	Mar-15	Jan-18	May-18	Aug-18	Dec-18	Apr-25
Project C & D	\$195.8	<b>Oct-11</b>	<b>May-14</b>	<b>Mar-15</b>	<b>Aug-18</b>	<b>May-19</b>	<b>Aug-19</b>	<b>Dec-19</b>	Apr-25
 I-5, Oso Parkway to Alicia Parkway	\$196.2	Sep-11	Jun-14	Nov-14	Jun-17	Dec-17	Feb-18	Jun-18	Nov-23
Project C & D	\$203.1	<b>Oct-11</b>	<b>May-14</b>	<b>Nov-14</b>	<b>Dec-17</b>	<b>Jun-18</b>	<b>Nov-18</b>	<b>Mar-19</b>	Dec-23
 I-5, Alicia Parkway to El Toro Road	\$133.6	Sep-11	Jun-14	Mar-15	Jun-18	Dec-18	Jan-19	May-19	Oct-24
Project C	\$165.9	<b>Oct-11</b>	<b>May-14</b>	<b>Mar-15</b>	<b>May-19</b>	<b>Apr-20</b>	<b>May-20</b>	<b>Sep-20</b>	Oct-24
 I-5, SR-73 to El Toro Road (Landscape)	TBD	N/A	N/A	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Project C	\$12.4	N/A	N/A	Jul-22	Mar-24	Jul-24	Sep-24	Nov-24	Jun-26
 I-5, I-5/El Toro Road Interchange	TBD	Apr-17	Nov-19	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Project D	TBD	<b>Apr-17</b>	Nov-21	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
 I-5, I-405 to Yale Avenue	\$230.5	May-14	Aug-18	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Project B	\$230.5	<b>May-14</b>	<b>Jan-20</b>	Sep-21	Jun-24	Dec-24	Apr-25	Jul-25	Jan-29
 I-5, Yale Avenue to SR-55	\$200.4	May-14	Aug-18	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Project B	\$200.4	<b>May-14</b>	<b>Jan-20</b>	Apr-21	Jan-24	Jul-24	Nov-24	Feb-25	Sep-28
 I-5, SR-55 to SR-57	\$38.1	Jul-11	Jun-13	Jun-15	Mar-17	Jul-17	Sep-17	Dec-17	Apr-21
Project A	\$39.7	<b>Jun-11</b>	<b>Apr-15</b>	<b>Jun-15</b>	<b>Jun-17</b>	<b>Dec-17</b>	<b>Mar-18</b>	<b>Nov-18</b>	<b>Jan-21</b>

Cost/Schedule Risk

## Capital Action Plan

Status Through March 2021











Updated: April 15, 2021

Capital Projects	Cost Baseline/Forecast (millions)	Schedule Plan/Forecast							
		Begin Environmental	Complete Environmental	Begin Design	Complete Design	Construction Ready	Advertise Construction	Award Contract	Complete Construction
 SR-55, I-405 to I-5 Project F <b>Cost/Schedule Risk</b>	\$410.9	Feb-11	Nov-13	Sep-17	Apr-20	Dec-20	Apr-21	Jul-21	Aug-25
	\$503.2	May-11	Aug-17	Sep-17	Apr-20	Sep-21	Dec-21	Apr-22	Apr-26
 SR-55, I-5 to SR-91 Project F	TBD	Dec-16	Jan-20	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
	\$131.3	Dec-16	Mar-20	May-22	May-25	Oct-25	Feb-26	May-26	Jul-29
 SR-57 Northbound (NB), Orangewood Avenue to Katella Avenue Project G	\$71.8	Apr-16	Dec-18	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
	\$71.8	Apr-16	Mar-19	Jan-22	Mar-24	Jul-24	Nov-24	Mar-25	Oct-27
 SR-57 (NB), Katella Avenue to Lincoln Avenue Project G	\$78.7	Apr-08	Jul-09	Jul-08	Nov-10	Mar-11	May-11	Aug-11	Sep-14
	\$38.0	Apr-08	Nov-09	Aug-08	Dec-10	Apr-11	Jul-11	Oct-11	Apr-15
 SR-57 (NB), Katella Avenue to Lincoln Avenue (Landscape) Project G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	N/A	N/A	N/A	May-09	Jul-10	Jun-17	Jul-17	Sep-17	Jun-18
 SR-57 (NB), Orangethorpe Avenue to Yorba Linda Boulevard Project G	\$80.2	Aug-05	Dec-07	Feb-08	Dec-09	Apr-10	Jun-10	Oct-10	May-14
	\$52.3	Aug-05	Dec-07	Feb-08	Jul-09	Dec-09	May-10	Oct-10	Nov-14
 SR-57 (NB), Yorba Linda Boulevard to Lambert Road Project G	\$79.3	Aug-05	Dec-07	Feb-08	Dec-09	Apr-10	Jun-10	Oct-10	Sep-14
	\$54.1	Aug-05	Dec-07	Feb-08	Jul-09	Mar-10	May-10	Oct-10	May-14
 SR-57 (NB), Orangethorpe Avenue to Lambert Road (Landscape) Project G	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	N/A	N/A	N/A	Oct-14	Aug-17	Dec-17	Jan-18	Feb-18	Apr-19
 SR-57 (NB), Lambert Road to Tonner Canyon Project G	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
	TBD	Sep-22	May-25	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
 SR-91 Westbound (WB), I-5 to SR-57 Project H	\$78.1	Jul-07	Apr-10	Oct-09	Feb-12	Jul-12	Aug-12	Nov-12	Apr-16
	\$59.2	Jul-07	Jun-10	Mar-10	Apr-12	Aug-12	Oct-12	Jan-13	Jun-16
 SR-91 Westbound (WB), I-5 to SR-57 (Landscape) Project H	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	N/A	N/A	N/A	Nov-14	Aug-16	Dec-16	Feb-17	Mar-17	Nov-17
 SR-91, SR-55 to Lakeview Avenue (Segment 1) Project I	\$100.9	Jan-15	Oct-18	Mar-20	Jan-23	Aug-23	Oct-23	Feb-24	Sep-27
	\$100.9	Jan-15	Jun-20	Mar-20	Jan-23	Aug-23	Oct-23	Feb-24	Sep-27
 SR-91, La Palma Avenue to SR-55 (Segment 2) Project I	\$208.4	Jan-15	Oct-18	Jun-20	Jul-23	Feb-24	Mar-24	Jul-24	Mar-28
	\$208.4	Jan-15	Jun-20	Jun-20	Jul-23	Feb-24	Mar-24	Jul-24	Mar-28
 SR-91, Acacia Street to La Palma Ave (Segment 3) Project I	\$116.2	Jan-15	Oct-18	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
	\$116.2	Jan-15	Jun-20	Nov-20	Sep-23	Apr-24	Jun-24	Sep-24	May-28
 SR-91 (WB), Tustin Interchange to SR-55 Project I	\$49.9	Jul-08	Jul-11	Jul-11	Mar-13	Jul-13	Aug-13	Oct-13	Jul-16
	\$42.5	Jul-08	May-11	Jun-11	Feb-13	Apr-13	Jun-13	Oct-13	Jul-16

## Capital Action Plan

Status Through March 2021











Updated: April 15, 2021

	Capital Projects	Cost	Schedule							
		Baseline/Forecast	Plan/Forecast							
		(millions)	Begin Environmental	Complete Environmental	Begin Design	Complete Design	Construction Ready	Advertise Construction	Award Contract	Complete Construction
	SR-91, SR-55 to SR-241	\$128.4	Jul-07	Jul-09	Jun-09	Jan-11	Apr-11	Jun-11	Sep-11	Dec-12
	Project J	\$79.7	Jul-07	Apr-09	Apr-09	Aug-10	Dec-10	Feb-11	May-11	Mar-13
	SR-91, SR-55 to SR-241 (Landscape)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Project J	N/A	N/A	N/A	May-12	Feb-13	Apr-13	Jul-13	Oct-13	Feb-15
	SR-91 Eastbound, SR-241 to SR-71	\$104.5	Mar-05	Dec-07	Jul-07	Dec-08	Mar-09	May-09	Jul-09	Nov-10
	Project J	\$57.8	Mar-05	Dec-07	Jul-07	Dec-08	May-09	Jun-09	Aug-09	Jan-11
	91 Express Lanes to SR-241 Toll Connector	TBD	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		TBD	Nov-13	Jan-20	Jun-16	Dec-21	Jun-22	Jul-22	Nov-22	Jun-25
	I-405, I-5 to SR-55	TBD	Dec-14	Jul-18	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
	Project L	TBD	Dec-14	Aug-18	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
	I-405, SR-55 to I-605 (Design-Build)	\$2,080.2	Mar-09	Mar-13	Mar-14	Nov-15	Feb-16	Mar-16	Nov-16	Feb-24
	Project K	\$2,080.2	Mar-09	May-15	Mar-14	Nov-15	Feb-16	Mar-16	Nov-16	Feb-24
	I-405/SR-22 HOV Connector	\$195.9	N/A	N/A	Sep-07	Sep-09	Mar-10	May-10	Aug-10	Aug-14
		\$120.8	N/A	N/A	Sep-07	Jun-09	Sep-09	Feb-10	Jun-10	Mar-15
	I-405/I-605 HOV Connector	\$260.4	N/A	N/A	Sep-07	Sep-09	Mar-10	May-10	Oct-10	Jan-15
		\$172.6	N/A	N/A	Sep-07	Sep-09	Feb-10	May-10	Oct-10	Mar-15
	I-405/SR-22/I-605 HOV Connector (Landscape)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		N/A	N/A	N/A	Jun-08	May-09	Feb-16	May-16	Jul-16	Feb-18
	I-605, I-605/Katella Interchange	\$29.0	Aug-16	Nov-18	TBD	Mar-23	Jul-23	Nov-23	Feb-24	Nov-25
	Project M	\$29.0	Aug-16	Oct-18	Dec-20	Mar-23	Jul-23	Nov-23	Feb-24	Nov-25
	Grade Separation Projects:									
	Sand Canyon Avenue Railroad Grade Separation	\$55.6	N/A	Sep-03	Jan-04	Jul-10	Jul-10	Oct-10	Feb-11	May-14
	Project R	\$61.9	N/A	Sep-03	Jan-04	Jul-10	Jul-10	Oct-10	Feb-11	Jan-16
	Raymond Avenue Railroad Grade Separation	\$77.2	Feb-09	Nov-09	Mar-10	Aug-12	Nov-12	Feb-13	May-13	Aug-18
	Project O	\$126.2	Feb-09	Nov-09	Mar-10	Dec-12	Jul-13	Oct-13	Feb-14	May-18
	State College Boulevard Railroad Grade Separation (Fullerton)	\$73.6	Dec-08	Jan-11	Jul-06	Aug-12	Nov-12	Feb-13	May-13	May-18
	Project O	\$99.6	Dec-08	Apr-11	Jul-06	Feb-13	May-13	Sep-13	Feb-14	Mar-18
	Placentia Avenue Railroad Grade Separation	\$78.2	Jan-01	May-01	Jan-09	Mar-10	May-10	Mar-11	Jun-11	Nov-14
	Project O	\$64.5	Jan-01	May-01	Jan-09	Jun-10	Jan-11	Mar-11	Jul-11	Dec-14

## Capital Action Plan

Status Through March 2021

Updated: April 15, 2021

Capital Projects	Cost Baseline/Forecast (millions)	Schedule Plan/Forecast							
		Begin Environmental	Complete Environmental	Begin Design	Complete Design	Construction Ready	Advertise Construction	Award Contract	Complete Construction
 Kraemer Boulevard Railroad Grade Separation Project O	\$70.4 \$63.8	Jan-01 <b>Jan-01</b>	Sep-09 <b>Sep-09</b>	Jan-09 <b>Feb-09</b>	Jul-10 <b>Jul-10</b>	Jul-10 <b>Jan-11</b>	Apr-11 <b>Jun-11</b>	Aug-11 <b>Sep-11</b>	Oct-14 <b>Dec-14</b>
 Orangethorpe Avenue Railroad Grade Separation Project O	\$117.4 \$105.9	Jan-01 <b>Jan-01</b>	Sep-09 <b>Sep-09</b>	Feb-09 <b>Feb-09</b>	Dec-11 <b>Oct-11</b>	Dec-11 <b>Apr-12</b>	Feb-12 <b>Sep-12</b>	May-12 <b>Jan-13</b>	Sep-16 <b>Oct-16</b>
 Tustin Avenue/Rose Drive Railroad Grade Separation Project O	\$103.0 \$96.6	Jan-01 <b>Jan-01</b>	Sep-09 <b>Sep-09</b>	Feb-09 <b>Feb-09</b>	Dec-11 <b>Jul-11</b>	Mar-12 <b>Jun-12</b>	May-12 <b>Oct-12</b>	Aug-12 <b>Feb-13</b>	May-16 <b>Oct-16</b>
 Lakeview Avenue Railroad Grade Separation Project O	\$70.2 \$110.7	Jan-01 <b>Jan-01</b>	Sep-09 <b>Sep-09</b>	Feb-09 <b>Feb-09</b>	Oct-11 <b>Jan-13</b>	Oct-12 <b>Apr-13</b>	Feb-13 <b>Sep-13</b>	May-13 <b>Nov-13</b>	Mar-17 <b>Jun-17</b>
 17th Street Railroad Grade Separation Project R	TBD TBD	Oct-14 <b>Oct-14</b>	Jun-16 <b>Nov-17</b>	TBD TBD	TBD TBD	TBD TBD	TBD TBD	TBD TBD	TBD TBD
<b>Rail and Station Projects:</b>									
 Rail-Highway Grade Crossing Safety Enhancement Project R	\$94.4 \$90.4	Jan-08 <b>Jan-08</b>	Oct-08 <b>Oct-08</b>	Jan-08 <b>Jan-08</b>	Sep-08 <b>Sep-08</b>	Sep-08 <b>Sep-08</b>	Sep-08 <b>Sep-08</b>	Aug-09 <b>Aug-09</b>	Dec-11 <b>Dec-11</b>
 San Clemente Beach Trail Safety Enhancements Project R	\$6.0 \$5.0	Sep-10 <b>Sep-10</b>	Jul-11 <b>Jul-11</b>	Feb-12 <b>Feb-12</b>	Apr-12 <b>Jun-12</b>	Apr-12 <b>Jun-12</b>	Jul-12 <b>Oct-12</b>	Oct-12 <b>May-13</b>	Jan-14 <b>Mar-14</b>
San Juan Capistrano Passing Siding	\$25.3 \$36.4	Aug-11 <b>Aug-11</b>	Jan-13 <b>Mar-14</b>	Mar-15 <b>Mar-15</b>	May-16 <b>Aug-18</b>	May-16 <b>Aug-18</b>	Aug-16 <b>Aug-18</b>	Dec-16 <b>Mar-19</b>	Feb-21 <b>Nov-20</b>
 OC Streetcar Project S	\$424.4 \$440.0	Aug-09 <b>Aug-09</b>	Mar-12 <b>Mar-15</b>	Feb-16 <b>Feb-16</b>	Sep-17 <b>Nov-17</b>	Oct-17 <b>Dec-17</b>	Dec-17 <b>Dec-17</b>	Aug-18 <b>Sep-18</b>	Dec-21 <b>Oct-22</b>
 Placentia Metrolink Station and Parking Structure Project R	\$34.8 \$40.1	Jan-03 <b>Jan-03</b>	May-07 <b>May-07</b>	Oct-08 <b>Oct-08</b>	Jan-11 <b>Feb-11</b>	TBD Feb-22	TBD Feb-22	TBD Jun-22	TBD Jan-24
 Orange County Maintenance Facility Project R	TBD TBD	Apr-20 <b>Apr-20</b>	Apr-22 <b>Apr-22</b>	TBD TBD	TBD TBD	TBD TBD	TBD TBD	TBD TBD	TBD TBD
Anaheim Canyon Station	\$27.9 \$34.2	Jan-16 <b>Jan-16</b>	Dec-16 <b>Jun-17</b>	Mar-19 <b>Mar-18</b>	May-19 <b>Oct-20</b>	May-19 <b>Oct-20</b>	Jul-19 <b>Oct-20</b>	Nov-19 <b>Mar-21</b>	Mar-21 <b>Oct-22</b>
Orange Station Parking Expansion	\$33.2 \$30.9	Dec-09 <b>Dec-09</b>	Dec-12 <b>May-16</b>	Nov-10 <b>Nov-10</b>	Apr-13 <b>Apr-16</b>	Jul-16 <b>Jul-16</b>	Jul-16 <b>Jul-16</b>	Nov-16 <b>Jun-17</b>	Feb-19 <b>Feb-19</b>

## Capital Action Plan

Status Through March 2021

Updated: April 15, 2021

Capital Projects	Cost	Schedule							
	Baseline/Forecast	Plan/Forecast							
	(millions)	Begin Environmental	Complete Environmental	Begin Design	Complete Design	Construction Ready	Advertise Construction	Award Contract	Complete Construction
Fullerton Transportation Center - Elevator Upgrades	\$3.5	N/A	N/A	Jan-12	Dec-13	Dec-13	Jun-14	Sep-14	Mar-17
	\$4.2	N/A	N/A	Jan-12	Dec-13	Dec-13	Aug-14	Apr-15	May-19
Laguna Niguel/Mission Viejo Station ADA Ramps	\$3.5	Jul-13	Jan-14	Jul-13	Aug-14	Aug-14	Sep-14	Jan-15	Apr-17
	\$5.0	Jul-13	Feb-14	Jul-13	Jul-15	Jul-15	Jul-15	Oct-15	Sep-17
Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center	\$227.4	Apr-09	Feb-11	Jun-09	Feb-12	Feb-12	May-12	Jul-12	Nov-14
Project R & T	\$232.2	Apr-09	Feb-12	Jun-09	May-12	May-12	May-12	Sep-12	Dec-14

Note: Costs associated with landscape projects are included in respective freeway projects.

Grey = Milestone achieved

Green = Forecast milestone meets or exceeds plan

Yellow = Forecast milestone is one to three months later than plan

Red = Forecast milestone is over three months later than plan

**Begin Environmental:** The date work on the environmental clearance, project report, or preliminary engineering phase begins.

**Complete Environmental:** The date environmental clearance and project approval is achieved.

**Begin Design:** The date final design work begins, or the date when a design-build contract begins.

**Complete Design:** The date final design work is 100 percent complete and approved.

**Construction Ready:** The date contract bid documents are ready for advertisement, including certification of right-of-way, all agreements executed, contract constraints are cleared.

**Advertise for Construction:** The date a construction contract is both funded and advertised for bids.

**Award Contract:** The date the construction contract is awarded.

**Construction Complete:** The date all construction work is completed and the project is open to public use.

### Acronyms

I-5 - Santa Ana Freeway (Interstate 5)

SR-73 - San Joaquin Freeway (State Route 73)

SR-55 - Costa Mesa Freeway (State Route 55)

SR-57 - Orange Freeway (State Route 57)

SR-91 - Riverside Freeway (State Route 91)

SR-71 - Corona Expressway (State Route 71)

SR-22 - Garden Grove Freeway (State Route 22)

I-405 - San Diego Freeway (Interstate 405)

SR-241 - Foothill/Eastern Transportation Corridor (State Route 241)

I-605 - San Gabriel River Freeway (Interstate 605)

ADA - Americans with Disabilities Act

HOV - High-Occupancy Vehicle

# Capital Programs Division

## Fiscal Year 2020-21 Performance Metrics Through March 2021

### Begin Environmental

Project Description	FY 21 Qtr 1		FY 21 Qtr 2		FY 21 Qtr 3		FY 21 Qtr 4		FY 21 Fcst
	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	
I-5, Avenida Pico to San Diego County Line						✓	X		
Total Forecast/Actual	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1

### Complete Environmental

Project Description	FY 21 Qtr 1		FY 21 Qtr 2		FY 21 Qtr 3		FY 21 Qtr 4		FY 21 Fcst
	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	
No "Complete Environmental" milestones scheduled for FY 2020-21									
Total Forecast/Actual	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

### Begin Design

Project Description	FY 21 Qtr 1		FY 21 Qtr 2		FY 21 Qtr 3		FY 21 Qtr 4		FY 21 Fcst
	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	
SR-91, Acacia Street to La Palma Avenue			X	✓					
I-605/Katella Avenue Interchange			X	✓					
I-5, Yale Avenue to SR-55							X		
Total Forecast/Actual	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	3

### Complete Design

Project Description	FY 21 Qtr 1		FY 21 Qtr 2		FY 21 Qtr 3		FY 21 Qtr 4		FY 21 Fcst
	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	
Anaheim Canyon Metrolink Station	X			✓					
Total Forecast/Actual	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

### Construction Ready

Project Description	FY 21 Qtr 1		FY 21 Qtr 2		FY 21 Qtr 3		FY 21 Qtr 4		FY 21 Fcst
	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	
Anaheim Canyon Metrolink Station	X			✓					
Placentia Metrolink Station and Parking Structure					X				
SR-55, I-405 to I-5							X		
Total Forecast/Actual	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	3

### Advertise Construction

Project Description	FY 21 Qtr 1		FY 21 Qtr 2		FY 21 Qtr 3		FY 21 Qtr 4		FY 21 Fcst
	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	
Anaheim Canyon Metrolink Station	X			✓					
Placentia Metrolink Station and Parking Structure					X				
Total Forecast/Actual	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

### Award Contract

Project Description	FY 21 Qtr 1		FY 21 Qtr 2		FY 21 Qtr 3		FY 21 Qtr 4		FY 21 Fcst
	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	
I-5, Alicia Parkway to El Toro Road	X	✓							
Anaheim Canyon Metrolink Station			X			✓			
Placentia Metrolink Station and Parking Structure							X		
Total Forecast/Actual	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	3

# Capital Programs Division

## Fiscal Year 2020-21 Performance Metrics Through March 2021

### Complete Construction

Project Description	FY 21 Qtr 1		FY 21 Qtr 2		FY 21 Qtr 3		FY 21 Qtr 4		FY 21
	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	Fcst	Actual	Fcst
San Juan Capistrano Passing Siding				✓	X				
I-5, SR-55 to SR-57						✓	X		
Total Forecast/Actual	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2

Totals	4	1	3	6	3	3	5	0	15
--------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

**Begin Environmental:** The date work on the environmental clearance, project report, or preliminary engineering phase begins.

**Complete Environmental:** The date environmental clearance and project approval is achieved.

**Begin Design:** The date final design work begins or the date when a design-build contract begins.

**Complete Design:** The date final design work is 100 percent complete and approved.

**Construction Ready:** The date contract bid documents are ready for advertisement, right-of-way certified, all agreements executed, and contract constraints are cleared.

**Advertise for Construction:** The date a construction contract is both funded and advertised for bids.

**Award Contract:** The date the construction contract is awarded.

**Construction Complete:** The date all construction work is completed and the project is open to public use.

#### Acronyms

I-5 - Santa Ana Freeway (Interstate 5)

SR-55 - Costa Mesa Freeway (State Route 55)

SR-57 - Orange Freeway (State Route 57)

SR-91 - Riverside Freeway (State Route 91)

I-605 - San Gabriel River Freeway (Interstate 605)

I-405 - San Diego Freeway (Interstate 405)

FY - Fiscal Year

X = milestone forecast in quarter

