		2022 CTFP Gu	idelines ((Projects O and P) – Proposed Changes List
No.	Chapter	Section	Page No.	Proposed Change
1	Ch. 6	2021 Program Revisions	6-1	Added the following language: 2021 Program Revisions On January 25, 2021, the Board authorized the revision of certain Project V program requirements primarily required as a result of the coronavirus pandemic and the need to update several program requirements. These changes focused upon modifying the program's minimum performance requirements, allowing for annual subsidy escalation, and implementing recent Internal Audit recommendations. The changes will be fully incorporated into these guidelines during the next Project V call. However, until that time, for the latest program modifications and requirements, please refer to the January 25, 2021 staff report, which can be found at: https://octa.legislationDetail.aspx
2	Ch. 6	Project Requirements – Operations and Maintenance	6-7	Added the following language, "For the for latest OCTA Board-approved Project V minimum performance standards (approved on January 25, 2021), please see the following link:" https://octa.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4748502&GUID=1D11B36 F-02B3-4A94-9C8E-C3EE9AB6D275&Options=&Search=
3	Ch. 7	2022 Call	7-3	 Updated the following: the year for the call to 2022; the call's funding target language to reflect \$32 million, but also noted that Project O recommendations may be higher or lower depending on the projects submitted; and the three-year programming period (FY 2022-23 – FY 2024-25).
4	Ch. 7	Applications	7-4	Noted that local jurisdictions are required to submit both online and hardcopy applications for the 2022 call by 5:00 p.m. on Thursday, October 21, 2021.
5	Ch. 7	Applications	7-4	Added language to clarify that hardcopy attachments of supporting plans and/or drawings must be in a minimum size of 11 x 17 inches.
6	Ch. 7	Additional Information	7-10	Added language to clarify that hardcopy attachments of preliminary plans, if available, should be included in hard copy attachments at a minimum size of 11 x 17 inches.

		2022 CTFP Gu	idelines ((Projects O and P) – Proposed Changes List
No.	Chapter	Section	Page No.	Proposed Change
7	Ch. 7	Application Review Process	7-13	 Updated proposed call schedule to the following: Board authorization to issue call: August 9, 2021; Application submittal deadline: October 21, 2021; TSC/TAC Review: February/March 2022; and Committee/Board approval: May 2022.
8	Ch.7	Potentially Eligible Items	7-16	Clarified that: Rough grading can be considered eligible, so long as it supports MPAH improvement(s) within the ROW and does not supplant developer (or any other project obligations). Any proposed rough grading outside of the MPAH ROW will be evaluated by OCTA on a case-by-case basis but must be tied to the MPAH improvement(s) and not supplant developer (or any other project obligations).
9	Ch.7	Ineligible Expenditures	7-17	Clarified that: Grading outside of the roadway ROW not related to a TCE or ROW agreement is generally considered ineligible but can be evaluated by OCTA on a case-by-case basis but must be tied to the MPAH improvement(s) and not supplant developer (or any other project obligations).
10	Ch.7	Selection Criteria, New Facilities, and Level of Service Improvement	7-21 7-25 7-35 7-46	Updated deadline date for "new" facilities/modeling and alternative analysis methodology requests to September 9, 2021.
11	Ch. 7	Ineligible Items	7-31	Clarified that: Grading outside of the roadway ROW not related to a TCE or ROW agreement is generally assumed to be ineligible but can be evaluated by OCTA on a case-by-case basis but must be tied to the MPAH improvement(s) and not supplant developer (or any other project obligations).
12	Ch. 7	Ineligible Items	7-32	Clarified that: Rough grading can be considered eligible, so long as it supports MPAH improvement(s) within the ROW and does not supplant developer (or any other project obligations). Any proposed rough grading outside of the MPAH ROW, will be evaluated by OCTA on a case-by-case basis but must be tied to the MPAH improvement(s) and not supplant developer (or any other project obligations).

	2022 CTFP Guidelines (Projects O and P) – Proposed Changes List				
No.	Chapter	Section	Page No.	Proposed Change	
13	Ch. 7	Potentially Eligible Items	7-43	Clarified that: Rough grading can be considered eligible, so long as it supports MPAH improvement(s) within the ROW and does not supplant developer (or any other project obligations). Any proposed rough grading outside of the MPAH ROW will be evaluated by OCTA on a case-by-case basis but must be tied to the MPAH improvement(s) and not supplant developer (or any other project obligations).	
14	Ch. 7	Ineligible Projects	7-44	Clarified that: Grading outside of the roadway ROW not related to a TCE or ROW agreement is generally assumed to be ineligible but can be evaluated by OCTA on a case-by-case basis but must be tied to the MPAH improvement(s) and not supplant developer (or any other project obligations).	
15	Ch. 8	Overview	8-1	Updated the year for call year to 2022.	
16	Ch. 8	2022 Call	8-2	 Updated the following: the year for the call to 2022; and the call's funding target language to reflect \$8 million, but also noted that Project P recommendations may be higher or lower depending on the projects submitted. 	
17	Ch. 8	Applications	8-3	Noted that applications for the 2022 call are due by 5:00 p.m. on Thursday, October 21, 2021.	
18	Ch. 8	Other Application Materials	8-5	Updated the year to 2022 for the supplemental application requirement.	
19	Ch. 8	Application Review and Program Adoption	8-8	Updated proposed call schedule to the following: Board authorization to issue call: August 9, 2021; Application submittal deadline: October 21, 2021; TSC/TAC Review: February/March 2022; and Committee/Board approval: May 2022.	

2022 CTFP Guidelines ((Projects O and P) - Proposed Changes List
No.	Chapter	Section	Page No.	Proposed Change
20	Ch. 8	Selection Criteria- Project Scale – Note	8-14 - 8-15	Added the following note: Note: Due to the length of PCH and the fact that broad portions of it are a Caltrans-owned facility, for project scoring purposes only, the "Percent of Main Corridor Being Retimed" scoring criteria (identified in Table 8-1) can be divided into the four following segments. 1. San Gabriel River (Los Angeles County Line) to North of Goldenwest Street. 2. Goldenwest Street to School State Park. 3. South of School State Park to Doheny Park Road. 4. South of Doheny Park Road to San Diego County Line. If an application is proposed to span two or more segments of PCH the "Percent of Main Corridor Being Retimed" calculation will be based upon the number of signals in the project application divided by total number of signals in the applicable segments.
21	Ch. 8	Selection Criteria – Current Project Status - Note	8-15	Added the following note: "Note: Applications that designate OCTA as the lead agency are not eligible to claim implementation within 12 months."
22	Ch. 8	Table 8-1 Point Breakdown	8-16	Under current project status category revised language to state: "Re-timing 75% of prior RTSSP project or Measure M Signal Improvement Program funded project".

Acronyms Board – Board of Directors

Call – call for projects

Caltrans – California Department of Transportation
CTFP – Comprehensive Transportation Funding Program

FY – Fiscal Year

MPAH – Master Plan of Arterial Highway

OCTA – Master Plan of Arterial Highway
OCTA – Orange County Transportation Authority
PCH – Pacific Coast Highway
ROW – Right-of-Way
RTSSP – Regional Traffic Signal Synchronization Program
TAC – Transportation Advisory Committee

TCE – Temporary Construction Easement TSC – Technical Steering Committee