



association of central oklahoma governments

Chair Ron Bledsoe
Slaughterville Mayor

Vice-Chair Willa Johnson
Oklahoma City Councilmember

Secretary / Treasurer Eddie Reed
Midwest City Mayor

Executive Director
Zach D Taylor

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 14, 2005

TO: 2030 OCARTS Plan Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)

FROM: Holly Massie, Special Programs Officer
Transportation Planning and Data Services (TPDS)

SUBJECT: Meeting Notice

The 2030 OCARTS Plan Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) will hold a meeting on

MONDAY, MARCH 21, 2005 AT 3:00 P.M.

in the ACOG Conference Room, 21 East Main Street, Suite 100, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

AGENDA

- I. CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS ([Attachment I](#))
- II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES ([Attachment II](#))
Action Requested: Motion to approve the February 14, 2005 minutes
- III. INTERMODAL ELEMENT (IME) FOR THE 2030 OCARTS PLAN ([Attachment III](#))
Action Requested: Consider recommending that the Intermodal Transportation Policy Committee (ITPC) approve inclusion of the Intermodal Element in the 2030 OCARTS Plan (The IME may be viewed online at <http://acogok.org/Newsroom/Downloads/preime2030.pdf>)
- IV. PRELIMINARY PROJECTED REVENUES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2030 OCARTS PLAN ([Attachment IV](#))
Action Requested: Review and comment on preliminary revenue projections

V. ESTIMATED COSTS FOR STREET AND HIGHWAY ALTERNATIVES (ONE, TWO AND THREE) FOR THE 2030 OCARTS PLAN ([Attachment V](#))

Action Requested: Review and comment on estimated street and highway network costs

VI. STREET AND HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS SUGGESTED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FOR INCLUSION IN ALTERNATE FOUR OF THE 2030 OCARTS PLAN ([Attachment VI](#))

Action Requested: For information, review and comment.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

VII. ADJOURNMENT

**2030 OCARTS PLAN CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MARCH 2005**

CAC VOTING MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES		
ORGANIZATION	MEMBERS	ALTERNATES
AIRPORT EXPRESS	Larry Lucas President	David Butson General Manager
AREAWIDE AGING AGENCY	Don Hudman Executive Director	
BIKEMINE	Ron Dougherty Operations Manager	
CAPITOL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	Aquilla Pugh Office Manager	
CAPITOL HILL MAIN STREET PROGRAM	Joe Mendoza Executive Director	
CARDINAL ENGINEERING	Steve Mason President	Deanne Hughes Engineer
CenSARA (CENTRAL STATES AIR RESOURCE AGENCIES ASSN.)	Chuck Layman Executive Director	Annette Sharp Technical Director
CENTRAL OKLA. TRANSP. AND PARKING AUTHORITY (COTPA)	C. Kay Bickham Board Trustee	
CITIZEN	Teresa Bragg	
CITIZEN	Sam Shehab	
DALE ROGERS TRAINING CTR.	Theresa Flannery Vocational Programs Admin.	
DALLAS MILLER LOGISTICS	Barry Miller President	
DOWNTOWN OKC, INC.	David Lopez President	Kim Searls, Marketing Dir. Alison Oschel
GROUND WATER PROTECTION COUNCIL	Mike Paque Executive Director	
GUTHRIE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	Kathy Montgomery President	
LATINO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY	Pat Fennell Executive Director	
LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS	Erin Van Laanen	
LOVE'S COUNTRY STORES	Frank Love Marketing Director	
McCORKLE TRUCK LINES	David McCorkle President	

CAC VOTING MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES (Cont.)		
ORGANIZATION	MEMBERS	ALTERNATES
MOORE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	Brenda Roberts Executive Director	
MUSTANG CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	Rebecca Julian Executive Director	Robert Crout ED Committee Chair
NEIGHBORHOOD ALLIANCE	Georgie Rasco Executive Director	
NORMAN, CITY OF	Rachel Butler Councilmember	
OKLAHOMA BICYCLE SOCIETY	Dennis Clark Vice President	
OKLAHOMA CITY, CITY OF	Willa Johnson Councilmember	
OKLAHOMA CITY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE	Dean Schirf VP, Government Relations.	
OG&E	Richard Clements Manager	
OKLAHOMA HIGHWAY USERS FEDERATION	Paul Matthews Executive Director	Chuck Mai, Dir. Pub./Govt. Rel. American Automobile Assn.
OKLAHOMA RAILROAD ASSOCIATION	John Kyle Director	
OKLAHOMA TRAFFIC ENGINEERING ASSN.	Leonard West Executive Director	
OKLAHOMA TRUCKING ASSN.	Dan Case Executive Director	
SIERRA CLUB, OKLAHOMA CHAPTER	Ed Hillock	
THOMPSON'S WOODLAWN NEIGHBORHOOD ASSN.	Mary Johnson Citizen	Larry Coffman Citizen
TINKER AFB	Bill Dalke Community Planner	John (Mark) Harbaugh Civil Engineer
TRANSIT USER	Donna K. Armstrong HUD Customer Service Rep.	Bridget Keith HUD Career Intern
TRAVELERS AID SOCIETY	Laurie Barbour Executive Director	
TRI-CITY YOUTH & FAMILY CTR.	Don Abbott Exec. Director	Peggy L. Clay Board Chair
UNITED PETROLEUM TRANSPORTS	Greg Price President	
UNITED WAY OF OKLAHOMA CITY	Bob Spinks President	

CAC NON-VOTING MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES		
ORGANIZATION	MEMBERS	ALTERNATES
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS (BIA) SOUTHERN PLAINS REG. OFFICE	Jerry Patterson Highway Engineer	
CART / NORMAN METRO TRANSIT	Carl Weckenmann Planner/Grants Specialist	Theta Dempsey, Director Parking & Transportation
COTPA / OKC METRO TRANSIT	Larry Hopper Principal Planner	Diponker Mukherjee, Planner II Marty Dickens, Asst. Planner
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION (FHWA)	Isaac Akem Community Planner	
FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION	Mac Kirk Division Administrator	
MUSTANG, CITY OF	Melissa Helsel City Planner	
OFFICE OF HANDICAPPED CONCERNS	William Ginn Disability Program Specialist	Marilyn Burr Disability Program Specialist
OKLAHOMA CITY DEPARTMENT OF AIRPORTS	Luther E. Trent Director	
OKLAHOMA CITY PLANNING DEPARTMENT	Lanc Gross Trails Coordinator	
OKLAHOMA CITY PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT	Paul Brum, Director Public Works/City Engineer	Dan Boland Civil Engineer IV
OKLA. DEPT. OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (ODEQ)	Scott Thomas Program Dir., Air Quality	
OKLA. DEPT. OF HUMAN SERVICES (DHS), AGING SERVICES DIVISION	Victoria Martinez Admin. Programs Officer	
OKLA. DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY (DPS)	J.D. Roberts, Administrator Law Enforcement Programs	
OKLA. DEPT. OF REHABILITATION SERVICES (DRS)	Mary Howell Staff Asst. to Director	
OKLA. DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION (ODOT) PLANNING DIVISION	Roger Saunders Transportation Manager	Dawn Sullivan Division Engineer
OKLA. DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION (ODOT) RAIL DIVISION	Joe Kyle, Manager Rail Programs Division	John Dougherty Asst. Manager, Rail Programs
OKLA. DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION (ODOT) REGULATORY SERV. DIV.	Geri Stevens, Tribal Liason Native American Outreach	
OKLA. DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION (ODOT) TRANSIT PROGRAMS DIV.	Kenneth LaRue, Manager Transit Programs Division	Randy Hogan Transportation Specialist
OKLA. DEPT. OF WILDLIFE CONSERVATION	Mark Howery Natural Resources Biologist	

3/14/05

MINUTES

2030 OCARTS PLAN CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)**February 14, 2005**

The fourth regularly scheduled meeting of the 2030 OCARTS Plan Citizens Advisory Committee was convened on February 14, 2005 at 3:00 p.m. in the Board Room of the ACOG offices, 21 E. Main Street, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. This meeting was held as indicated by advance notice filed with the Oklahoma County Clerk and by notice posted at the ACOG offices at least twenty-four (24) hours prior to the meeting.

PRESIDING

C. Kay Bickham, Central Oklahoma Transportation and Parking Authority (COTPA), Trustee,
Vice-Chair

CAC VOTING MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT

Don Abbott, Tri-City Youth & Family Center
Teresa Bragg, Citizen
Hon. Rachel Butler, Norman Councilmember
Dennis Clark, Oklahoma Bicycle Society
Richard Clements, Oklahoma Gas & Electric
Larry Coffman, Thompson's Woodlawn Neighborhood Assn.
Robert Crout, Mustang Chamber of Commerce
Bill Dalke, Tinker Air Force Base
Ron Dougherty, BikeMine
Ed Hillock, Sierra Club
Rebecca Julian, Mustang Chamber of Commerce
Steve Mason, Cardinal Engineering, Inc.
Paul Matthews, Oklahoma Highway Users Federation
Mike Paque, Ground Water Protection Council
Greg Price, United Petroleum Transports
Dean Schirf, Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce
Sam Shehab, Citizen

CAC NON-VOTING MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT

Lanc Gross, City of Oklahoma City, Planning Dept. - Trails
Randy Hogan, Oklahoma Dept. of Transportation (ODOT), Transit Programs
Larry Hopper, Central Oklahoma Transportation & Parking Authority (COTPA)

Mary Howell, Oklahoma Dept. of Rehabilitation Services (ODRS)
Joe Kyle, Oklahoma Dept. of Transportation (ODOT), Rail Division
Diponker Mukherjee, COTPA
Roger Saunders, Oklahoma Dept. of Transportation (ODOT), Planning Division
Scott Thomas, Oklahoma Dept. of Environmental Quality (ODEQ)
Carl Weckenmann, CART/Norman Metro Transit

GUESTS

Rick Cain, COTPA
Amy Ford, COTPA
Mike McAnelly, Carter & Burgess
Lee Nichols, Carter & Burgess
Tom Shelton, Carter & Burgess
David Streb, ODOT

STAFF

Zach D. Taylor, Executive Director, ACOG
Holly Massie, Special Programs Officer, TPDS
Linda Koenig, Division Director, TPDS
Doug Rex, Assistant to the Executive Director
John Sharp, Program Coordinator, TPDS
Daniel O'Connor, Associate Planner, TPDS
Melissa Baldwin, Associate Planner, TPDS
Randy Entz, Associate Planner, TPDS
Jerry Church, Special Programs Officer, IGS
Ellen Owens, Department Secretary, TPDS

I. CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

Vice-Chair Bickham welcomed everyone and asked them to introduce themselves and state the name of the organization they represent.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mike Paque made a motion to approve the January 18, 2005 minutes. Ron Dougherty seconded the motion and with the vote, the motion passed.

At this point, Vice-Chair Bickham stated that Item IV would be considered first, as David Streb of ODOT had to leave early.

IV. STATUS REPORT ON THE SOUTHWEST OUTER LOOP

David Streb commented he wanted to give an update on the Southwest Outer Loop and on what is happening, what is reality, and what is rumor. Mr. Streb said there is a long history of the Outer Loop Study. The Outer Loop Study is a three-party effort with the Oklahoma Department of Transportation, ACOG, and the Oklahoma Transportation/Turnpike Authority. ODOT serves as the lead agency. Mr. Streb said that he knew that ACOG recently had held Public Listening Sessions for their Long Range Plan process; and, in that process, maps were put up that illustrated the conceptual corridor for the Southwest Outer Loop as it was defined two years ago. Since that time, the Outer Loop Study process has sat still.

There are still some consensus issues that need to be worked out on this alignment; and most of those are centered in the vicinity of Indian Hills Road, near Moore and Norman. The history of this includes a Public Meeting that was held in 2001. At that meeting, a proposed connection at I-35 was shown adjacent to Indian Hills Road. We received some comments on that at that time, and we thought we were being responsive to those, and moved that line a little to the north. We received some resistance to that as well, following another meeting in Spring 2002. Since then, we have been trying to bring all the parties together to bring the issue to consensus. I think we are making progress towards that. We are very optimistic that we will get the affected entities to the table to work on the consensus issues.

Additionally, it is important for everyone to be aware that we did all the conceptual engineering studies, all the public meetings, and received comments on where the best fit is. I know the municipalities that are impacted by this are trying to take a look at future developments, and still try to work with this Outer Loop conceptual corridor. However, until we reach a consensus on an alignment and where it ties in with I-35, it will be difficult for the cities to protect the area from development. The one thing that hasn't changed is the increasing rate of congestion on I-35.

Dean Schirf said that, speaking from the perspective of the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce, the future project is critical to the movement of motorists and commerce around the the City. Some people think that I-44 is the Outer Loop; the City is growing so rapidly that unless we act soon, that will be the only loop. He said we need to think, in a very serious way, about addressing the project that Mr. Streb just described. He said he was familiar with the concerns about I-35 between Moore and Norman, and has some concerns about the rapid development that is taking place where the Kilpatrick Turnpike that exists today comes into I-40 on the west side of Oklahoma City. In talking to the City of Oklahoma City staff, Mr. Schirf said he is aware that there is a good deal of residential development activity in that area. He said it is really critical that we move this roadway study to the point where we can evaluate it from an environmental standpoint. This could

very well end up, and we feel it probably will, being an extension of the Kilpatrick Turnpike as a toll road facility. He said he thought it was very important to do something to save this corridor.

Vice-Chair Bickham asked if this Outer Loop Study Committee was actively meeting now, or is it the case that affected entities will meet at some point. Mr. Streb said there is a renewed desire to meet and reach consensus on the issue.

Sam Shehab asked if, based on ODOT's experiences with Moore and Norman, there is a potential for consensus? And if they did reach a consensus, what method is available to secure the right-of-way to protect the corridor?

Mr. Streb said he agreed with Dean Schirf as to what will happen if we don't reach a consensus. As far as being able to preserve the right-of-way, if we can have an agreed upon alignment, then all of the municipalities can work together in a good faith effort to protect the corridor. The other thing is that an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) is the next step. Until that process is done, we cannot buy the right-of-way. That is a key step, and until we reach that point in time, we have no way of taking that alignment into our own control. Everything from now, until that happens, is strictly a good faith effort with cities, the county, or state to work with developers.

Linda Koenig asked Mr. Streb to speak to the issue of toll versus a highway facility and what the different views would be as far as engineering or environmental issues. Mr. Streb said the goal here is to have an alignment that the region agreed upon. Whether that turns out to be a toll road or free road is not part of the Outer Loop Study. ODOT wants the corridor protected. Similar examples we can recall from the past include the Lake Hefner Parkway and the Kilpatrick Turnpike. Both were corridors that were identified for many years. Hefner Parkway was built by ODOT with federal funds; Kilpatrick Turnpike was built by the Turnpike Authority. Those are two corridors that were protected in similar ways, but funded differently. I think the same would hold true for the Southwest Outer Loop. We cannot predict how it will be funded. He said the alignment issue is independent from the funding solution. Mr. Paque said that, based on his experience working for the City of Oklahoma City at the time the Lake Hefner Parkway was being planned, early definition of an alignment is absolutely critical.

Rachel Butler said the last time we met we learned that what can be included in the Plan should be realistically fundable within the time horizon. Mr. Streb said in fifteen or twenty years from now, if funding is available for the Outer Loop, and the decision makers that are in key positions decide to proceed with that facility, I think now is the time to ensure we have a place to put it.

Mr. Streb said that if the Turnpike Authority builds a job with bond funds, they don't have to go through as extensive an environmental process as ODOT (which uses federal funds). When the Department uses federal funds, the EIS is much more laborious and inclusive.

Robert Crout asked if it costs more and it is more laborious to do a federal EIS than a turnpike environmental study, then how do we know which way to go? Mr. Streb replied that if you don't do a federal EIS, you can't use federal funds. However, an EIS can be a valid environmental study if a decision is made to construct a facility with turnpike bonds. Mr. Crout asked then if we are trying to do an EIS as soon as we can. Mr. Streb said he would like to get an alignment agreed upon first. Mr. Crout asked Mr. Streb if he had an Outer Loop alignment on the OCARTS Plan, other than the area around I-35. Mr. Streb said yes. He said, as you go through the environmental and the design processes, it will likely vary – not a mile and a half – but a bit. Mr. Crout asked when an EIS might start. Mr. Streb said he did not know as there is no consensus on the I -35 connection yet.

Mr. Streb said the purpose of his visit here today is to let everyone know that there is no recent forward movement on this issue; until there is consensus on the south end, he does not see progress happening. He said the Study sponsors would try to hold a meeting fairly soon. Mr. Crout asked if the meeting would be between the Moore and Norman governments or land-owners. Mr. Streb said that remains to be seen.

Mr. Schirf asked how we can get this issue moving. He said he thinks it is important to get an alignment agreed upon; then the challenge will be to get funds to allow the EIS to go forward.

Vice-Chair Bickham asked if the Outer Loop should be included in the 2030 Plan. Mr. Shehab said in order for it to be considered for future state planning efforts and in order for the project to be eligible for federal funds, it has to be part of the Long Range Transportation Plan. If it isn't part of the Plan, we cannot do an EIS. Mr. Schirf said he felt it most definitely should be in the Plan. He said he felt it was important for the OCARTS Committees to address the issue and to do what we can to accomplish defining a clear alignment.

Ms. Massie commented that it is in the 2025 Plan as a mile-wide general swath in the southwest part of the region; the assumption was, for financial planning purposes, that it would be built as a toll road. The transportation modeling will be very dependent on whether or not we have a Loop there, because that will affect the trips on I-35 and other facilities.

Greg Price asked whose responsibility is it to take the leadership role in seeing that the corridor alignment is being worked on. Mr. Streb said consensus is needed from each of

the affected municipalities. Ms. Massie asked if ODOT was leading the way to get the communities together. Mr. Streb replied that it is a three-party effort between ODOT, ACOG, and the Transportation Authority.

Bill Dalke asked if it would help to have a motion or resolution from the Committee stating it was important for the affected entities to meet and reach consensus. Mr. Matthews said that he felt it was the role of the Citizens Committee to advocate for the process of getting this done. Vice-Chair Bickham asked if it was appropriate for action to be taken at this time since it was not listed on the agenda for action. Mr. Taylor said that he felt ACOG and ODOT staff had a clear understanding of the sense of the Committee on this issue.

III. PRESENTATION ON THE CENTRAL OKLAHOMA FIXED GUIDEWAY STUDY INITIATED BY COTPA

Tom Shelton, of Carter-Burgess, introduced his colleagues, Mike McAnelley and Lee Nichols. They distributed materials regarding the Study to the Committee members. He said they were recently hired by COTPA to conduct the Fixed Guideway Study, which will take about 12 months, and that the firm just recently initiated the Study. Mr. Shelton said there are already 27 cities in North America that have a light rail system and 20 cities with commuter rail projects. There are another 140 projects that the FTA will consider for some form of fixed guideway transit.

Mr. Shelton presented a slide show to describe the Study. He said they want to investigate what is occurring in the Oklahoma City metropolitan area. He indicated they would look at the 2000 Census, the demographics of population and employment growth, the trip patterns, and would project to the year 2030 how that might change. He said the purpose of the study is to identify the needs and challenges for establishing fixed guideway transportation in the region, evaluate corridors and technologies to see what is feasible, look at estimated ridership and costs, and make recommendations. An action plan will then be developed.

Mr. Shelton indicated a steering committee comprised of approximately 30 elected and business leaders, has been convened. The first steering committee meeting was held in December. The committee will be involved in guiding the Study process. He referred to the handout called "*Pathways*" which lists the steering committee members, plus the public meetings that will be held to request public input on February 21, 22, 23, and 24 at local area libraries.

Mr. Shelton said the consultant intends to investigate different forms of fixed guideway technologies based on needs, densities, ridership and cost effectiveness. They will evaluate various technologies including High Occupancy Vehicle lanes, bus rapid transit, light rail transit, modern street cars, commuter rail, heavy rail, and monorail. He said

there are nine corridors that will be analyzed, plus the Central Business District (CDB) itself.

He displayed a variety of photographs of light rail and commuter rail stations across the country. He said there are a lot of opportunities for joint development. Mr. Shelton mentioned that in the last five to ten years, there has been focus on Transit Oriented Development (TOD). He said TOD is needed to compliment an effective Fixed Guideway system in providing mobility, easing congestion, and improving air quality. Rail transit, for example, will stimulate new types of development around transit stations because there will be a mix of retail, residential, commercial, and office space. They need to be pedestrian friendly.

Mr. Shelton said the federal funding partner is the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and they have a required process to follow if the local governments intend to garner federal funding. He said the feasibility study, or systems planning phase, is the first step. The outcome of this phase will be a recommendation of corridors that could move forward to the Alternatives Analysis process, part of the formal FTA process. Potential funding strategies include the federal FTA Section 5309 program, but there is a lot of competition for that funding. He said it has been his experience, that the entire FTA process (from Systems Planning to construction) could take anywhere from eight to nine years, depending upon the critical issue of funding, and if the local match is readily available.

A comment was made that there are already rail lines running through Choctaw, Midwest City, Edmond, and Guthrie. Mr. Shelton said many of the corridors being looked at do parallel existing railroad tracks. Commuter rail is very easy to implement as long as it is coordinated with the railroad operators. Separate railroad lines are needed for light rail because of safety issues.

Mr. Schirf commented that the process may take eight to nine years, but even before that, the local community has to participate financially. He asked Mr. Shelton to comment on that. Mr. Shelton said at a minimum, there is a federal requirement that any project be in the Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO) Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Additionally, these projects need to have a significant amount of public involvement.

Mr. Paque remarked that in the last 25-30 years there has been a drastic difference in terms of employment and residential areas in the metropolitan area. He said he noted that Portland, Oregon implemented their fixed guideway very incrementally. Their history is similar to the Oklahoma City metro area, and their system might be a good model for us.

Mr. Shelton commented that when the actual data of the 2000 census was released, it was very interesting. A lot of the national data on population and employment numbers were greater than had been projected. He said in the late 1990's, there was a significant change in the population of minority and low-income groups and in the elderly community. There was also a significant change in household size. This indicates that there is a need for cities to provide for greater mobility of its citizens.

Zach Taylor commented that the last OCARTS plan update suggested that the fixed guideway study be revisited, and that there are compelling reasons for central Oklahoma to look at this. It has been at least ten years since the last study. He encouraged Committee members to attend the public meetings and offer ideas for routes and transit system improvements, so they can be evaluated. Mr. Taylor said the demographics for this region, as well as land use and densities, are changing dramatically. He said there is only so much we can build out in the way of roads. He said the results of the Fixed Guideway Study will be incorporated into future planning

Roger Saunders said there is a large segment of the population that is aging. He asked if a fixed guideway system would address the needs of that population. Mr. Shelton replied that it does. Statistics show the elderly population's greatest need is health care. The study will look at trip patterns for the elderly and disabled.

Mr. Matthews asked how Carter-Burgess was selected to conduct this study, how much the study will cost, and where is the funding coming from. Rick Cain said that COTPA went through a selection process (an RFP) where it identified a scope of services for a Fixed Guideway Study and about seven firms responded to the RFP. There was a selection committee made up of six people, some within the COTPA organization, some outside. There was an evaluation done and Carter-Burgess was chosen. He said the cost will be about \$750,000, 80% of which will be federal funds; the City of Oklahoma City is paying the local share through COTPA.

Larry Hopper said there will be news stories about the community involvement meetings soon.

V. **PROPOSED UNIT COSTS FOR DEVELOPING COST ESTIMATES FOR THE STREET AND HIGHWAY ALTERNATIVES FOR THE 2030 OCARTS PLAN**

Doug Rex said that federal transportation law requires the Long Range Transportation Plan to be financially realistic. It must be demonstrated that the cost of the Plan improvements can be paid for from revenues reasonably anticipated to be available during the Plan period. Mr. Rex informed the Committee that the estimated cost for the Street and Highway element of the Plan will be based on unit cost information that was derived from two sources. One is the 2003 Needs Assessment Report from ODOT

(adjusted to base year 2000 dollar figures), and the unit costs for maintenance on local streets will be based on costs received from a sub-group of local entities.

Mr. Rex referred the Committee to the table on Page V-2 of the Agenda. The table breaks down the unit costs. He indicated the units costs vary based on functional classification and on urban and rural area. The costs for construction and maintenance of facilities in the urban area are more than they are in the rural area.

Mr. Rex said in comparison to the unit costs in the 2025 Plan, construction costs have increased substantially in the range of 20%. Maintenance costs were calculated differently between the 2025 and 2030 Plans. The 2025 Plan unit costs were based on a three-inch overlay, whereas the 2030 Plan is based on a two-inch overlay. This is due to a change in ODOT requirements and reduced the maintenance costs to some degree.

Mr. Rex said the unit cost for maintenance of roadways under local jurisdiction is a new category for the 2030 Plan.

Mr. Saunders asked if the units costs are per lane mile. Mr. Rex replied that is correct.

Mary Howell asked if this is 2005 or 2030 money. Mr. Rex replied it is 2000 money. Everything is in the base year dollars.

VI. REVISED PRELIMINARY TRANSIT REPORT FOR THE INERMODAL ELEMENT OF THE 2030 OCARTS PLAN

Randy Entz said the revised Preliminary Transit Report, which is a part of the Intermodal Element of the 2030 OCARTS Plan, is available on ACOG's web site. Any written comments should be received by February 25, 2005. The final version of the report will be brought before this Committee at the March meeting.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Crout asked if there could be an update on the Outer Loop progress that ACOG has made in the next agenda. Ms. Massie asked if he wanted a follow-up to the presentation made today. Mr. Crout replied in the affirmative.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Abbott made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Crout seconded the motion. Vice-Chair Bickham adjourned the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

ACOG

ASSOCIATION OF CENTRAL OKLAHOMA GOVERNMENTS

21 E. Main St, Suite 100, Oklahoma City, OK 73104-2405

(405) 234-2264 Fax: (405)234-2200 TDD: (405) 234-2217

www.acogok.org

e-mail: acog@acogok.org

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 14, 2005

TO: 2030 OCARTS Plan Citizens Advisory Committee

FROM: Danny O'Connor, Associate Planner
Transportation Planning and Data Services (TPDS)

SUBJECT: Intermodal Element (IME)
for the 2030 OCARTS Plan

INFORMATION:

The Intermodal Element report profiles the five modes of transportation in the OCARTS area that compliment and work in concert with the street and highway network. This report can be viewed at: <http://acogok.org/Newsroom/Downloads/preime2030.pdf>, or for individuals receiving a paper agenda, a copy is enclosed. The report will be able to function as a stand-alone piece of the 2030 OCARTS Plan; and also will be summarized in the final Plan Report and Plan documents. It should be noted that many of the modes discussed in the Intermodal Element rely on an efficient street and highway network, therefore underscoring the importance of an integrated intermodal network for the movement of goods and people. The following is a brief synopsis of each mode.

Transit

Public transportation within the OCARTS area has several components. These include specific services for the elderly and disabled, taxi operations, demand response programs for rural areas, as well as traditional fixed route bus service throughout the metropolitan area. The transit section includes a profile of existing services and current trends within the study area in addition to analysis of service demand and supply. Options for future transit initiatives, including expanded bus service and fixed guideway transit, are also discussed. Other pertinent issues addressed include the expansion of Amtrak service and the pursuit of other passenger rail options.

Bicycles and Pedestrian Trails

Development of a comprehensive bicycle network is fully supported by the goals established by the MPO for a higher quality, more efficient transportation system, that is environmentally and economically sound. The trails section summarizes the existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities and compares the extent of existing infrastructure to a suggested standard. Based on projected regional population growth and the development of OCARTS area communities, an assessment of the regional bicycle facilities desired for the future is quantified. Future options are proposed in response to identified area bicycle network deficiencies.

Pedestrian issues are fundamental to an integrated transportation system. Since it is the mode most often used in conjunction with other modes, it is a key element of an intermodal transportation system. The pedestrian network system within the OCARTS area is the least cohesive of the individual modal networks. Currently, the pedestrian network is an articulation of disparate plans adopted or proposed by member jurisdictions within the OCARTS area. The pedestrian section focuses on enhancing pedestrian traffic and integrating the pedestrian mode with other modes of travel.

Air, Rail, and Motor Carriers – Facilities for Freight Movement

Transportation of freight cargo is often considered the lifeline of an area because of the essential movement of goods and products in and out of the area. The existing OCARTS freight movement network is a well-established composite of trucking, railroad, and air cargo facilities. The intermodal freight section reviews existing OCARTS area freight movement for these facilities. It includes a profile of the existing services and current trends for the three types of facilities and summarizes the current level of service. Future options are provided which would enhance the mobility of freight and further integrate freight movement with the intermodal network. Proposals to enhance airport access are also discussed, so that the OCARTS area may fully benefit from increased airport passenger services and intermodal freight linkages.

Plan recommendations for Transit, Trails, and Freight Movement are included on p. 101-106 of the Intermodal Element document.

ACTION REQUESTED:

Consider recommending that the Intermodal Transportation Policy Committee (ITPC) approve inclusion of the Intermodal Element in the 2030 OCARTS Plan.

ACOG

Association of Central Oklahoma Governments

21 E. Main St, Suite 100, Oklahoma City, OK 73104-2405
[405] 234-2264 Fax: [405] 234-2200 TDD: [405] 234-2217
www.acogok.org e-mail: acog@acogok.org

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 14, 2005

TO: 2030 OCARTS Plan Citizens Advisory Committee

FROM: Holly Massie, Special Programs Officer
Transportation Planning and Data Services

SUBJECT: Preliminary Projected Revenues for Implementation of the 2030 OCARTS Plan

INFORMATION:

In order to gauge the financial feasibility of the 2030 OCARTS Plan alternatives, a preliminary 30-year (2000-2030) projection of revenue has been developed for comparison with the estimated cost of each alternative.

Transportation revenues historically available to, or spent within, the OCARTS area were identified from a variety of federal, state and local sources. This historical information was then used as the basis for the revenue projections. Projected local revenues were derived from responses to an ACOG survey distributed last November to each OCARTS area local government.

The following table summarizes the revenues estimated to be available for implementing the *street and highway, bicycle and pedestrian, and transit modes* of the 2030 OCARTS Plan. Also included, are tables that describe the historical information upon which each component of the 30-year revenue projection is based. Please be reminded that the base year of the 2030 Plan is the year 2000, and all cost estimates and revenue projections use base year dollars for comparison purposes.

Please review the preliminary revenue projections and advise of any additional sources or information you may be aware of so that information can be included in the final revenue projection for the 2030 OCARTS Plan.

ACTION REQUESTED:

Review and comment on preliminary revenue projections.

**ESTIMATED TRANSPORTATION REVENUES
FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2030 OCARTS PLAN**

STREETS AND HIGHWAYS, BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN MODES:	Estimated 30-Year Total
Federal Sources (Plus Matching Funds):	
Federal-aid Funds (Includes IM, NHS, BR, STP, STP Enhancement, STP-UZA, CMAQ and MG funds)	\$2,077,081,401
Federal Discretionary Earmarks (1999 - 2005) (Includes Demonstration, HPP / I-40 earmarks, ITS, NCPD and other discretionary funds)	\$206,865,882
Future Federal Discretionary Earmarks (Assumes \$2.5 mil./yr. for 2006-2030, \$180 mil. for I-40 Crosstown Relocation, and \$34,500,000 to implement ITS Deployment Plan)	\$274,500,000
State Sources:	
State Highway Maintenance, Industrial Access and Lake Access Funds	\$165,608,160
Capital Improvements Program Funds (Through 2004)	\$109,247,122
Oklahoma Transportation Authority (Equals estimated tumpike costs)	\$518,660,609
GARVEE Bond Debt Service*	(\$13,300,000)
State Assessed Taxes and Fees:	
State Taxes and Fees Distributed Directly to Counties (Includes gasoline, diesel & special fuel taxes; gross production taxes; and motor vehicles collections including County Road and Bridge Improvement funds)	\$613,544,400
State Taxes and Fees Distributed Directly to Cities and Towns (Includes gasoline excise tax, motor vehicle collections)	\$285,858,840
Local Sources: (Includes funds for transportation improvements from: general fund, street and alley fund, developer contributions, bond issues and local sales tax revenues)	\$1,082,269,010
Subtotal	\$5,320,335,424
TRANSIT MODE:	
Federal Sources: (Includes FTA Sec. 5307, Sec. 5309, JARC, Sec. 5310, Sec. 5311 and CMAQ)	\$232,847,310
State Sources: (Transit Revolving Funds for COTPA, CART, First Capital Trolley and Delta Public Transit)	\$21,453,570
Local Sources: (Includes municipal, county, university and private funds for urban and rural operators)	\$407,532,930
Subtotal	\$661,833,810
TOTAL ESTIMATED REVENUES FOR 2030 OCARTS PLAN	\$5,982,169,234

* Approximately \$40 million in GARVEE bond funds will be spent within the OCARTS area and will be repaid with Federal Funds. Therefore, the GARVEE revenues are not reflected in the total revenues above. The debt service on these bonds will be repaid with State funds.

**OCARTS AREA FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY FUNDS - 30-YEAR ESTIMATE
2030 OCARTS PLAN**

HISTORICAL FEDERAL-AID EXPENDITURES WITHIN OCARTS:						
Funding Category:	Basis of Suballocation to OCARTS Area	Fed. Share	FFY 1998-2004 Average	Matching Funds**	Total	30-Yr. Estimate
Interstate Maintenance	State Discretion	90%	\$24,645,606	\$1,834,728	\$26,480,334	\$794,410,033
National Highway System	State Discretion	80%	\$1,108,277	\$82,505	\$1,190,782	\$35,723,462
Bridge Program	State Discretion	80%	\$2,976,992	\$221,621	\$3,198,613	\$95,958,375
STP *, Statewide & Safety	State Discretion	80%	\$8,050,621	\$599,324	\$8,649,945	\$259,498,350
STP, Enhancement	State Discretion	80%	\$3,058,830	\$339,870	\$3,398,700	\$101,961,000
STP, UZA Suballocation	TEA-21 Formula	80%	\$14,805,442	\$1,645,049	\$16,450,491	\$493,514,733
Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality	State Discretion	80%	\$100,000	\$11,111	\$111,111	\$3,333,333
Minimum Guarantee	State Discretion	80-90%	\$3,115,696	\$346,188	\$3,461,884	\$103,856,533
Subtotal			\$57,861,464	\$5,080,397	\$62,941,861	\$1,888,255,820
10% Contingency for Cost Overruns			\$5,786,146	\$508,040	\$6,294,186	\$188,825,582
Total			\$63,647,610	\$5,588,436	\$69,236,047	\$2,077,081,401

* Surface Transportation Program **Match for IM, NHS, BR and STP-State reduced by 1/3. Assumes Soft Match will continue for 10 years.

NON-RECURRING FEDERAL REVENUES	
	FFY 1999-2005 Total
Demonstration Funds	\$1,840,250
High Priority Proj./I-40 Earmarks	\$180,795,251
Intelligent Transp. Systems	\$4,041,126
ITS CVISN Projects	\$1,787,470
Nat'l Corridor Planning & Devel.	\$2,239,950
Transp Comm System Preserv.	\$1,606,807
Other Discretionary Funds	\$4,363,361
FFY 2004 Earmarks*	\$2,800,000
FFY 2005 Earmarks**	\$7,391,667
Total	\$206,865,882

* Includes FFY 2004 earmarks for Turner TP Gate near Luther, Lake Draper road improvements and NE 23rd St. improvements

** Includes FFY 2005 earmarks for I-40/Morgan intchg., Broadway Ext., Hudiburg Dr. in MWC, RR grade sep. in Norman & other OCARTS area projects

Sources: Oklahoma Transportation Commission Agendas / Awards Lists, ODOT Programs Division and ODOT Planning Division

**OCARTS AREA STATE FUNDS - 30-YEAR ESTIMATE
2030 OCARTS PLAN**

MAINTENANCE FUNDS:		
County	FY 1998-2004 Annual Avg.	Estimated 30-Year Total
Canadian	\$465,820	\$13,974,600
Cleveland	\$838,009	\$25,140,270
Grady	\$37,756	\$1,132,680
Logan	\$333,670	\$10,010,100
McClain	\$258,729	\$7,761,870
Oklahoma	\$2,930,121	\$87,903,630
Total		\$145,923,150
OTHER STATE FUNDS:		
Fund	FY 1998-2004 Annual Avg.	Estimated 30-Year Total
Ind. Access	\$595,222	\$17,856,660
Lake Access	\$60,945	\$1,828,350
Total		\$19,685,010
Total Maintenance, Indus. and Lake Access		\$165,608,160
Other	OCARTS Total	One-Time Est.
CIP Program	\$109,247,122	\$109,247,122
Turnpike Revenues*	\$520,160,609	\$518,660,609
Total Estimated Revenue		\$793,515,891

* Includes \$3.5 million for the Turner TP Gate near Luther. Additional funds for the gate will come from an FFY 2004 federal earmark (included in Non-Recurring Federal Revenues), Oklahoma City and Oklahoma County.

Sources: ODOT Programs Division and OTC Awards Lists
Oklahoma Transportation Authority, SW Outer Loop MIS, Oklahoma County

c:\files\lfiles\2030plan\revenues\staterev 30 Yr Estimate.xls

**STATE ASSESSED TAXES AND FEES - 30-YEAR ESTIMATE
2030 OCARTS PLAN**

TAXES AND FEES DISTRIBUTED DIRECTLY TO COUNTIES:		
<small>(Fuel Taxes, Gross Production Taxes and Vehicle Motor Collections, including County Road & Bridge Impr. Funds)</small>		
County	FY 98-04 OCARTS Annual Average	Estimated 30-Year Total
Canadian	\$2,731,800	\$81,954,000
Cleveland	\$3,794,821	\$113,844,630
Grady	\$1,237,361	\$37,120,830
Logan	\$1,783,559	\$53,506,770
McClain	\$1,491,073	\$44,732,190
Oklahoma	\$9,412,866	\$282,385,980
Totals	\$20,451,480	\$613,544,400
TAXES AND FEES DISTRIBUTED DIRECTLY TO CITIES AND TOWNS:		
<small>(Admission Fees, Alcoholic Beverage Tax, Gas Excise Tax and Motor Vehicle Collections)</small>		
County	FY 98-04 OCARTS Annual Average	Estimated 30-Year Total
Canadian	\$468,230	\$14,046,900
Cleveland	\$1,539,663	\$46,189,890
Grady	\$78,511	\$2,355,330
Logan	\$151,526	\$4,545,780
McClain	\$161,845	\$4,855,350
Oklahoma	\$7,128,853	\$213,865,590
	\$9,528,628	\$285,858,840

Note: The above figures are based on each county's percent of population in the OCARTS area
Source: "State Payments To Local Governments," FY 1998 - FY 2004, Oklahoma Tax Commission

c:\files\lfiles\2030 Plan\Revenues\taxes&fees 30 yr Estimate.xls

**ESTIMATED LOCAL TRANSPORTATION REVENUES
2030 OCARTS PLAN**

OCARTS Entity	Current General Fund	Future General Fund	Street & Alley Fund	Developer Contrib.	Current G. O. Bond Revenues	Proposed G. O. Bond Revenues	Current Sales Tax Revenues	Proposed Sales Tax Revenues
Choctaw	\$0	\$0	\$480,000	Unknown			Unknown	Unknown
Del City	\$6,375,000	Included in Current	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$1,200,000	\$3,000,000
Edmond	\$86,000,000	\$87,500,000	Varies	\$12,000,000 for S&H \$3,000,000 for Sidewalks	\$0	\$0	\$5,335,500 for S&H \$4,250,000 for Trails	\$21,342,000
Harrah	\$250,000 S&H \$750,000 Trails	Included in Current	\$3,600,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$250,000 S&H \$150,000 Trails
Midwest City	\$66,077,760 (Includes Future)	\$1,500,000 CIP Fund for Sidewalks	\$15,000,000	N/A	\$23,400,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Moore	\$30,000,000	Included in Current	\$9,625,000	\$0	\$5,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Mustang	\$180,000	\$2,500,000	\$0	Sidewalks required on new Res. and Comm. Developments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Nichols Hills						Pending March 2005 Vote		

ESTIMATED LOCAL TRANSPORTATION REVENUES 2030 OCARTS PLAN

OCARTS Entity	Current General Fund	Future General Fund	Street & Alley Fund	Developer Contrib.	Current G. O. Bond Revenues	Proposed G. O. Bond Revenues	Current Sales Tax Revenues	Proposed Sales Tax Revenues
Noble	\$100,000	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$320,000	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$0
Norman	\$24,000,000	Included in Current	\$0	\$47,500,000 for S&H \$2,500,000 for Sidewalks	\$0	Pending March 2005 Vote	Unknown	Unknown
Oklahoma City	\$180,000,000	Included in Current	\$150,000,000	Unknown	\$65,475,000	\$120,600,000	\$0	\$0
The Village	\$2,083,750	\$12,125,000	\$4,800,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Yukon	\$39,000,000	Included in Current	\$0	\$10,000,000	\$32,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTALS	\$434,816,510	\$104,625,000	\$183,505,000	\$75,000,000	\$126,195,000	\$122,600,000	\$10,785,500	\$24,742,000
GRAND TOTAL \$1,082,269,010								

Source: ACOG Survey of Local Revenue Sources for Street Improvements for 2030 OCARTS Plan Financial Capacity Analysis, September 2004

c:\files\lfiles\2030plan\revenues\local revenues-30 year estimate.xls

ACOG

Association of Central Oklahoma Governments

21 E. Main St, Suite 100, Oklahoma City, OK 73104-2405
 (405) 234-2264 Fax: (405) 234-2200 TDD: (405) 234-2217
 www.acogok.org e-mail: acog@acogok.org

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 14, 2005

TO: 2030 OCARTS Plan Citizens Advisory Committee

FROM: Douglas W. Rex, Asst. to the Executive Director/
Program Coordinator, TPDS

SUBJECT: Estimated Costs for Street and Highway Alternatives for the 2030 OCARTS Plan

INFORMATION:

As part of the development of the 2030 OCARTS Plan, preliminary cost estimates have been calculated (using the approved unit costs), for each street and highway alternate developed to date. Cost (and revenues) are calculated in year 2000 dollars. The following is a brief description of each alternate and its associated cost.

Alternate One – Present Plus Committed Network Includes:

- OCARTS network streets and highways as they existed in the 2000 base year
- All street and highway improvements expected to be funded through October 2005

Table 1 summarizes the total costs for the street and highway network for Alternate One of the OCARTS Plan. As you will note, the major share of the cost is attributed to maintenance. Construction costs reflect projects underway between 2000 and 2005.

Table 1:
Estimated Costs for Implementing Alternate One of the 2030 OCARTS Plan
(Present Plus Committed Network)

Functional Classification	Linear Miles	Lane Miles	COST (in thousands)			
			Const.	Maint.	R.O.W.	Total
Turnpikes	60.00	240.00	60,961	75,096	6,164	142,221
Interstates & Freeways	168.08	858.76	232,054	215,729	13,000	460,783
Principal Arterials	446.29	1,659.47	35,049	234,219	16,274	285,542
Minor Arterials	1,388.37	3,469.48	119,452	407,403	57,893	584,748
Collectors	204.11	515.98	10,532	59,812	4,340	74,684
TOTAL	2,266.84	6,743.69	\$458,048	\$992,259	\$97,671	\$1,405,757

Note: Only includes street and highway costs. The construction cost figures include structure costs. Maintenance costs are for a 2-inch asphalt-concrete overlay every 10 years over the planning period (2000-2030).

Alternate Two – 2025 OCARTS Plan Network Includes:

- Present Plus Committed Network (Alternate One).
- All street and highway improvements called for by the 2025 OCARTS Plan. (Southwest Outer Loop was assumed to be a toll facility).

Consideration of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), Travel Demand Management (TDM), and Traffic System Management (TSM) on recurring congestion corridors.

Table 2 summarizes the estimated costs for implementing Alternate Two of the 2030 OCARTS Plan. Alternate Two will require higher investments for construction and right-of-way acquisition because it calls for more new street/highway improvement projects.

When calculating the cost estimates for implementing Alternate Two, new street/highway construction and widening projects were separated into two categories, according to the time frame that the improvements are expected to be implemented:

- *Short-range* projects (from the year 2005 to the year 2014)
- *Long-range* projects (from 2015 to 2030)

For cost estimate purposes, the short-range projects are assumed to require two maintenance cycles and the long-range projects are assumed to require one maintenance cycle. The short-range and long-range assignments were based on the proposed staging of improvements reflected in the adopted 2025 OCARTS Plan.

**Table 2:
Estimated Costs for Implementing Alternate Two of the 2030 OCARTS Plan
(2025 OCARTS Plan Network)**

Functional Class	Linear Miles	Lane Miles	COST (in thousands)					Total
			Const.	Maint.	R.O.W.	Major Interchange	Non-Trad'l Imprv'ts ^d	
Turnpikes ^a	80.00	320.00	424,961	84,036	6,164	7,000		522,161
Interstate & Freeway ^b	172.40	968.48	736,425	207,603	84,000	^c 245,969	18,995	1,292,952
Principal Arterials	446.78	1,785.08	247,008	221,579	95,882		17,745	582,214
Minor Arterials	1,397.58	4,109.66	904,566	395,017	382,650		3,630	1,685,863
Collectors	207.09	558.39	55,770	59,847	30,882			146,499
TOTAL	2,303.84	7,741.61	\$2,368,730	\$968,082	\$599,578	\$252,969	\$40,330	\$4,229,688

Notes: Only includes street and highway costs. The construction cost figures include structure costs. Maintenance costs are for a 2-inch asphalt-concrete overlay every 10 years over the planning period (2000-2030).

^aSouthwest Outer Loop was considered a toll facility and the cost figures were based on the Outer Loop Corridor MIS (updated to 2000 dollars) and information provided by OTA.

^bConstruction (\$289 million) and ROW acquisition (\$71 million) for the I-40 Crosstown realignment project was based on information provided by ODOT.

^cMajor Interchanges include I-240/I-35, I-44/I-235 (project also includes widening of I/44 from 63rd St. to 36th St from 4 to 6 lanes; Widening of Santa Fe from 50th St. to 63rd St.), Broadway Extn./Memorial Road, I-40/Morgan Rd., I-35/Shields Ave.

^dThe non-traditional improvements in the aggregate are expected to cost approximately \$40 million, and they will be implemented for the most part on freeways and principal arterials. Non-traditional improvements include the deployment of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), Travel Demand Management (TDM), and Traffic System Management (TSM).

Alternate Three – Revised 2025 OCARTS Plan Network Includes:

- Present Plus Committed Network (Alternate One)
- 2025 OCARTS Plan Network (Alternate Two)
- Approved 2025 OCARTS Plan Amendments:
 - State Highway 9 (SH9) from Cleveland/Pottawatomie County line to 168th Ave E. (3 miles). Widen 2 to 4 lanes
 - State Highway 74 (Portland) from NW 136th Street (Memorial Road) to NW 248th Street (Waterloo Road) in Oklahoma County (8 miles). The proposal calls for the widening of the present 2-lane facility.
 - Kelly Avenue from Waterloo Road (N. 248th) to Coffee Creek (N. 220th) (2 miles). Widen to 4-lane divided facility
- Oklahoma City 2000 General Bond Projects
 - SW 29th Street from Meridian Avenue to MacArthur Avenue – 2 to 4 lanes
 - Morgan Road from SW 15 Street to SW 29th Street - 2 to 4 lanes
 - NE 122nd Street from Broadway Extension to Kelley Avenue - 2 to 4 lanes

Table 3 summarizes the estimated cost for Alternate Three. It appears that the inclusion of the six projects described earlier will increase the cost of the 2030 OCARTS Plan by approximately \$63 million.

**Table 3:
Estimated Costs for Implementing Alternate Three of the 2030 OCARTS Plan
(Revised 2025 OCARTS Plan Network)**

Functional Class	Linear Miles	Lane Miles	COST (in thousands)					Total
			Const.	Maint.	R.O.W.	Major Interchange	Non-Trad'l Imprv'ts ^d	
Turnpikes ^a	80.00	320.00	424,961	84,036	6,164	7,000		522,161
Interstate & Freeway ^b	173.33	979.10	774,563	209,591	84,000	^c 245,969	18,995	1,333,078
Principal Arterials	456.77	1,825.04	269,268	225,027	105,986		17,745	618,026
Minor Arterials	1,386.66	4,073.02	895,278	391,451	382,488		3,630	1,672,847
Collectors	207.09	558.39	55,770	59,847	30,882			146,499
TOTAL	2,303.84	7,755.55	\$2,419,840	\$969,952	\$609,520	\$252,969	\$40,330	\$4,292,610

Notes: Only includes street and highway costs. The construction cost figures include structure costs. Maintenance costs are for a 2-inch asphalt-concrete overlay every 10 years over the planning period (2000-2030).

^aSouthwest Outer Loop was considered a toll facility and the cost figures were based on the Outer Loop Corridor MIS (updated to 2000 dollars) and information provided by OTA.

^bConstruction (\$289 million) and ROW acquisition (\$71 million) for the I-40 Crosstown realignment project was based on information provided by ODOT.

^cMajor Interchanges include I-240/I-35, I-44/I-235 (project also includes widening of I/44 from 63rd St. to 36th St from 4 to 6 lanes; Widening of Santa Fe from 50th St. to 63rd St.), Broadway Extn./Memorial Road, I-40/Morgan Rd., I-35/Shields Ave.

^dThe non-traditional improvements in the aggregate are expected to cost approximately \$40 million, and they will be implemented for the most part on freeways and principal arterials. Non-traditional improvements include the deployment of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), Travel Demand Management (TDM), and Traffic System Management (TSM).

ACTION REQUESTED:

Review and comment on the estimated street and highway network costs for 2030 OCARTS Plan alternates.

ACOG

Association of Central Oklahoma Governments

21 E. Main St, Suite 100, Oklahoma City, OK 73104-2405
[405] 234-2264 Fax: [405] 234-2200 TDD: [405] 234-2217
www.acogok.org e-mail: acog@acogok.org

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 14, 2005

TO: 2030 OCARTS Plan Citizens Advisory Committee

FROM: Douglas W. Rex, Asst. to the Executive Director/
Program Coordinator, TPDS

SUBJECT: Street and Highway Improvements Suggested by Local Governments for
Inclusion in Alternate Four of the 2030 OCARTS Plan

INFORMATION:

In February, ACOG staff conducted subarea meetings to receive input from local governments regarding the projects/improvements that they would like to have tested for possible inclusion in the Alternate Four network of the 2030 OCARTS Plan. The OCARTS area was divided into four subareas for this purpose: 1) East Oklahoma County, 2) Cleveland and McClain Counties, 3) West Oklahoma County and Logan County, and 4) Canadian and Grady Counties.

The suggestions received at these meetings were tabulated and are presented in the following pages.

Since anticipated revenues may not be sufficient to cover the cost of all proposed projects and not all projects demonstrate a strong need for implementation by the year 2030, all suggestions for change to the Alternate Four network will be prioritized based on a scoring system presented to the CAC in January and approved by the ITPC on January 27, 2005.

The system evaluates the level of congestion anticipated under Alternate Three, and analyzes whether the introduction of the proposed projects in Alternate Four will reduce the congestion.

The assumption of this scoring system is that projects that show greater improvement (largest percent reduction in V/C ratio) will receive higher priority in project selection for Alternate Four.

East Oklahoma County

Entities Present: Del City, Midwest City, Spencer, ODOT

Monday, February 7, 2005, 1:30 – 3:30pm

Reed Center

Consider adding the following improvements:

City	Location	From	To	Proposed Alt. Four Improvement	Length (miles)	Proposed Staging	Alt. Three V/C Ratio	Alt. Four V/C Ratio
Spencer	Post Rd	N 63rd St	N 36th St	2 to 4 lanes	2.00	L		
DC	Reno Ave	Bryant Ave	Sooner Rd	4 to 5 lanes	2.00	S		
MWC	Reno Ave	Sooner Rd	Post Rd	4 to 5 lanes	4.00	L		
MWC	Sooner Rd	BNSF Railroad tracks	N 23rd St	2 to 4 lanes	0.55	L		
DC	S 15th St	I-40	Sooner Rd	4 to 5 lanes	0.50	S		
MWC	S 29th St	Sooner Rd	I-40	4 to 5 lanes	0.75	L		

Canadian/Grady Counties

Entities Present: Yukon

Thursday, February 17, 2005, 2:00 – 4:00pm

Yukon City Hall

Consider adding the following improvements:

City	Location	From	To	Proposed Alt. Four Improvement	Length (miles)	Proposed Staging	Alt. Three V/C Ratio	Alt. Four V/C Ratio
Yukon	Frisco Rd	SH-66	N 10th St	2 to 4 lanes	2.00	L		
Yukon	Mustang Rd	N 50th St (Wagner Rd)	SH-66	2 to 4 lanes	1.00	L		
Yukon	N 10th St	Frisco Rd	Cemetery Rd	2 to 4 lanes	1.00	L		
Yukon	N 23rd St	Mustang Rd	Sara Rd	2 to 4 lanes	1.00	L		
Yukon	N 50th St (Wagner Rd)	Cemetery Rd	Sara Rd	2 to 4 lanes	3.00	L		
Yukon	N 78th St (Wilshire Blvd)	Richland Rd	SH-4	2 to 4 lanes	3.00	L		

West Oklahoma County/Logan County

Entities Present: Edmond, Logan County, Oklahoma City, Warr Acres, ODOT

Wednesday, February 16, 2005, 1:30 – 3:30pm

ACOG

Consider adding the following improvements:

City	Location	From	To	Proposed Alt. Four Improvement	Length (miles)	Proposed Staging	Alt. Three V/C Ratio	Alt. Four V/C Ratio
Edmond	Broadway Ave	N 248th St (Waterloo Rd)	N 220th St (Coffee Creek Rd)	2 to 4 lanes	2.00	L		
OKC	Coltrane	N 206th St (Covell Rd)	N 178th St (Edmond Rd)	2 to 4 lanes	2.00	S		
OKC	Council Rd	S 44th St	S 74th St	2 to 4 lanes	2.00	L		
Warr Acres	MacArthur Blvd	N 78th St	N 36th St	4 to 5 lanes	3.00	S		
OKC	Morgan Rd	S 15th St	S 59th St	2 to 4 lanes	3.00	S		
Edmond	Post Rd	N 206th St (Covell Rd)	N 178th St (Edmond Rd)	2 to 4 lanes	2.00	L		
OKC	N 108th St (Hefner Rd)	County Line Rd	Council Rd	2 to 4 lanes	1.00	S		
Edmond	N 206th St (Covell Rd)	Pennsylvania Ave	Western Ave	2 to 4 lanes (div)	1.00	S		
Edmond	N 206th St (Covell Rd)	Douglas Blvd	Post Rd	2 to 4 lanes	1.00	S		
Logan Cnty	N 248th St (Waterloo Rd)	Kelly Ave	I-35	2 to 4 lanes	4.50	L		
OKC	N 78th St (Wilshire Blvd)	Rockwell Ave	SH-3 (Northwest Expressway)	2 to 4 lanes	0.86	S		
OKC	N 93rd St (Britton Rd)	County Line Rd	Council Rd	2 to 4 lanes	1.00	S		
OKC	S 15th St	Morgan Rd	County Line Rd	2 to 4 lanes	1.00	S		
OKC	S 29th St	MacArthur Blvd	Meridian Ave	2 to 4 lanes	1.00	S		

CONSIDER DOWNGRADING IN THE 2030 OCARTS PLAN

City	Location	From	To	Proposed Alt. Four Improvement	Length (miles)	Proposed Staging	Alt. Three V/C Ratio	Alt. Four V/C Ratio
OKC	MacArthur Blvd	SW 104th St	SW 119th St	4 to 2 lanes	1.00			
OKC	Robinson Ave	Main St	Sheridan Ave	4 to 2 lanes	0.08			
OKC	Sheridan Ave	E. K. Gaylord	Lincoln Blvd	4 to 2 lanes	0.65			

Cleveland /McClain Counties

Entities Present: Moore, Noble, Norman, Slaughterville

Friday, February 11, 2005, 2:00 – 4:00pm

Norman City Hall

Consider adding the following improvements:

City	Location	From	To	Proposed Alt. Four Improvement	Length (miles)	Proposed Staging	Alt. Three V/C Ratio	Alt. Four V/C Ratio
Norman	Eastern Ave (24th Ave W)	S 194th St (Franklin Rd)	US-77	2 to 4 lanes	0.80	L		
Moore	I-35 frontage roads	S 149th St (S 19th St)	34th St/S 164th St	3 to 5 lanes	1.00	L		
Norman	Lindsey St	Sooner Rd (12th Ave E)	Midwest Blvd (36th Ave E)	2 to 4 lanes	1.00	L		
Norman	Main St	Carter Ave	Sooner Rd (12th Ave E)	2 to 4 lanes	0.50	S		
Norman	Rock Creek Rd	at I-35		New interchange		L		
Norman	Rock Creek Rd	Kelley Ave (36th Ave W)	Eastern Ave (24th Ave W)	2 to 4 lanes	1.00	L		
Norman	Rock Creek Rd	1/2 mile west of 36th Ave W	Kelley Ave (36th Ave W)	2 to 4 lanes	0.50	S		
Norman	SH-9	Eastern Ave (24th Ave W)	Sooner Rd (12th Ave E)	4 to 6 lanes	4.00	S		
Norman	Sooner Rd (12th Ave E)	SH-9	S 299th St (Cedar Lane Rd)	2 to 4 lanes	0.45	S		
Moore	S 164th St (34th St)	at I-35		New interchange		S		
Moore	S 164th St (34th St)	I-35	Broadway	2 to 4 lanes	1.20	L		
Norman	S 194th St (Franklin Rd)	US-77	Eastern Ave (24th Ave W)	2 to 4 lanes	0.30	L		
Norman	S 194th St (Franklin Rd)	Santa Fe Ave (48th Ave W)	I-35	2 to 4 lanes	1.46	S		
Norman	S 299th St (Cedar Lane Rd)	Sooner Rd (12th Ave E)	1/2 mile east of 24th Ave E	2 to 4 lanes	1.50	S		
Clev. Co.	US-77	S 329th St. (Etowah Rd.)	Purcell City Limits	2 to 4 lanes	11.50	L		

CONSIDER DOWNGRADING IN THE 2030 OCARTS PLAN

City	Location	From	To	Proposed Alt. Four Improvement	Length (miles)	Proposed Staging	Alt. Three V/C Ratio	Alt. Four V/C Ratio
Norman	Anderson Rd (84th Ave E)	Norman city limits	S 194th St (Franklin Rd)	4 to 2 lanes	2.00			
Norman	Choctaw Rd (120th Ave E)	S 149th St (Stella Rd)	S 254th St (Alameda St)	4 to 2 lanes	7.00			
Norman	S 194th St (Franklin Rd)	US-77	Douglas Blvd (48th Ave E)	4 to 2 lanes	6.25			
Norman	S 254th St (Alameda St)	1/2 mile W of 36th Ave E	Choctaw Rd (120th Ave E)	4 to 2 lanes	5.50			

Other Meetings

Entities Present: Piedmont, Goldsby

February 24-March 1, 2005

ACOG

Consider adding the following improvements:

City	Location	From	To	Proposed Alt. Four Improvement	Length (miles)	Proposed Staging	Alt. Three V/C Ratio	Alt. Four V/C Ratio
Goldsby	SH-74	I-35	5.50 miles S. of I-35	2 to 4 lanes	5.50	L		
Piedmont	N 178th St	Piedmont Rd	Portland Ave	2 to 4 lanes	9.00	L		

ACTION REQUESTED:

For information, review and comment