

Appendix B

Public Involvement

Public Involvement Plan

FIXED GUIDEWAY STUDY

Prepared for:

**Central Oklahoma Transportation And Parking
Authority (COTPA)
METRO Transit**

Prepared by:

Carter  Burgess

in association with:

Huitt-Zollars
Saxum Strategic Communications
Traffic Engineering Consultants, Inc.
Manuel Padron & Associates
Legacy Engineering

December 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FORWARD	i
CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 PURPOSE	1
1.2 PROJECT STUDY AREA.....	3
1.3 MISSION STATEMENT.....	3
CHAPTER 2 - COMMUNITY AND AGENCY ISSUES	5
2.1 LOCAL COMMUNITY ISSUES	5
2.2 AGENCY ISSUES	6
CHAPTER 3 - GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	7
CHAPTER 4 - PROPOSED PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN	10
4.1 THE FIXED GUIDEWAY STUDY STEERING COMMITTEE	10
4.2 COMMUNITY LEADERS.....	11
4.3 AGENCY INVOLVEMENT.....	11
4.4 GENERAL PUBLIC	12
4.5 OTHER IMPLEMENTING AGENCY BOARDS AND AUTHORITIES.....	13
4.6 ORGANIZED INTEREST GROUPS.....	14
4.7 PROGRAM STRUCTURE, ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	15
4.8 PUBLIC OUTREACH OPPORTUNITIES AT PROJECT MILESTONES.....	16
CHAPTER 5 - EVALUATIONS AND MONITORING.....	18
5.1 EVALUATION AND MONITORING ACTIVITIES	18
5.2 RESULTS AND LESSONS LEARNED	19

Foreword

The Fixed Guideway Study presents the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area and the Central Oklahoma Transportation and Parking Authority (COTPA – METRO Transit) a unique opportunity to identify potential transportation solutions that improve connections among Oklahoma City’s growth centers, enhance economic development opportunities, improve mobility, expand transportation options, and improve air quality. This project is a continuation of the previous long-range transportation planning efforts and serves as the next step in the Project Implementation Process defined by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Examples of the previous plans include the COTPA Long Range Plan, 2025 OCARTS Plan, City of Edmond Comp Plan, City of Norman Comp Plan, Oklahoma City Comp Plan, 1993 Oklahoma City Western Corridor Analysis, 1992 Oklahoma Fixed Guideway Transportation System Study, 1988 Oklahoma City Northeast Rail Feasibility Study, and 1983 Fixed Guideway Mass Transit Feasibility Study.

The Public Involvement Plan was prepared to identify the various methods that will be used to inform the public about the study. The Public Involvement Plan document, required by the FTA process, establishes the methods of informing the public, as well as schedule of milestones correlating the public involvement opportunities with the study work effort. The document will be updated as required to reflect community issues and involvement needs.

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

This Public Involvement Plan (PIP) describes a recommended structure for the public involvement process to be used for the Fixed Guideway Study. It includes the project study area, project mission statement, and guiding principles for the study.

The findings of the study will result in the recommendation of corridors and fixed guideway technologies for the potential construction and operation of a high-capacity transit line or system in the Oklahoma City area. This recommendation for a preferred transportation investment solution could require major construction, including further documentation in an Alternatives Analysis, Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Deriving a consensus on the recommendation can be achieved only through active participation from stakeholders. Thus, informed stakeholders that are actively involved in the decision-making process and that understand the range of alternatives are critical to building consensus for the preferred transportation solution as it moves towards implementation. Another key element of a successful project is a sound working relationship among the implementing agencies.

1.1 PURPOSE

The active participation of leadership from all effected governmental entities is necessary for a successful project, including COTPA, Oklahoma City and other affected municipalities, Oklahoma County and other affected counties, Association of Central Oklahoma Governments (ACOG), Greater Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce, business leaders, and community leaders. Public participation and involvement throughout the study will ensure that citizens contribute ideas for and will benefit from transportation improvements that add mobility choices and have a positive impact on quality of life.

The PIP will be a key element of the foundation for the technical analysis of the Fixed Guideway Study. This task will provide an open, proactive, participatory process for the public, affected agencies, and others to become partners throughout the entire study. Stakeholders will have the opportunity to direct, review, and comment on analysis and results as major milestones are reached during the course of the study. Additionally, the PIP will be conducted in a manner consistent with regulations and guidelines of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to ensure compliance with New Starts funding requirements.

The purpose of the proposed PIP is to support COTPA's decision-making process over the course of the study by:

- Articulating the mission statement, goals, and objectives of the public and agency outreach activities;
- Identifying the target audiences of the study;
- Establishing a framework for the structure and schedule of program activities;
- Using specific methods or activities that reach target audiences while achieving desired results;
- Describing how public and agency issues and concerns will be documented and addressed;
- Developing evaluation and monitoring techniques to measure program effectiveness; and,
- Identifying methods to maintain public support through subsequent stages of project development.

The PIP has been created to engage individuals, neighborhoods, community and special interest groups, agency representatives and policy leaders in meaningful and collaborative decisions regarding considerations for implementation of fixed guideway transit improvements in the Oklahoma City region. The program seeks to build consensus among these interests by involving them in the planning process. To achieve this purpose, the program must be inclusive, proactive, flexible, responsive and must maintain accountability.

The Steering Committee represents one of the unique aspects of this project. Similar projects are often staff-driven and may not have full support from community leaders even after public meetings and other outreach activities. In this project, the Steering Committee is composed of regional leaders and stakeholders. Another unique aspect of this project is the strong participation from the COTPA Board, to ensure that the study recommendations are coordinated with and supportive of investments made in transit.

This program has been designed to be consistent with the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), and the US Department of Transportation (USDOT) guidelines for public

involvement, including but not limited to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Executive Order 12898 Environmental Justice provisions. It is also consistent with local, regional, and state agency policies that seek to fully involve the public in the planning and project development processes.

1.2 PROJECT STUDY AREA

The study area for the Fixed Guideway Study includes the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area, with emphasis placed on the MPO's OCARTS area. The study will be emphasizing connections among growth centers along high priority corridors.

1.3 MISSION STATEMENT

This study will expand on previous work and assess how a fixed guideway transit network may better serve the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area and the ACOG's OCARTS area. Moreover, COTPA is seeking an innovative, holistic approach to planning for growth, promoting transit-oriented development, and developing transit services to connect the area's employment and activity centers.

Recognizing the broader goals of this study, the following mission statement is proposed for the Fixed Guideway Study, to guide the overall project and, more importantly, articulate the program mission to the public.

The purpose of the study is to identify, evaluate, and recommend a locally preferred public transportation system, including a potential fixed guideway transit system, that will strengthen the Oklahoma City area's employment and activity centers. Such an option should satisfy the following objectives:

- *Increase overall mobility through identifying the best corridors that form the backbone of a long-term fixed guideway transportation network and supports the transit investments that have already been made;*
- *Provide feasible transportation links that increase access among major activity hubs;*
- *Consider economic, environmental, and social impacts to existing and future residences, residential areas, and businesses;*

- *Guide future population and employment growth by leveraging transit-oriented development that supports the investments made in transportation infrastructure;*
- *Suggest realistic cost and funding options, and*
- *Ensure that investments are socially and environmentally sensitive and fiscally responsible, promoting a reduction in pollution and energy consumption while supporting additional growth in the region.*

Carter & Burgess will work with COTPA and the Steering Committee to finalize the mission statement and objectives for the Fixed Guideway Study.

CHAPTER 2 - COMMUNITY AND AGENCY ISSUES

A necessary first step in the public involvement process includes identifying local agency and community issues related to transportation. These issues will provide the basis for the goals, objectives, and the structure of the PIP. In addition to identifying agency issues, this portion of the study will identify the need to coordinate with other related transportation planning studies to ensure that the results of this study are consistent with existing transportation plans.

2.1 LOCAL COMMUNITY ISSUES

Local community issues often center on the impact major transportation investments have on the local tax base and neighborhoods. Roadway construction, added traffic, noise, and pollution are often local community issues. For major transit investments, local community issues might center on the relative value of construction and the high volume of passengers who may be viewed as disruptions to businesses and neighborhoods. Whereas businesses often recognize the value of additional traffic generated by expanded roadways, residents often feel powerless to address new traffic and related noise. New communities unfamiliar with high-capacity transit modes may not recognize the value of having a transit station near their homes or businesses, particularly if the proposed line does not serve their own personal transportation needs. Although some Oklahoma City area residents may be familiar with the COTPA METRO Transit's bus system, most Oklahoma City area residents and businesses may not yet recognize how a major transit investment could impact or benefit local mobility.

One of the first and most critical tasks to be undertaken by the Project Team is to finalize and implement a PIP. The PIP will be augmented over the course of completion of the project. The program addresses the techniques, timing and content of the distribution of information and participatory events to select and build consensus for a potential fixed guideway transit system.

As the lead agency, COTPA will oversee the management of the PIP. The Project Team, led by Carter & Burgess, will be responsible for implementation of the PIP and notification of the involved stakeholders, arranging for meeting locations, and developing technical materials for meetings, as well as documentation of meeting minutes.

2.2 AGENCY ISSUES

Agency issues are equally complex. Any transit investment should be compatible with transportation investments made by other jurisdictions. The Oklahoma Department of Transportation's (ODOT) highway network and the local street system built and maintained by municipalities may each have significant impacts on both construction and operation of a high-capacity transit system. The Association of Central Oklahoma Governments (ACOG) can provide long-term transportation plans, while, the City of Oklahoma City and other municipalities will be valuable resources for information about existing and future land use and anticipated developments that could reinforce (or negatively impact) transit investments.

This task will include meetings with key representatives from the Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT), ACOG, local city transportation and planning departments, chambers of commerce, the media, neighborhood organizations, economic development entities, special interest groups, bicycle organizations, developers and landowners, and the general public. Results of these meetings will play a critical role in determining the feasibility, technology, and route of a high-capacity transit investment. The results of these meetings will be documented in a report format that satisfies criteria defined by the FTA.

CHAPTER 3 - GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Once the mission statement has been finalized, the Steering Committee must articulate a set of goals and objectives for the study as a whole. These goals and objectives ensure that the PIP meets the federal requirements for systems planning.

The following are possible goals and objectives that could provide guidelines for the development of a PIP. The program and planning process should be designed to provide constructive opportunities for interested parties to exchange information, debate issues, and play a role in the decision-making process at key milestones during the study. The following goals and objectives are consistent with the existing policies of COTPA METRO Transit, and with those strategies recommended by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and FTA in the publication “Public Involvement Techniques for Transportation Decision-Making” (September 1996).

GOAL 1: Inform, educate, and actively involve the public and local agencies throughout the planning process.

Objectives:

1. Provide the public with information regarding the objectives of the study process, as well as the importance of their role in defining transportation improvement alternatives and in helping to select the most feasible corridors and technologies.
 - Inform the public through a broad range of innovative outreach methods that target different audiences, including traditionally under-represented groups, and strive to maintain a high level of public interest and enthusiasm in the study and its possible outcomes. Numerous methods will be used to make the community aware of the study and provide opportunities for input.
2. Provide a variety of means for public participation that are accessible in terms of location and time, as well as flexible in terms of resource allocation of time, so certain individuals or groups are not precluded from participating in the process.
3. Where possible, encourage private-sector participation in public outreach efforts to further increase awareness of this decision-making process, reduce costs, and develop project support.

4. Ensure the public has ample opportunity to understand the challenges and opportunities related to fixed guideway transit technologies, especially in terms of costs, ridership warrants, life cycle benefits, and construction lead times.

GOAL 2: Create opportunities for early and continuing community and agency participation in the decision-making process.

Objectives:

1. Develop and implement a formal process for enabling the public and agencies to actively participate in the recommendation-making process, including the development of alternative strategies, identification of trade-offs and methods for evaluating and selecting the most feasible corridors and fixed guideway transit technologies.
2. Identify and contact key community and agency leaders to obtain input on local issues and concerns regarding transportation problems and potential improvement strategies, as well as to identify possible study participants.
3. Involve affected agencies early in the planning process to identify key environmental issues and concerns that may affect the feasibility of alternatives.
4. Identify financial issues, concerns, and solutions related to feasibility of fixed guideway development.

GOAL 3: Maintain accountability, credibility, and responsibility of the Fixed Guideway Study Steering Committee and sponsoring agencies throughout the study.

Objectives:

1. Clearly communicate the role of the Steering Committee in recommending the final study conclusions of potential corridors with fixed guideway implementation to the COTPA Board of Directors based on the results of the planning process.
2. Maintain accurate documentation and attendance records of all project meetings so that interested parties can be informed of the results and decisions, and so that the responsibilities can be assigned to key project participants.
3. Identify potential conflicts of interest or other related ethical issues among the active study participants.

4. Cooperate with local and regional transportation agencies conducting concurrent transportation studies in order to avoid public confusion and to avoid the duplication of effort between related projects in the Study Area.

GOAL 4: Assure inclusion of traditionally under-represented groups in the planning process.

Objectives:

1. Seek out the participation of low-income, minority, youth and elderly populations, as well as persons with disabilities, the chambers of commerce, economic development council, and business groups. Monitor the participation of these groups so that alternative involvement methods can be implemented as necessary to ensure their representation and participation.
2. Present information in a manner that overcomes potential language, economic or cultural barriers, and that is meaningful to different cultural groups.
3. Facilitate effective participation by the hearing and sight-impaired.
4. Ensure conformance with Title VI and Environmental Justice provisions.

GOAL 5: Achieve regional consensus among competing interests.

Objectives:

1. Present study findings in an understandable, objective and reader-friendly manner, focusing on how the fixed guideway transit options differ in meeting the mobility and accessibility needs in the study area.
2. Facilitate communication among community stakeholders so that tradeoffs among alternative strategies and funding options can be identified.
3. Formalize a process to incorporate public and agency input into the technical analyses performed during the study, and be able to demonstrate to the community that their issues and concerns have been considered in an equitable manner by the Project Team, even if not eventually adopted.

CHAPTER 4 - PROPOSED PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN

This chapter describes the proposed structure of the PIP for the Fixed Guideway Study. It includes a discussion of the various targeted audiences in the study area and outreach methods. A critical element of the program structure is the process of selecting representatives of target audiences to fill the leadership roles of the work groups. In addition to community, staff, and executive level involvement, affected resource agency involvement will be addressed. Finally, a summary of the public involvement opportunities at key project milestones is presented.

4.1 THE FIXED GUIDEWAY STUDY STEERING COMMITTEE

The Steering Committee is responsible for the oversight and direction of the study as a whole and is the first point of contact between the Carter & Burgess project team and the communities and agencies participating in the study. It will also serve as an advocacy role within the communities to garner support for the project, and the Committee will have a later role when local, state, and federal funds are needed for the project. Among the responsibility of committee members are:

1. Assist in the definition and evaluation of project alternatives and funding options;
2. Monitor the study process from a community perspective;
3. Highlight potential issues and concerns specific to their interests;
4. Disseminate information and generate interest in the study throughout the community;
5. Offer strategies to resolve issues between competing interests;
6. Review technical studies and staff recommendations; and
7. Disseminate information within their respective constituencies.

During the course of this project, Carter & Burgess staff will meet with the Committee on a quarterly basis. At each of those meetings, Carter & Burgess will provide an update on the progress of the study, highlighting major milestones and achievements. The Committee will provide direction at critical turning points throughout the course of the project.

4.2 COMMUNITY LEADERS

The public involvement portion of this project will actively seek input from interested residents, business leaders, and special interest groups. Several leaders will be asked to participate in the stakeholder interviews. The Steering Committee will assist the Project Team in identifying those critical groups that should include the following:

- Neighborhood organizations: These groups should be involved to ensure that neighborhoods are informed and supportive of transportation investments
- Business leaders and chambers of commerce: These groups often rely on transportation for the success of their businesses and often serve as vocal advocates of transportation investments in a community
- Developers and other real estate professionals: Cities with successful transit-oriented development programs have formed partnerships with land developers to ensure that transportation investments and services are consistent with market demand for transit-oriented developments.

4.3 AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

The agency involvement portion of this project will actively seek input from affected municipal jurisdictions, the MPO, school districts, and county governments to ensure that transportation plans throughout the region are compatible with and supportive of any recommended high-capacity transit alternative:

- Key agency staff should be involved in a support or technical work group to maintain coordination and avoid duplication of effort
- Technical staff meetings should be tied to key study milestones
- Technical staff meetings should be held on a regular basis, and held on an as-needed basis to discuss specific issues
- Each agency should select one or two staff representatives, with other departmental staff to attend meetings as necessary depending on the topic of discussion
- Related projects should be coordinated through agency project managers
- Resource agencies should be closely involved given the potential environmental effects of alternatives.

4.4 GENERAL PUBLIC

The broad interests of the general public can be difficult to engage effectively in the planning process due to the size and diversity of the population at large. Interaction with these citizens requires that outreach methods and participation techniques be equally diverse. The general public can play an invaluable role in providing the study team with fresh perspectives, possible solutions for community-specific problems, and in identifying potential areas of concern or controversy.

Public involvement should be targeted to the following groups:

- Neighborhood organizations and districts to provide input on local issues and concerns
- Chambers of commerce, business associations, urban main street groups and improvement districts to promote the evaluation of the options of a locally preferred transportation system
- Environmental, natural resource, and open space planning groups to ensure that due consideration is given to the preservation or enhancement of sensitive resources
- Ethnic, cultural, low-income, physically challenged, and elderly group representatives to ensure involvement from traditionally under-represented and underserved groups
- Developers and other real estate professionals to address the potential for economic development
- Possible representation from adjacent municipal jurisdictions and county governments to address long-term transportation improvements, expanded service areas, and extended transit lines
- Active citizens and students to provide their perspectives on potential issues
- Interested civic groups such as the League of Women Voters, Rotary Clubs, OKC Beautiful, Central Oklahoma Citizens League, Latino Development Agency, Urban League, Asian District, etc., to provide their perspectives on potential issues.

To maximize the effectiveness of their role, members of the general public will require the following information:

- Concise, easily understandable and engaging summaries of study progress and findings on a regular basis

- Information on how they can participate in the planning and decision-making process, and how their input will be incorporated into study outcomes
- Notice of availability of and convenient access to final copies of decision documents and milestone products.

Participation from the general public is generally inconsistent, and largely depends on the topic of discussion and how it is perceived to affect them personally. Past experience has shown that interest levels are higher during later phases of the study during which improvement strategies are more defined. However, it is critical to actively engage and inform the public early on to develop a common base of understanding, to instill a sense of ownership for future recommendations, and to identify possible issues that could delay the project during later phases of design and implementation.

4.5 OTHER IMPLEMENTING AGENCY BOARDS AND AUTHORITIES

Other implementing agencies will play a role in implementing the elements of the corridor fixed guideway transit recommendations. Thus, it will be important to involve key representatives of these agencies on a regular basis. The agencies contacted may represent diverse interests, including FTA, FHWA, Amtrak, US Army Corps of Engineers (the Corps), the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the State legislature, various divisions of ODOT, Oklahoma Tourism and Recreation Department (OTRD), the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ), and the State Historic Preservation Office of the Oklahoma Historical Society. Coordination with utility companies, other transportation agencies, emergency service providers, and others will also take place as needed during the study.

These individuals will provide overall policy direction specific to their implementing agency, and will assist with reaching closure on key study decisions. To be effective in this role, this group will require:

- Early coordination to inform the agencies of the study and its purpose;
- Periodic briefings to summarize project progress;
- Notice of and summary information for public meetings and events;

- Summaries of comments received from the public and draft responses or approaches to address key comments;
- Staff recommendations on key issues;
- Summaries of technical findings to support staff recommendations;
- Knowledge of the positions of other stakeholders, policy leaders and public agencies;
- Final copies of decision documents or milestone products; and,
- Structured process to allow for regular project updates and discussion.

Participation from key policy representatives and staff of these groups will be accomplished through periodic briefings to agency boards and staff at key project milestones.

4.6 ORGANIZED INTEREST GROUPS

Organized interest groups generally include groups which have been formed around other related interests but which have an interest in the outcomes of the study. These groups include transportation coalitions, MPO citizen advisory groups, the Oklahoma Alliance for Public Transportation (APT), the Oklahoma Transit Association (OTA), neighborhood organizations, environmental groups, civic groups, business organizations, chambers of commerce and other community- or issue-based organizations. These groups will play valuable roles in providing input on the key transportation issues in the study area, and in evaluating proposed solutions that might affect their particular area of interest. They will also assist in generating interest among the general public and disseminating information to others in the study area. To be effective in this role, key representatives of these groups will need the following information:

- Brief and easy-to-follow summaries of the study progress and findings on a regular basis;
- Methods to enhance public participation and notices of opportunities to participate in the planning process;
- Fact sheets addressing key areas of interest or concern, and summaries of responses to comments received during public meetings and events; and,
- Notices of availability of, and access to, final decision documents and milestone products.

Participation levels from each particular group will vary depending on the stage of the study and how proposed solutions may affect their interest. However, because there are a number of trade-offs with potential transportation strategies that may affect groups differently, it will be important to meet with key representatives on a regular basis so that trade-offs and the perceived and real effects of the alternatives can be openly discussed among competing interest groups.

4.7 PROGRAM STRUCTURE, ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Steering Committee will ultimately have final responsibility for recommending the corridors and fixed guideway transit plan to the Board of Directors of COTPA METRO Transit. Prior to recommending the fixed guideway transit plan, the Steering Committee and sponsoring agencies must have continuous and thorough involvement in the planning process. COTPA will play the lead role in conducting the future alternatives analysis, environmental analysis, preliminary engineering, implementing corridor and area plans, and other measures to support the transit investment.

To be effective in this role, the Steering Committee will require the following:

- Notice of public meetings and events, and summary information for presentation and distribution at the events
- Study information provided at strategic COTPA METRO Transit Board meetings
- Summaries of public and special interest group positions on major issues
- Concise summaries of technical documentation that address issues raised by the constituencies
- The position of implementing agency boards and elected officials on key project issues.

Participation will occur at committee meetings and by voluntary attendance at project meetings. The Steering Committee will furnish policy direction and oversight of major activities associated with the study and be given an opportunity to comment, recommend or request modifications to the milestone results. The purpose of this requirement is to ensure that the fixed guideway transit plan, when finally recommended, has been thoroughly understood and accepted by the Committee and sponsoring agencies at each stage of the process.

4.8 PUBLIC OUTREACH OPPORTUNITIES AT PROJECT MILESTONES

Opportunities for active participation from all target audiences will be provided on a regular basis throughout the study. Participation from the general public will be encouraged throughout the planning process and emphasized at key project milestones. The following list summarizes the range of public involvement techniques that can be used to inform, educate, and solicit input from study participants. Public and agency participation and input will be critical during these milestones in order to strive for or work towards a consensus on the fixed guideway transit plan. Each of these techniques supports one or more program goals, and targets certain groups at different milestones.

The following describes public outreach activities and methods that will be implemented during the study:

- **Stakeholder Contact List** – A mailing list including names of interested people, organizations, elected officials, and property owners will be developed, expanding on the existing stakeholder database maintained by COTPA. This database will be updated throughout the course of the study and used for the mailings of newsletters and public notices.
- **Public Meetings** – Public meetings will be held at various locations in the proposed corridors. Meetings will be scheduled to avoid major vacation/breaks such as winter break and spring break. Public meetings will be conducted at key project milestones to present analysis results for public comment. Prior to each meeting, an open house will be held to allow time for attendees to review displays and ask questions. After the determination of the fixed guideway transit plan, meetings will be held in accordance with federal alternatives analysis and environmental documentation requirements. The last series of meetings may be conducted as public hearings for the Fixed Guideway Study.
- **Project Diary** – Comments received from the public and all stakeholders will be documented via a “Project Diary.” This Project Diary will document the name and contact information of the person submitting the comment, the definition of the comment

received, and the method of how the comment will be addressed. This Project Diary will be maintained, updated frequently, and posted on the project web site for viewing.

- **Postage-Paid Comment Card** – Comment cards will be available during public meetings and in each newsletter.
- **Stakeholder Interviews** – One-on-one interviews will be conducted of the key stakeholders throughout the study area in order to receive intimate and detailed information and response on issues of concerns to these stakeholders. Discussion during these stakeholder interviews will be documented in meeting minutes and referred to frequently to ensure issues are being addressed.
- **Mailings** - Direct mail will be used to notify people on the project mailing list of the date, time and place of all public meetings.
- **Web Site** – A project Web site (linked under projects through the COTPA METRO Transit website) will be established to include study information, meeting announcements, newsletters, reports and maps for the study. It will also allow for the public to comment on-line. Throughout the study, the Web site will be updated to include current project information and meeting schedules. The project Web site should include links to and from other related sites.
- **Newsletters** - Newsletters will be direct-mailed, as well as posted on the project Web site. Public libraries, the MPO, community centers, and chambers of commerce locations will also have copies of the newsletters available.
- **Information at Public Libraries** - Final reports from the Fixed Guideway Study will be made available in the Reference Section of the local public and university libraries.
- **Presentations** - Staff of COTPA METRO Transit or consulting firm staff will make presentations and briefings to various community organizations.
- **Cable Television** – The local cable access channel will be used for public meeting notifications and/or broadcasts as appropriate.
- **Media Information**– Media releases will be issued to local newspapers and television and radio stations as appropriate.

CHAPTER 5 - EVALUATIONS AND MONITORING

Evaluation and monitoring activities will be conducted at key points during the study, as well as during the preparation of the Fixed Guideway Study. This evaluation and monitoring process will assist in maintaining project support as the preferred alternatives near identification. These activities will serve several purposes:

- To measure the awareness of and satisfaction with study activities from different target audiences;
- To ensure that comments received during the study process are being addressed and incorporated into the decision-making process;
- To determine the effectiveness of the program in increasing awareness and understanding of the different fixed guideway transit alternatives;
- To identify ways in which the program can be improved in terms of reaching target audiences and methods of participation and education; and
- To insure that eventual recommendations have a realistic expectation of being adopted by the Committee and sponsoring agencies.

5.1 EVALUATION AND MONITORING ACTIVITIES

There are several techniques that can be employed to evaluate the effectiveness of the Public and Agency Involvement Program:

- **Comment Cards** – Comment cards can be provided at all public meetings, work group meetings and associated study activities where information is distributed. Comment cards should also be provided at key activity centers in the study area (schools, libraries, grocery stores, the MPO, shopping centers, places of worship, etc.). Comment cards should ask: how the person found out about the event, which aspects were most or least effective, including location, format and materials, their respective residence zip code, and whether they would participate in a similar activity again. The comment card will include an option for that person to be added to the project mailing list if they are not already included. Greeters at every study activity will have comment cards available for attendees.

- **Comment/Response** – Following each public meeting, a summary of comments received should be prepared. Responses and/or the method by which each comment will be addressed in subsequent study activities should be included. Such comment summary matrices will be referenced during key decision-making milestones to ensure that issues are incorporated and that appropriate modifications can be made to the Public and Agency Involvement Program.
- **Web site** – The number of hits will be reviewed periodically throughout the study. Web site comments will be summarized and documented. Comments regarding the Web site content and its accessibility will be taken into account and site revised as appropriate.
- **Review of Attendance** – Following each public meeting, zip codes of attendees will be reviewed to ensure attendance by those in potentially affected areas.

5.2 RESULTS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Conducting a comprehensive PIP is a learning experience and its effectiveness can vary depending on the level of controversy and the range of competing interests. The COTPA Fixed Guideway Study PIP should be thoroughly documented and monitored throughout the planning process, so that the lessons learned can be passed on for consideration during subsequent studies undertaken by the sponsoring agencies. In order to accomplish this, the project team will develop a summary document highlighting the results and lessons learned during the study.

Meeting Report

PROJECT: 2004-04 Fixed Guideway Study

PROJECT NO.: 022845

Central Oklahoma Transportation and Parking Authority (COTPA)

PRESENT: Committee Members:

Sam Bowman, Ward 2 City Council, City of Oklahoma City
Bernest Cain, State Senator, OK Senate Dist 46
Rick Cain, COTPA
Bill Case, State Representative, OK House Dist 95
Joe Clytus, Oklahoma City Public Schools
Myron Coleman, City-County Health
Mick Cornett, Mayor, City of Oklahoma City
Harold Haralson, Mayor, City of Norman
Lyda Harrell, Traffic Commission Chair, City of Oklahoma City
Steve Jones, Representative of Congressman Ernest Istook
Chris Kauffman, COTPA Chairman/The Insurance Center
Hershel Lamirand, OU Medical Center
David Lopez, Downtown Okla. City Inc.
Rick Moore, Municipal Contractors Association
Gary Marrs, Ward 1 City Council, City of Oklahoma City
Ford Price, Price Edwards & Co.
Robin Roberts, Greater Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce
Paula Sanford, Edmond City Council
Dean Schirf, Greater Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce
Odell Smith, COTPA Trustee, Smith Printing
David Streb, Oklahoma Department of Transportation
Richard Tanenbaum, Gardner/Tanenbaum Group
Zach Taylor, ACOG
James Thompson, OKC City Manager's Office
Amy Underwood, OKC Beautiful Representative
Mike Voorhees, S. OKC Chamber of Commerce Representative
John Yoeckel, At-Large Planning Commissioner, City of Oklahoma City

MEETING

DATE: 12/14/2004

Project Staff:

Larry Hopper, COTPA Project Manager
Tom Shelton, Carter & Burgess Project Manager
Renzi Stone, Saxum Strategic Communications
Mike McAnelly, Carter & Burgess
Lee Nichols, Carter & Burgess
Sandra Williams, Carter & Burgess

Attendees/Guests:

Scott Barrett, Legacy Engineering
Kay Bickham, COTPA Trustee
Dan Boland, Public Works, City of Oklahoma City

Attendees/Guests (continued):

Todd Butler, TEC
Jim Couch, City Manager, City of Oklahoma City
Randy Entz, ACOG
Ken Hughes, Huitt-Zollars, Project Team
Dick Lee, COTPA Trustee
Holly Massie, ACOG
Diponker Mukherjee, COTPA
Doug Rex, ACOG
Max Wensel, representing Klay Kimker of Devon Energy

The following is our understanding of the subject matter covered in this meeting. If this differs from your understanding, please notify us within five working days.

The December 14, 2004 meeting for the Central Oklahoma Transportation & Parking Authority (COTPA) Fixed Guideway Transit Study Steering Committee (TSSC) Kickoff Meeting was held at the Presbyterian Health Foundation Conference Center located on 655 Research Parkway, Oklahoma City. The meeting began at 4:00 P.M. Handouts made available were included in a three-ring binder: meeting agenda, Purpose and Mission Statement of the TSSC, Guiding Principles for the TSSC, the Steering Committee roster, a copy of the meeting presentation, the Transit Fact sheets (Bus, HOV, Busways, Streetcars, Light Rail, Commuter Rail, Heavy Rail, and Monorail/AGT), a set of figures (Preliminary Study Corridors, 2000 Population Density, 2030 Population Density, 2000 Employment Density, 2030 Employment Density), the Public Involvement Plan, and the project schedule.

1. **Opening Remarks** - The Honorable Mick Cornett, Mayor of Oklahoma City, convened the meeting by welcoming all attendees (committee members and guest). He began by discussing the importance of the TSSC kick-off meeting, conveying to them that this meeting is the beginning of the planning process and is designed to provide them the opportunity to become informed regarding the fixed guideway transit study. He encouraged everyone to ask questions and solicited their input. He also encouraged the committee members to be active members throughout the study process. He then turned the meeting over to Chris Kauffman, Chair of the COTPA Board of Trustees.
2. **Introductions** – Chris Kauffman introduced himself as COTPA Chair and briefly explained what COTPA is. He then reiterated the mayor's welcoming to all in attendance and asked each attendee to introduce themselves and their affiliation. He then introduced, Tom Shelton, Carter & Burgess Project Manager, who continued the meeting by reviewing the purpose and objectives of the study.
3. **Purpose and Objectives of the Fixed Guideway Transit Study** – Tom Shelton also welcomed the attendees to the meeting. He summarized that the purpose of the Fixed Guideway Study and its Steering Committee is to identify, evaluate, and recommend a set of fixed guideway transit investment options that would strengthen the connections to the region's employment and activity centers. He stated that the study would identify unique opportunities for a fixed guideway system that could offer the Oklahoma City area the chance to identify potential transportation solutions to improve connections among the region's growth centers, enhance economic development opportunities, improve mobility, expand transportation options, and improve air quality. He further stated that the purpose of the kick-off meeting was to discuss the objectives and mission of the study, the study process itself, and the guiding principles for the study. He presented a slide show illustrating the Fixed Guideway Transit Technologies, briefly discussing the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Project Implementation Process (including alternatives analysis, environmental documentation, and selection of a locally preferred alternative), reviewed national rail transit

trends, and described transit technologies available, potential funding strategies (federal, state and local match), and the relation between transit and economic development.

4. **Project Schedule** – Copies of the detailed Project Schedule were included in the notebooks. Tom Shelton explained that the study would follow a planning schedule that includes seven tasks for development and completion of the study. This process typically takes 12 months. Public involvement is also included in this schedule and will be ongoing throughout the process.
5. **Role of the Steering Committee** – Tom Shelton reviewed the role and the purpose of the Steering Committee. He explained that the committee members have advisory responsibility relating to the oversight and direction of the study. They are the primary point of contact between the project team and the communities and participating agencies. He emphasized that it is essential that the steering committee members be actively involved in the decision-making process throughout the study. Their understanding of the study, in particular, the range of alternatives considered, is critical to building a consensus for the selection of the preferred transportation solution. He requested the members to review Chapter 4 of the Draft Public Involvement Plan regarding the details of their role.
6. **Guiding Principles** – Mr. Shelton referred the members to the draft Guiding Principles for the Fixed Guideway Study contained in the binder. Tom briefly discussed the six principles, which included: 1) achieve regional consensus, 2) enhance mobility, 3) be fiscally responsible, 4) consider appropriate technologies, 5) consider effects on the corridors, and 6) economic development. He requested that the members -review these draft guiding principles and refer any suggestions or comments to Larry Hopper, COTPA Project Manager. The guiding principles will be utilized later as part of the evaluation of alternatives for the fixed guideway corridors.
7. **Transit Technologies to be Studied** – Tom Shelton stated that an evaluation of transit technologies would be conducted at key points during the study to assist in gathering critical data for identifying the preferred alternatives. He described that the study was about more than just Light Rail. The alternative fixed guideway technologies to be studied will include a range of options as well as the specifications for each: Light Rail Transit (LRT), modern streetcar, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Commuter Rail, High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) facilities, Heavy Rail, and Monorail. He told the members that the evaluation criteria for each of the technologies identified would include: 1) operations and service levels, 2) expandability and phasing, 3) availability, 4) capital cost, and 5) operating and maintenance cost.
8. **Overview of the Public Involvement Plan** – A Public Involvement Plan was prepared for the study and is included in the binders provided to the Steering Committee. Active participation among the committee members will be critical to the success of the study project. Mr. Shelton pointed out that the participation and involvement of citizens and interested parties will also be critical to ensure that their contributions and ideas are considered throughout the process as well. He asked the committee to review the Public Involvement Plan and direct any questions and comments to Larry Hopper.
9. **Schedule of Subsequent Steering Committee Meeting** – The next Steering Committed meeting will be held on **March 3, 2005**, at 4:00 P.M., in this same location (the Presbyterian Health Foundation Conference Center located at 655 Research Parkway). Prior to the next Steering Committee meeting, the project team will be conducting a series of public meetings in late February 2005, to inform citizens about the Fixed Guideway Study. Comments and questions received from these public meetings will be summarized at the next Steering Committee meeting.

10. **Final Comments and Questions** – Members of the Steering Committee were invited to make comments and questions regarding the study and Mr. Shelton's presentation:

Comment: What is the current Federal match for funding on transit projects?

Answer: The current Federal match for funding is 50%.

Comment: What are the characteristics of a successful system?

Answer: A successful system has two measures: cost effectiveness and a good ratio of forecast ridership to capital cost. The optimal length for a light rail (LRT) corridor, for example, is 12 to 15 miles with a cost of \$30 to \$40 million-per mile. The primary goal for the transit system is the ability to attract riders.

Comment: Does the Federal government fund operation and maintenance costs?

Answer: Federal funding is available for operations and maintenance for bus systems, but not for rail transit systems.

Comment: Where does the revenue come from? Is a subsidy needed to fund a rail transit system?

Answer: Nationally, approximately 10 to 25 percent of transit operating costs are covered by revenue received from the fare box. Other revenue sources must come in the form of a subsidy such as a dedicated sales tax or other funding source.

Comment: What about cost per rider (?)

Answer: Federal funding for rail transit projects is awarded based on a favorable cost effectiveness ratio of cost per rider, compared to other competing systems. The local share includes capital funds to match the Federal share, plus the operating and maintenance funds. For a feasible project, the region has to figure out how we want to pay for the local share costs.

Comment: What about density?

Answer: Comparative statistics for rail transit agencies around the country will be provided as information at the next meeting.

Comment: Are there any cities operating rail transit without a subsidy? Are there any cities operating without a subsidy that have already built their system?

Answer: No, but all forms of transportation, even roads, highways, and airports are subsidized.

Comment: Areas such as Dallas and Houston have such high traffic issues. We (Oklahoma City) don't have those types of traffic issues. How would rail be justified in this area?

Answer: The answer to that question will be an outcome of the study. The Oklahoma City metropolitan area is a growing area with congestion increasing in the next 10 to 20 years. This study is a proactive approach looking at possible transit technologies to help alleviate future traffic congestion. This study will look at various transit technologies such as bus rapid transit, commuter rail, and light rail. The potential use of the various technologies, not just light rail, will be studied and the feasibility of each technology has to be warranted on its own merits.

Comment: Are there cultural differences regarding public acceptance of rail transit among different parts of the country?

Answer: There used to be, but they are becoming less distinctive. Current LRT projects can be seen in development not just in the larger cities, but all over the country in places such as San Diego,

CA; Denver, CO; Dallas, TX; Houston, TX; Phoenix, AZ; and in New Jersey. Competition for Federal funds is very intense among projects in cities all over the nation.

Comment: Is there a website for this project?

Answer: The website is currently under development and the web address will be distributed once the site is complete.

Comment: From an economic development standpoint, those systems considered should be proven very carefully when comparing them to or addressing our area, as it seems the data for places like Oklahoma City is not conclusive.

Answer: When gathering examples for economic development, the consultant team will gather information from cities that are similar in size and stature with the Oklahoma City metropolitan area.

Comment: How would the fixed guideway transit study address sprawl?

Answer: Fixed guideway transit systems encourage development patterns that produce higher densities within the corridors they serve. Rail transit often creates mixed-use development around station locations, referred to as "transit oriented development" (TOD). The study will examine various examples of TOD occurring around LRT stations and the economic development opportunities that might be provided for the greater OKC area. In relation to sprawl, this type of development attracts denser development where people can live, work, shop, and play all with the ability of not using a car. It creates a community where everything is in walking distance. It helps curtail sprawl by creating dense development without the expansive roadways and parking lots.

The question and answer session was closed. Mr. Shelton noted that the corridor map was preliminary and reminded the committee that approximately 85% of fixed guideway trips are work-related. Tom thanked everyone for attending and turned the meeting over to COTPA Chair Chris Kauffman.

Mr. Kauffman commented that this study would be a great tie-in to carry out COTPA's 2001 Long Range Plan. He then introduced Rick Cain, who was recently appointed as the new COTPA Administrator. He then thanked everyone for attending. The meeting adjourned 5:15 pm.

REPORTED BY: Tom Shelton, Project Manager

Meeting Report

PROJECT: Fixed Guideway Study,
Central Oklahoma
Transportation and Parking
Authority (COTPA)

PROJECT NO.: 022845.010.001

PRESENT: See attached sign-in sheets

DATE: February 21-24, 2005

The following is our understanding of the subject matter covered in this meeting. If this differs from your understanding, please notify us within five working days.

An initial series of seven public meetings was conducted at various locations dispersed across the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area over a period of four days, from February 21 to February 25, 2005. The purpose of the meetings was to provide information about the Fixed Guideway Study and to obtain input regarding the potential corridors and alternative fixed guideway transit technologies that should be address by the Fixed Guideway Study. The public comments received from the meetings are documented for each meeting location in the following sections of this meeting record.

Oklahoma City Downtown Public Library Monday, February 21, 2005 12:00 PM to 1:30 PM

Chris Kaufman, Chair of the COTPA Board of Trustees, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and introduced other community officials. A slide show was presented by Tom Shelton, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, methodology, technology alternatives, and preliminary corridor delineations. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments were received.

C: Good presentation; he proposed consideration of a grid network of commuter rail or light rail lines, to provide a platform for future growth. The new trains might be better.

C: Concerned about the fact that OKC doesn't have a successful bus route. How will the area support a rail system?

R: The study will identify the forecast ridership make recommendations according to what is needed to serve realistic projections.

C: She brought quotes with her, which she submitted and are contained in the appendix. She doesn't want the region to be 'left behind'; she thinks that trucks don't pay their share, and that the roads and bridges are being torn up. No one has convinced ODOT that transit is a priority. Public transit will put fewer wheels on the road. She is in favor of a fixed guideway transit system that provides accessibility for people with disabilities.

C: We need infrastructure to support rail. Public transit service should be available so people don't need to drive to the location of the rail stations.

R: The study will identify the types of support services like parking and feeder buses needed to develop a multimodal transportation system. That might require new funding like MAPS

C: A lot of people would give up driving if they had better public transportation; the current bus system is lousy. There are many people who can't drive because of age or health; they need to be able to get to places, like hospitals.

R: We will look at corridors and see what technology meets the need of the people and the corridor. METRO Transit is meeting the needs of OKC transit riders with what they can afford with their current level of funding. If Metro Transit can receive better funding more service can be provided (i.e. more routes, frequent service, extended service hours).

C: Both cities talked about today are linked to OKC by railroads. Rail transit is cheaper.

C: Pointing to areas on the map of the Oklahoma City metropolitan area, he talked about the OKC Chamber of Commerce's Project Next. He noted that cities of density and diversity are usually cities that are landlocked. OKC has nothing to hold us in. We should follow the routes of the original rail lines; some kind of transit is key for development if we want a great downtown. There is a problem -- we need to change the mentality of 'I must have a car'. Need to start small, perhaps first developing a N-S rail line and tie into bus routes. This study should tie into Project Next, which recognizes that people can live in dense central core, or they can live further out and have lots of property in Oklahoma. The key will be in connecting those two lifestyles together.

C: One of the railroad lines shown on the map is not 'abandoned'; it is owned by COTPA. He questioned the relationship between ODOT and Carter Burgess. The presentation was shallow and did not provide recommendations. It would be intelligent to make more use of the existing railroads; everyone he talks to agrees.

R: The rail line will be labeled to reflect COTPA ownership of the ROW. This is a kick-off meeting for the study; it is intended to be an overview and may seem shallow because we haven't made any decisions yet. The purpose is to hear citizen's perceptions of the needs and challenges facing the area. Carter & Burgess is serving as COTPA's consultant and our reputation depends on our professionalism.

C: This was a great presentation. It is important to also recognize that there are over 100 private vans and buses used for transporting the elderly and handicapped. Taxicab fare is 40% discounted for the elderly under the COTPA Share-A-Fare program.

C: Instead of moving I-40, the right-of-way and maybe the bridges should be saved for some type of elevated rail transit. Union Station needs to be taken advantage of and might serve as the hub where the rail lines come together in the core area.

C: The elderly are currently giving up their cars and the buses do not provide enough service to all the places they need to go. Many would like to use light rail to get to the doctor and hospital. People on the westside need more transportation options.

Belle Isle Public Library

Monday, February 21, 2005, 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM

Larry Hopper, COTPA Transportation Planner, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and introduced other community officials. A slide show was presented by Tom Shelton, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, methodology, technology alternatives, and preliminary corridor delineations. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments were received.

Q: Who selected the FGS Steering Committee? How were they selected and how was it determined that they would be the best people to help decide? Elected officials should have to use the proposed fixed guideway transit system for at least seven days to see how it works.

R: The FGS Steering Committee members were appointed by the Mayor and the Chair of the COTPA Board of Trustees with the assistance from city staff. The members were identified based on their interest and involvement in on-going and previous transit planning for the OKC metropolitan region. The members represent different viewpoints and attitudes about the potential future role for transit and are persons who are recognized for their community interest, open-mindedness, and public-spirited dedication.

Q: What is the definition of "light rail?"

A: The principal characteristic of light rail transit is that the trains are electrified, using electric powered vehicles with overhead catenary lines providing power to the vehicles. Light rail also has less passenger-carrying capacity than heavy rail.

C: Transit buses need to be designed to accommodate passengers carrying packages or baggage, so that someone can go grocery shopping and ride back on the bus, or travel to and from the AMTRAK or airport terminals.

C: Future meeting notices should be sent out through utility bills to reach a larger portion of the community residents.

C: Military and civilian personnel who fly into the OKC Will Rogers World Airport have limited public transportation choices to get to Enid, Altus or Vance Air Force Bases. There isn't public transit and cab fare is too high for those destinations. Volunteers at the airport see this problem first hand every day.

Q: What is the length of this study?

A: This is a 12 to 14-month study that started in December of 2004.

Norman Public Library

Tuesday, February 22, 2005, 12:00 PM to 1:30 PM

Harold Haralson, Mayor City of Norman, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and introduced other community officials. A slide show was presented by Tom Shelton, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, methodology, technology alternatives, and preliminary corridor delineations. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments were received.

C: There needs to be a perimeter bus loop route for the surrounding Norman area. He must ride his bike 3 miles to get to the nearest bus stop.

C: This project should make the OKC Chamber of Commerce happy, since improved transit service would (and does now) make it easier to get to Crossroads Mall (in South OKC) than it would to get to Sooner Fashion Mall across Norman. Transit will drain retail shoppers from Norman to OKC. The study should focus on providing better public transportation within Norman.

R: The Fixed Guideway Study is intended to determine whether there is sufficient commuter demand to justify providing fixed guideway transit serving the major travel corridors within the OKC metropolitan region. The feasibility of serving individual corridors will depend on the forecast passenger ridership and the cost-effectiveness of alternative technologies such as Bus HOV, Bus Rapid Transit, Commuter Rail, or Light Rail. Any of the fixed guideway technologies would require that there also be an adequate level of feeder bus service available for people to travel between the fixed guideway stations and their origins and destinations including residences, work places, schools, shopping areas, and other major locations.

C: Our community isn't set up to provide adequate bus service inside of Norman, so we should enhance CART service before developing a fixed guideway system connecting Norman to OKC and other points.

R: The existing CART service is well run by the University of Oklahoma and there are indicators that point to the need for future improvement and expansion within Norman. Future service improvements will also require identifying a source of adequate funding to meet the cost of necessary services. As noted in the previous response, the Fixed Guideway Study is focused on identifying existing and future need for commuter-type service options and assumes that there will be improvements in local bus service to provide the necessary feeder bus service connections within the community.

C: The study should look at the integration between corridors and communities; a grid bus route network would be the best way to serve the local area. The service needs to be accessible to handicapped riders including adequate wheelchair spots on vehicles.

R: Any proposed transit service will need to comply with ADA requirements.

C: There are a lot of options. Fixed guideway service is important. The study will need to show convincing justification for feasible options. Union Station is very important as a potential future rail transit terminal for central OKC. The MAPS referendum for funding the downtown rail trolley was not successful. Community officials need to provide the leadership to make transit a viable option, consistent with the identified needs. He had a letter to the editor published in the Norman Transcript, saying friends won't drive from Norman to OKC unless it is a dire

emergency. The Fixed Guideway Study needs to show what modes of transportation are feasible and when they can be provided?

Q: Mr. Elmore commented that the low level of attendance at meeting yesterday at the Oklahoma Downtown Library was due to the meeting being held on a holiday. Mr. Elmore also mentioned that the lack of media coverage was disappointing and that Metro Transit and the consultant team should do a better job of getting the word out to the public and the media regarding public participation at these meetings. OKC is 15 years behind other communities in beginning to develop fixed guideway transit service. A meeting should be held next time in Tuttle or El Reno, which has a vintage trolley in operation. He praised Midwest City for their recent rail study.

A: It should be noted that Sara Kahne, staff writer with The Oklahoman, was present at the meeting in Downtown Oklahoma and wrote an article that appeared in Tuesday's newspaper. Also, a radio talk show interview was conducted earlier today on AM 1520 KOKC, hosted by Steve Summer.

C: We need dramatic changes to reverse things right now. Rail will enforce transit-oriented land use and development. Trains can be run automatically and cost-effectively.

Q: Can we use wind, solar power, or other alternative fuels to generate the needed electric power?

A: A local source of electric power will be necessary and could include a variety of generating sources. That is a consideration but the Fixed Guideway Study will not delve into alternative means of power production for the area.

C: Would like to see the City of Norman more active in the Fixed Guideway Study.

R: The City of Norman is represented on the Steering Committee, those members are present today, and the University is also involved. More involvement of Norman residents is welcomed and they are invited to sign up on the website to receive the project newsletter and future meeting notices.

C: Norman needs a change of behavior, a change of view. The system needs to have a flexible schedule. He praised the football game day shuttle buses.

C: We should call this "Operation Republican Burgess" because of our views. No one cares about those who can't afford a car or have a disability. They only start caring once healthcare becomes an issue. He is going to write a letter in the Norman Transcript and suggest a perimeter transit loop for Norman.

C: We need transit service 24/7; it needs to be as cheap as an OU game.

C: Right now we can't conveniently get to the Social Security Office (23rd and Villa)

C: Vance and Altus Air Force Bases are linked to OKC by the railroads. We shouldn't miss out on the train opportunity for future passenger rail service to these areas and elsewhere.

Q: Will the study look at the integration of transportation services within the corridors and the community?

A: The study is a multimodal transportation study and will be focused on the commuter transportation needs, but we will also look at the connections to the Heartland Flyer and other potential future AMTRAK intercity passenger rail service and the interaction with the community.

Q: What is the cost per mile for light rail in relation the cost for highways?

A: Light rail costs \$20 to 40 million per mile to build. Highway costs are on the order of \$80 to \$100 million per mile for Interstate Highways.)

C: Union Station needs to be used as an intermodal center.

R: It is too early in the study to know what places should be stations or stop. The first step is to determine the high priority corridors.

C: The City of Norman needs to take more of an interest in transit within the city.

C: For transit to be successful, the negative perception in association with public transportation needs to be changed. The system that will be designed with the conclusion of this study needs to be flexible.

Q: How much does signal pre-emption cost?

A: The cost of adding signal pre-emption is relatively small for existing signal systems. It is also beneficial for emergency services.

Southern Oaks Public Library
Tuesday, February 22, 2005 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM

Dick Lee, COTPA Board Trustee, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and introduced other community leaders. A slide show was presented by Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner for Carter & Burgess, providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, methodology, technology alternatives, and preliminary corridor delineations. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments were received.

C: Mr. Hughes suggested establishing a vintage rail streetcar system from Memorial to 63rd along Western. His Rail 90 group wants to provide streetcar service from Bricktown to the Stockyards. He suggested a streetcar system that connects from the hotel area along Meridian Avenue, to downtown Oklahoma City, to the Ft. Smith junction. Light rail can be elevated and look very nice, compatible with the surrounding area and land uses. A line running along North Western Avenue or Military could be partially depressed. The tracks would need to be separated from express traffic lanes within the roadway.

C: The Oklahoma City area's long-range transportation improvement plan needs to start with the highways and provide lanes to move traffic quickly. Area employers need to get involved with improvements to coordinate the joint use of cars and parking needs.

C: We need effective public transportation. Without transportation choices, it limits employment opportunities. We need to expand the existing network, frequency, and service hours for Metro Transit bus routes.

C: When the I-40 Crosstown Expressway relocation is completed, the city should keep the old I-40 right-of-way for some kind of transportation improvement such as a boulevard with a trolley line

C: A streetcar along Western would be a good idea, and also running from Bricktown to the Stockyards.

C: Military would be a good corridor for light rail.

C: Get employers involved in the use and development of the system.

Q: What Federal funding is available for this type of project regarding capital and operating costs?

A: The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) will provide 50% match for capital costs. Currently no federal funding is available for operating costs.

C: People think that independence means private automobiles. Federal funding is not available for rail transit operational costs, which means there has to be a local commitment to support the operating expense for any type of fixed guideway service.

Q: What is the light rail carrying capacity per hour in relation to highways?

A: Light rail can match and exceed the capacity of highways. The capacity of rail transit can be adjusted to match the demand by varying the number of cars in the makeup of trains, and decreasing the headways (time between trains arriving at stations).

Q: Will the study go into the financing of the system?

A: Yes, the study will outline alternative funding sources to finance the system.

Q: Who's going to ride the system and where are they going?

A: The study will include analysis of ridership for the identified corridors and technology alternatives. The ridership forecasts will identify the estimated future ridership. Transit riders may include all types of people whether they are going to work, school, hospitals, or to the store. A fixed guideway system would be designed to serve local residents, students, and tourists, including those who are dependent on public transportation as well as others who may choose to use service that is a convenient, affordable, and comfortable alternative to the automobile.

C: The area needs a plan to improve the existing transit system, one for the average Joe's of today.

Ralph Ellison Public Library
Wednesday, February 23, 2005 12:00 PM to 1:30 PM

Larry Hopper, COTPA Transportation Planner, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and introduced other community officials. A slide show was presented by Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner for Carter & Burgess, providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, methodology, technology alternatives, and preliminary corridor delineations. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments were received.

C: Route 23 from the State Capitol westward along 23rd Street is COPTA's current highest ridership corridor.

C: Mr. Hughes part of a group that has proposed establishing a vintage rail streetcar system from Memorial to 63rd along Western. The group wants to provide streetcar service from Bricktown to the Stockyards. Adequate security should include at least one officer per station. Train stations should be served by bus routes connecting to the surrounding neighborhood areas.

C: Ms. Shoemaker has lived in this area since 1958, MAPS seems to only effect the other side of town. She wants the east part of OKC to see the same type of improvements and benefits. Transit riders need to be informed about upcoming changes in transit service. There have been changes such as moving the bus stops and riders don't know about it.

C: This study is about our vision for the future of the Oklahoma City metro area.

C: We need to over-design the system since it will take so long to implement.

C: Kudos to COPTA for what they are trying to do. We need to consider creative reuse of the area's existing rail facilities, which some say are the best set in the west. It should be possible to start at far lower costs by using commuter rail on an existing rail line. Bus service improvements should be made along with the development of rail transit.

C: The first successful operation of rail transit will end the argument and prove the value of transit. We need it to begin somewhere soon. We need to look at what resources we have available and make use of what we already available on the ground.

C: Trails for pedestrians and bike trails should be incorporated in the plan. These trails can share the right- of-way with the new system that is implemented.

C: The economic benefit of development around rail transit stations can be huge. Not all riders will be tourists. Many will continue to drive cars but workers, commuters, shoppers, students, elderly, and tourists will use rail transit.

C: Many also need transportation to medical services. The middle class will ride trains, when they will not ride buses. The workforce of commuters needs a choice for transportation, especially facing increasing fuel prices. There is a lot of mythology about who will ride, but one good line of transit will prove that rail is worth the investment.

Q: Where is the Oklahoma City area Congressional delegation on this?

A: The Fixed Guideway Study was authorized and is receiving Federal funding because there is recognition of the need for a fair and unbiased study to see what Oklahoma City can support and what the public would like to see for their community.

Edmond Public Library

Wednesday, February 23, 2005, 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM

Kay Bickham, COTPA Trustee, called the meeting to order. She welcomed the participants and introduced other community officials. A slide show was presented by Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner for Carter & Burgess, providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, methodology, technology alternatives, and preliminary corridor delineations. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments were received.

C: Could you go from Edmond to OKC? Where could you go from there?

R: The Edmond corridor would link Edmond and downtown Oklahoma City, with potential alignments along the existing BNSF rail line, the Broadway Extension, or I-35. The Edmond corridor could connect to other potential corridors at the central station in downtown OKC. For example, you might be able to travel from Edmond to downtown OKC and then continue to Norman, either on the same train or changing to another train depending on your arrival time and destination.

C: Glad to see that COTPA is looking at the feasibility for fixed guideway alternatives. The Portland corridor should be split up into the Edmond corridor and the NW corridor. The HOV lanes may be a good alternative for encouraging transit use in congested corridors, but it may be difficult to obtain use of right-of-way along the highway or railroad corridors.

C: NW Expressway would accommodate an at-grade level busway or light rail line. The ultimate system could be in an H pattern, with other routes extending along Quail Springs to I-44, Yukon to Tinker, and Edmond to Norman.

C: In Dallas each community had to agree to participate in the local sales tax for funding DART. Is this what will be needed here?

R: The Fixed Guideway Study will identify funding options. Most communities that have successfully implemented commuter rail or light rail transit have a dedicated source of funding, such as a sales tax.

Q: Transit is a public service. How do you change people's attitudes and perceptions?

A: Transit ridership on Edmond express buses is up 20% this year, which indicates there is increasing acceptance and demand for service.

C: Transit ridership will increase if more transportation options are provided. The real objective is for a multimodal system.

C: How do Portland and Salt Lake City make their transit systems work? In Portland, they had HOV 30 years ago. It helps to have a more aggressive society that sees transit as a good investment in the community's future.

C: Park and ride lots need to be part of the future system. It needs to be cheaper to ride public transportation. We need to study what they are doing in Dallas. There is an antique shop in Edmond that was the old Oklahoma railway office. If they did the Interurban railways 60 years ago we can do it now.

C: We need to look at the relocation of the I-40 Crosstown Expressway and consider a future plan for using the old right-of-way.

C: Will service be more frequent with a fixed guideway form of transit?

R: Yes, the system would likely offer headways of about 10 minutes at peak times and 20 minutes in off-peak times.

C: What is the timing for providing some type of fixed guideway transit service?

R: It takes about seven years to implement a New Starts project, if everything goes well. The time can be longer if there are delays in taking the necessary steps. When the study is completed, the COPTA Board will be in a better position to follow through with the recommendations.

C: Traffic is bad and people need to get with their elected officials to tell them that other options of transportation should be developed for the city. Progressive leaders are needed

Midwest City Public Library

Thursday, February 24, 2005, 12:00 P.M. to 1:30 P.M.

Larry Hopper, COTPA Transportation Planner, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and introduced other community officials. A slide show was presented by Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner for Carter & Burgess, providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, methodology, technology alternatives, and preliminary corridor delineations. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments were received.

C: Will the presentation be available online?

R: The presentation will be available for download on the Fixed Guideway Study website at www.okfgs.org.

C: Are streetcars feasible in downtown OKC?

R: The study will examine the feasibility of a downtown streetcar circulator system. There are old tracks that might be rehabilitated for a modern streetcar system.

C: What drives the need for this kind of study?

R: The study will look into the future, 20 or 30 years from now, to consider the future growth and identify changing transportation needs.

C: Over the course of these meetings, have you found any opposition to new methods of transportation? Do you find that people would rather invest this money into improving our current highways?

R: Overall, the response in the meetings thus far has been positive. People are concerned about funding but they recognize that in the future our highways will be more crowded and they realize we need to consider other feasible ways to approach our transportation needs.

C: It seems it would be counterproductive to put more money into continued expansion of the number of lanes in our existing roads.

R: Fixed guideway transit can provide more transportation choices in the future. It can relieve some of the travel demand for the highway and roadway network. Adding, BRT, commuter or light rail can carry passengers that would otherwise require more lanes on the freeway.

C: How much might it cost a consumer to use a light rail system?

R: In Dallas, the DART light rail fare averages about \$30 a month for daily travel to and from work.

C: Where is OKC in deciding what kind of transportation would be beneficial?

R: The Fixed Guideway Study will be a 12-14 month process and we are in the third month of the study.

C: Part of MAPS turned into the Downtown trolley buses but that hasn't provided the service needed. Could we have another MAPS to bring in Federal money to solve the transportation dilemma correctly?

R: We're at least 2 years away from the expiration of the MAPS for kids tax, but it could be possible. Some communities like Seattle and Houston have used local funding to do their rail transit projects without using matching Federal funds.

C: Will the study consider a light rail system out to Edmond?

R: We are looking at the region as a whole and trying to determine which alternative technology would benefit each of the potential corridors in the most effective way.

C: In regards to a HOV lane, how do you determine whether that's necessary?

R: We will look at the ridership forecasts and capital cost for the alternative technologies that are best suited for each corridor, to see which alternative might be more cost effective.

Meeting Report

PROJECT: 2004-04 Fixed Guideway Study

PROJECT NO.: 022845

Central Oklahoma Transportation and Parking Authority (COTPA)

PRESENT: Committee Members:

Sam Bowman, Ward 2 City Council, City of Oklahoma City
Rick Cain, COTPA
Myron Coleman, City-County Health
John Dugan, OKC Planning Director
Brett Hamm, Assistant to the Mayor, City of Oklahoma City
Harold Haralson, Mayor, City of Norman
Stan Inman, Chairman, Board of Commissioners
Steve Jones, Representative of Congressman Ernest Istook
Chris Kauffman, COTPA Chairman/The Insurance Center
Klay Kimker, Devon Energy
Hershel Lamirand, OU Medical Center
David Lopez, Downtown Okla. City Inc.
Rick Moore, Municipal Contractors Association
Gary Marrs, Ward 1 City Council, City of Oklahoma City
Paula Sanford, Edmond City Council
Dean Schirf, Greater Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce
Ira Schlezinger, Integris Health
David Streb, Oklahoma Department of Transportation
Richard Tanenbaum, Gardner/Tanenbaum Group
Zach Taylor, ACOG
James Thompson, OKC City Manager's Office
Mike Voorhees, S. OKC Chamber of Commerce Representative
John Yoeckel, At-Large Planning Commissioner, City of Oklahoma City

MEETING

DATE: 04/05/2005

Project Staff:

Larry Hopper, COTPA Project Manager
Tom Shelton, Carter & Burgess Project Manager
Renzi Stone, Saxum Strategic Communications
Sara Lashley, Saxum Strategic Communications
Mike McAnelly, Carter & Burgess
Lee Nichols, Carter & Burgess

Attendees/Guests:

Kay Bickham, COTPA Trustee
Dick Lee, COTPA Trustee
Scott Barrett, Legacy Engineering
Randy Entz, ACOG
Amy Ford, COTPA
Bill Hancock, Oklahoma County District 3
Linda Koenig, ACOG
Holly Massie, ACOG
Diponker Mukherjee, COTPA

The following is our understanding of the subject matter covered in this meeting. If this differs from your understanding, please notify us within five working days.

The April 5, 2005 meeting for the Central Oklahoma Transportation & Parking Authority (COTPA) Fixed Guideway Transit Study Steering Committee (TSSC) Meeting was held at the Presbyterian Health Foundation Conference Center located on 655 Research Parkway, Oklahoma City. The meeting began at 3:30 P.M. Handouts were made available and included the meeting agenda, meeting minutes from the public meetings held February 21-24, 2005, copy of the power point presentation, map packet – included the updated corridor map, 2000 and 2030 level of service, 2000 and 2030 population and employment density, 2000 land use, 2003 aerial, individual corridor maps, demographics analysis, peer city characteristics summary, and reports discussing transit oriented development and the related economic impacts.

1. **Opening Remarks** – Brett Hamm, assistant to Mick Cornett, Mayor of Oklahoma City, welcomed all in attendance. He apologized for the Mayor's absence and stressed that the Mayor thinks this is an important project and encourages all steering committee members stay actively involved in the project.
2. **Introductions** – Chris Kauffman, COTPA Chair, reiterated Mr. Hamm's welcome and thanked all steering committee members for their continued involvement in the project. Larry Hopper, COTPA project manager thanked all for attending.
3. **Results of February 21 – 25 Public Meetings** – Tom Shelton, Carter & Burgess Project Manager, summarized the seven public meetings that were held February 21 – 25, 2005. Meeting attendance was more than expected and the consultant team received a large volume of positive input regarding the project. A sample of the meeting comments included:
 - Strong support and recognition of the need for adequate public transit service
 - General interest in and support for future fixed guideway transit.
 - Place priority on making bus service improvements in concert with fixed guideway transit development.
 - Service must be convenient, comfortable, safe, and cost effective.
 - Emphasis on Central Area and the major commuter corridors
 - How do we pay for fixed guideway and other transit improvements?
4. **Results of March 15, 2005 Interagency Work Group Meeting** – Tom Shelton next discussed the results of the interagency work group meeting that was held at the offices of METRO Transit on March 15, 2005. Key staff from COTPA, ACOG, City of Oklahoma City, and ODOT were in attendance. The objective of the working meeting was to provide technical coordination and exchange data. The meeting was very successful and it helped the consultant team refine the corridors to be studied, and provided input on the future needs of the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area.
5. **Delineation of Corridors to be Studied** – Tom Shelton next presented to the steering committee the modified concept corridors that were a result of the public involvement process and interagency comments. These corridors will be evaluated to determine which fixed guideway technology (if any) will be appropriate for a given corridor. Some preliminary analysis had already been done regarding these corridors. Each steering committee member received in their handouts a demographic and land use break down of each corridor. Demographics included 2000 and 2030 employment and population densities, and 2000 land use breakdowns. Also included were maps of each corridor showing major employers, population and employment growth patterns (2000 and 2030), traffic congestion (2000 and 2030). Finally, statistics from other national fixed guideway transit projects were presented and how each city compared to the Oklahoma City Metropolitan area.

6. **Break-Out Session** – During the break out session, the four groups of steering committee members were asked to provide information regarding the following three topics:
- A. Review of Project Corridor Delineation
 - B. Key Activity Centers – Current and Future
 - C. Review of Corridor Evaluation Criteria

Table participants were encouraged to mark on the maps provided to show any corridor modifications, and any future or present activity centers that were not presently shown on the map. Also, each steering committee member was asked to rank their top five corridor evaluation criteria and provide the consultant team any input on the criteria itself. The members placed dots on a large plot to rank their top five criteria. During the report back of the break out session the results were presented.

7. **Report Back of Break-Out Session** – Each steering committee table elected a person to report back to the entire group the “main points” of their tables. Each table’s discussion is as follows:

A. **Table 1**

Corridors

- Bailey Corridor (new corridor) – I-44 South and Southwest to Tuttle/Newcastle Area
- Central Corridor – Consider stretching east to Eastern (NACC) and west to Meridian (Dell)
- Norman Corridor – should be broad/wide enough to embrace Sooner Road and extend north to I-240
- Westside I-44 Corridor – extend south to include Will Rogers World Airport

Activity Centers

- Consider adding major shopping malls/centers
- Check to see if following areas are included:
 - Quad Graphics
 - Dell
- Interview key civic leaders re: expected development/activities in OKC Downtown, Bricktown, Health Science area
- Check with OKC Planning – “Housing Market Study” (J. Dugan)
- Activity centers/maps: may want to depict locations that “generate” a lot of trips, even though number of employees are small (special generators)
- Look at concentration of public employees/activities e.g. Norman Civic Center Complex
- Should examine/map entire State Capitol Complex
- Hertz location on Memorial Road/Kilpatrick
- Silver Springs – Sprint/William Sonoma/Hartford, etc. (Northwest Expressway and Council)
- Express Personal – Home improvement stores in Northwest Highway Council area
- Gulfstream – at Wiley Post Airport (no longer at the location it is shown)

B. **Table 2**

- Percentage below poverty line/gas price; priority of assignments; mass transit needs to address lower income; age requirements, handicap requirements?
- Ridership? What is it? Breaking down demographics based on age; what is the profile of an average bus rider?
- Who rides the rails, what is the demographic?
- Is fixed guideway transit faster and cheaper?

- When will the region have sufficient population densities? We have to have the density; population dictates routes.
- Convention and downtown traffic facilitated from outside core; find school data.
- We will have at least half-million more people by 2030, 600,000 new homes by 2030 (380,000 people).
- Bothered by poverty line – priority according to income/need/use; is there a priority favoring older and disabled people?
- The current bus system has good ridership
- Are we considering demographics?
- Bus stops on Lincoln & 23rd have 5 to 7 people waiting at stops
- Salt Lake City has a very successful light rail system with the majority of it's riders being white color workers.
- Make sure to consider demographics; will \$65,000 and up ride?
- Areas of congestion
 - Broadway Extension – 23rd and Capitol to HSC
 - Northwest Expressway
- Is fixed guideway transit faster?
- Is fixed guideway transit less expensive?
- When will we have the density to have people ride transit?
- We don't manage our urban growth the way fixed guideway needs this – no patterns.
- We should respond to the growth, not “build and they will come”.
- Consider events like fair, Ford Center.
- If there were Light Rail along I-235 and I-40, how many jobs and residents would we hit/miss?

C. Table 3

Activity Centers

- Oklahoma River is about one mile south of downtown, and Dell is to be the first of many traffic generators.
- Santa Fe terminal.
- Norman to Edmond travel (especially football games).
- Low level of activities in East 23rd corridor.
- Retail development for I-240 corridor.
- Increase bus service along Meridian and to Airport (Westside I-44 Corridor).
- Hobby Lobby warehouse and manufacturing center west of Airport.

Review of Corridor

- Why a little bubble for Airport Corridor?
- Kilpatrick and Westside I-44 Corridors make sense.
- Why Norman and Edmond Corridors not one corridor?
- Light rail might be considered in the following corridors:
 - Edmond
 - Norman
 - Midwest City/Tinker
 - Airport
- Bus Rapid Transit might be considered in the following corridors:
 - Norman
 - Edmond

- Kilpatrick
- Northwest OKC has lots of growth, so it needs to be included; maybe for bus rapid transit.
- I-240 corridor could be extended eastward to include residential development east of Tinker AFB.

Evaluation Criteria

- Criteria are satisfactory.
- Oklahoma has lower citizen tolerance for congestion.

D. Table 4

- Is corridor width an issue?
- How much of the total area of OKC are covered by corridors?
- Would width of corridors include core service area?
- Corridors should represent the most efficient route to get people where they want to go.
- Feeder bus system will be part of the fixed guideway system.
- Mary Mahoney Health Center is in 23rd corridor.
- Hispanic population from the south Oklahoma City area comes to Mary Mahoney Health Center.
- Need to see trip origin/destination information.
- Historic perspective of OKC area development should be considered.
- Airport renovation will enhance the image of OKC, but not expected to increase employment.
- The CBD area to the Medical Center and Capitol will continue to gain many jobs.
- Edmond will develop along I-35 corridor.
- MROTC – I-235 corridor – (Tinker AFB planned expansion) must be considered as a location of tremendous employment growth.
- FAA facility near airport is growing and is an important activity center.
- More development in Kilpatrick corridor.
- Finding a corridor with good fare box return will be difficult.
- Light rail is difficult to justify cost wise in a spread out region like ours.

The top five evaluation criteria as picked by the steering committee are:

- Criteria #8 – Capital Costs (23 dots)
- Criteria #1 – Ability to Satisfy Operation and Service Levels (21 dots)
- Criteria #9 – Operating and Maintenance Costs (20 dots)
- Criteria #5 – Compatibility with Existing Infrastructure (14 dots)
- Criteria #3 – Compatibility with Local Land Use and Environmental Plans (12 dots)

8. **Future Steering Committee Meeting and Final Comments** – Tom Shelton again thanked everyone for coming and asked them to mark June 28, 2005 late afternoon on their calendars for the next Steering Committee meeting. Larry Hopper mentioned that another public meeting will be held in downtown Oklahoma City. Further information will be provided later. The meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Public Meeting Report

PROJECT: Fixed Guideway Study, Central Oklahoma Transportation and Parking Authority (COTPA)

PROJECT NO.: 023144.010.001

PRESENT: See attached sign-in sheets

DATE: June 14-16, 2005 and July 7, 2005

The following is our understanding of the subject matter covered in this meeting. If this differs from your understanding, please notify us within five working days.

The second series of seven public meetings was conducted at various locations dispersed across the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area over a period of three days, from June 14-16, 2005 and July 7, 2005. The purpose of the meetings was to provide an update about the Fixed Guideway Study and to obtain input regarding alternative fixed guideway transit technologies and potential alignment concepts for each of the project corridors. The following handouts were made available to meeting participants: Meeting Agenda, *Pathways* May 2005 newsletter, Comment Card, Land Use map, and Existing Transit Service map. The public comments received from the meetings are documented for each meeting location in the following sections of this meeting record.

Norman Library, 225 N. Webster Ave., Norman -- Tuesday, June 14, 2005, 12:00 PM to 1:30 PM

Harold Haralson, Mayor of the City of Norman, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and introduced other community officials. A slide show was presented by Tom Shelton, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, providing an update of the Fixed Guideway Study. Tom reviewed the results from the February 21-25, 2005 public meetings. He reviewed some of the previous public meeting comments, revised delineation of concept corridors, 2030 population and employment densities, 2000 Land Use, 2030 traffic congestion and level of service (LOS). Tom then reviewed the corridors, evaluation criterion, travel demand, and applicable potential fixed guideway technologies for the corridors. Subsequent to the presentation, breakout tables were formed. Meeting participants were encouraged to provide comments and mark up maps pertaining to technology preferences in their corresponding corridor. The following comments were received from participants in the meeting.

- Public transportation should utilize the most cost effective alternatives.
- Historically, the Norman and Oklahoma City area has a well developed interurban rail transit system, which should be considered as a model for possible re-introduction of fixed guideway transit for the area.
- The Bus Rapid Transit technology alternative should include consideration of adding new lanes to I-35 between Norman and Oklahoma City.
- Bus Rapid Transit seems to be an attractive option because stations could be located at points encircling Norman:
 - North side of Norman
 - West at W.24th and Main
 - East at E. 24th and Main

- On the OU campus
 - South on HWY 9
 - Add a seasonal stop for football games or special events at the University
- Would like to look at Commuter Rail going from Oklahoma City to Norman (or even further south to Purcell or Noble) with a downtown central hub in both Norman and Oklahoma City
 - Need a station by Crossroads Mall
 - Norman stop should be at the downtown Norman rail station - make it a central hub connecting to bus routes, hike and bike trails, and commuter parking.
- Need to improve the existing bus system!
 - Current bus system is not sufficient for people living outside zone 2
 - Handicap riders must call a van to get a ride somewhere – demand responsive service
 - Need more frequent buses (it is an hour wait now)
 - Need more wheelchair seating on buses; some wheelchair riders have to wait for another bus because the handicap seating is taken
- Light rail or streetcar stations should be located near the Health Science Center, Oklahoma State Capitol campus, and Downtown
- Need a transit hub at a location in downtown Norman like the Santa Fe Station
- Union Station in Oklahoma City has more available land for redevelopment around it; not as congested as the Santa Fe terminal near Bricktown in OKC.
- Historic transit service should be considered, recognizing the Interurban trolley lines that once served the area.
- New rail transit could be less expensive by using the existing rail right-of-way.
- The Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway is considering adding a second main line for their own freight rail use. Additional capacity may be necessary for commuter rail use. Additional tracks could be shared for use by freight and commuter rail.
- May need to consider widening the existing railroad right-of-way to accommodate both freight and commuter rail.
- Park & Ride station locations can be at OU, HSC, State Capitol, Downtown, at Hwy 9 & BNSF RR, and at Tecumseh & BNSF RR.
- Light Rail Transit might be easier to implement than Commuter Rail since LRT could utilize the streets right-of-way.
- Availability of locations for a park and ride station is difficult between the new Research Park and the OU campus.
- Improved bus service would be a better possibility than Bus Rapid Transit.
- Something other than regular bus service should be considered which does not use existing roads/streets, because of busy traffic causing congestion on the roadways during peak periods.
- Hwy 9 gets lots of traffic. Hwy 9 east of Hwy 77 needs to have improved bus service.
- Light Rail Transit can save fuel costs because it is electrically powered.
- Light Rail Transit can use existing street right-of-way to connect between places. That's why it can be very effective in this corridor.
- A commuter rail connection should be established between Tinker AFB and the northern portion of the Norman-Oklahoma City corridor. I-240 is the connecting route between I-35 and Tinker AFB.
- The cost of constructing Light Rail Transit is very high compared to the improved bus, Bus Rapid Transit, or Commuter Rail options.
- Travel patterns/times should be considered in order to plan the network of alignments for the fixed guideway system.

- Southwest Norman is designated as the future growth area.
- Commuter Rail Transit (CRT) could extend south to Purcell with varying stations. Union Station is too far from CBD so the downtown Oklahoma City station should be located at the Santa Fe Depot.
- Double track should extend all the way between Norman and Oklahoma City with a third track added at some locations.
- HOV lanes would require new lanes to be added to I-35.
- Union Station would be a desirable intermodal site serving the central Oklahoma City area.

Belle Isle Public Library, 5501 N. Villa Ave., Oklahoma City --Tuesday, June 14, 2005, 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM

Larry Hopper called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and introduced other community officials. A slide show was presented by Tom Shelton, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, providing an update of the Fixed Guideway Study. Tom reviewed the results from the February 21-25, 2005 public meetings. He reviewed some of the previous public meeting comments, revised delineation of concept corridors, 2030 population and employment densities, 2000 Land Use, 2030 traffic congestion and level of service (LOS). Tom then reviewed the concept corridors, evaluation criteria, travel demand, and applicable potential fixed guideway technologies for the corridors. Subsequent to the presentation, breakout tables were formed. Meeting participants were encouraged to provide comments and mark up maps pertaining to technology and alignment preferences in their corresponding corridor. The following comments were received.

- It is logical to use history as our guide. There used to be Interurban rail lines that went through Yukon. We should start in the central area and then expand outward to the surrounding areas.
- Don't think people will ride buses, but Light Rail has more appeal.
- Northwest Highway has a good median that should be taken advantage of.
- Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) would be a good solution for the Northwest Corridor.
- We need to get acceptance by providing good bus service that will get people on board. People are married to their automobiles - idea to fix that would be to reduce availability or increase cost of downtown parking.
- Need to improve current bus system with more frequent service and expanded routes.
- Consider putting Bus Rapid Transit on Broadway Extension, Hefner Parkway, and Yukon Corridor
- CRT can use the existing right-of-way - Yukon to Oklahoma City downtown.
- LRT is more expensive than CRT, though it is more attractive
- HOV lane can be implemented along I-40 from Yukon to downtown Oklahoma City.
- Environmental study needs to be done to find out impact of noise and safety issues.
- These CRT or HOV will include employment areas along South Meridian - south of I-40.
- Park and Ride locations: Mustang Road, Meridian, Rockwell, Fairgrounds.
Westside I-44 Corridor
- Utilize the highway right-of-way
- Hefner Parkway & I-44 need some kind of HOV lanes to control traffic
- NW of Oklahoma City is having rapid growth
Northwest Corridor
- NW Expressway is a six-lane roadway with a wide median.
- BRT can be implemented along the median.

Edmond Public Library, 10 S. Boulevard, Edmond -- Wednesday, June 15, 2005, 12:00 PM to 1:30 PM

Larry Hopper called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and introduced other community officials. A slide show was presented by Mike McAnelly, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, providing an update of the Fixed Guideway Study. Mike reviewed the results from the February 21-25, 2005 public meetings. He reviewed some of the previous public meeting comments, revised delineation of concept corridors, 2030 population and employment densities, 2000 Land Use, 2030 traffic congestion and level of service (LOS). Mike then reviewed the corridors, evaluation criteria, travel demand, and applicable potential fixed guideway technologies for the corridors. Subsequent to the presentation, breakout tables were formed. Meeting participants were encouraged to provide comments and mark up maps pertaining to technology preferences and potential alignments in their corresponding corridor. The following comments were received.

- Most of the people who live in Edmond don't work in Edmond.
- 87% of University of Central Oklahoma students commute.
- More bus routes should be provided around the University of Central Oklahoma campus.
- HOV or Light rail should be considered down the Broadway Extension or Commuter Rail along the existing BNSF tracks
- Improved Bus is needed along 2nd Street.
- Whatever technology is used, it needs to go far enough North to reach the MAC senior center with a station somewhere between Covell and Sorghum Mill.
- Would be ideal to go as far north as Guthrie with Commuter Rail service.
- Should be a station or stop on Britton, 63rd, or at I-44 and 23rd street ending in downtown Edmond.
- BRT alignment should be considered along either Eastern/MLK or Sooner
- BRT alignment should also be considered along Kilpatrick or Memorial
- Traffic congestion occurs during peak periods along Memorial and Pennsylvania.
- Streetcar should be considered in Downtown Oklahoma City.
- Light Rail technology could consider alignments along Hefner Parkway and I-35 instead of along the Broadway Extension.

Rose State College, Student Union Raider Room, 6420 SE 15th St., Midwest City -- Wednesday, June 15, 2005 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM

Larry Hopper called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and introduced other community officials. A slide show was presented by Mike McAnelly, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, providing an update of the Fixed Guideway Study. Mike reviewed the results from the February 21-25, 2005 public meetings. He reviewed some of the previous public meeting comments, revised delineation of concept corridors, 2030 population and employment densities, 2000 Land Use, 2030 traffic congestion and level of service (LOS). Mike then reviewed the corridors, evaluation criterion, travel demand, and applicable potential fixed guideway technologies for the corridors. Subsequent to the presentation, breakout tables were formed. Meeting participants were encouraged to provide comments and mark up maps pertaining to technology preferences and potential alignments in their corresponding corridor. The following comments were received.

- The proposed Midwest City Comprehensive Plan includes participating in future transit improvements and includes preserving the UPRR corridor for future fixed guideway transit. Midwest City wants to be “on board” for transit. The abandoned UPRR corridor could be considered for hike/bike trail until it is used for fixed mass transit.
- Stations for Bus Rapid Transit, Commuter Rail or Light Rail should be considered at Tinker AFB, Midwest/15th and the Del City feedstore on Reno.
- Improved Bus Service should be considered with commuter rail or other fixed guideway service along the UPRR alignment.
- Shuttle bus service should be considered to the Reed Center, 29th, and Tinker AFB.
- High Occupancy Vehicle lanes could be considered along I-40.
- Bus Rapid Transit could be considered along Sooner Road between Norman and I-44.
- High density locations should be evaluated to determine where stations should be located.
- Midwest City and Del City area population is concentrated in the area between Reno and I-240, and between Douglas and I-35. Sooner Road is in center and suffers from traffic congestion due to development.
- Concern whether Light Rail would be suitable to damage by tornados and severe winds in OKC area. Overhead electrical wiring would need to be designed for local weather conditions. In the long run, cost for repair and rebuilding might outweigh/overshadow cost savings by LRT.
- Life cycle and cost effectiveness for Bus Rapid Transit versus Light Rail Transit should be considered in choosing preferred technology alternatives.
- How much reduction in traffic congestion results from Light Rail or Commuter Rail?

Kiwanis Club Meeting, Santa Fe Cattle Company Restaurant, 1445 SW 74th St., Oklahoma City -- Thursday, June 16, 2005, 12:00 PM to 1:30 PM

Larry Hopper called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and introduced other community officials. A slide show was presented by Mike McAnelly, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, providing an update of the Fixed Guideway Study. Mike reviewed the results from the February 21-25, 2005 public meetings. He reviewed some of the previous public meeting comments, revised delineation of concept corridors, 2030 population and employment densities, 2000 Land Use, 2030 traffic congestion and level of service (LOS). Mike then reviewed the corridors, evaluation criterion, travel demand, and applicable potential fixed guideway technologies for the corridors. Subsequent to the presentation, breakout tables were formed. Meeting participants were encouraged to provide comments and mark up maps pertaining to technology preferences in their corresponding corridor. The following comments were received.

- Live near the intersection of Northwest Highway and Kessler Road – like the idea of fixed guideway transit along the Northwest Highway corridor. The area needs better bus service.
- Funding is the most important issue. What will be the most cost effective option?
- Rubber-tired trolley service used to operate along Meridian connecting to the Cowboy Hall of Fame. The service was discontinued because it did not transport sufficient riders in comparison to other Metro Transit routes.
- Would like to see express bus service to Remington Race Track and Casino.
- Sidewalk improvements are needed so that pedestrians can walk to bus stops.
- Need more frequent buses and improved bus service.
- Many south OKC neighborhoods have no sidewalks, so people walking (or people in wheelchair) are exposed to safety hazard in getting to bus stops.

- Avoid requiring too many transfers between buses and fixed guideway service.
- There used to be a trolley system that went by the zoo and Remington Park. There needs to be transit service from Remington (because of its expansion) to the hotel district along Meridian and to Will Rogers World Airport.
- Need transit service to the airport, to Norman for football games, and to Crossroads Mall.

**Ralph Ellison Public Library, 2000 NE 23rd St., Oklahoma City
Thursday, June 16, 2005, 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM**

Larry Hopper called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and introduced other community officials. A slide show was presented by Mike McAnelly, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, providing an update of the Fixed Guideway Study. Mike reviewed the results from the February 21-25, 2005 public meetings. He reviewed some of the previous public meeting comments, revised delineation of concept corridors, 2030 population and employment densities, 2000 Land Use, 2030 traffic congestion and level of service (LOS). Mike then reviewed the corridors, evaluation criterion, travel demand, and applicable potential fixed guideway technologies for the corridors. Subsequent to the presentation, breakout tables were formed. Meeting participants were encouraged to provide comments and mark up maps pertaining to technology preferences and potential alignments in their corresponding corridor. The following comments were received.

- People in Nichols Hills won't use transit; service should be provided in low income areas.
- Park and ride service needs to provide enough parking spaces that are not pay-parking.
- Can we afford the expense of operating a fancier transit system? Need to focus on improving the bus system to provide more frequent bus service.
- Ridership varies -- some days there are 50 people on the bus and some days there are only 5.
- Need to keep what we have and improve it; not add more expensive technologies
- Consider Commuter Rail along existing railroad tracks.
- Can we use the existing railroad tracks where the new army center near N.E. 36th, or is it too close?
- Utilize the abandoned railroad tracks for Commuter Rail
- Need adequate parking at stations or people won't use Commuter Rail.
- Need adequate bus service.
- Need closer bus stops, so elderly will not have to walk 3 or 4 blocks.
- Need transit service to the airport.
- Need to pick a hub that has lots of room around it
- Need to increase frequency of bus service and decrease the time people are waiting on buses.
- Consider Light Rail along Military St. from about N.W. 23rd to N.W. 50th.
- Worried about how to fund it -- service needs to be cost effective
- Centennial bus is always packed
- Consider High Occupancy Vehicle lane on Broadway Extension and along Reno.
- Include improved bus service all the way to the City of Spencer

**McAlpine Center, 428 W. California, Oklahoma City -- Thursday, July 7,
2005, 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM**

(To be added subsequent to the scheduled meeting date.)

Meeting Report

PROJECT: 2004-05 Fixed Guideway Study
Central Oklahoma Transportation and Parking Authority (COTPA)

PROJECT NO.: 023144

PRESENT: Committee Members:

Mick Cornett, Mayor, City of Oklahoma City
Harold Haralson, Mayor, City of Norman
Hershel Lamirand, OU Health Center Foundation
David Lopez, Downtown Oklahoma City, Inc.
Gary Marrs, Ward 1 City Council
Paula Sanford, Edmond City Council
Dean Schirf, Greater Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce
Zach Taylor, ACOG
James Thompson, City Manager's Office Oklahoma City
Amy Underwood, Oklahoma City Beautiful Representative
Mike Voorhees, South Oklahoma City Chamber Representative
John Yoeckel, At-Large Planning Commissioner

MEETING

DATE: 06/28/2005

Project Staff:

Rick Cain, COTPA METRO Transit
Larry Hopper, COTPA METRO Transit
Diponker Mukherjee, COTPA METRO Transit
Tom Shelton, Carter & Burgess, Inc.
Mike McAnelly, Carter & Burgess, Inc.
Lee Nichols, Carter & Burgess, Inc.
Renzi Stone, Saxum Strategic Communications
Sara Lashley, Saxum Strategic Communications
Scott Barrett, Legacy Engineering

Attendees/Guests:

Kim Cooper-Hart, City of Oklahoma City
Randy Entz, ACOG
David Fotouhi, Congressman Istook's Office
Marc Hader, Oklahoma County, District 3
Steve Hofener, TEC
Brice Kovnegary, Congressman Cole's Office
Dick Lee, COTPA
Holly Massie, ACOG
Doug Rex, ACOG

The following is our understanding of the subject matter covered in this meeting. If this differs from your understanding, please notify us within five working days.

The June 28, 2005 meeting for the Central Oklahoma Transportation & Parking Authority (COTPA) Fixed Guideway Transit Study Steering Committee (TSSC) Meeting was held at the Presbyterian Health Foundation Conference Center located at 655 Research Parkway, Oklahoma City. The meeting began at 3:00 PM. Handouts were made available and included the meeting agenda; and meeting minutes from the public meetings held June 14 – 16, 2005. The handouts also included a map packet including the potential fixed guideway alignments for further analysis, potential bus rapid transit alignments for further analysis, potential commuter rail alignments for further analysis, potential streetcar alignments for further analysis, and potential downtown alignments for further analysis. Committee members also received a copy of the the May 2005 Newsletter, and the Draft Corridor Technology Evaluation report.

1. **Opening Remarks** – Honorable Mick Cornett, Mayor of Oklahoma City, welcomed all in attendance. He thanked everyone for attending and reminded everyone of the importance of this study to the Oklahoma City Metropolitan area and requested that all members keep actively involved in the project.
2. **Introductions** – Dick Lee, COTPA, reiterated Mayor Cornett’s welcome and thanked all steering committee members for their continued involvement in the project. He talked briefly about the recent passing of steering committee member and COTPA Trustee Odell Smith.
3. **Results of June 14 – 16 Public Meetings** – Tom Shelton, Carter & Burgess Project Manager, summarized the six public meetings that where held June 14 – 16, 2005. Meeting attendance was more then expected and the consultant team received a large volume of positive input regarding the project. Public notice for the meetings included use of a “robocall” system to leave voice mail messages for more than 3,000 residences within the zip code areas where the meetings were held. Many of the meeting attendees indicated they had learned about the meetings from the phone message. Tom mentioned that on July 7, 2005, there will be a city-wide public meeting at the McAlpine Center from 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM and encouraged everyone to attend. The final meeting in the second round of public meetings will be a report back to citizens on the potential alignments and station areas that were identified based on the citizen input received during the previous six public meetings.
4. **Results of June 21, 2005 Interagency Work Group Meeting** – Tom Shelton next discussed the results of the interagency work group meeting that was held at the offices of METRO Transit on June 21, 2005. Key staffs from COTPA, ACOG, City of Oklahoma City, and ODOT were in attendance. The objective of the working meeting was to provide technical coordination and exchange data. The meeting was very successful and it helped the consultant team refine the alignments for further analysis, and provided input on the future needs of the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area. Item discussed included ridership forecast methodology, corridor alignment concepts, downtown development plans, I-40 crosstown relocation, and potential HOV application.
5. **Corridor Alternative Technologies and Alignment Concepts** –
 - *Corridor Delineation* – Tom Shelton discussed the revised delineation of the Concept Corridors. The final corridors include the central area, seven radial corridors, and three cross-town corridors.
 - *Travel Demand and Ridership Potential* – To determine the ridership in each corridor Tom Shelton discussed the first step in the modeling effort which is to determine the 2030 travel

demand for each corridor. From the preliminary results the top three corridors are the Norman, Edmond, and Westside I-44 corridors.

- *Alternative Fixed Guideway Transit Technologies* – Mike McAnelly, Carter & Burgess Senior Planner, discussed the various fixed guideway technologies that the consultant team will be analyzing for the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area. Technologies discussed were Improved Bus, HOV/Managed Lanes, Bus Rapid Transit, Commuter Rail and Light Rail Transit or Modern Streetcar. For each technology the characteristics were given and also the preliminary results of the technology evaluation. He also described that Heavy Rail and Monorail have been eliminated for consideration in the study.
- *Alternative Alignments and Station Areas* – Mike McAnelly presented the committee the conceptual alternative alignments for the respective technologies within each corridor. The maps depicted potential commuter rail, bus rapid transit, light rail/streetcar, and HOV/managed lanes.

6. **Break-Out Session** – During the break out session, the four groups of steering committee members were asked to review and comment on the following:

- A. Alternative Technologies
- B. Alternative Alignments
- C. Stations Areas

Table participants were encouraged to mark on the maps provided to show any potential alignment modifications, possible station areas, and to provide information on any alternative route or technology that was not currently shown.

7. **Report Back of Break-Out Session** – Each steering committee table elected a person to report back to the entire group the “main points” of their tables. A summary of the comments are as follows:

- Are there plans to extend the lines beyond those shown on the maps?
 - That is possible and will be considered in future analysis.
- The lunch time trolley to Bricktown is profitable since the frequency was increased.
- What will the size of the light rail or commuter rail parking lots be like?
 - Parking lot size is based on ridership analysis to estimate parking demands. It is designed by the amount of right-of-way that is available. The size will vary to meet the expected parking demand for riders.. Station parking lots may be a joint use with shared parking for surrounding land uses.
- Congestion may not be an issue when the construction on IH 35 is complete.
 - When looking at traffic congestion one needs to look at 2030 traffic congestion and not just in the immediate future.
- Transfers need to be convenient and easy. A seamless transit system is the objective.
- *Commuter Rail*
 - The industrial rail spur along Ann Arbor off the BNSF line in west Oklahoma City should be considered for commuter rail.
 - A lot of commuters come from the Shawnee/Tecumseh area to Tinker AFB. Maybe the commuter rail line could be extended to the east to accommodate these commuters.
 - What are the additional costs in relation to commuter rail?
 - Track upgrades and improved crossing protection
 - Improved RR signals and train control system
 - Purchasing of commuter rail vehicles

- Construction of commuter rail stations
- Look at extending commuter rail service to connect to the Airport.
- In Norman, there is not adequate parking on Main St. or downtown. Suggest having a commuter rail station at the Lloyd Noble Center because it has lots of parking.
- We need commuter rail in the following order:
 - Norman Corridor
 - Edmond Corridor
 - Midwest City/Tinker Corridor
- Add a station at Memorial Road
- Add a station at 63rd Street instead of Britton Road.

- *Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)*

- Will the bus rapid transit (BRT) have pull-outs for buses?
 - This will be determined on a station by station basis in a future study.
- Move the line along Martin Luther King to the West.
- Have a line that goes along Memorial in the Westside I-44 corridor.

- *Light Rail Transit/Streetcar*

- Needs to go to 13th as shown
- Needs to connect with Saint Anthony's Hospital (possible along 10th Street) – all groups mentioned this
- Need more stops and routes in OU Medical Center area.
- Add a line on Robinson
- Move line to Reno vs. the IH-40 boulevard – two groups mentioned this
- Connect to Fairgrounds, its used about 200 days a year for different events
- Line at 10th Street is better than 13th Street
- Line at 4th Street is better than 6th Street
- OU Medical Center currently has shuttles.

8. **Future Steering Committee Meeting and Final Comments** – Tom Shelton again thanked everyone for coming and asked them to tentatively mark September 13 and September 20, 2005 from 3:00 PM to 5:00 PM as the next Steering Committee meeting, and to send a message to tom.shelton@c-b.com indicating which date is better for their schedule. The selected date will be confirmed via e-mail to all the committee members later. Larry Hopper reiterated that a city-wide public meeting will be held July 7, 2005 at the McAlpine Center from 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM. The meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

REPORTED BY: Tom Shelton, Project Manager

Public Meeting Report

PROJECT: Fixed Guideway Study,
Central Oklahoma
Transportation and Parking
Authority (COTPA)

PROJECT NO.: 023144.010.001

PRESENT: See attached sign-in sheets

DATE: July 7, 2005

The following is our understanding of the subject matter covered in this meeting. If this differs from your understanding, please notify us within five working days.

The second series of seven public meetings concluded with this meeting held on Thursday July 7, 2005 from 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM at the McAlpine Center located at 428 W. California, in Oklahoma City. Six meetings were conducted previously on June 14-16, 2005 at various locations around the metropolitan area. The purpose of the public meetings was to provide an update about the Fixed Guideway Study and to obtain input regarding alternative fixed guideway transit alignments for each of the corridors. The following handouts were made available to meeting participants: Meeting Agenda, *Pathways* May 2005 newsletter, and Comment Card. Draft alignment maps of commuter rail, bus rapid transit, light rail streetcar and downtown alignments were displayed on the wall and laid out on each meeting table for review and comment by the attendees.

The meeting began at 6:30 PM with an open house where participants were able to get refreshments and view the displays. Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner for Carter & Burgess, called the meeting to order and welcomed the participants and introduced other community officials. A slide show was presented that provided an update of the Fixed Guideway Study. Mike reviewed the results from the June 14 – 16, 2005 public meetings. He reviewed the revised delineation of concept corridors, evaluation criteria, projected future travel patterns, and applicable potential fixed guideway technologies for the corridors. On each of the table tops, maps were displayed that depicted the alignments for further study for commuter rail, bus rapid transit (BRT), and light rail/modern streetcar alignments. Meeting participants were encouraged to provide comments and mark up maps to show their comments and ideas for the technology preferences and potential alignments. The following comments were received.

- How will the planned IH 40 Crosstown Relocation affect the study?
 - IH 40 would affect both HOV and commuter rail. The design of Crosstown IH 40 would potentially accommodate an HOV lane. Currently the project is in final design and ODOT plans to leave one or two of the existing rail lines in place on the south side of Union Station, which could accommodate commuter rail.

- How will the results of this study affect rural transportation needs?
 - Whether a fixed guideway alternative is applicable in a corridor or not, improved bus service will be a system-wide improvement as a result. All fixed guideway technologies should include a feeder bus system that will transport people to and from the transit station, serving the surrounding area. All service will be in

compliance with ADA regulations. Rural areas with low population density are typically served by rural transportation providers, including demand responsive service. This is a specialized service for rural areas that can be provided by various different service agencies with federal and state assistance. It can be coordinated with METRO Transit service to provide convenient transfers.

- Why isn't the current METRO Transit service better?
 - It's all about funding. The question that needs to be asked is "what are people willing to pay in order to obtain better transit service?" One of the results of the study will be to provide METRO Transit with recommendations for fixed guideway transit service and funding options to pay for it.. With more funding, better service will be available.
- What is the role of the Steering Committee?
 - The steering committee was appointed by COTPA and consists of community leaders from around the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area. The goal of the steering committee is to be the advisory board for the Fixed Guideway Study. The steering committee members are listed on the back of the *Pathways* Newsletter
- Are there any hybrid transit technologies that can operated at a lower cost and still spur economic development?
 - BRT is a good example of this. It is a rubber-tired vehicle that operates like light rail transit. It has a lower cost and a high level of service, and has a distinctive quality of "not just another bus." BRT vehicles have low floors, wide doors, big windows, off-board fare collection, signal preemption, and other passenger amenities more typical of rail passenger vehicles than buses. BRT operates on a fixed guideway that can be a dedicated lane on a highway, or a separate right of way.
- Can BRT vehicles share the road with cars or do they have to operate in a separate guideway?
 - The answer is both. BRT vehicles can operate in existing traffic or in their own dedicated guideway. It's all a matter of design and the desired level of service.
- Have you studied the affect of ridership depending on appearance, i.e. advertising on buses?
 - Lots of research has been done regarding this issue. Advertising on buses is a source of revenue for transit agencies and is in common practice around the nation.
- Vehicle designs that are more modern with low floors and large windows are more attractive.
- Will the stations have areas for taxi pickup and will they be accessible for the disabled?
 - Stations will include areas for transfers to buses, taxi's and personal vehicles. All stations are required by federal law to be ADA compliant.

- Will a ramp or elevator be provided at the stations to provide access to the platforms?
 - Yes, if the station design requires these. The platforms must be ADA accessible.

- What environmental factors will you be looking at?
 - Environmental issues considered will include features such as air quality, jurisdictional waters (include lakes, streams, wetlands), impacts to low income and minority populations, impacts to parks and historical structures. For a system feasibility study like this project, the environmental analysis is just sufficient to establish that there is not a “fatal flaw” for the recommended improvements. Before a project can be built, a full environmental analysis would need to be completed. This would be accomplished by preparing either an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement. All environmental studies will follow the guidelines set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other pertinent laws and regulations.

- What about the storm impacts of tornados to the overhead catenary lines for light rail vehicles?
 - Potential wind shear and other impacts would be considered in design of any future facilities. This technology is used throughout the world and is successful in a variety of climatic settings.

- Harrah, in the Midwest City/Tinker Corridor, is a growing area and deserves a station.

- With all the changes taking place downtown, would BRT be a better option because you could change the routes?
 - Both BRT and LRT/Streetcar are being analyzed to determine which technology, if either, would be a better fit for downtown Oklahoma City. BRT is sometime considered as a first phase of fixed guideway service, to be followed later by Light Rail or other improvements when the ridership demand increases to warrant a higher level of service.

- Commuter Rail seems to go where there are existing railroad lines. Would you consider building additional lines?
 - Commuter Rail is designed to operate within existing freight rail corridors. New track may be built as a parallel track to existing freight lines or to provide short connectors. It is generally cost prohibitive to acquire new right-of-way and build new rail.

- How willing will the study be to include stops at community colleges, i.e. Oklahoma City Community College and Rose State?
 - Community colleges are major destination points and will be looked at for the potential of fixed guideway service.

Mike McAnelly thanked everyone for coming out and providing their input. He reminded attendees that comments and information are also available on the website at okfgs.org. The meeting adjourned at 8:00 PM.

Meeting Report

PROJECT: 2004-05 Fixed Guideway Study

PROJECT NO.: 023144

Central Oklahoma Transportation and Parking Authority (COTPA)

PRESENT: Steering Committee Members:

Bill Case, OK House District 95
John Dugan, City of Oklahoma City
Harold Haralson, City of Norman
Chris Kauffman, The Insurance Center
Hershel Lamirand, OU Medical Center
Dick Lee, COTPA
Rick Moore, Municipal Contractors Association
Ford Price, Price Edwards & Co.
David Streb, ODOT
James Thompson, City of Oklahoma City
Amy Underwood, Oklahoma City Beautiful
Mike Voorhees, South Oklahoma City Chamber

MEETING

DATE: 09/20/2005

Project Staff:

Scott Barrett, Legacy Engineering
Rick Cain, COTPA
Larry Hopper, COTPA
Sara Lashley, Saxum Strategic Communications
Mike McAnelly, Carter & Burgess
Diponker Mukherjee, COTPA
Lee Nichols, Carter & Burgess
Tom Shelton, Carter & Burgess

Surrogates for Committee Members and Attendees/Guests:

Randy Entz, ACOG
Marc Hader, Oklahoma County
Pam Harkey, Congressman Istook's Office
Holly Massie, ACOG
Mike Ogan, Greater Oklahoma City Chamber
Doug Rex, ACOG
M. Wensel, Devon Corp.

The following is our understanding of the subject matter covered in this meeting. If this differs from your understanding, please notify us within five working days.

The September 20, 2005 meeting for the Central Oklahoma Transportation & Parking Authority (COTPA) Fixed Guideway Transit Study Steering Committee (TSSC) Meeting was held at the Presbyterian Health Foundation Conference Center located at 655 Research Parkway, Oklahoma City. The meeting began at 4:00 PM. Handouts were made available and included the meeting agenda and meeting minutes from the steering committee meeting held June 28, 2005. The handouts also included the presentation and a map packet including the potential fixed guideway alignments for further analysis, enhanced bus concept, potential bus rapid transit alignments for further analysis, potential commuter rail alignments for further analysis, and downtown streetcar alignments for further analysis. Committee members also received a copy of the September 2005 Newsletter, and the COTPA Fixed Guideway Study Guiding Principles.

1. **Welcome and Overview** – Chris Kauffman, COTPA Board Chairman, welcomed all in attendance. He thanked everyone for attending and reminded everyone of the importance of this study to the Oklahoma City Metropolitan area and requested that all members keep actively involved in the project.
2. **Purpose and Objectives of Study** – Tom Shelton, Carter & Burgess Project Manager, presented an overview of the purpose and objectives of the study, which were previously discussed and adopted during the first Steering Committee meeting on December 14, 2004. The purpose and objectives of the study are :
 - Identify, evaluate, and recommend a set of fixed guideway transit investment options;
 - Strengthen connections to the region’s employment and activity centers;
 - Identify unique opportunities for a fixed guideway system that offers the Oklahoma City area potential transportation solutions;
 - Improve connections among the region’s growth centers;
 - Enhance economic development opportunities;
 - Improve mobility, expand transportation options, and improve air quality;
 - Adhere to FGS Guiding Principles.
3. **Results of the September 13, 2005 Interagency Work Group Meeting** – Mr. Shelton next discussed the results of the interagency work group meeting that was held at the offices of METRO Transit on September 13, 2005. Key staff members from COTPA, ACOG, City of Oklahoma City, and ODOT were in attendance. The objective of the meeting was to provide technical coordination and exchange data. Items discussed during the meeting included ridership forecasts, capital cost estimates, and other preliminary findings.
4. **Ridership Forecasts and Cost Analysis for Alternatives** – Mr. Shelton next presented the preliminary ridership forecasts and cost analysis for each of the fixed guideway alternatives. During this discussion Mr. Shelton described the fixed guideway technology alternatives; concept corridors, alternative alignments and station areas; the analysis of ridership and capital costs; and the preliminary results and recommendations. He noted that all these numbers are draft and subject to change with future analysis. The following table shows the initial ridership and cost analysis:

Alternative Technologies and Corridors	Capital Cost (millions)	Annualized Ridership	Cost per Rider
Enhanced Bus	\$32	5,210,400	\$0.56
HOV/Managed Lanes	\$302	4,894,900	\$5.79
Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)			
– With Enhanced Bus	\$48	1,870,300	\$2.20
– With Commuter Rail	\$34	411,300	\$7.85
Commuter Rail Transit (CRT)			
– Edmond to Norman	\$178	697,300	\$21.19
– Midwest City to Yukon	\$96	278,730	\$31.03
Light Rail Transit (LRT)			
– Edmond to Norman	\$1,732	1,303,000	\$107.67
Modern Street Car			
– With Enhanced Bus	\$83	151,300	\$44.54
– With BRT	\$83	248,700	\$27.11
– With Commuter Rail	\$83	498,200	\$13.53

The Federal Transit Authority (FTA) generally considers a project to be a viable candidate for federal funding if the annualized capital cost per rider is less than \$25.00 per rider. Based on the \$25.00 per rider threshold, commuter rail from Midwest City to Yukon, modern streetcar with enhanced bus, modern streetcar with bus rapid transit, and light rail transit may not be feasible for the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area. These costs do not include operating costs.

Mr. Shelton also noted that the Enhanced Bus option is the baseline alternative and is considered to be necessary for all of the other alternatives.

5. Questions and Discussion by Steering Committee – The following questions and comments were received during the meeting:

Q: What percentage of the total trips is the commuter rail ridership based on?

R: The mode split model was calibrated based on the 2000 Census Journey to Work data, which indicated 2.5% mode share for transit of total person trips in 2000. The actual percent of 2030 trips will vary depending on the attractiveness of FGS transit in the corridors. This is a conservative estimate, but adequate for this level of analysis. If the project was to move forward into Alternatives Analysis, a more detailed modal split would need to be calculated. ACOG, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), would have to augment their modeling process as the first step.

Q: How does this compare to peer cities?

R: Successful systems can approach approximately 15% of the downtown trips. Once a system plan is developed, the consultant team can compare the ridership to peer cities.

Q: Where is the bulk of ridership for commuter rail coming from?

R: The preliminary findings show the majority of commuter rail riders are boarding at the middle stations in south Oklahoma City and north Oklahoma City, not the end stations in Norman and Edmond.

Q: What is the engineering feasibility for HOV lanes?

R: IH 35 South poses some design challenges for HOV lanes. The pavement is already set for possible HOV along the Broadway Extension and the planned IH 40 Crosstown. As a result, some HOV lanes might be added at lower costs than estimated.

- Q: Is it normal to use such a conservative estimate in regard to ridership?
R: Yes, especially at this level of analysis. If COTPA decides to pursue a particular corridor and proceed into an Alternatives Analysis, more detailed ridership and cost analysis will be performed.
- Q: Is it too soon to throw out light rail since we are using such conservative numbers?
R: With a preliminary estimate of the cost per annualized rider of \$107.67 it would be difficult to justify carrying this technology further. However, this is the first run at ridership and capital cost estimates and it is possible with future analysis that this number may change.
- Q: Chris Kauffman stated he is proponent of a regional body for transit and asked what institutional changes would be necessary to implement a fixed guideway transit system?
R: Establishment of a regional transit authority for the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area with a dedicated source of funding would be a necessary step.
- Q: How will increasing gas prices affect transit usage?
R: With the recent rise in gas prices, transit agencies have seen sharp increases in ridership, averaging about 30% above the same period in the previous year. This is expected to continue as long as gas prices remain at or near record levels.
- Q: What are the operating costs for the alternatives?
R: Along with the capital costs, the operating costs will be presented for each alternative. The operating costs will be added and presented at the next Steering Committee meeting.
- Q: How should the plan be incrementalized, or phased in?
R: This is a systems plan study and a phasing plan for the best options can be presented next time, with some discussion of feeder systems.
- Q: What sort of local bus service will be provided for riders to get to and from the stations?
R: Feeder bus system is necessary to support any of the fixed guideway technologies. The enhanced bus plan and a basic system of feeder bus routes are included in the service assumptions for all the alternatives.
- Q: What is the population density for cities that are compared to Oklahoma City for fixed route bus service?
R: The average population density for service areas are shown in the following table.

Transit Agency	COPTA	TARC	Pierce Transit	KCATA	GRTC	Community Transit	CATS	IndyGo	NCTD	COT
Location	Oklahoma City, OK	Louisville, KY	Tacoma, WA	Kansas City, MO	Richmond, VA	Everett, WA	Charlotte, NC	Indianapolis, IN	Oceanside, CA	Tucson, AZ
Service Area										
Population	747,003	754,756	679,815	756,557	818,836	693,247	681,310	791,926	821,403	720,425
Square Miles	322	283	450	396	437	294	445	373	403	291
Population Density (persons/sq. mi.)	2,320	2,667	1,511	1,910	1,874	2,358	1,531	2,123	2,038	2,476
Ridership										
Avg. Weekday Boardings	14,141	46,074	47,376	46,846	42,298	29,522	65,677	39,339	36,349	N/A
Annual Boardings	3,959,551	12,900,738	13,265,299	13,116,956	11,843,548	8,266,233	18,389,837	11,015,152	10,177,885	N/A
Service										
Annual Vehicle Revenue Miles	3,783,765	7,439,078	9,764,345	7,760,344	4,862,398	8,955,960	9,501,032	6,755,785	7,192,273	6,947,289
Annual Vehicle Revenue Hours	236,235	587,426	652,063	504,378	440,166	495,985	719,341	473,700	488,656	532,745
Annual Veh. Rev. Miles per Capita	5.07	9.86	14.36	10.26	5.94	12.92	13.95	8.53	8.76	9.64
Annual Veh. Rev. Hours per Capita	0.32	0.78	0.96	0.67	0.54	0.72	1.06	0.60	0.59	0.74

Note: The area in square miles is not based on municipal city limits, but is based on federal definitions.

- Q: Was the Housing Market Demand Study for downtown considered in the ridership forecasts?
R: The report was reviewed and it depicts the possibilities for future residential development in downtown Oklahoma City. The Fixed Guideway Study ridership forecasts are based on ACOG's current regional travel demand model and demographic forecasts, which do not include the changes in resident population within the center city predicted by the more recent Housing Study. ACOG should consider the results of the Housing Study in a future update of the travel demand model demographic projections, which would need to be accomplished for use in performing an Alternatives Analysis. The forecasts presented in this meeting are conservative in that they are based on the current ACOG model and projections.
- Q: How would HOV lanes on the planned IH 40 Crosstown be beneficial?
R: As an HOV, they might be an extension of the HOV on IH 35 south. More likely, they might be designed as Express Lanes to serve through traffic on IH 40, which would be different from HOV lanes. ODOT is considering the appropriate options in design of the new Crosstown segments.
- Q: Is the final report going to include revenues and not just costs?
R: Yes, potential revenue sources for funding the recommended system plan will be included.
- Q: What about the economic development impact of fixed guideway transit?
R: Yes, there is significant potential for economic development associated with fixed guideway transit, particularly for light rail and modern streetcar alternatives. Commuter rail and BRT may also generate transit oriented development, although these technologies are still being examined for their long-term economic development benefits.

Q: Will the final report focus on environmental impacts?

R: The final report will include a "fatal flaw" environmental impact analysis. A more detailed environmental analysis would be part of the Alternative Analysis stage when the NEPA review process is initiated.

Q. If the percentage of trips taken on transit in 2030 goes up, will the cost per rider go down?

R. Yes.

6. **Future Steering Committee Meeting and Final Comments** – Tom Shelton thanked everyone for attending the meeting and asked them to tentatively mark Tuesday, December 15, 2005 from 3:00 PM to 5:00 PM as the next Steering Committee meeting date. The third round of public meetings will be conducted on October 11 – 13 and will consist of seven meetings at locations around the metropolitan area. Steering Committee members are encouraged to attend the public meetings. The meeting adjourned at 5:30 pm.

REPORTED BY: Tom Shelton, Project Manager

Meeting Report

PROJECT: Fixed Guideway Study,
Central Oklahoma
Transportation and Parking
Authority (COTPA)

PROJECT NO.: 023144.010.001

PRESENT: See attached sign-in sheets

DATE: October 11 – 13, 2005

The following is our understanding of the subject matter covered in this meeting. If this differs from your understanding, please notify us within five working days.

The third series of public meetings was conducted at various locations dispersed across the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area over a period of three days, from October 11 – 13, 2005. The purpose of these meetings was to present the public the initial ridership and cost data for the fixed guideway alternatives (enhanced bus, high occupancy vehicle lanes, bus rapid transit, commuter rail, and light rail streetcar), and outline the next steps of the study.

Warr Acres Public Library

Tuesday, October 11, 2005 12:00 PM to 1:30 PM

Tom Shelton, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and thanked everyone for coming. A slide show was presented by Mr. Shelton and Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner for Carter & Burgess, providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, technology alternatives, and preliminary cost and ridership data. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments/questions were received.

- C: Light Rail in Houston gets in the way of normal traffic flow and should be elevated.
- C: The east/west commuter rail alignment along the Union Pacific railroad should be along Reno.
- C: Railroad companies do not want to deal with passenger rail service because of liability reasons.
- C: Light rail should be located on the IH 40 bridge.
- C: Enhanced bus and other fixed guideway technologies should go where the riders are.
- C: Weekend transit service needs to be increased not decreased.
- C: Each suburb should have its own transit station.
- C: In determining the future transportation needs for Oklahoma City, the transit options need to be more practical.

Q: On the animation, there was green space in the median; is this how it would look?

R: That is one option; this is an urban design treatment.

Q: Why is light rail so expensive?

R: The main reason why light rail (LRT) is so expensive is because of the electrification and the relocation of utilities.

Association of Central Oklahoma Governments
2030 OCARTS Plan Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)
Tuesday, October 11, 2005, 3:00 PM

Leonard West, CAC Chairman, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and asked each attendee to introduce themselves. Mr. West then introduced Tom Shelton, Project Manager, and Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner, from Carter & Burgess. A slide show was presented by Mr. Shelton and Mr. McAnelly providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, technology alternatives, and preliminary cost and ridership data. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments/questions were received.

Q: How did you factor the trip figure?

R: This was based on infrastructure that's in place today and what is planned for the future. It shows total person trips, not trips by mode.

Q: In the enhanced bus option are you looking at suburban areas that currently aren't served like Moore?

R: Yes, we are looking at the entire region and where people work and live. We are not constrained by what METRO Transit serves today.

Q: What is paratransit?

R: Paratransit is an on-demand service that is federally required. This service is currently being served by METRO Lift.

Q: Why was the line to the airport not analyzed?

R: Within the model it is difficult to capitalize the ridership to and from the airport. Other factors considered in the analysis are trip length, ridership demand and capital costs.

Q: Why didn't we use the old inter-urban routes?

R: The scope of the study is to stay in the OCARTS region.

C: The Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) route would need double-tracking in some areas and an operations agreement with the BNSF.

C: Light rail in a freight right-of-way would need three times the spacing than commuter rail. Commuter rail is FRA compliant while light rail is not.

Q: Does the commuter rail cost estimate include the construction of additional track?

R: Yes, the cost estimates assumes double tracking along the entire north/south alignment and the construction of 1,000 foot sidings at stations along the east/west alignment.

- Q: Will the study make finite recommendations?
R: Yes, the study will create an implementation plan and make funding recommendations.
- Q: What is the federal match?
R: The current reauthorization bill, SAFETEA-LU, includes an 80/20 split (20% local match). The current administration doesn't support this and wants a 50/50 split.

McAlpine Center Tuesday, October 11, 2005, 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM

Tom Shelton, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and thanked everyone for coming. A slide show was presented by Mr. Shelton and Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner for Carter & Burgess, providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, technology alternatives, and preliminary cost and ridership data. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments/questions were received.

- Q: Are the numbers presented on the bus comparison table existing numbers or for 25 years from now?
R: They are existing numbers.
- Q: Are you going to compare the existing bus rapid transit and light rail ridership numbers from other agencies to the projected numbers for Oklahoma City?
R: We do have those numbers, but they are not being shown at this time. The point we are trying to make is how the existing transit service in Oklahoma City relates to peer cities throughout the country. It shows that the demand for transit service in Oklahoma City is greater than the service METRO Transit currently provides.
- Q: Is bus rapid transit susceptible to adverse weather conditions such as rain and snow unlike light rail?
R: Yes.
- Q: Does bus rapid transit drive economic development like light rail does?
R: This is a new technology and the jury is still out on the amount of transit oriented development (TOD) that will occur around bus rapid transit (BRT) stations. However, early studies have shown that TOD is occurring around BRT stations, but at a smaller scale than what is occurring along light rail lines.
- Q: Oklahoma City has old track under asphalt from the old inter-urban lines. Would it be cost effective to use these?
R: Other cities have tried that, but have found it very costly to rehabilitate the old track.
- Q: When calculating the cost effectiveness for each fixed guideway technology, do you quantify the amount of money for what people are spending on auto related expenses?
R: Those calculations are available, but at this level of analysis we are normalizing the numbers for comparison purposes. The Federal Transit Administration has a more complex cost/benefit analysis that will need to be done if COTPA decides to proceed further into alternatives analysis.

C: In Oklahoma City the need for transit is greater than what is currently available. COTPA needs better funding to serve the transit needs of Oklahoma City. Cities dedicated to transit have created an independent regional transit authority with dedicated funding.

Q: How will the east/west and the north/south commuter rail lines connect?

R: This connection will be made by the creation of an intermodal center where the two lines cross.

Q: What is the time line for completion and phasing?

R: Complete build-out of the system would occur in 25 years. The consultant team will develop a phasing and implementation plan at the end of this study.

C: The modern streetcar route is in agreement with what was discussed by St. Anthony's Hospital and the Health Science Center.

C: Other cities seem to have more of a sense of community than the OKC metro area.

Q: Are you thinking a way to pay for this would be MAPS 3?

R: Yes.

Norman Public Library

Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 12:00 PM to 1:30 PM

Tom Shelton, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and thanked everyone for coming. A slide show was presented by Mr. Shelton and Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner for Carter & Burgess, providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, technology alternatives, and preliminary cost and ridership data. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments/questions were received.

Q: What is the distinction between home based work (HBW) and home based non-work (HBNW) trips? Why is HBNW so much greater than HBW in the Norman Corridor?

R: HBW trips are trips people make from home to work. HBNW are trips people make to the store, drop kids off at school, etc. We've made the same distinction about the large amount of HBNW trips being so much greater than the HBW trips in the Norman Corridor. We have asked ACOG for clarification on the matter. It should be noted that these trips include school trips and trips through the corridor.

C: The Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT) mentioned that no federal money can be spent on high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes.

R: We are not aware of that comment from ODOT, and federal money may be used for HOV projects.

Q: Is low transit ridership in Oklahoma City due to the lack of service or the people of Oklahoma City?

R: It is due to the lack of service in Oklahoma City. METRO Transit is provided the best service possible with the amount of funding it receives. If METRO Transit was properly funded the service would increase and as a result the ridership would increase.

- Q: How do other transit agencies get money?
R: Regional transit agencies across the country receive a dedicated funding source through tax revenue or other funding sources. This study will look at how funding can be provided.
- Q: Is COTPA a regional agency?
R: No, it's a department within the City of Oklahoma City that receives its funding out of the cities annual budget.
- Q: What happened in Dallas?
R: First, a state level action was initiated to allow a regional transit agency to be created. Once approved by the State a referendum occurred to let voters decide to be a member city of DART and impose a 1% sales tax.
- Q: Was DART bus ridership poor before the light rail (LRT) system was built?
R: Dallas' bus service wasn't properly funded, like Oklahoma City is now, and they couldn't provide the proper service the City needed.
- C: Light rail induces ridership and increased density.
- Q: Why would you want a bus to act like light rail?
R: Cost is the primary reason. With the cost of light rail approaching \$50 million per mile it is difficult for cities to meet the federal requirements for federal funding. Bus Rapid Transit is a transit technology that can carry as many or more passengers then light rail and at a fraction of the cost. Because of the low cost it is easier to qualify for federal funding.
- C: Siding the commuter rail line and making the commuter rail wait for passing freight trains would kill the route.
R: The schedules would be coordinated so no delays would occur.
- C: The Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad would benefit from double tracking of the railroad.
- Q: \$50 million per mile for light rail doesn't seem right, what does this cost include?
R: The cost estimate includes electrification, stations, vehicles, lying of track, and utility relocation. Right-of-way costs are not included in this estimate.
- C: The presentation is boring and you should be doing more "selling" of the project.
- Q: Union Station and the rail yard are not usable in this study. Does the cost estimate take into account a new rail hub?
R: The cost estimate for commuter rail includes double tracking of the entire north/south route, 1,000 foot siding track along the east/west route, stations, and vehicles. Right-of-way costs is not included in the cost estimate.
- Q: How would the Santa Fe Station be ADA accessible?
R: Renovation would need to occur to provide elevators and/or escalators and other improvements to bring it up to federal requirements.

Q: What is the current bus ridership in Oklahoma City?

R: Around three million riders per year.

Q: Would you have to build a second track for commuter rail?

R: The determination will come in further analysis of that corridor. However, in the cost estimate we assumed double tracking the entire north/south corridor and placing 1,000 foot sidings at stations along the east/west corridor.

Q: What is the cost per Modern Street Car Vehicle?

R: Approximately \$1.3 million.

Q: To what extent are you free in your report to convey your ideas and how are you constrained by politics and not able to express your expertise?

R: No constraints have been expressed, except our professionalism.

Edmond Public Library

Wednesday, October 12, 2005 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM

Tom Shelton, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and thanked everyone for coming. A slide show was presented by Mr. Shelton and Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner for Carter & Burgess, providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, technology alternatives, and preliminary cost and ridership data. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments/questions were received.

Q: Does the ridership projection include where people go and their desirability of mode of transportation?

R: Yes, it has been seen across the country that people are more likely to ride rail than bus. Convenience and reliability makes rail more appealing.

Q: Current ridership in Oklahoma City is low, so increasing service will increase ridership?

R: Yes, that is true.

Q: What difference would a rider see from bus rapid transit (BRT) and modern streetcar?

R: Not sure at this time. BRT and modern streetcar are both less than five years old and statistical data is not yet available. The potential for transit oriented development exists for these technologies.

Q: Is there a next phase or step that will look at outside areas such as Guthrie?

R: The current priority is to focus on the ACOG area. A follow up study needs to be done in the future that includes outside communities such as Guthrie. Some of the technology best addresses the longer commutes of rural citizens. Rural citizens need to voice their opinion on the need for the technology to reach rural areas.

South Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce

Thursday, October 13, 2005 7:30 AM to 9:00 AM

Tom Shelton, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and thanked everyone for coming. A slide show was presented by Mr. Shelton and Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner for Carter & Burgess, providing an overview of the Fixed

Guideway Study objectives, technology alternatives, and preliminary cost and ridership data. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments/questions were received.

- C: The rail line that runs east to Remington Park is not completely abandoned. It is leased from METRO Transit by Union Pacific and the Railroad Museum.
- C: The streetcar alignment that runs along 10th to Walker needs to be looked at possible running along 13th. 13th has tracks embedded in the asphalt that could be reused. The old Capitol line could be put back into use. 10th street is a very congested street. Visibility is better on 13th than on 10th after you cross the BNSF railroad.
- R: The streetcar route is not fixed, but shows the needs of tourists, residents, employers, etc. to circulate downtown.
- Q: Why is the Capitol Hill bus circulator not being used anymore?
- R: Due to lack of funding and declining ridership METRO Transit felt it would be best to discontinue the Capitol Hill bus circulator.
- C: All of these methods seem to have a great economic impact.
- C: This is a good study, you are appealing to both the blue and white collar workers.
- C: Need transportation from the fairgrounds- Rock Island line, had a street car to fairgrounds good to run for conventioners.
- C: In El Reno when they did the trolley system, they had to re-do the track.

Association of Central Oklahoma Governments Intermodal Transportation Technical Committee (ITTC) Thursday, October 13, 2005, 10:00 AM

Doug Rex, Program Coordinator with ACOG, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and asked each attendee to introduce themselves. Mr. Rex then introduced Tom Shelton, Project Manager, and Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner, with Carter & Burgess. Mr. Shelton and Mr. McAnelly gave a brief presentation providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, technology alternatives, and preliminary cost and ridership data. Due to time constraints comments and questions were not able to be solicited.

Midwest City Public Library Thursday, October 13, 2005, 11:00 AM to 12:30 PM

Tom Shelton, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and thanked everyone for coming. A slide show was presented by Mr. Shelton and Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner for Carter & Burgess, providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, technology alternatives, and preliminary cost and ridership data. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments/questions were received.

- C: Northeast Oklahoma City is currently underserved, but right now there is no major call for mass transit.
- R: Leadership needs to be vocal and proactive. It is possible that in a phase II or III outlying areas may be served.
- C: Midwest City Draft Comprehensive Plan meeting is next Thursday (October 20, 2005). Anything that comes along Midwest City is a willing participant and political leadership is backing it.
- Q: Does the lane for BRT have to be the same size as a car lane?
- R: It has to be a minimum of 11ft.

Urban League

Thursday, October 13, 2005, 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM

Larry Hopper, Senior Planner METRO Transit, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and thanked everyone for coming. A slide show was presented by Mr. Hopper providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, technology alternatives, and preliminary cost and ridership data. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments/questions were received.

- Q: The cities that spend four times more on public transportation, are they on the coast or up north?
- R: No, actually even Texas to our south does spend a lot more on transit.
- Q: What is a corridor?
- R: A general direction people want to travel, a long strip of land.
- Q: Could we go to Stillwater?
- R: There are no plans extending to Stillwater at this time.
- Q: Do other cities operate (bus routes) 24 hours a day?
- R: Yes, many cities around the country operate 24 hour transit service.
- Q: Is this why they spend more?
- R: They do spend more by at least three times.
- Q: Is there a city with both underground & above ground public transit?
- R: Yes, Dallas, Boston, New York, and Atlanta for example, but underground is expensive and we have no plans for that here.
- Q: Was light rail the track remains I had seen somewhere near (Villa from the 60's)(not clear)
- R: Yes, there was a rail toward (19th)
- Q: How would I get to Bethany?
- R: There is already some service that comes near Bethany. The enhanced Bus option would go there. The funding & public support would have to be there. We might need Bethany to help pay for it or develop a transit portion of community government that would cross jurisdictions and manage the funding.

Q: What about Guthrie?

R: What makes public transit work best is population density. Guthrie does not have the population at this time. Future studies will determine if transit is feasible in this area.

Q: What about Stillwater?

R: There is a bus that runs from Quail Springs Mall or the 122nd and I-35 park & ride lot to OSU. You would have to look on OSU's website to find out details about that.

Q: Will our system help Katrina victims?

R: If they move close to busy bus routes they will be helped.

Q: I am wondering about something similar to "MetroLift"?

R: "ParaLift" is the national term; enhanced bus service is especially designed to be helpful.

Q: What about Enid?

R: We cannot go that far as a municipality. Still, there is actually another service to there that is not too expensive.

Meeting Report

PROJECT: 2004-05 Fixed Guideway Study

PROJECT NO.: 023144

Central Oklahoma Transportation and Parking Authority (COTPA)

PRESENT: Committee Members:

Sam Bowman, Oklahoma City City Council
Bernest Cain, OK Senate District 46
Bill Case, OK House District 95
Myron Coleman, City County Health
Mick Cornett, Mayor City of Oklahoma City
John Dugan, City of Oklahoma City
Steve Jones, COTPA/Congressman Istook's Office
Chris Kauffman, The Insurance Center
Hershel Lamirand, OU Medical Center
Dick Lee, COTPA
David Lopez, Downtown Oklahoma City Inc.
Gary Marrs, City of Oklahoma City
Rick Moore, Municipal Contractors Association
Paula Sanford, Edmond City Council/Edmond Tag Agency
Dean Schirf, Greater Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce
David Streb, ODOT
Zach Taylor, ACOG
James Thompson, City of Oklahoma City
Mike Voorhees, South Oklahoma City Chamber
John Yoeckel, Planning Commission

MEETING

DATE: 12/15/2005

Project Staff:

Scott Barrett, Legacy Engineering
Rick Cain, COTPA
Larry Hopper, COTPA
Sara Lashley, Saxum Strategic Communications
Mike McAnelly, Carter & Burgess
Diponker Mukherjee, COTPA
Lee Nichols, Carter & Burgess
Tom Shelton, Carter & Burgess

Surrogates/Guests:

Brion Bannister, Carter & Burgess, Inc.
Kay Bickham, COTPA
Jim Couch, City of Oklahoma City
Randy Entz, ACOG
Marc Hader, Oklahoma County
Richard Marshment, University of Oklahoma
Holly Massie, ACOG
Mike Ogan, Greater Oklahoma City Chamber
Jose Perez, COTPA
Doug Rex, ACOG
Anais Starr, City of Midwest City
Dawn Sullivan, ODOT

The following is our understanding of the subject matter covered in this meeting. If this differs from your understanding, please notify us within five working days.

The December 15, 2005 meeting for the Central Oklahoma Transportation & Parking Authority (COTPA) Fixed Guideway Transit Study Steering Committee (TSSC) Meeting was held at the Presbyterian Health Foundation Conference Center located at 655 Research Parkway, Oklahoma City. The meeting began at 3:00 PM. Handouts were made available and included the meeting agenda and meeting minutes from the October public meetings. The handouts also included the presentation and a map packet including the draft system plan, and the draft implementation plan. Committee members also received a copy of the draft system plan narrative and operating and capital costs, the implementation capital cost breakdown, the purpose and mission statement for the Fixed Guideway Study, and the COTPA Fixed Guideway Study Guiding Principles.

- 1) **Welcome and Overview** – Mayor Mick Cornett welcomed all in attendance and thanked the Steering Committee members for their work over the past year. He recognized that it was timely for the City to consider the results of the Fixed Guideway Study. Mayor Cornett mentioned that the members of the Steering Committee will hopefully play a continuing role as advocates for public transportation.
- 2) **Purpose and Objectives of Study** – Chris Kauffman, Chairman of the COTPA Board of Trustees, thanked the Mayor for his support and extended his appreciation to the members of the Steering Committee. He mentioned that developing a public transportation plan for the City out to the year 2030 is an important undertaking. Chairman Kauffman also mentioned that today we will see some ideas for what is needed for the future, how it might be funded, and what can be done to implement the plan.

Tom Shelton, Project Manager Carter & Burgess, reviewed the items included in the handout packets. Mr. Shelton presented a refresher of the early steps in the study, which the committee has seen in previous meetings. ACOG has played an important role in the study by providing much of the data and modeling tools used in the Fixed Guideway Study. The recommendations derived from this study are being provided today. Mr. Shelton mentioned that an investment in transit helps to meet many objectives of the City; such as, reducing congestion, improving air quality, serving transit dependent citizens, creating jobs, and supporting economic development. A significant amount of public involvement was included in the development of the Fixed Guideway Study, with four rounds of public meetings, five steering committee meetings, individual stakeholder meetings, newsletters, and the website (www.okfgs.org). In developing the system plan major travel corridors were identified early in the study and travel, land use and demographic characteristics of each of the corridors were analyzed.

- 3) **Results of the October 11 – 13 Public Meetings** – Mr. Shelton next discussed the results of the seven public meetings that were held in various locations around the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area. The purpose of these meetings was to present the public the initial ridership and cost data for the fixed guideway alternatives (enhanced bus, high occupancy vehicle lanes, bus rapid transit, commuter rail, and light rail streetcar), and to outline the next steps of the study. Meeting minutes from those meetings were included in the meeting packet.
- 4) **Presentation of Fixed Guideway Study Findings and Recommendations** –
 - a) **Fixed Guideway System Plan** – Mr. Shelton presented the System Plan map and said this represents a “Vision” for the transportation needs of the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area in the year 2030. The system plan includes enhanced bus, bus rapid transit, commuter rail, and modern streetcar. Mr. Shelton turned the presentation over to Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner Carter & Burgess, to present an overview of the different transportation modes included in the system plan. He reviewed the revenue miles, revenue hours, annual boardings, capital costs, operating cost, and annualized cost per rider.

- i) **Enhanced Bus** – Enhanced bus service will be an enhancement to METRO Transit's current bus service. It includes more frequent service (15-30 minute peak, 30-45 off peak headways), extended service hours, expanded service area, more express routes, park and rides, and new transit centers. Enhanced bus service includes almost four times the existing service (annual revenue miles) at a capital cost of \$34.4 million with an annual operating cost of \$60 million. The annualized cost per rider is \$0.56. 7.2 million annual boardings are expected on the enhanced bus system. Below are comments and questions regarding the enhanced bus service:

Q - Does enhanced bus cost assume a government subsidy?

R - Yes, the cost is the total cost and is contingent on the participation by not just Oklahoma City, but other cities as well.

Q - What is the expected fare box return?

R - Across the nation the fare box return is between 15 – 20%. Currently METRO Transit has a 14 – 16% fare box return.

Q - What are the expected fares?

R - Fares will be dependent on the COTPA Board. It is expected that the fares would remain the same as what METRO Transit charges today, \$1.25.

Q - How was the annual ridership for enhanced bus calculated?

R - The ridership was calculated based on the ACOG model. The model output gives us the 2030 ridership. The 7.2 million riders are based on the complete system plan and the interaction between the technologies.

Q - When will the system be complete?

R - The system will reach complete build out in the year 2030.

Q - What does the \$34.4 million include?

R - The bulk of the capital cost would be in the purchase of buses and the construction of bus shelters. Funding would come from multiple entities and include 50 – 80% federal funding.

Q - Is the total cost for enhanced bus an increment from what is in place now?

R - Yes, the cost includes current and anticipated cost, or cost it would be to achieve the 2030 build out from today's system.

- ii) **Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)** – Mr. McAnelly next presented BRT. BRT can operate in many different ways, such as its own right-of-way, dedicated lane, or in mixed traffic. Running characteristics of the BRT system will be determined in alternatives analysis. BRT will include quick stops, modern vehicles, and signal priority. The BRT is present in the Northwest Corridor along Northwest Expressway, Yukon Corridor along Reno Avenue, Westside I-44 Corridor along Meridian, and the I-240 Corridor along 59th Street. The BRT component of the system plan includes 660,000 annual revenue miles at a capital cost of \$40.2 million with an annual operating cost of \$35.7 million. The annualized cost per rider is \$9.80. 750,000 annual boardings are expected on the BRT system. Below are comments and questions regarding BRT:

Q - Who has deployed bus rapid transit?

R - BRT is currently operational in Las Vegas, Boston, Los Angeles, Pittsburgh, and Philadelphia.

Q - Who has development plans for bus rapid transit?

R - BRT development is currently happening in San Diego, Dallas, Houston, San Antonio, and Denver.

Q - Who manufactures the buses?

R - The same manufacturers who produce regular buses also manufacture the BRT buses.

iii) **Commuter Rail** – Mr. McAnelly presented the three commuter rail lines. Commuter rail is proposed in the Norman, Edmond, and Midwest City/Tinker corridors. Commuter rail will use the existing railroad infrastructure. Vehicles will be diesel or diesel-electric. The commuter rail component of the system plan includes 645,000 annual revenue miles at a capital cost of \$234.0 million with an annual operating cost of \$9.7 million. The annualized cost per rider is \$35.48, averaged over all three corridors. 1.8 million boardings are expected on the commuter rail system. Below are comments and questions regarding commuter rail:

Q - Some of the north/south commuter rail line is currently single tracked. With the amount of freight activity along this corridor are you advocating a dual track system?

R - Yes, the capital cost estimate does include double tracking the entire length of the north/south corridor. Also included in the cost estimate is upgrading the signaling and crossings.

Q - BNSF may double track the line. Is there enough room for a third rail line?

R - Yes, currently BNSF has 100 feet of right-of-way and that is plenty of room for a third rail line.

Q - Why commuter rail and not bus rapid transit to Tinker Air Force Base?

R - The ridership model showed better performance for commuter rail than bus rapid transit. Station to station model results show the greatest number of riders at the terminus of the line which fits commuter rail rather than bus rapid transit.

Q - What is the commuter rail fare box return?

R - Fare box return is much like the bus fare return, 14 – 16%.

Q - What are the currently boardings on the Trinity Railway Express (TRE)?

R - Around 8000 boardings per day on the TRE which is about approximately 2.3 million annualized riders.

Q - Is the DART fare box return comparable to what we see here?

R - Yes

Q - Does the annualized cost per rider only take into account capital costs?

R - Yes

Q - Do railroads charge for the use of its rail and if so, is this cost taken into account in the cost estimate?

R - Yes railroads do charge for the use of their rail. At this level of analysis it is hard to determine those costs. There is a large contingency cost built into the cost estimate to anticipate this.

iv) **Modern Streetcar** – Mr. McAnelly presented the final technology in the system plan, modern streetcar. Modern streetcar will operate on-street with mixed traffic as a circulator in downtown Oklahoma City. The modern streetcar component of the system plan includes 215,100 annual revenue miles at a capital cost of \$83.2 million with an annual operating cost of \$3.2 million. The annualized cost per rider is \$19.97. 680,000 boardings are expected on the modern streetcar system. Below are comments and questions regarding modern streetcar:

Q - Is the modern streetcar a single direction line?

R - The system could be bi-directional or single direction. This would be determined in the alternatives analysis stage.

- v) **Phased Implementation Plan** – Mr. Shelton discussed the implementation and financial strategy for the system plan. The implementation plan includes four major phases, each five to seven years in duration extending over a twenty five year period from 2006 to 2030. Mr. Shelton presented the project implementation process of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) which includes alternatives analysis, preliminary engineering and environmental clearance, obtaining a full funded grant agreement, design, construction, and beginning operation. All of these phases require a five to seven year timeline for a new starts project. Mr. Shelton displayed the implementation phasing on a series of study area maps and noted a schedule of implementation phasing and capital costs; this information was included in the handout packet.
- vi) **Financial Implementation Strategy** – Mr. Shelton presented the financial implementation strategy that would employ a variety of funding sources and financing methods. Federal participation in capital costs is anticipated for most of the capital projects at 50%. Local and regional funding mechanisms might include sales tax (dedicated quarter of a cent throughout one or more counties), property tax, business improvement district, tax increment finance district, parking meter fees, parking bonds, and motor vehicle registration taxes. Potential funding of the local share for the modern streetcar system by Oklahoma City might be included in the future MAPS III sales tax bond program. Enhanced bus, BRT, and commuter rail are regional services that should be on a regional base through creation of a regional transportation authority (RTA); creation of a RTA may require state enabling legislation. Mr. Shelton mentioned that a detailed financial strategy including these costs and funding sources will be included in the study documentation.
- vii) **Maintaining Momentum Strategies** – Mr. Shelton presented information on strategies for maintaining the momentum following completion and approval of the Fixed Guideway Transit Study. These strategies include identifying a “champion”; creation of Oklahoma City Regional Transit Committee; enhancement to the ACOG Travel Demand and Ridership model; fiscal year 2007 appropriation bill earmark; initiation of starter corridor alternatives analysis; maintain public awareness. Improvement of the regional model was described as needing immediate attention and was necessary before alternatives analysis could begin.
- viii) **Next Steps** – The next steps for the completion of the Fixed Guideway Study are to present Steering Committee recommendations to the COTPA Board; fourth round of public meetings January 23 – 24, 2006; and the Final Fixed Guideway Study Report and Executive Summary.

5) **Questions and Discussion by Steering Committee** – The following are questions and comments received:

Q - Are boardings calculated by mode?

R - Yes, but the system does account for transfers.

Q - Would a person pay two fares?

R - The fare system would probably be a single fare system with free transfers creating a seamless transportation system. Monthly passes or day passes would be available for purchase also.

Q - The first phase is all inside Oklahoma City. How will you get regional political support?

R - Phase I is centrally focused, but the outlying areas participation and financial support would be necessary. Participating cities would benefit from local assistance funding during the early

years before they receive much transit. These funds would be used by the cities for transportation purposes such as street repair and improvement along enhanced bus routes, and from enhanced bus service.

Q - Is bus rapid transit in the Midwest City/Tinker Corridor?

R - No, but we did test bus rapid transit within that corridor.

Q - What is the percentage of Average Daily Trip (ADT) Mode Share?

R - The transit mode share projected by the model ranges on average from one to two percent in lower density outlying areas to six to eight percent in the core of the central business district for Oklahoma City.

6) **Final Comments** – Mr. Shelton expressed Carter & Burgess' appreciation for the support provided during the study by COTPA, ACOG, the City of Oklahoma City, and ODOT.

Mr. Kauffman assured the Steering Committee that COTPA and the Committee will provide leadership towards transit progress. He emphasized the importance of moving this fixed guideway program along.

Mayor Mick Cornett summarized his reaction to the results presented. He indicated the results were both exciting but sobering in light of the costs. He indicated that the Committee's work may not be done and that there was a need for greater buy-in by mayors and citizens around the region. Regional funding support would be essential to services that benefit suburbs or areas outside of Oklahoma City. Consensus from this committee will result from further communication.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

REPORTED BY: Tom Shelton, Project Manager

Meeting Report

PROJECT: Fixed Guideway Study,
Central Oklahoma
Transportation and Parking
Authority (COTPA)

PROJECT NO.: 023144.010.001

PRESENT: See attached sign-in sheets

DATE: January 23 – 24, 2006

The following is our understanding of the subject matter covered in this meeting. If this differs from your understanding, please notify us within five working days.

The fourth series of public meetings was conducted at various locations dispersed across the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area over a period of two days, from January 23 – 24, 2006. The purpose of these meetings was to present the final recommendations of the Fixed Guideway Transit System Plan. The need for enhanced bus service, modern streetcar, bus rapid transit, commuter rail and implementation plan was also presented. The final analysis discussed included input received from previous public meetings, the Fixed Guideway Study Steering Committee, and dozens of individual meetings throughout the past year. Participants' comments and comment cards from this series of meetings would be summarized.

Items presented at the public meetings included the presentation of the System Plan, the phased implementation plan, capital and operating costs, how to maintain the momentum of support for the Plan, and funding strategies. Several funding strategies were presented that included the creation of a Regional Transit Authority (RTA) made up of counties and/or cities in the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area; potential funding from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA); local funds from sales tax, property taxes, vehicle registration and parking fees, or other sources.

McAlpine Center

Monday, January 23, 2006 5:30 PM to 7:00 PM

Larry Hopper, Principal Planner for METRO Transit, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and thanked everyone for coming. Mr. Hopper then introduced Tom Shelton, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, and Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner for Carter & Burgess. A slide show was presented by Mr. Shelton and Mr. McAnelly that presented the 2030 System Plan Vision for the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area. Items discussed during the presentation included capital cost and ridership for enhanced bus, bus rapid transit (BRT), commuter rail transit (CRT), and modern streetcar; 25 year implementation plan; potential funding strategies; how to maintain the momentum; and the next steps in the project. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. Participants agreed to allow the Alliance for Public Transportation (APT) to be in contact with them after the meeting. The following comments/questions were received.

C: An Oklahoma Supreme Court ruling states that the city cannot charge more from parking than what is cost to maintain the operation.

- Q: Will the report have an analysis of the different types of riders that exist in Oklahoma City?
R: Yes, that data will be available in the final report. The system plan that is being presented will serve many different types of riders. This will be accomplished by the enhanced bus service, which will increase the service area for the demand response service, and feeder bus service that will provide service to commuter rail and BRT stations.
- Q: When will the final report be available?
R: Later this month, or in February.
- Q: Why is the Midwest City commuter rail line in phase IV?
R: The technical reason why the Midwest City CRT lines is in phase IV is based on the ridership results from the model. This line has the lowest ridership of the other two commuter rail lines, so that in turn would make implementation after the Norman and Edmond lines. Please remember that this analysis is purely technical and the implementation plan is just a "vision". If Tinker AFB or Midwest City were to assure additional local funding the CRT line could be feasible sooner.
- C: The study needs to take into account future BRAC commission meetings, the MRO aircraft maintenance facility being constructed at Tinker AFB, and the possibility of providing mass transit opportunities to employees of Tinker AFB.
- Q: How are you integrating the Oklahoma transit systems together? Maybe create a statewide transit master plan.
R: The focus of this study was the ACOG region. Before a statewide transit initiative can be implemented METRO Transit needs to be better funded so the needs of the Oklahoma City Metropolitan area can be met.
- C: The area needs a change in mentality to support transit. The downtown streetcar project needs to be pushed especially since good transit drives and attracts good development.
- C: Downtown Oklahoma City still has streetcar tracks under the asphalt. Money needs to be invested into rehabbing the track that is currently in place.
- Q: Was the rail line from Union Station to the Airport investigated for commuter rail?
R: Yes, that line was analyzed, but bus rapid transit was shown to be more cost effective.
- Q: How do comments get into the public record?
R: Notes are being taken at this meeting and they will be posted on the website and included in the final report. The comment cards that were handed out may be filled out and placed in the box at the end of the meeting or may be mailed in at your convenience. People can also go onto the website and fill out the comment form and those comments will be recorded in the final report.
- Q: Are your ridership numbers based on the levels of traffic or where people are going to and from?
R: It is based on both of those numbers.
- Q: When you refer to project costs, is that in today's dollar or future dollars?
R: It is based in 2005 dollars.

Norman Library

Tuesday, January 24, 2006, 11:30 AM to 1:00 PM

Larry Hopper, Principal Planner for METRO Transit and COTPA's Project Manager, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and thanked everyone for coming. Mr. Hopper then introduced Tom Shelton, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, and Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner for Carter & Burgess. A slide show was presented by Mr. Shelton and Mr. McAnelly that presented the 2030 System Plan Vision for the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area. Items discussed during the presentation included capital cost and ridership for enhanced bus, bus rapid transit (BRT), commuter rail transit (CRT), and modern streetcar; 25 year implementation plan; potential funding strategies; how to maintain the momentum; and the next steps in the project. Participants agreed to allow the Alliance for Public Transportation (APT) to be in contact with them after the meeting. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments/questions were received.

Q: What is the cost difference between the price of a BRT bus and a regular bus?

R: A BRT bus cost about 1 ½ times more than a regular bus.

Q: Why not just use regular buses instead of the special BRT bus?

R: Regular buses are not as effective for many reasons, only one of which is their image and how that image is not as effective at inspiring ridership. BRT buses have wider doors, no farebox (due to off-vehicle fare collection, and a more futuristic look that resembles a light rail vehicle. This helps eliminates the negative stereotye that buses can have and creates excitement and a service that is differentiated from the regular bus service.

Q: Is commuter rail faster than buses?

R: Yes, operating speed is faster than buses.

Q: Please explain the annualized cost number.

R: The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) uses this measure to compare projects from across the nation for federal funding. Projects that have a more favorable annualized cost are more likely to receive a better rating from FTA. This is just a relative measure that FTA uses and does not reflect a fare.

Q: Why does the commuter rail only go to Moore in phase I?

R: The main reason is cost. This is what can be afforded in phase I. If Norman or another possible funding source comes available the line could be extended down to Norman in phase I.

C: Capital cost of the new Interstate 40 Crosstown is more than the total capital cost of the proposed system plan.

Q: If the system is implemented today can it handle 100,000 people per day?

R: Yes

Q: Why wait 25 years for the plan to be complete?

- R: Money is the biggest issue. Funding sources need to be in place for capital and operating costs of the system. The sooner the money can be found the quicker the system can be implemented. It was noted that many nearby cities have dedicated sales taxes for transit, such as these at one cent: Austin, Dallas, Denver, Houston, and St. Louis. Fort Worth has a half-cent transit sales tax. The Plan for this region suggests the equivalent of funding that could be derived from a quarter-of-a-cent tax.
- Q: Will the commuter rail ridership in phase I be more or less if you go from Norman to Oklahoma City then to Moore?
- R: The ridership will be less if the CRT line is built to Norman. The line from Moore north to 63rd Street is the highest performing CRT section.
- C: Light rail transit (LRT) in Oklahoma City can be built for \$25 million per mile.
- R: Currently LRT is going for around \$50 million per mile which includes right-of-way, stations, utility relocation and electrification.
- Q: Are the financing proposals for Oklahoma County only or for the entire region?
- R: It would be the entire region whether it is various cities or counties in the region.
- C: Norman is being neglected by the current fixed guideway study implementation plan.
- C: Rural areas need to be considered also.
- R: With the implementation of the enhanced bus system rural areas will be better served by paratransit service and demand response service.
- Q: Why is the Northeast 23rd Corridor left out?
- R: The 23rd Corridor is in the Plan. It was looked at and is proposed to have enhanced bus service. The frequency of bus line on 23rd out toward Choctaw will be increased to 20 – 30 minute peak and 45 – 60 minute off-peak service. The population and employment density are not dense enough to warrant fixed guideway transit in that corridor.
- Q: 50% to 80% of the cost would be federal funded, what is that based on?
- R: This is based on FTA's funding record over a 20 year period.
- C: The bus system in Norman needs to be enhanced to be able to reach what is proposed.
- R: Point taken and this will be accomplished with the enhanced bus plan and feeder bus system.
- C: Seems like CRT from the Airport to downtown via Union Station would make sense.
- R: This was looked at in the study.
- Q: Will there be a park and ride in Moore?
- R: Yes, a park and ride will be located at the commuter rail station in Moore.
- Q: Can you compare fares to the annual cost numbers?
- R: Fares are typically 20% of the cost to provide services.
- Q: Isn't there an economic development factor that comes into play, such as it will bring in more people?
- R: Those factors will be determined in our next phase, alternatives analysis.

Edmond Library

Tuesday, January 24, 2006, 5:30 PM to 7:00 PM

Tom Shelton, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, called the meeting to order and introduced Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner for Carter & Burgess. Mr. Shelton welcomed the participants and thanked everyone for coming. A slide show was presented by Mr. Shelton and Mr. McAnelly that presented the 2030 System Plan Vision for the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area. Items discussed during the presentation included capital cost and ridership for enhanced bus, bus rapid transit (BRT), commuter rail transit (CRT), and modern streetcar; 25 year implementation plan; potential funding strategies; how to maintain the momentum; and the next steps in the project. Participants agreed to allow the Alliance for Public Transportation (APT) to be in contact with them after the meeting. Elected officials with the City of Edmond and a COTPA Board member were introduced by Larry Hopper of COTPA, and all present were reminded that they might also wish to attend the Edmond Transportation meeting happening a few blocks away. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments/questions were received.

- Q: The CRT station and park and ride should be at Danforth Road not at 2nd Street.
R: That will be looked at, but cost, ridership, and other factors will determine if that is possible.
- Q: What year are the cost totals in?
R: They are current year costs.
- Q: Does the capital cost estimate include park and rides and right-of-way costs?
R: Yes
- Q: How does this plan compare to Dallas and Houston?
R: Dallas and Houston have far greater needs and a larger plan, but already have funded their plan.
- C: Maybe an extensive grid of rail service would help here, or even reuse of the I-40 Crosstown bridge for light rail.
- Q: How do you get people to ride?
R: Inform people of the opportunity to avoid traffic congestion and the cost of parking. With the continued increase in the price of gas mass transit is a cheaper alternative than driving.
- Q: How much double tracking and right-of-way is needed on the north/south CRT line?
R: No additional right-of-way is needed for the north/south line. The capital cost estimate assumes double tracking the entire length of the corridor, but with additional analysis in future studies this number may decrease.
- Q: How have civil and political leaders reacted to this plan, especially the enhanced bus component?
R: They have reacted positively towards the plan.
- C: Portland, OR has received \$3 billion in investment along the streetcar routes. Rail there promoted infill development and reinvestment.
- C: The McKinney trolley in Dallas promoted private reinvestment and development.

- Q: Why is the commuter rail cost effectiveness index (CEI) so high? It was lower at the previous public meeting.
- R: The CEI is higher because it is a combination of the three CRT lines. The Midwest City/Tinker CRT line is bringing up the CEI number.
- C: On the BNSF line that crosses IH 235 (close to 50th Street), ODOT is working on plans to replace the bridge that goes over IH 235, you all should talk with them and get them to go ahead and widen that bridge so that it could someday be ready to accommodate an extra line of track.



FIXED GUIDEWAY STUDY COMMENT FORM

What are the Oklahoma City area's primary transit needs and challenges?
(check a MAXIMUM of THREE in each column)

Needs

- Service for those in need or without options
- Transit services to jobs/employment
- Increased mobility
- Increased quality of life
- Economic development
- Other _____

Challenges

- Cost of transit/funding transit
- Education and acceptance of transit
- Reducing single occupant vehicle trips
- Coordination among local entities
- Roadway Congestion
- Other _____

No needs or challenges that are not being met

My Commute

I live in: _____ (city)

I work in: _____ (city)

Home zip code: _____

Work zip code: _____

My trip takes _____ minutes each way

For my commute, I: Drive alone Car/vanpool Use transit Other _____

Other Comments?

Please use the area below and the back of the page to add any additional comments.

Name: _____ Address: _____

Phone: _____ Email: _____

Thank you! We welcome your input.

(fold)

(fold)

Post Office
Will Not Deliver
Without Stamp

Carter  **Burgess**

10001 N. Broadway Extension

Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73114-6307

Comments Submitted

Date	Firstname	Lastname	Email Address	Comments
1/27/2006	Don	Whitney	dcw5601@gmail.com	<p>On behalf of the OKC Downtown Lions Club, I would like to invite your group to present the PowerPoint that I saw this week in Edmond. Our Club meets at the McAlpine Center at 428 West California (off Walker) and we usually have 80 to 100 members attend. I would suggest Tuesday, March 21 at lunchtime. Please let me know if you could be our speaker at this or some other time. Thanks, Don work phone 228-3292 home phone 341-5507</p>
1/25/2006	Nelson	Dent	ndentus@yahoo.com	<p>New Mexico last 16 months accomplishments... NM has their own commuter rail equipment and maintance crew NM has their own rail line extending 300 miles from Trinidad, CO to Belen, NM NM has a timetable of 16 trains NM Rail Runner is supported by the local and state people including the Governor OK last 16 month accomplishments... OK Heartland Flyer is often overcrowded and people get bumped off ODOT refuses to acknowledge a successful Guthrie run in Sept 05 that had more passengers than the OU/TX train!!! ODOT refuses to lease additional equipment to supplement increasing passengers. One of Oklahoma's Passenger cars is sitting in a Texas Rail Yard. Sitting. Not moving. Does your study look at - * Rerouting I-40 cross-town around Union Station and run NM style trains? * Saving Union Station – Few at grade crossings, 12 track yard, and surface level station. Tracks that go east-west-south-north. Tracks that go to the airport and Tinker! * Getting a commuter train up and running going through Norman-Moore-OKC-Edmond-Guthrie New Mexico is blowing us away in transportation. Can you mention in your report that hundreds of people want other options besides a bus and more highways? You guys did a nice job in your presentations and your work looks good. However, light rail and commuter rail is the way to go. We don't want to clog our already busy streets with more buses. We need other options like light rail and commuter trains. Look at Denver, Dallas, Portland, and now look at Santa Fe with eh Rail Runner.</p>

Date	Firstname	Lastname	Email Address	Comments
1/25/2006	Nelson	Dent	ndentus@yahoo.com	World class cities have world class transportation. Salt Lake City recognized this going into the 2002 Winter Olympics -- and insisted on developing rail transit. Acceptance and performance was overwhelming. If Oklahoma City wants "a dynamic urban core," the key is access and mobility. Rail transit -- fuel efficient, universally useful -- is the choice of the middle class all over the West. The argument is over. Dallas, Denver, Salt Lake, Portland, San Diego and Sacramento are just a few of the cities with maturing rail systems -- kicking our behinds in every economic indicator. In a state drowning in unfunded highway maintenance need, rail services offer far higher capacity at far lower maintenance cost. Any respectable single track rail line can move anything in a proportion equal to the capacity of a 20 lane expressway. Double tracking massively increases that capacity. In Dallas, DART Rail will require no significant maintenance for 40 years. The trains are clean, fuel efficient, all-weather and meet suburbanites at park and ride lots on the periphery of the urban core, a truly "multimodal" system. We "can't afford it?" We "don't have the population density to support it?" Strange -- we "do" have the "population density" to pay whatever costs and overwhelming debt the highway lobby wants to impose on us and our grandchildren! We can't afford not to have rail transit -- and we'd better get started.
1/24/2006	Richard	Robinson	RichardR369@cox.net	I gave up going to the FGS meetings because I know that it's a dog and pony show to cover up the fact that Carter-Burgess is not providing advice but are taking orders from ODOT instead. New Mexico and Utah and everybody else are advancing their communities while we're destroying ours. Good thing Fritz Kahn is fighting for the citizens of Oklahoma City at the federal level because he's our only hope against this blatant corruption.
1/24/2006	Richard	Robinson	RichardR369@cox.net	I gave up going to the FGS meetings because I know that it's a dog and pony show to cover up the fact that they're not providing advice but are taking orders from ODOT instead. New Mexico and Utah and everybody else is advancing their communities while we're destroying ours. Good thing Fritz Kahn is fighting for the citizens of Oklahoma City at the federal level because he's our only hope against this blatant corruption.
1/12/2006	larry	van schuyver	gmcme9@yahoo.com	sir, I like to get info on the possibility of getting a bus stop located by KBCCC Correctional center located at NW 39th access road and Land or Drexal. We have approx 300 riders a day that would use the bus service and be a big safety issue for our ladies who are on work release. Thanks L. Van Schuyver
1/8/2006	Your	SIGHT		Your sight sucks!

Date	Firstname	Lastname	Email Address	Comments
1/4/2006	Carl	Alice	ranger2958@peoplepc.com	<p>You can change routes, you change buses out but if the drivers do not what routes cross there routes what good dose it! I was on the 23route paying bills then I got on the meridian route but that driver did not know what route I need to get to 59th & may ave. I was trying to see the other stops along the route but I end up at the airport, and he charged me again to get back to 23 route so I could get home. I alive up on 36th mac arther. We do not have any services up here. The other thing about this what if I was sent by a small company to how good the services are here in oklahoma city for the company for employee who do not drive! Think about that driver would be that persons first I would have seen and he did not know anything! OH THAT'S BAD NEWS. I GOT ON THIS ROUTE ABOUT 4:10 IN AFTERNOON AND GOT OFF ABOUT 5:10 THE BUS # 0221. I have been on route 23,5,22, and this drivers understand that their are people who do not ride all the time and know all the routes and they try to help, I thank God for them! IF we had sevice up here at 36th & Mac Arther I would ride the meto a lot more but because I have to walk to 23rd & mac arther ot get on I only use the meto when i have to because I am DISABLED and it hurts for me to walk that far and my wife is in a power chair and can not get down their. We live in warr acres. Thank You for your time & God Bless you all ! Carl & Pamela Alice</p>
10/26/2005	Doug	Vincent	doug2001ou@earthlink.net	<p>DART has an updated (September 2005) study of economic development around its stations. It was performed by the same University of North Texas researchers as the 2002 study you include. Here is the URL: http://www.dart.org/WeinsteinDARTDevelopment2005.pdf</p>
9/27/2005	Darlene	Bricky	dbricky@odmhsas.org	<p>A co-worker and I how conveniet it would be for working folks, who use Mass transit, like we do, if they had an easily accessible public evening meeting for us to attend. Thank you</p>
9/7/2005	Shantel	Pittman		<p>Bicycles!! They would be used more if people thought they would be a safe alternative.</p>
8/3/2005	Richard	Robinson	RichardR369@sbcglobal.net	<p>I just read a 'final' report on the Carter-Burgess study. It doesn't surprise me that after the Rose State College meeting when several attendees mentioned rail going through Union Station, that was omitted. Corruption will always prevail in Oklahoma.</p>

Date	Firstname	Lastname	Email Address	Comments
8/1/2005	Paula	McKinney	paula_mckinney98@yahoo.com	<p>After spending a summer in Seattle Wa., we were excited about using public transportation more often. We live near the intersection of Rockwell and Memorial. We were shocked to find out that there is not one bus route to Tinker Air Force Base. I realize most people who work on base own cars. However, there are people who drop their cars off to be worked on and later need a ride home. Others might be interested in riding the bus to work every day. Is there any plan to implement a bus route to Tinker? If my husband could get to work with one transfer downtown, he would probably ride the bus. If he could get to Tinker without any transfers, he would definitely ride the bus.</p>
7/16/2005	Kevin	Dunn	ch_jeep@yahoo.com	<p>This is not a very easy web site. I was hoping to type in an originating address, destination address and times to find out how to get there and how much. That is not possible to figure out from your web site. It would also be nice to find out how much it would cost after you typed in your trip information. Finally, the header takes up way too much room on the screen and having the acrobat scedule vertically on the screen doesn't help anything. I was really hoping to use the transit system to get to my new job, but this is too hard to figure out. Check out the Greyhound website and try to improve on it. sincerely, Kevin Dunn Midwest City</p>
7/7/2005	Andie	Stringfellow	vbnerd@gbronline.com	<p>I haven't looked at the full website but there is one area about the mass transit that has been sorely lacking and I for one would like to see this changed. There doesn't seem to be mass transit for example up MacArthur in OKC. There are bunches of apartments I would have considered living in along that area but I wanted to be close to the bus line. I'm assuming the reason may be a dividing line with OKC and its neighboring communities of Warr Acres and Bethany. But the bus line as it is now has large holes where there is no service and that is the one thing I would put my 2-cents worth in about.</p>
6/27/2005	Luke	Barrett	swooshou@yahoo.com	<p>I would love to see a light rail system in OKC. I am a young urbanite who lives in Mesta Park. There are plenty of young hipsters in and around downtown OKC who would gladly ride a train around town to do their errands rather than drive. I'll be glad to do anything I can do to help make this happen. Luke Barrett</p>
6/16/2005	Sandy	Meier	smeier@yukoncc.com	<p>Can you please tell me if the July 7th meeting will be the same forum as the June 14-16 meetings?</p>

Date	Firstname	Lastname	Email Address	Comments
6/15/2005	Tim	Hunt	huntwrite4fun@cox.net	<p>Dear Central OK Transportation & Parking Authority: Several years back, a former member of the Tulsa City Planning Commission "Jim Biffle," a personal friend, offered plans for a modern, high-speed monorail system to connect Tulsa & Oklahoma City, as well as loops around both cities with stops at the major airports and major trade centers. However sadly, due to the politics of the time, this project was abandoned. There was even a map once made by Tulsa showing the plans for this type of a mass transit system, which was patterned after the ones in Europe and Japan. After these plans were dropped due to the politics of the day, sighting what was then considered too costly, Jim Biffle was later hired to plan such systems for major cities in Canada and Hawaii. If these plans had been pursued by pooling resources in a joint effort of OKC, Tulsa and the State Transportation Authorities, this system would have long since become a working reality. Maybe it is time to go back and look at these plans and reconsider this type of a system that would not only benefit Central Oklahoma and its economy, but also set us apart as a model for other states. An above the ground system, much like the "L's" in several larger cities, are much more feasible and affordable than the once proposed subway systems. And though the inception is more expensive than other rail or buss systems, a monorail system built from the modern technology of super-conductors, would be much more economic to maintain and operate for the future of central Oklahoma. Not only are electric driven monorail systems quieter and faster, this new technology of using super-conductors create systems that are incredibly safe and economic to operate, once the rail systems are in place. Another suggestion is to look at the public mass transit system in Seattle Washington. This system uses hundreds of cable cars, which are basically city busses that are each modified with a boom attached to each bus for hooking up to a network of electric cables to run their routs by electric motors, while in and around the Seattle Metro Area. They use a small diesel engine to drive the bus to a hook up site, then a boom is connected to the cable that is a part of a network of cables that power electric motors to drive the busses much more economically along their routs. When the drivers complete their daily routs, they simply detach the booms and drive the buss under it's own power by the diesel engine back to the City Buss Garage where it is well maintained. This system is a free system for citizens, paid for by the city's huge tax base, and since it offers rides for no costs to citizens, it gives great incentive for people to ride rather than to drive to their destinations, greatly lowering the percentages of air pollution from the cars that would have otherwise been used. In addition, for the existing road and highway systems in OKC, Tulsa, and Central OK, it would be wise to study how San Antonio has configured their thoroughfares with turnarounds, at each major intersection, which greatly increases the continual flow of traffic alleviating many traffic back-ups during times of heavy traffic. Additionally, it might be wise to consider having special commuting lanes on the major highways around our larger metropolitan areas, such as the highways in Seattle and LA, where a bypass lane is</p>

Date	Firstname	Lastname	Email Address	Comments
6/14/2005	Eileen	Koelsch	ekoelsch@rose.edu	Members of my family own a building and property, Ted Koelsch Hardware and Feed Store, on Sooner Road and Reno in Del City. The railway adjacent to the property would be useful in establishing transportation from Midwest City/Del City to Bricktown and elsewhere. Please consider this in your efforts to ease the daily commute and to increase revenue. I heard the building was a depot in WWII for the soldiers. Mom and Dad started the business in approx 1947 (we lived there for a time) and my brother had to close it after 50 years. It could be an historical stop along the commute as well as a future place of business for someone. I hope this will be of help.
6/7/2005	Kevin	Pargeter	kevinpargeter@gmail.com	What is the environmental impact--i.e. for land, air, and water--of a Fixed Guideway transit system?
6/1/2005	Don	Whitney	dcw5601@aol.com	Please add the May 2005 Parthways Newsletter to your web site.
3/7/2005	Harry	Wilson	hchoochoo@aol.com	I was out of the city when the February meetings occurred. I would like to be informed of future meetings. I am especially interested in the 10th st. plan.
3/7/2005	Harry	Wilson	hchoochoo@aol.com	I was out of the city when the February meetings occurred. I would like to be informed of future meetings. I am especially interested in the 10th st. plan.