WELCOME

Public Meeting For
US-62 From SH-9 to Anadarko, Caddo County

May 5, 2016
PURPOSE OF THIS MEETING

...is to Discuss the Need and Present the Proposed Alternatives to Improve US-62 From SH-9 to Anadarko in Caddo County
PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT

...is to Correct the Deficient Curves on US-62 and Improve the Safety of the Roadway
PROJECT HISTORY

- Prior Study by ODOT
  - Three Alternatives Studied
    - Improvements to Existing
    - North Alignment
    - South Alignment
  - Public Meeting Held
    - February 28, 2012
  - North Alternative Selected
  - Field Survey – Found Isolated Grave Site
  - Additional Alternatives Considered
SH-9 From Fort Cobb to US-62 (Apache “Y”)

- Initial Data Collection
- Preliminary Options
- Option Screening

- N 2570 Rd.
- N 2610 Rd.
- Fort Cobb
- E 1340 Rd
- N 2580 Rd.
- Apache “Y”
- Washita River
PROJECT AREA INFORMATION

- **General Data**
  - 2-Lane Roadway With 3-Foot Shoulders
  - Speed Limit – Posted 65 mph
  - 1 Bridge Structure (Hog Creek)
  - Projected Traffic (2036): 5,270 Vehicles / Day (10% Trucks)
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**PROJECT AREA INFORMATION**

- **General Data**
  - 2-Lane Roadway With 3-Foot Shoulders
  - Speed Limit – Posted **65 mph**
  - 1 Bridge Structure (Hog Creek)
  - Existing (2016) Traffic: 3,780 Vehicles / Day
  - Projected Traffic (2036): **5,270** Vehicles / Day (10% Trucks)

- **Collision Data**
    - 48 Personal Property Damage
    - 38 Injury
    - 4 Fatal
  - **More Than Twice the State Average** for Collisions (expressed in crashes per million vehicle miles)
    - US-62: 155.4 (65.6 injury, 6.9 fatality)
    - Statewide for Non Interstates: 63.82 (30.56 injury, 2.60 fatality)
EXISTING CONDITIONS WARRANT IMPROVEMENT

- Roadway Deficiencies
  - Narrow Shoulders
  - Roadway Geometry
    - Horizontal Curves – 11 Total, 6 Deficient (Curvature and Superelevation)
    - Vertical Curves – 35 Total, 12 Deficient
  - Limited Sight Distance
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- Roadway Deficiencies
  - Narrow Shoulders
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STUDY AREA CONSTRAINTS
Identified Project Constraints

- Topography
- Homes & Businesses
  - Driveways
  - Local Access
- Utilities
- Tribal Properties & Cultural Sites
- Environmental Resources
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PROJECT CONSTRAINTS

- **Data Collection Area**
  - Encompassed all Alternatives
  - Database Research and Field Reconnaissance
**Tribal Properties (West Project)**
- Trust Lands (Hatched)
- According to Information From the Counties and BIA
- Primarily in the West Project
**PROJECT CONSTRAINTS**

- **Tribal Church and Cemetery**
  - Ware’s Chapel
  - Ware’s Cemetery
  - Grave Site (Helen James Died 1912?)
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- **Tribal Church and Cemetery**
  - Ware’s Chapel
  - Ware’s Cemetery
  - Grave Site (Helen James Died 1912?)
**PROJECT CONSTRAINTS**

- **Wetlands and Streams**
  - Streams – Hog Creek & Tributaries, Washita River
  - Wetlands – Associated With Washita River
  - Large Floodplain
PROJECT CONSTRAINTS

- **Cultural Resources**
  - OK Indian Missionary Conference Center and Campground (Potential Historic Buildings)
  - One Known Archaeological Site
DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVES
DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVES

- **Proposed Design Criteria**
  - **Roadway Section**
    - Two 12-Foot Lanes
    - 8-Foot Shoulders
  - **Design Speeds** – 65 mph
  - **Clear Zone** – 28 Feet
  - **Maximum Superelevation of 8%**
Overview

- West Project – Alternatives 1, 2 and 3
  - Different Alignments Cross Country
  - Hog Creek Bridge
  - County Road Intersections With Heavier Movement

- East Project – Alternatives A, B and C
  - Different Offsets – North
  - Far East End – All Centered on Existing
  - Horizontal Curve Corrections

- Combinations
**Overview**

- **West Project – Alternatives 1, 2, and 3**
  - Different Alignments Cross Country
  - Hog Creek Bridge
  - County Road Intersections With Heavier Movement
  - South Alternative – Floodplain, NRCS Dam, & Reservoir
**Overview**

- Aligns With Improvements at Apache Y
- Closest to Existing Alignment
- Key Features
  - Offset 50 feet South
  - Three Curves Greater Than 6% Superelevation
  - Left Turn Lanes at NS 2610 Rd. & NS 2620 Rd.
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  - Left Turn Lanes at NS 2610 Rd. & NS 2620 Rd.
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- Aligns With Improvements at Apache Y
- **Key Features**
  - Offset 35 Feet North
  - Two Curves Greater Than 6% Superelevation
  - Climbing Lane
  - Left Turn Lanes at NS 2610 Rd. & NS 2620 Rd.
  - Improve Grades West of NS 2620 Rd., < 4%
Alternative 2

**Overview**
- Aligns With Improvements at Apache Y
- **Key Features**
  - Offset 35 Feet North
  - Two Curves Greater Than 6% Superelevation
  - Climbing Lane
  - Left Turn Lanes at NS 2610 Rd. & NS 2620 Rd.
  - Improve Grades West of NS 2620 Rd., < 4%
- Bridge Over Hog Creek Offset to South – 50 Feet
- Portion of Existing Highway to Remain
**Overview**

- Aligns With Improvements at Apache Y
- **Key Features**
  - Offset 50 Feet South
  - One Curve Greater Than 6% Superelevation
  - Climbing Lane
  - Left Turn Lanes at NS 2610 Rd. & NS 2620 Rd.
Overview
- Aligns With Improvements at Apache Y
- Key Features
  - Offset 60 Feet South
  - One Curve Greater Than 6% Superelevation
  - Climbing Lane
  - Left Turn Lanes at NS 2610 Rd. & NS 2620 Rd.
  - Improve Grades West of NS 2620 Rd., 4%
ALTERNATIVE 3

Overview

- Aligns With Improvements at Apache Y
- Key Features
  - Offset 60 Feet South
  - One Curve Greater Than 6% Superelevation
  - Climbing Lane
  - Left Turn Lanes at NS 2610 Rd. & NS 2620 Rd.
  - Improve Grades West of NS 2620 Rd., 4%
- Bridge Over Hog Creek – Near Washita River
- Portion of Existing Highway to Remain
ALTERNATIVES -- EAST PROJECT

- East Project – Alternatives A, B and C
  - Different Offsets – North
  - Far East End – All Centered on Existing
  - Horizontal Curve Improvements (5 Curves)
Offset Roadways

- **Alternative A – 0 feet, Centered on Existing**
  - Temporary Widening (22 ft), South Side at Horizontal Curves
  - Overlay Existing Pavement With New Shoulders, One Lane Flagging Needed

- **Alternative B – 13 feet North**
  - Temporary Widening (8 ft), South Side
  - Overlay Existing Pavement With New Pavement on North Side (20 ft)

- **Alternative C – 50 feet North**
  - No Temporary Widening Needed
  - New Pavement with Old Pavement Removed

- Far East End - Overlay Existing Pavement With New Shoulders
- South Offset Considered – Eliminated due to Number of Structures Impacted
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

- Compare the Impacts of the Various Options
  - Overlay Each Option and Tabulate Impacts
  - Develop a Relative Means of Comparison
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

- All Alternatives Will Avoid the Cemetery, Ware’s Chapel, and the Grave Site
- If There are Other Culturally Important Sites That we Should Avoid, Please Let us Know
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

- **Evaluation Criteria**
  - Roadway Geometrics, Intersections, and Safety
  - Impacts to Tribal & Private Property
  - Impacts to Homes & Businesses
  - Impacts to Environmental Resources
  - Constructability and Maintenance of Traffic During Construction
  - Cost – Construction, Right-of-Way, Utilities
  - Tribal and Public Input

![Map showing Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, with West and East Projects highlighted. Maps show geographical layout including roads and landmarks.]
West Project

- Improvements to Grades and Sight Distance Under Alternative 1 are Limited Due to Adjacent Properties and Cemetery
- Alternative 2 Improves Curves but Intersection at NS-2620 is Not Ideal
- Alternative 3 Has the Most Desirable Grades, Intersections, and Sight Distance
- Alternatives 2 and 3 Will Require a Climbing Lane Due to the Length of Grade
**East Project**

- All of the Alternatives Will Correct the Horizontal Curves
- All of the East Project Alternatives are Similar in Terms of Safety
## IMPACTS -- WEST PROJECT

### West Project
- Alternative 1 Has the Most Impacts to Homes and Businesses
- One Business (Fruit Stand) Will be Affected by All Alternatives
- Alternative 3 Requires the Most Property and Affects Wetlands

### JP No. 27076(04) US-62 West of Anadarko, Caddo County

#### West Project Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Right-of-Way (Acres)</th>
<th>Number of Relocations</th>
<th>Tribal Property (acre)</th>
<th>Wetlands (acre)</th>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Traffic-Dependent Businesses</th>
<th>Maintenance of Traffic (Lanes Closed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13.5 M</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (relocation)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$15.8 M</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$15.7 M</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# IMPACTS – EAST PROJECT

## East Project
- Alternative C Requires the Most Property
- Alternative A Would Require One-Lane Traffic for a Longer Period
- Other Impacts are Similar for the East Project Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Right-of-Way (Acres)</th>
<th>Number of Relocations</th>
<th>Tribal Property (acre)</th>
<th>Wetlands (acre)</th>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Traffic-Dependent Businesses</th>
<th>Maintenance of Traffic (Lanes Closed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>$10.1 M</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>$10.1 M</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>$10.4 M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEXT STEPS
NEXT PROJECT STEPS

- Public Input
- Comment Period May 19, 2016
- Select Preferred Alternative
- Prepare Environmental Document
- Right-of-Way 2018
- Construction 2023
THANK YOU!

Please Submit Your Comments by May 19, 2016

✓ Leave Your Comment Form Here Today
✓ Mail the Comment Form Back to ODOT:
  Environmental Programs Division
  200 NE 21st Street
  Oklahoma City, OK 73105
✓ Email Your Comments to ODOT-Environment@ODOT.ORG

QUESTIONS?