

VIRTUAL OPEN HOUSE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY REPORT

**Open House Dates:
April 13 – 27, 2022**

**INTERSECTION MODIFICATION SH-4: AT FOX LANE (EW-122) 2.24
MILES NORTH OF I-44**

**GRADY COUNTY
J/P No. 34262(04); Project No. J3-4262(004)**

Prepared for:



**OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION**

Prepared by:



**CC Environmental, LLC
PO Box 1292
Norman, OK 73070**

July 15, 2022

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As part of the Oklahoma Department of Transportation's (ODOT) efforts to keep the public informed and involved in the decision-making process, a Virtual Open House was held. The Virtual Open House was hosted in a web-based format, and no in-person meeting was held. The following is a generalized summary of the public involvement effort, the information provided as part of the outreach, and the comments and input received. ODOT responses to comments are also presented in this document.

1.1 OPEN HOUSE DATES

April 13 through 27, 2022

1.2 MEETING WEBSITE

www.odot.org/SH4foxlane

1.3 PURPOSE OF VIRTUAL OPEN HOUSE

The purpose of the virtual open house was to introduce the public to the proposed project, provide detail on the various alternatives being considered, and to solicit input.

1.4 PROJECT BACKGROUND

ODOT, in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), is evaluating options to improve traffic operational safety at the intersection of Fox Lane (EW-122) and SH-4 located three miles south of the SH-37 and SH-4 intersection in Grady County, Oklahoma. This segment of SH-4 is a two-lane open section minor arterial highway with 12-foot-wide driving lanes and 2-foot-wide shoulders. The intersection has dedicated left and right lanes from north- and southbound SH-4 to Fox Lane, and traffic is controlled onto SH-4 by stop signs. The current traffic volume on SH-4 is 8,740 vehicles per day (vpd), and is expected to increase to 15,900 vpd by 2050.

1.5 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

ODOT is evaluating several options for improving this intersection while taking into consideration the cost of construction, right-of-way and utilities impacts, and environmental constraints. ODOT studied three fundamental alternatives with several variations—Alternative 1 includes at-grade modifications, Alternative 2 includes the construction of a low-speed round-about, and Alternative 3 includes a grade-separated intersection where Fox Lane passes over SH-4 or SH-4 passes over Fox Lane. Refer to the figures for a general depiction of the proposed alternatives.

The following variations of the three alternatives have been evaluated:

- **Alternative 1: At-Grade Modifications**
 - Alternative 1A: No improvements—the roadway would remain as is with a two-way stop.
 - Alternative 1D: Convert to a four-way stop controlled intersection.
 - Alternative 1E: Add stop lights to the intersection, and include eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes onto Fox Lane.
 - Alternative 1F: Increase the length of the SH-4 north- and southbound deceleration right-turn lanes and move them to a slight offset alignment.

- **Alternative 2: Low-Speed Roundabout**
 - Alternative 2A: Construct a single-lane roundabout.
 - Alternative 2B: Construct a roundabout with the addition of right-turn bypass lanes.

- **Alternative 3: Grade-Separated Intersection**
 - Alternative 3A: Reconstruct Fox Lane to go over SH-4.
 - **Alternative 3A2: Reconstruct Fox Lane to go over SH-4, and add northbound lanes on SH-4 within the limits of the project area to achieve a four-lane divided highway. (Preferred alternative.)**
 - Alternative 3B: Reconstruct SH-4 to go over Fox Lane.
 - Alternative 3B2: Reconstruct SH-4 to go over Fox Lane, and add northbound lanes on SH-4 within the limits of the project area to achieve a four-lane divided highway.
 - Alternative 3C: Construct SH-4 on a new offset alignment to the east.

All alternatives would allow the highway to remain open during construction, and access to local residences and businesses would be maintained throughout the project duration.

1.6 PUBLIC NOTICES

- ODOT mailed invitation letters to various political entities, interested parties, the public and Native American Tribes on April 6, 2022. These letters provided a short project description and included information about the Open House and requested that recipients provide input by April 27, 2022. Enclosed with the letter was a copy of the project location and alternative maps.
- ODOT mailed Virtual Open House pamphlets via Direct Mail to property and business owners on three mailing routes along the project area on April 8, 2022.
- ODOT mailed Virtual Open House pamphlets to property owners, utility owners, and other stakeholders on April 8, 2022.
- ODOT mailed solicitation letters to various state and federal agencies on April 13, 2022. These letters provided a short project description and included information about the Open House and requested that recipients provide input by April 27, 2022. Enclosed with the letter was a copy of the project location and alternative maps.
- ODOT sent out a press release and general media announcements on April 13, 2022.

1.7 VIRTUAL OPEN HOUSE FORMAT

The Virtual Open House was available for public access online at www.odot.org/SH4foxlane between April 13 and 27, 2022. The Virtual Open House home page specified the purpose of the proposed construction and of the Virtual Open House, and provided a description and background of the proposed project. From the home page, could select from the following pages for detailed information:

- Sign-In – This page contained a form for signing in to the virtual open house meeting.
- Pamphlet – This page contained a PDF copy of the virtual Open House pamphlet.
- Alternatives Considered – This page contained a list of the alternatives considered for this project. The alternatives that were evaluated were accompanied by a description of the proposed improvements and an interactive diagram. The preferred alternative was presented with a description, interactive diagram, and fly-through imagery of the proposed alternative.
- Environmental Considerations – This page compiled the findings of the detailed environmental studies.
- Preliminary Report & Conceptual Plans – This page contained a copy of the Preliminary Engineering Report completed for this project, and a copy of the Conceptual Plans.
- Frequently Asked Questions – This page included a list of frequently asked questions regarding the project and their answers. (Refer to Appendix C for the materials presented.)
- Property Rights – This page included a copy of the ODOT Property Rights Brochure.
- Submit a Comment – The public was encouraged to participate in the public outreach process, and were provided several methods for submitting comments regarding the project. This page provided the deadline and contact information for providing comments.

1.8 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS & RESPONSES

In total, six hundred twenty-seven (627) users visited the project webpage as part of the Virtual Open House process, and ODOT received input from three (3) agencies and one (1) tribe, along with comments/questions from eighty-three (83) responders¹, including three (3) phone calls, three (3) emailed comments, thirty-three (33) website comments, and thirty-nine (39) paper comment forms received by mail.

The comments and responses associated with each media are presented in the following sections.

1.8.1 Website Analytics

VIRTUAL OPEN HOUSE WEBSITE ANALYTICS	
VIRTUAL OPEN HOUSE WEBSITE PAGE	TOTAL
Users / Visitors	627
Attendees Who Signed Electronic Sign-In Sheet	36
SH-4 at Fox Lane	961 views
Alternatives Considered	300 views
Preliminary & Conceptual Plans	134 views
Pamphlet	126 views
Sign-In	106 views
Frequently Asked Questions	83 views
Environmental Studies	48 views
Property Rights Brochure	46 views
Attendees Who Filled Out Electronic Comment Form	33

¹ Some responders may have submitted via multiple media options

1.8.2 Public Comments

COMMENTS	
GENERAL COMMENT CONTEXT	INPUT
Respondent 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operates the facility west of the intersection at top of hill (oilfield location) 18-wheelers access the site 24hr/7 Has questions regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plans for keeping intersection open Other options for accessing site during construction Would like to discuss situation with ODOT
Respondent 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has questions regarding the project.
Respondent 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asked if the project would require more right-of-way near her home on Sara Rd. Asked about the scope of the project.
Respondent 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lives ½ mile west of the project intersection on Fox Lane. The traffic volume grows constantly. Access to Highway 4, especially left turns, is very difficult during heavy traffic times. All of the traffic east and west bound on Fox Lane west of Highway 4 goes right by her driveway. The preferred alternative 3A2 would be the best choice. Assumes that eventually Highway 4 will be expanded to four lanes and connect to the Norman Spur, and eventually the Kilpatrick near Mustang, so might as well make this stretch of roadway compatible with that eventual expansion. Thanked ODOT for the materials and access to the website, and would appreciate any updates as they are available.
Respondent 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lives south of SH-4 and Fox Lane. Did not pay attention to the envelope/information he received Wants to know who needs to contact to determine if his property will be affected.
Respondent 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lives at 1278 County Street 2953, Tuttle OK 73089. Wants to know if their property will be affected.
Respondent 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: Will the project continue south making all of SH-4 a 4-lane highway? How long before we will know if our home will be affected by this project or the continuation of the project?
Respondent 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 1E: This is the greatest idea. The community has been asking for stop lights at the intersection for years and this would greatly improve it. They cannot stand the idea of any other alternative because they seem very expensive, and will take forever to complete. All we need are stop lights.

<p>Respondent 9</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: This is desperately needed. It is only a matter of time till a school bus full of our children gets hit at this intersection.
<p>Respondent 10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 1E: This input is about the letter we received regarding the state giving homeowners fair market value for their property. We live appx. 1 mile south of the SH-4 and Fox Ln intersection and 0.25 mile west of SH-4, so it concerns me as to why we would receive this information when, from the looks of the plans, our home should not be affected. If this is not the case, please let me know. Responding to alternative 3A2: I think alternative 3A2 is an outstanding choice albeit, probably the most expensive. SH-4 is getting busier by the day and ODOT needs to plan correctly for the future. Four lanes are already needed, so as soon as ODOT can add those, the better. I think it's better to have a bridge go over the highway vice adding a bridge to SH-4 that goes over Fox Ln. Responding to alternative 3B: I like both 3B and 3B2, just as I do 3A and 3A2; however, I think having the bridge going over the highway is better than a bridge going over Fox Ln. I'm not seeing any advantages of alternative 3C. Responding to alternative 3A: I like both 3A and 3A2 with 3A2 being my preferred action. Responding to alternative 2A: Both 2A and 2B are incredibly stupid ideas. Who in their right mind would think placing a roundabout within a stretch of a very rural state highway with a speed limit of 65 is a good idea? If it was an Engineer, they need to be fired or go back to school! Responding to alternative 1F: This would probably be the cheapest fix for this intersection as long as the turn lanes would made long enough as to not impeded the flow of traffic on SH-4 although, higher vehicles (large motor homes, semi's etc.) might block the view for those on Fox Lane from safely turning onto the highway. Responding to alternative 1E: First- I'm not sure why we received information regarding getting fair market price for our property. We live approximately 1 mile south and 0.25 mile west of SH-4. As for the alternative 1E- ANYTHING having to do with a stop sign, stop light, etc. is a bad idea. Vehicles (including numerous semi's per day) are doing 65+ mph on the highway. Making people have to stop in this area is a terrible idea. At night it would be even worse since it is very dark in this area. The traffic flow on SH-4 should not be impeded by any form of stopping (sign or light). The traffic is high in this area and it would create a huge backup which could possibly extend toward the rise in the road. People coming from the south would not have time to react should vehicles be backed up to this point, leading to multiple accidents.
<p>Respondent 11</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: This has been needed out here for a long time. Thanks for the information on the plans. Looks like you all thought this out all the way. May the project go right as planned. This will help with the traffic on SH-4 so much.
<p>Respondent 12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: The proposed 3A2 is the only one that safely lets cars access SH4 without crossing traffic. Cars do not slow down for the intersection currently and those trying to cross take chances to cross, especially with the high school so close. The other options are not viable. I'm in favor of Fox lane crossing over SH4. Will SH4 be widened to 4-lane from SH37 to the Norman spur and will access from other side roads be made safer?

<p>Respondent 13</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: The preferred alternative 3A2 looks like the best application for the SH-4 and Fox Lane intersection. Therefore, I submit my agreement with ODOT for the 3A2 alternative.
<p>Respondent 14</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 1F: Since the Spur opened in 2001(?), I have traveled South on SH-4 to work every day in OKC, and north to Mustang, etc. on most weekends. I agree that traffic has certainly increased at this and nearby intersections. We moved here for the rural attributes and to live away from congestion and urban influences. I usually have to wait a couple of seconds to minutes to turn south on SH-4 from Fox Rd., but to me, that's okay to prevent a motor vehicle accident. Option 1F is better than yet another stop light, stop sign, and worst-case scenario, yet another large overpass expense further eating into our neighbors' pastures and yards. This is Bridge Creek, NOT OKC, Dallas/Ft Worth or some Northern urbana. I recommend reducing the speed limit from Hwy 9 & Spur to SH-4 north and south for a mile or so, and minimizing traffic flow disturbances on SH-4 by just adding better turn-off lanes to Fox Lane. Thank you for your interest in improving this intersection. God bless.
<p>Respondent 15</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 2A: Please no roundabouts! This comment also applies to alternative 2b. The amount vehicles would need to slow down to navigate the roundabout would be huge and cause massive backups during rush hour. Plus, people don't even slow down northbound when they come off the 75 mph turnpike. There's a huge chance they would wreck or rear end someone else trying to slow down enough to navigate the roundabout. I have lived in several locations with roundabouts. All were on city streets, not major highways and they still had numerous accidents in them.
<p>Respondent 16</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: Not associated with a business/organization...just a grandparent of kids (one approaching driving age) that attend Bridge Creek School. I agree 100% with "Preliminary Preferred alternative: Alt. 3A2 INTERCHANGE"
<p>Respondent 17</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: I would like to vote for the alternative 3A2 option. Thanks!
<p>Respondent 18</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: I understand that you performed some preliminary noise testing. The noise is already obnoxious and wakes us up several times a night. Did you conduct the noise test with sirens blaring down the highway or with engine brakes going full bore? I'm standing in my kitchen right now and I can hear noisy tires on the highway. I invite you to come spend time in my home and see how noisy it is the road will be even closer to our house. Very close to our property line. We need some noise solutions.

<p>Respondent 19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: I think 3A2 would be the best long-term solution to the increased traffic needs of this area. I have had numerous close calls at this intersection and something has to be done. I have pulled out from east bound Fox LN onto southbound Hwy 4 when it was as clear a good distance and still have people pass me (in oncoming traffic lane) because I can't go from 0 to 65 fast enough. People in this area tend to take stop signs as a "suggested" thing to do and I do not think they would solve the problem. I think more lighting and or reflectors need to be added further south of this intersection just north of I-44. It's difficult to see the roadway in the dark, especially when it's raining.
<p>Respondent 20</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: I like alternative 3A2. My question is about the addition of north bound lanes to achieve a four-lane divided highway. Will that make Hwy 4 a four-lane divided highway all the way to Hwy 37? If not, why not? Also, what about adding south bound lanes to achieve a four-lane divided highway all the way to the spur? I do not understand why Hwy 4 narrows from a four-lane divided highway to a two-lane highway and then back to a four-lane highway in a 4 mile stretch.
<p>Respondent 21</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: I have noticed that an area of concern is on SH4 at intersection of CR 1226, traffic entering & exiting that road have caused near crashes. Can anything be done to help this?
<p>Respondent 22</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: I fully support this alternative as I feel it provides the best option for safety, future growth and maintaining traffic flow on SH-4. I would like to ask who will have responsibility for ice/snow removal on a bridge over the highway? I am unsure what organization is currently tasked with it but they do a decent job. At present the county is unable or unwilling to take that task on and the traffic volume for this intersection only seems to be increasing. Also, to all the other alternatives put forth, they all would limit the flow on SH-4 based on speeds attainable by fully loaded semi-trucks. Having any traffic control device to stop/slow traffic would limit traffic speed to how fast a truck could accelerate on a two-lane highway. This in turn creates frustration and loss of patience while vehicles attempt to pass in very limited passing zones. So, while traffic control devices at the intersection may fix a "safety Issue" at that point it would also create more safety issues on the highway. Highway 4 needs to be expanded to 4 lanes from Tuttle all the way to the turnpike to maintain traffic flow and increase safety. Thank you for your diligent work on this issue.
<p>Respondent 23</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: I do think alternative 3A2 would be the best long-term solution. However, I believe there needs to be a short-term solution as soon as possible such as alternative 1D or 1E to alleviate problems with this intersection. Too many accidents and just trying to cross Hwy 4 during certain times of day is nearly impossible.
<p>Respondent 24</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responded three times to alternative 3A2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response 1 - I do prefer 3A2 HOWEVER I wish that you would have extended the 4-lane divided to meet up with the 5-lane already done 3/4 mile south of HWY 37. Response 2 - I prefer 3A2. Response 3 - Questions – (1) how far north on HWY 4 will the 4-lane divided highway go? (2) will it go to the 5-lane highway 3/4 mile south of highway 37? (3) or all the way to HWY 37? 4. I live at 204 S. Mustang Rd; will my property be affected?

<p>Respondent 25</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 1F: I do not see the need for improvements at this time. If improvements are to be made, I would prefer the simplest modification 1F. Highway 4 is currently 65 mph from 44 to 37. I do not want that to change and therefore reject 1D, 1E, 2A and 2B.
<p>Respondent 26</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A: I definitely think something needs to be done at this dangerous section of road and I don't have an opinion as to which alternative method is chosen as you all are the professionals and have the knowledge of what will work the best, but I do think something needs to be done before the year of 2027, because there many accidents and near misses that happen in this area and crossing HWY 4 while traveling Fox Ln, gets more difficult and dangerous every day.
<p>Respondent 27</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: I am against the alternative 3A2 as I believe the expense is not justified by the expected benefits. The necessary safety increase can be achieved via one of the less expensive options, plus the impact on the surrounding land owners (except speculators) will be greatly decreased. The 3A2 seems like a massive expenditure of taxpayer money. But I can't know for certain until I review the cost/ benefit study. Oh yeah, where are the cost benefit study results?? The alternative 2 "roundabout" is the worst idea in terms of traffic flow. Backed up rush hour traffic will cause accidents and a massive increase in gasoline consumption (with the accompanying emissions increase). I think alternative 1E is the most practical. Add a stoplight to the intersection, to include capacitive sensors, with programming to keep SH4 open unless traffic is waiting on Fox Lane. This alternative will provide a significant safety improvement over the current layout at a reasonable cost to taxpayers. Will you publish a summary of the results of the comments you receive from this website? Thanks for your attention.
<p>Respondent 28</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: I am against alternative 3A2 (the reconstruction of Fox Lane to go over SH-4, with added northbound lanes on SH-4 to achieve a four-lane divided highway) as it appears to take up a large amount of land (including and belonging to private citizens), would be very costly, and would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding community, environment, and wildlife. Instead, I would like to see alternative 1E (add stop lights and include eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes onto Fox Lane) or alternative 2A (construct a single-lane roundabout). Alternatives 1E and 2A would have less of a detrimental impact and likely would be less costly, while improving the safety of the intersection.
<p>Respondent 29</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: Hwy 4 has become a major thoroughfare. I believe in preparing for the future long term. Alt. 3A2 is the way to go in my option. I wish it could start construction before 2027. If not Alt. 3A2, then Alt. 3 the bridge for Fox lane to go over Hwy 4. Alt 2: Roundabout- NO, PLEASE, NO! Thank you for listening!
<p>Respondent 30</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: Hello, the preferred alternative does seem like the best plan. I was wondering, however, if any thought has been given to providing access to Sarah Road / CS2970 from SH4. It seems like that would considerably reduce the traffic demands at the SH4/Fox Lane intersection. Thank you!

<p>Respondent 31</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: As witnessing a 3 car accident this afternoon (4-12-22) and traveling through this intersection several times a day, I feel that something needs to be addressed. I feel that the 3A2 preferred alternative would be the best and safest solution to this intersection.
<p>Respondent 32</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: As a 30-year paramedic that spent his career working this area I have responded to numerous horrific and fatality auto accidents at this intersection. I am thrilled that ODOT is planning to improve safety here. I feel option 3A2 is the best and most practical option for this project. This option not only provides for a safer intersection but also takes in consideration of a future 4 lane project for this rest of this stretch of road between the H.E. Bailey turnpike and SH 37. Thank you again for your consideration and your work thus far on this dangerous intersection.
<p>Respondent 33</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: After reviewing all proposed options, alternative 3A2 appears to be the best approach. Comments – (1) The on/off ramps look longer than needed and takes more land than would really be needed. Can we relook at those to see if they can be shortened? (2) If the highway will be expanded to 4-lane, wouldn't it make more sense to extend the 4-lanes N to Hwy 37 and S to link to Norman Spur as they have already been expanded to 4-lanes?
<p>Respondent 34</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 1E: Adding more toll roads to a small area where inflation is killing people makes no sense at all. This will attract more traffic which ultimately brings more trouble. The issue is not the need for more roads, it's getting people paying better attention to them. I would rather spend my tax dollars on officers enforcing the law that giving it to the state for roads they don't take care of to begin with. On top of that, this is rural America and y'all just want to pave over the entire world. Enough is enough. If people want faster living, stay in the big cities. I just cashed in all I had to get out here for peace and quiet and y'all want to ruin it like you do everything else. I oppose more turnpikes but understand y'all have your hearts set on doing something, so just give us a stop light and leave us small town lovers alone. Child trafficking doesn't need any more help. Lastly, people complaining about traveling to and from work, this doesn't change that. This area needs businesses before it needs more toll roads. I'm so disappointed in this proposal.
<p>Respondent 35</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: A question for you concerning alternative 3A2. In this option, Fox Lane will be an overpass and SH4 will be widened to 4 lanes with a center median. My question is, how far north and south of Fox Lane will SH4 be widened? Please respond via email. Thanks. Responding to alternative 3C: From a traffic safety view point there does not seem to be much difference between alternative 3C and Preferred alternative 3A2. Both alternatives have Fox Lane converted into an overpass going over SH4, both have 4 lanes north and south. Alternative 3C seems to be able to accomplish the goal of making the intersection of Fox Lane and SH4 safer without acquiring excess private land. Additionally, it would appear to cost less and take less time to complete.

<p>Respondent 36</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: 3A2 or secondarily 1E will work fine.
<p>Respondent 37</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding the alternative 3A2: 3A2 looks like the best to prevent accidents. It also is safer at high traffic times and the school traffic. Thank you for allowing my input.
<p>Respondent 38</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: 3A2 best prepares the intersection for rapid increases in traffic by going to split lanes now. We'll not have to rebuild the entire intersection for a predictable increase in traffic. 3A2 keeps SH4 at ground level, so in icy conditions, traffic on the road more heavily traveled can more safely transit. Fox Lane traffic is slower and less frequent, and should therefore better handle an elevated surface. 3A is an acceptable second choice, provided the bridge leaves room to expand SH4 to four lanes without alteration. 1E makes for a decent stop-gap, but just puts off the inevitable expansion. Just do it right the first time with 3A2. 3A2 maintains the integrity of a high-speed thoroughfare versus the insanity of putting a 25 MPH roundabout on a de facto 70 MPH road that will eventually be widened to four lanes anyway. 3A2 results in a smaller bridge being built for Fox Lane, which it seems to me would be less expensive to build and maintain than two highway-quality bridges. Do the intersection according to the 3A2 plan. Responding to alternative 2A: Please, no 25 MPH roundabout on a road that vehicles drive 70 MPH! Doing nothing is better than switching to a roundabout.
<p>Respondent 39</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responding to alternative 3A2: 1. With the extremely close proximity of the exit lane to my property line what are you doing to mitigate noise and security? 2. Is a sound barrier being considered for the project? If not, why? If so, what dimensions are being considered? 3. How close will the finalized constructed be to our property line? 4. I would like to involved or notified of any activity around my property.
<p>Respondent 40</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stated that alternative 3A2 is the best option. (Thinks the roundabout is a horrible idea.) ODOT should also look at constructing turn lanes at the intersection of Highway 4 and 122G. It is a dangerous intersection.
<p>Respondent 41</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not want a low-speed roundabout. ODOT should consider erecting concrete road noise barriers to deflect the constant road noise on the east side of SH-4, north of Fox Lane. The commenter included a hand-drawn diagram of the area.
<p>Respondent 42</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative 3A2 is the most feasible option for future long-range growth. The truck traffic from Highway 37 to the turnpike on Highway 4 is increasing daily, and that will add to more accidents if Highway 4 is not make into a four lane. It would be better to spend more now than to come back in 10 years to re-do the intersection.

<p>Respondent 43</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asked ODOT to do the project for the future. Stated that short-sightedness is why it has to keep being done over and over. • Would prefer alternative 3B2.
<p>Respondent 44</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the Preliminary Preferred alternative 3A2.
<p>Respondent 45</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefers Preliminary Preferred alternative 3A2.
<p>Respondent 46</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thinks alternative 3A2 is the safest possible plan for this intersection. It separates the traffic and allows for the increase of traffic on Highway 4. • Says Highway 4 is a dangerous place and should be four-laned from the spur north to SH-37.
<p>Respondent 47</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefers alternative 3A2. • Has lived in the area since 1982 and loved it when they got SH-4, but the intersection has gotten scary. Doesn't use this intersection to avoid the wrecks and takes back roads to go north. • It will be nice to have the intersection improvements.
<p>Respondent 48</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn't completely understand all the alternatives, but likes the idea of Fox Lane going over Highway 4 with exit and entrance ramps on and off Highway 4. • Prefers alternative 3A2.
<p>Respondents 49 & 50</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction costs will never be lower, so now is the time to get his project underway. • Completely supports alternative 3A2. It will save lives and keep traffic flowing.
<p>Respondent 51</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to know where funding for the project is coming from. • Would like to know how long each option will take to construct. • Prefers alternative 1E with stop lights.
<p>Respondent 52</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefers alternative 3A2. It would be a huge improvement, not only in terms of function, but a huge improvement to public safety. • The current intersection is an accident waiting to happen. • Thanked ODOT for the pamphlet.

Respondent 53	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefers alternative 3B2.
Respondent 54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the alternative with stop lights (alternative 1E).
Respondent 55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested ODOT leave everything alone and spend the money where it's really needed.
Respondent 56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn't think it's necessary to construct the preferred alternative. • Prefers alternative 1E with the stop lights and says it should have been done a long time ago. • Suggests that decreasing the speed limit after the toll booth would solve a lot of the problem and cut down on accidents.
Respondent 57	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefers the alternative in picture #4 (alternative 3B). It looks like it would accommodate better in the future.
Respondent 58	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommends alternative 3A2 as first choice and 3A as second choice.
Respondent 59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative 3B would offer an answer to all the issues. HE Bailey (Hwy. 4) customers can continue non-stop. Fox Lane would be able to move through the area separate from the speeding cars on the turnpike. No one would have traffic lights to worry about.
Respondent 60	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative 3A2 is best for safety and long-term growth.
Respondents 61 & 62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leave the road as it is. There is not enough traffic to warrant the expense or changes.
Respondents 63 & 64	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ranked alternatives from worst to best: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ 2A – Roundabout will cause congestion when schools let out, and people will get distressed. ◦ 1 – No change ◦ 2B – Better, but still dangerous ◦ 3C – Lots of money, but not much help. ◦ 3A – Good ◦ 3A2 – Better. 3A2 will move traffic the best and be safest.

Respondent 65	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No to alternatives 1 & 2. Yes to any version of alternative 3, preferable 3B2.
Respondent 66	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With the heavy traffic and future heavy traffic and increasing growth in this area, recommends alternative 3A2.
Respondent 67	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moved to the area because he enjoys peace and quiet. Feels that if this project moves forward, it will bring businesses into this quiet area. This will be a nightmare for his family to navigate while the project is under construction. Does not like the thought of taking property through Eminent Domain from people who have worked so hard for it. Recommends ODOT put in traffic lights and let the people who love the country enjoy it. The light at Hwy 34 and Rte 4 works very well. Is opposed to the project.
Respondent 68	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggests alternative 3.
Respondent 69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendation would be either alternative 3A2 or 3B2. Disapproves of alternative 1. Since they are in the country, he has seen first-hand vehicles that blow through stop signs and lights. Also, a bad alternative because it would create more stop-and-go traffic and cause more fuel burned and more pollution. Disapproves of alternative 2. The roundabout will be a mess for people to deal with, and it's a safety issue that people don't understand how roundabouts work. The traffic keeps moving with alternatives 3A2 or 3B2 without hindrance. It's a bigger footprint, but in the long-run will be the best solution. Hwy 4 traffic has picked up tremendously over the last couple years.
Respondent 70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes the option to make Fox Lane go over Highway 4 is the best option (3A2). Says school bus safety alone to come from this development will be incredible. Requested additional lighting upon approaches at minimum. Thanked ODOT for the information and for accepting public opinion.
Respondents 71 & 72	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Absolutely does not want alternative 2. There is too much possibility for accidents. Suggests making Highway 4 a four-lane with turn lane exits onto Fox Lane (Included a sketch of the proposal).
Respondent 73	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prefers alternative 1E with stop lights. Going over the highway during bad weather would be too dangerous. Only wants stop lights.

<p>Respondent 74</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the preliminary preferred alternative 3A2. Believes it is the best designed to support the anticipated growth in traffic over the next 25 years. • Concerns about area south of the proposed interchange. Presumes the four-lane divided highway will be extended south to the turnpike as it makes no sense to reduce traffic to two lanes for a partial mile and then expand it again. • There is also a growing amount of traffic. Avoiding the school and using the roads by the business, Tin Horns R Us. Would like to know if this will continue to have access. • Would like to know if a side road will be constructed down to Fox Lane, and if Sooner Road will receive an interchange or entrance/exit ramps. Says this area is growing rapidly and will need attention.
<p>Respondent 75</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Says that whatever option is chosen, it must be able to handle the large trucks that travel both roads. The oil and gas trucks tear up the roads, so building for their weight is critical. • Doesn't want traffic to slow down with lights. • Prefers alternative 2B. Says they can handle a roundabout.
<p>Respondent 76</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern is at SH-4 and County Road 1226. This is no turn lane or pull off to turn onto 1226. • Also needs to be an intersection sign so people will know there is a turn. • There have been several wrecks and near-misses, and says he's almost been hit several times. • Thinks this area should be a big concern. • Prefers alternative 1E on Fox Lane and SH-4.
<p>Respondent 77</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school at Bridge Creek doesn't have a safe intersection to access the west side of SH-4. Alternative 3A2 would provide this safety to reach the west side of SH-4, and the interchange would be in service whenever the traffic count on SH-4 warrants four lanes. • Thanked ODOT for the opportunity.
<p>Respondent 78</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Votes for alternative 1A. • Sees no reason for change as there are already turn lanes and thru lanes. • Additional changes like lights would only slow current and future traffic, and the expense of building over/under seems unwarranted. • Asks that ODOT Leave the intersection alone.
<p>Respondents 79 & 80</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feel that alternative 1E would fulfill the need of improvement of this intersection.
<p>Respondent 81</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Votes for alternative 1a, no change at all. Says It is absolutely not needed.
<p>Respondent 82</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Likes alternative 3A2. It seems like the safest and doesn't impede traffic.

Respondent 83	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highway 4 has become a major thoroughfare. • Believes in planning for the future, so prefers the preliminary preferred alternative 3A2. • Alternative 3 would be the next best option. • Wishes the project could begin earlier than 2027. • Asks ODOT not choose the roundabouts in alternative 2.

1.8.3 ODOT Responses to Public Comments

The responses received were summarized and generically grouped into categories, each of which are presented below. Next to each comment is ODOT’s response.

ODOT RESPONSES TO ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS	
ISSUE/COMMENT/CONCERN	RESPONSE
Specific Property Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODOT is not providing specific information regarding individual property impacts at this time. • No specific property owner impacts are available at this stage in the planning process. (Design plans are not available to determine impacts.) • After an Alternative is selected and right-of-way design plans are available, affected individuals would be notified/contacted.
ODOT Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contact ODOT (580) 255-7586 to discuss the proposed project in more detail.
Project Extent & Divided Highway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The four-lane highway portion of this project will extend north approximately 2,000 feet north of Fox Lane and 3,000 feet south of Fox Lane. • There are conceptual, future plans for extending the 4-lane highway north and south, but are not specifically associated with this project.

Why Was The Project Pamphlet Received By Individuals Away From The Project Area?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pamphlet was mailed to property owners adjacent to the SH-4 and Fox Lane intersection, and to all residents within the United States Postal Service (USPS) Direct Mail routes for the project area.
Prefer Alternative 1E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted. ODOT appreciates the feedback.
Prefer Alternative 1E with stop lights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted. ODOT appreciates the feedback.
Prefer Alternative 1F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted. ODOT appreciates the feedback.
Against Alternative 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted. ODOT appreciates the feedback.
Prefer Alternative 2B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted. ODOT appreciates the feedback.
Alternative 2A & 2B – Request for no roundabouts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted. ODOT appreciates the feedback.
Prefer Alternative 3A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted. ODOT appreciates the feedback.
Against Alternative 3A2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted. ODOT appreciates the feedback.
Prefer Alternative 3B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted. ODOT appreciates the feedback.
Prefer Alternative 3B2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted. ODOT appreciates the feedback.
Speed Limit Related Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highways are designed to support the posted speed limits. ODOT determines the speed limit based on several safety and design factors. The proper highway speed will be established for the selected Alternative and associated design parameters.
Timeframe Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Something needs to be done before 2027 Interim solution, such as Alternative 1D or 1E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning, assessing, designing, and constructing highway improvement projects is an involved and complicated process and unfortunately takes time. No interim or expedited options are available or proposed at this time.
No improvements are needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ODOT respectfully disagrees. This intersection is experiencing a high rate of collisions and poor traffic flow. Improvements are needed to enhance safety, improve traffic operations and accommodate the anticipated increase in traffic volume along SH-4.
Recommendation Of Providing Access to Sarah Rd. / CR 2970 From SH-4 To Reduce Traffic Demands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted. ODOT appreciates the feedback. The plans do not include access to Sarah Rd. from SH-4 at this time. ODOT may consider this as part of future planning.
Request For Improvements at Another Area of Concern on SH-4 at the Intersection With CR 1226	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted. ODOT appreciates the feedback. The plans do not include access to CR 1226 from SH-4 at this time. ODOT may consider this as part of future planning.

Can The On/Off Ramps Be Shortened to Take Up Less Land?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment noted. ODOT appreciates the feedback. • On/off ramps are specifically sized to meet safety design standards. Shortening the length could create unsafe conditions for exiting and entering traffic.
Toll Road Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed improvements are not associated with a toll road.
Adverse Effect on Rural Lifestyle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently this part of Oklahoma is experiencing elevated growth and suburban development independent of transportation planning and highway construction. • ODOT planning is based on anticipated traffic volumes from other population growth metrics.
SH-4 Is Dangerous and Should be Four-Lane from The Spur, North To SH-37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments noted. ODOT appreciates the feedback.
Request for Construction of Turn Lanes at Intersection of SH-4 & CR 1226.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plans do not include access to CR 1226 from SH-4 at this time. • ODOT may consider this as part of future planning.
No Low-Speed Roundabouts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments noted. ODOT appreciates the feedback.
Noise Impacts & Request for Noise Mitigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using the FHWA traffic noise model, the existing and future exterior noise levels were determined for 15 residential homes and compared for the proposed alternatives. • Based on the analysis, no adverse impacts occur. • An updated analysis will be completed for the preferred alternative, but no adverse impacts are anticipated. • A noise wall is not anticipated at this time.
ODOT Should Start Construction Now Before the Cost Goes Up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning, assessing, designing, and constructing highway improvement projects is an involved and complicated process and unfortunately takes time. No interim or expedited options are available or proposed at this time.
Where is Funding Coming From?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding is provided from both state and federal transportation related sources.
How Long Will Each Option Take to Construct?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No information is available for each specific Alternatives. • More information, along with the planned project timeline, will be available once an Alternative is selected.
Opposed to the Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments noted. ODOT appreciates the feedback.
Request For Additional Lighting Upon Approaches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments noted. ODOT appreciates the feedback.
Suggestion for Making SH-4 a Four-Lane Roadway with Turn Lane Exits on to Fox Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments noted. ODOT appreciates the feedback.
Will the School and Businesses Still Have Access?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to local residences, businesses, and the school would be maintained throughout the project duration.
Will A Side Road Be Constructed Down to Fox Lane?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plans do not include a side road along Fox Lane. ODOT will not be constructing a side road at this time.

Will Sooner Road Receive an Interchange or Entrance/Exit Ramps?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plans do not include an interchange or entrance/exit ramps to Sooner Road at this time.
Any Option Must Be Able to Handle the Large Trucks That Travel the Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oklahoma's highways support the movement of regular and oversize/overweight (OSOW) loads in accordance with state and federal statutes. The Oklahoma weight threshold for the common tractor trailer combinations is 80,000 pounds on interstate highways and 90,000 pounds on non-interstate highways.
The School at Bridge Creek Does Not Have a Safe Intersection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The design process takes into consideration intersections throughout the corridor and addresses unsafe situations.

1.8.4 Stakeholder Comments

Before the start of the Virtual Open House, several political entities, interested parties, and Native American Tribes were mailed letters requesting comments on the proposed project. One tribe responded that they cannot participate in the public comments process due to sensitive information regarding cultural and sacred sites, but the area is culturally significant. Individual comments are summarized below.

STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS	
AGENCY	INPUT
Chickasaw Nation Tribal Historic Preservation Officer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot participate in the public comments process because it may be necessary to reveal confidential information about cultural and sacred sites. The proposed project area is culturally significant to the Chickasaw Nation. Asked that ODOT contact their office when the Section 106 review process begins.
	<p style="text-align: center;">ODOT RESPONSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response required at this time. The Chickasaw Nation will be consulted further during the formal tribal consultation process.

1.8.5 Agency Comments

After the start of the Virtual Open House, several agencies were mailed solicitation letters requesting comments on the proposed project. Four (4) agency and tribal comments were received. Individual comments are summarized below.

AGENCY COMMENTS	
AGENCY	INPUT
Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) General Counsel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No environmental concerns under DEQ jurisdiction are anticipated. DEQ Recommended ODOT obtain a construction storm water permit (OKR10).
	<p style="text-align: center;">ODOT RESPONSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The DEQ stated that ODOT should obtain a construction storm water permit authorization under OKR10. ODOT is aware of the permitting requirements and the process involved. ODOT requires construction contractors to obtain an OKR10 permit authorization (when applicable) prior to starting any construction activities.
OK Aeronautics Commission (OAC) Aviation Program Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OAC wanted to remind ODOT of the obligation to comply with 14 CFR Part 77.13 regarding construction activity near federal airports. OAC did state that the potential project does not appear to pose a hazard to safe and efficient use of navigable airspace.
	<p style="text-align: center;">ODOT RESPONSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted. No FAA airports are located within 4 miles of the proposed project.
OK State Parks Planning Coordinator II – Tourism and Recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project proposal will have no significant adverse impacts on any federally funded park or recreation area or state park, regarding the LWCF Act 54 U.S.C. 200305(f)(3) no land may be permanently used for private or non-outdoor recreation purposes (defined by the program).
	<p style="text-align: center;">ODOT RESPONSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments noted.

1.8.6 Overall Comment Summary

All comments were compiled below. The table is designed to provide an overall summary of the input received with respect to project approval and the major issues of concern.

SUMMARY OF ALL COMMENTS	
ISSUE / COMMENT / CONCERN	NUMBER OF COMMENTS/RESPONSES
Total Number of Individual Commenters / Responders	76
Residential & Business Comments	72
Agency and/or Tribal Comments	4
Specifically Approve of Project / Provided Support for Project	7
Specifically Disapprove of Project	6
General Comment Categories	-
o Property Impacts / Right-of-Way Concerns	4
o Preferred Alternative Approvals	42
o Preferred Alternative Disapprovals	3
o Other Alternative Approvals	17
o Other Alternative Disapprovals	9
o No Improvements Needed	5
o Design Questions & Speed Limits	8
o Turning Lane Request	1
o Requests for Other Improvements	6
o Noise Concerns	2
o Project Timeline	4
o Funding	1
o School & Business Access	2
o Unrelated/Miscellaneous Comments	