

# **Stakeholder Meeting Summary**

---

**Oklahoma Department of Transportation**

**I-40 Corridor Study, Reno Ave. to Industrial Blvd.**

**Oklahoma County, Oklahoma**

**JP 29143(05)**

**April 17, 2018**

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents .....	2
List of Appendices .....	2
1.0 Introduction.....	3
2.0 Stakeholder Meeting .....	3
2.1 Meeting Notification.....	3
2.2 Meeting Information and Format.....	3
2.3 Questions/Comments Received at Meeting.....	4
2.4 Summary of Written Comments .....	4
2.4.1 Stakeholder Comments on Section 1.....	4
2.4.2 Stakeholder Comments on Section 2.....	5

## List of Appendices

Appendix A	Stakeholder Meeting Letters and Lists
Appendix B	Stakeholder Meeting Sign-in Sheets
Appendix C	Stakeholder Meeting Presentations
Appendix D	Stakeholder Meeting Handouts and Scroll Plots
Appendix E	Written Comments

## 1.0 Introduction

This document summarizes the Stakeholder Meetings conducted for the I-40 Corridor Study from Reno Ave. to Industrial Blvd. in Oklahoma County [JP 29143(05)]. The purpose of these meetings was to present the proposed alternatives for the Interstate 40 (I-40) Corridor Study to key stakeholders in the corridor and obtain input regarding critical social, economic and environmental effects that may result from the project. The study corridor was divided into two sections (Section 1 and Section 2) due to different land uses and access needs in each section. Section 1 includes I-40 from Reno Ave. extending southeast approximately 3 miles to Hudiburg Drive and Section 2 includes I-40 from Hudiburg Drive extending east approximately 2 miles to Industrial Blvd. The purpose of the study is to identify a preferred solution to improve the capacity, operations, and safety in the I-40 corridor.

## 2.0 Stakeholder Meeting

### 2.1 Meeting Notification

Notice of the Stakeholder Meetings was sent by letter with a brief description of the purpose and need for the study and an invitation to attend Section 1, Section 2, or both meetings. Stakeholders invited to the Section 1 meeting included the City of Del City (administration and emergency services), Del City Parks and Recreation, Del City Chamber of Commerce, major businesses, and school districts within the corridor. Stakeholders invited to the Section 2 meeting included Tinker Air Force Base, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), the Oklahoma Tourism and Recreation Department, City of Midwest City Welcome Center, and major businesses within the corridor. Stakeholders invited to both Section 1 and Section 2 meetings included the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Division IV Transportation Commissioner, Oklahoma County Board of County Commissioners, Midwest City Chamber of Commerce, Greater Oklahoma City Chamber, Office of the Governor, elected officials (federal and state), Association of Central Oklahoma Governments (ACOG), emergency service providers from Midwest City and Oklahoma City, local school districts, and major businesses within the corridor. Each letter was accompanied by a project location map and a meeting location map. Letters were mailed on February 16, 2018. A copy of the letters and the mailing list is included in **Appendix A**.

### 2.2 Meeting Information and Format

The Stakeholder Meetings were held on March 14, 2018, Section 1 at 9:30 AM and Section 2 at 1:30 PM, at the Rose State College Professional Training and Education Center at 1720 Hudiburg Drive in Midwest City, OK. Thirty-three (33) people signed in for the Section 1 meeting, including representatives from ODOT, Garver, City of Oklahoma City, City of Del City, Del City Fire Department, Oklahoma City Fire Department, Oklahoma City Police Department, Rose State College, ACOG, and Hudiburg Auto Group. Twenty-four (24) people signed in for the Section 2 meeting, the majority of these attendees were present at the Section 1 meeting; however, representatives from the City of Midwest City and Tinker Air Force Base were also in attendance. A copy of the Section 1 and Section 2 sign-in sheets are included in **Appendix B**.

Mr. Brian Taylor, ODOT Division 4 Engineer, opened the meeting and welcomed the attendees. Garver then gave a presentation about the study, followed by an open question and answer period facilitated by Mr. Taylor. ODOT and Garver staff were available following the formal presentation for one-on-one and

small group discussions with the stakeholders after each meeting. Scroll plots showing the study location and alternatives for each section were available for viewing. A handout was available for each section and included a description of the study, the purpose of the study, and described the alternatives under consideration for each section. A copy of the presentation is included in **Appendix C**. A copy of the meeting handouts and scroll plots are included in **Appendix D**. The stakeholder comment period was open until March 28, 2018.

The presentations covered:

- Corridor Study Sections
- Purpose of the Meeting
- Purpose of the Project
- Project Development Process
- Initial Data Collection
  - Environmental Constraints
  - Traffic Data & Observations
  - Collision Data
- Existing Conditions
- Design Alternatives
- Access Changes
- Safety and Traffic Operations Comparisons and Travel Times
- Next Steps

### **2.3 Questions/Comments Received at Meeting**

Comments and questions from the Section 1 meeting were primarily related to removing the ramps at Scott Street and how that will affect police, fire, and emergency medical services (EMS) response. The City of Del City informed ODOT of new retail development south of I-40 that would rely on the Scott Street interchange for access. The Hudiburg exit and raising the elevation of I-40 in this area and its effect on driveway access was also a concern. Comments and questions from the Section 2 meeting primarily related to discussion of the 1-way frontage roads and the effects on Town Center patrons. There were questions regarding the timeframe of both sections and a request to receive both presentations was also made.

### **2.4 Summary of Written Comments**

Six (6) written comments from the stakeholders were received both during and after the Section 1 stakeholder meeting. Two (2) written comments from stakeholders were received both during and after the Section 2 stakeholder meeting. Copies of the written comments from both meetings are included in **Appendix E**. ODOT responses are provided after each comment.

#### *2.4.1 Stakeholder Comments on Section 1*

The **City of Oklahoma City** would like receive a copy of the scroll plots of the alternatives to use in their review.

RESPONSE: ODOT provided a link to all meeting materials to all stakeholders on March 19, 2018.

The **Del City Fire Department** stated that the one-way access road concept is a good concept. There is an issues with removing the Scott Street on/off ramps. For the Del City Fire Department, going westbound, Scott Street is the last off-ramp to remain within the city limits, especially responding to vehicle accidents and incidents west of Sunnyslane. The fire department would have no exit ramp to remain in Del City without having to go to NE 10<sup>th</sup> which is in Oklahoma City. In addition, going east bound to respond to a wreck between I-40/I-35 and Sunnyslane, there are no access points for responding emergency units.

RESPONSE:

**Eason Enterprises LLC** reviewed the project and would like to see Alt 1-1 as the preferred alternative. Mr. Eason liked the turnarounds at Sunnyslane Bridge and the reduced conflict points at the intersections. He also pointed out the future retail development at Scott Street and the need to retain an exit at that location. The City of Del City has invested 3 million dollars to remove the apartment complex and relocate existing power lines to the rear of the property in preparation of a new movie theater, four national restaurants, and a major grocery store.

RESPONSE:

The **Walmart Real Estate** engineer suggested to add pork chop striping and right turn signage and pavement markings at each of their driveways.

RESPONSE:

**Rose State College** expressed concerns about the access to the College from the proposed relocation of ramps at Hudiburg Drive. Both alternatives would result in a more challenging route to the College and it would be additional time for students, faculty, and staff to commute. The College is also concerned about the increased response time for EMS and suggests an alternate ramp location be provided between Sooner Road and Hudiburg Drive. In addition, the College is concerned about the increase in elevation of the Hudiburg Drive bridge and frontage roads which may lead to 1) the loss of the STEM Center and Community Learning Center buildings, or 2) the need for a retaining wall which would result in an unattractive appearance to the entrance of the College. Both alternatives would impact access to the STEM Center from Hudiburg Drive and Alt 1-1 could possibly increase the elevation of the frontage road so steep it would present significant issues for drivers. In addition, both alternatives would lead to widening of the frontage roads on the north side of I-40 making the drive even closer to the right turning lane from the westbound frontage road that could lead to accidents from individuals attempting to cross in front of right turning traffic. The College does support the reconstruction of the Hudiburg Drive bridge and would like to see an attractive functional bridge that will serve as an entrance to the campus.

RESPONSE:

#### *2.4.2 Stakeholder Comments on Section 2*

The **City of Oklahoma City** would like receive a copy of the scroll plots of the alternatives to use in their review.

RESPONSE: ODOT provided a link to all meeting materials to all stakeholders on March 19, 2018.

The **OK Travel Center** reviewed the project and all three alternatives and is not in favor of Alt 2-1, which they believe will result in the least improvements, especially in the intersection of SE 29<sup>th</sup> and Air Depot where congestion and delays will just get worse. Alt 2-2 would eliminate the building (travel center and

the Convention Visitors Bureau office) where the OK Travel Center is located. Alt 2-3 would greatly impact the 29<sup>th</sup> Street businesses resulting in loss of income for the City during construction. Businesses may have to close due to lower income and higher rent, and after construction is over, travelers may miss the exit and may not go back to the north side retailers if one-way.

RESPONSE:

**Tinker Air Force Base** expressed concerns about clear zones and accident potential zones (APZs) at the end of the runway. Tinker AFB would like to make sure that, per the Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) 3-260-01 *Airfield and Heliport Planning and Design*, there cannot be anything built 1-inch above the end of the runway elevation within the clear zone. Tinker AFB mentioned the Industrial Blvd. bridge, in all three alternatives, is in the clear zone and they would like to see if the bridge could be moved further east. A copy of the constraints map was included.

RESPONSE: