Public Meeting Summary and Responses to Comments

Oklahoma Department of Transportation

I-40 From East of Douglas Boulevard to I-240 Oklahoma County, JP 31011(05)(06)(07)

Prepared by:



6450 S. Lewis Ave., Suite 300 Tulsa, OK 74136

March 31, 2017

Garver Project No.: 14037085



Table of Contents

Table of	of Contents1	ĺ
List of	Tables1	
Appen	dices1	
Execut	iive Summary2	2
1.0	Introduction	Ļ
2.0	Agency Solicitation	Ļ
3.0	Public Meeting4	Ļ
3.1	Meeting Notification	Ļ
3.2	Meeting Information and Format4	Ļ
3.3	Summary of Public Meeting Comments and Responses	5
3.4	Summary of Written Comments)
3.4	4.1 Agency Comments6)
3.4	4.2 Public Comments	,
List c	of Tables	
Table '	1: Agency Comment Summary2	2
Table 2	2: Public Comment Summary	2
Table 3	3: Public Comment Summary	}

Appendices

Appendix A: Agency Solicitation Letter and List

Appendix B: Public Meeting Invitation Letter and List

Appendix C: Public Meeting Sign-in Sheets

Appendix D: Public Meeting Presentation

Appendix E: Public Meeting Handouts and Board Displays

Appendix F: Written Comments





Executive Summary

This document summarizes the public meeting conducted for the I-40, Douglas Blvd. to I-240 project in Oklahoma County, Oklahoma. The purpose of the public meeting was to present information about the proposed improvements to I-40 from east of Douglas Boulevard to I-240 to the public and obtain input.

The public meeting was held on February 21, 2017 at 6:00 PM at the Heartland Retreat Center. Sixty-six attendees signed in for the meeting. The meeting included a presentation on the project from the Oklahoma Department of Transportation's (ODOT) engineering consultant, Garver. Representatives from ODOT, CEC and Garver were available for discussion before and after the presentation. (CEC is completing the I-40 bridge design for this project.) The comment period was open until March 7, 2017 with a total of eight (8) written comments received, including six (6) from agencies and three (3) from members of the public. Agency responses are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Agency Comment Summary

Agency	Comment
Bureau of Land	No objections.
Management	
Natural Resources	No objections.
Conservation Service	
Oklahoma Corporation	Identified one mud plugged well in the project area. Attached well information
Commission – Oil and	and Google Earth location with comment.
Gas Division	
Oklahoma Aeronautics	Comment included recommendations to inform the Administrator of the FAA
Commission	per CFR Title 14 Part 77.13 and may be required to fill out a 7460-I form.
	Proposed changes may pose a hazards to the safe and efficient use of
	navigable airspace due to the proximity to Tinker Air Force Base.
Oklahoma	Concerns with construction activities at one stream crossing (Soldier Creek)
Conservation	that may potentially impact wetland resources and riparian areas. Comment
Commission	also included general recommendations to minimize impacts on stream and
	riparian areas.
Oklahoma State Parks	No impacts to parks are anticipated. There is a neighborhood park at the NE
	corner of I-40 and Anderson Road. This is not a LWCF park.

Public comments included concerns for increased traffic on ramps and at intersections, access, and safety conditions. Many felt improvements to I-40 at Anderson and Choctaw Roads should be made to increase safety and accommodate traffic. Table 2 summarizes the comments received.

Table 2: Public Comment Summary

Comment	# of Comments
Ramps should be two lanes on Anderson Road	3
Need safer interchange at Choctaw Road	1
Need 2-lane ramps at Choctaw Road	1





Traffic lights at Choctaw Road would improve safety	1
Drainage is a problem under I-40 at Choctaw Road	1
Will new Choctaw interchange include a ramp from I-240/I=40 to Choctaw Rd?	1
Anderson Road should be 5 lanes under I-40	1
We are glad you are beginning this project	1





1.0 Introduction

This document summarizes the public meeting conducted for the I-40, Douglas Blvd. to I-240 project in Oklahoma County, Oklahoma [JP 31011(05)(06)(07)]. The purpose of the public meeting was to present information about the proposed improvements to I-40 from east of Douglas Boulevard to I-240 to the public and obtain input.

2.0 Agency Solicitation

Initial agency solicitation letters were mailed on January 31, 2017. These letters provided the purpose of the proposed project and a short project description with an enclosed project location and project area map. The letter requested recipients provide input by March 7, 2017 and included an invitation to the public meeting. This letter was sent to federal and state resource agencies. Copies of the letter and mailing list are included in **Appendix A**.

3.0 Public Meeting

3.1 Meeting Notification

Notice of the public meeting was sent by letter to the Governor's office, elected officials (federal and state), Oklahoma County Commissioners, Cities of Oklahoma City and Midwest City, Tinker Air Force Base, local school districts, emergency service providers, and medical facilities in the study area. The letter provided a brief description of the purpose and need for the project, and an invitation to the public meeting. The letter was accompanied by a project location map. Letters were mailed on January 31, 2017. Copies of the letter and list are included in **Appendix B**.

3.2 Meeting Information and Format

The public meeting was held on February 21, 2017 at 6:00 PM at the Heartland Retreat Center, 4910 S. Anderson Road in Oklahoma City, OK. Sixty-six (66) people signed in for the meeting, including Oklahoma State Representative Teague, and representatives from ODOT, Garver, CEC, Midwest City, City of Oklahoma City, and members of the public. Copies of the sign-in-sheets are included in **Appendix C**.

Mr. Frank Roesler, III, ODOT Public Involvement Officer, and Mr. Brian Taylor, ODOT Division 4 Engineer, opened the meeting with some general remarks. Garver then gave a presentation about the project, followed by an open question and answer period. ODOT and Garver staff were then available for one-on-one and small group discussions. Display boards showing the area of the proposed improvements and environmental constraints were available for public viewing. A handout with project information and a map of present right-of-way and environmental constraints was provided to attendees. English, Spanish, and Vietnamese versions of the handout were available upon request. A copy of the presentation is included in **Appendix D**. Copies of the handouts and board displays are included in **Appendix E**.

The presentation covered:

Purpose of the Meeting





- Purpose and Need for the Project
- Project Background
- General Project Information & Project Area Constraints
- Existing Bridges
- Proposed Design
- Project Impacts
- Construction Schedule and Cost

3.3 Summary of Public Meeting Comments and Responses

After the presentation, the floor was opened to questions and comments from the public. In addition, two questions were asked during the presentation that Garver and ODOT and CEC addressed. Points raised included the following:

- Were the accidents shown in the presentation just within the project area or does it include areas
 west of Douglas? RESPONSE: The accidents included in this presentation are within the project
 area. The accident numbers do not include accidents that occurred west of Douglas.
- Were earthquake issues considered when designing the bridges? RESPONSE: All bridges will be
 designed to current seismic standards. Decision on bridge materials are related more to
 geometrics than seismic considerations.
- What is the timing for the Choctaw Road project? RESPONSE: The project is scheduled for letting in June 2017.
- Can you describe how you are going to raise the Westminster Bridge? RESPONSE: The bridge will be raised using jacks underneath the bridge. The bridge is in good shape and does not need to be replaced.
- Why not lower I-40 instead of raising Westminster Bridge? RESPONSE: Correcting the vertical clearance is the main issue. Lowering the road affects a long section of I-40. It is more economical in this case to raise the bridge.
- Will the surface improvements be similar to what they did on Luther? RESPONSE: The deciding factor to determine the type of surface will be economics. It will either be asphalt or concrete.
- What is the height of the barrier wall and will it be tall enough to protect from headlight beams during the night? RESPONSE: The height is still to be determined. The headlight glare should not be an issue. They should not have to add glare screens to the concrete barrier.
- Why not use cable barrier versus the concrete barrier? RESPONSE: It comes down to deflection. You get 8 to 10 feet of deflection when you hit a cable barrier. In this case that would put a vehicle that hit the barrier in the oncoming traffic lanes. This situation requires a rigid barrier.





- There is a lot of traffic east bound on I-40 that exits Anderson Road. Drivers use that area like it has two lanes. Is there a possibility for a clover leaf at that exit? There is currently a diamond. RESPONSE: The diamond configuration is expected to perform adequately at this location. A cloverleaf is not anticipated.
- Are there plans to four lane Anderson Road? RESPONSE: Anderson Road belongs to the City of Oklahoma City and they would be responsible for improvements on Anderson Road. The I-40 bridge will be long enough to accommodate future widening.
- Is the 63,000 traffic count based on loads coming off the turnpike? RESPONSE: Turnpike traffic was not accounted for in the 63,000 number. Turnpike traffic is anticipated to use I-240 more so than I-40.
- There are lot of Tinker employees that use Westminster Bridge. When Westminster is closed, will
 there be other closures? RESPONSE: We anticipate no other closure during the Westminster
 closure. Post Road should have no closures for the duration of this project and Anderson Road
 will only experience nighttime closures.
- Is there anything allocated from the 8-year plan for this project? RESPONSE: There is \$32M programmed for the I-40 projects but hope to receive a federal Fastlane grant for this project and the I-40 & Douglas Interchange project to help make up the difference.

3.4 Summary of Written Comments and Responses

Five (5) written comments from agencies and three (3) written comments from the public were received both before and after the public meeting. Copies of written comments are included in **Appendix F**.

3.4.1 Agency Comments

The **Bureau of Land Management** had no comments or objections to the project. No BLM land or federal minerals will be affected.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

The **Natural Resources Conservation Service** had no comments or objections to the project. The NRCS would like to be contacted if any new construction or other disturbances outside of the proposed projected occur.

RESPONSE: Comment noted.

The **Oklahoma Corporation Commission – Oil and Gas Division** identified one mud plugged well in the project area. The well records and a Google Earth location map of the well was also included with the written comment.

RESPONSE: Thank you for the information.

The **Oklahoma Aeronautics Commission** comment included recommendations to inform the Administrator of the FAA per CFR Title 14 Part 77.13 and may be required to fill out a 7460-I form.



1-40 From East of Douglas Boulevard to I-240 Public Meeting Summary



Proposed changes may pose a hazard to the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace due to the proximity to Tinker Air Force Base.

RESPONSE: If needed, ODOT will complete the required form.

The **Oklahoma Conservation Commission (OCC)** provided a response expressing their concerns with construction activities at one stream crossing (Soldier Creek) that may potentially impact wetland resources and riparian areas. Comment also included general recommendations to minimize impacts on stream and riparian areas.

RESPONSE: Thank you for your comment. Impacts to streams will be minimized as much as possible.

The **Oklahoma State Parks** Department stated that there are no anticipated adverse impacts on any federally funded park or recreation area or state park. There is a neighborhood park at the northeast corner of I-40 and Anderson Road. The park is not funded with LWCF. The area is noted as a "campground" on the USGS map so may have been a place for outdoor recreation for a while. *RESPONSE: Thank you for your comment.*

3.4.2 Public Comments and Responses

All of the written public comments were related to issues and concerns at Anderson Road and Choctaw Road. Comments and responses are summarized in Table 3:





Table 3: Public Comment Summary

Comment	# of Comments	Response
Ramps should be two lanes at Anderson Road	3	
REPONSE: We are investigating whether there is enough room to have two lanes at		
the intersection of the ramps for I-40 and Anderson Road to better facilitate traffic in		
this area .		
Need a safer interchange at Choctaw Road	1	
Response: The Choctaw Road interchange is a scheduled project for the ODOT 2017		
Work Plan. Once completed the interchange will be a diamond interchange with		
increased capacity.		
Need 2-lane ramps at Choctaw Road	1	
RESPONSE: The new Choctaw Road interchange will include two lane ramps.		
Traffic lights at Choctaw Road would improve safety	1	
RESPONSE: The new Choctaw Road interchange will include traffic signals at the		
intersection of the I-40 ramps and Choctaw Road.		
Drainage is a problem under I-40 at Choctaw Road	1	
RESPONSE: Proper drainage is included on all designs and the new Choctaw Road		
interchange will improve drainage issues		
Will the new Choctaw interchange include a ramp from I-240/40 to Choctaw Rd?	1	
RESPONSE: As part of the I-40 and Choctaw Road interchange project, there will be		
improved access to and from the I-40/I-240 interchange and Choctaw Road.		
Anderson Road should be 5 lanes under I-40	1	
RESPONSE: The new bridge for I-40 over Anderson Road allows for a 5-lane section		
underneath. We will work with our partners at the City of Oklahoma City in addressing		
improvements along Anderson Road.		
We are glad you are beginning this project	1	
RESPONSE: Thank you.		



Appendix A

Agency Solicitation Letter and List

Appendix B

Public Meeting Letter and List

Appendix C

Public Meeting Sign-in Sheets

Appendix D

Public Meeting Presentation

Appendix E

Public Meeting Handouts and Board Displays

Appendix F

Written Comments