# Virtual Open House Public Meeting Summary



## Oklahoma Department of Transportation

### **I-35 Corridor Study**

from South of Robinson Street in Norman to North of S.W. 4th Street in Moore Cleveland County, JP 31443(04)

Prepared by:



#### **Executive Summary**

This document summarizes the virtual open house public meeting conducted for the Interstate 35 (I-35) Corridor Study in Cleveland County, Oklahoma. The purpose of the open house was to update the public on the progress of the study, present preliminary design options, and obtain public input. The meeting included information on the study history, the preliminary improvement alternatives, and the next steps for the study.

Due to concerns about the spread of COVID-19, the Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT) held a virtual open house public meeting, which was held online between November 15 and December 10, 2021. One hundred and seventeen (117) members of the public electronically signed in. However, sign-in was optional to access the virtual meeting. According to website analytics, 1,586 unique users viewed the website 1,885 times over the 25-day period. In total, 68 individuals submitted written comments/questions through the virtual open house website. Some members of the public submitted multiple comments and/or commented on multiple topics within a single comment. In addition, one verbal comment regarding the meeting was recorded at the City of Moore Council Meeting. In total, 73 public comments were received.

Comments from the public included comments supporting or opposing the proposed options as well as questions, concerns, and design suggestions for different aspects of the proposed options.

The table below (**Table ES1**) provides a summary of all public comments categorized under the comment types described above. In addition, ODOT has provided a general response to these comments.

#### **Table ES1: Comment Summary**

	Comment Topic	No. of Comments
Su	pport	62
Re	asons for supporting the general design options included:	
-	Support overall project and/or improvements to existing intersections.	
-	Support addressing traffic congestion, especially at Indian Hills Road	
	and/or 19 <sup>th</sup> Street.  easons for supporting Option 1 included:	
Re		
-	Addition of interchanges.	
-	Addition of on and off ramps and/or the addition of an interchange at the	
	34 <sup>th</sup> Street bridge in Moore, which may help reduce traffic congestion on	
	19 <sup>th</sup> Street.	
-	Addition of on and off ramps at Rock Creek Road, which may provide	
	easier access to nearby homes, businesses, and other development.	
-	Improvements to traffic mobility and reducing congestion, especially with	
	upcoming development.	
-	Design choices at the existing 4 <sup>th</sup> Street, 19 <sup>th</sup> Street, and Indian Hills Road	
	intersections with I-35.	
-	Franklin Road bridge improvements.	
-	Extending the southbound on-ramp at Tecumseh Road.  Connecting the roundabout at Radius Way.	
-	Dedicated U-turn lane at Robinson Street.	
-	Improved safety at existing interchanges.	
R	easons for supporting Option 1B included:	
_	Support for the removal of the southbound ramp at Indian Hills Road.	
Re	easons provided for support of Option 1XB included:	
_	Widening the 19 <sup>th</sup> Street bridge and including a walkway.	
_	X ramps will help with congestion.	
_	Ability to bypass intersections while staying on the frontage road.	
Reasons for supporting Diverging Diamond Interchanges included:		
_	Diverging Diamond Interchanges are safer, more efficient, and/or easier to	
	navigate (while noting it might take time to get used to them).	
Re	asons for supporting conversion to one-way frontage roads included:	
-	General support, especially at the I-35/34 <sup>th</sup> Street and I-35/Rock Creek	
	Road interchanges.	
Co	oncerns Control of the Control of th	30
Co	ncerns regarding the proposed options included:	
-	Concerns about the length of the merge lanes.	
-	Overall traffic design is focused on catering to businesses instead of	
	residents who have been and will be there longer term.	
Co	ncerns regarding Option 1 included:	
-	Residents were previously told on/off ramps would not be added at the 34 <sup>th</sup>	
	Street bridge at the time the bridge was slated to be built.	
-	Congestion and safety at 34 <sup>th</sup> Street.	
Co		
-		
Co	oncerns regarding Option 1XB included:	
	Opposed to X ramps.	

- This option will be more difficult to use, especially at 4<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Streets.
- On/off ramps in relation to Tecumseh Road will not work.
- Lack of access at Rock Creek Road.
- Distance from the southbound I-35 exit to Robinson Street.
- On ramps are located too far from their related intersections.
- Bypass lanes on the frontage roads that do not lead to the I-35 mainline.

#### **Concerns regarding Diverging Diamond Interchanges included:**

- Traffic counts are not high enough to warrant them.
- Too complex.
- Would not help Robinson Street due to stoplights.
- SPUIs have already improved traffic flow at Main and Lindsey Streets and are easier to navigate.
- Prefer SPUIs, because they allow for more lanes.
- Norman residents already know how to use SPUIs.

#### Concerns regarding conversion to one-way frontage roads included:

- They waste time and gas
- They will cause drivers to have to go unnecessarily out of their way to get to their destination.
- They will not work without also adding the ability to do quick U-turns over the bridges to avoid stoplights.
- They will add traffic to 19th Street instead of 34th Street.
- Opposed to having to cross I-35.
- Emergency responses would be delayed.
- It will add congestion to the I-35/Robinson Street interchange.

#### **Concerns regarding safety included:**

- Proposed interchanges are too complex, especially at Robinson Street.
- The speed limit from Indian Hills Road to South 12<sup>th</sup> Street should be 60 mph.
- Larger shoulders be included for safer emergency stopping.
- Traffic and pedestrian safety, especially from SW 19<sup>th</sup> Street to Tecumseh Road.
- Traffic speed on the 34<sup>th</sup> Street bridge.

#### Concerns regarding property impacts included:

- Impacts due to access changes either during, or as a result of, construction.
- Access to the post office on westbound 4<sup>th</sup> Street.
- Impacts to neighborhoods, specifically if a frontage road would be added between SW 19<sup>th</sup> and SW 4<sup>th</sup> Streets on the east side of I-35.

Questions 10

#### Questions regarding the proposed design options included:

- How would traffic go from southbound I-35 to eastbound Robinson Street?
- Would the planned project to convert the 4<sup>th</sup> Street railroad crossing to an underpass affect the design for this corridor?
- How would traffic get from eastbound Robinson Street to northbound I-35?
- Are additional lanes being considered for the I-35 mainline?
- Are noise barrier walls feasible?
- What are the differences in X ramps from "normal" ramps?
- Would this design require redesigns of major intersections not directly connected to I-35?

	expected start and end dates of construction?	
<ul> <li>What would t</li> </ul>	he timing of construction be relative to the repairs at Robinson	
Street?		
- Will new fron	tage roads be completed before they are all converted to one-	
way roads?	,	
Suggestions		7
Design suggestions provided by commenters included:		
- Lengthen I-3	5 on ramps.	
- Combine Op	tions 1B and 1XB to include the X ramps and keep the off	
ramp at 4 <sup>th</sup> S		
- Rework the F	Flood Avenue interchange.	
- Add more ma	ainline lanes to I-35.	
- Remove fron	tage roads entirely.	
- Remove the	bypass roads that do not connect with I-35.	
- Add a bridge	over the railroad tracks east of Indian Hills Road.	
- Add a media	n or barrier at the intersection of 19 <sup>th</sup> Street and the I-35	
frontage road	ds.	
- Realign traffi	c lights near 19 <sup>th</sup> Street, 4 <sup>th</sup> Street, and Classen Avenue	
relative to the	e lanes.	
Other		15
- Commenters	expressed approval of the virtual public meeting and/or	
appreciation	for the informative interactive map.	
	expressed having some difficulty with the virtual public	
meeting form	at.	
- Other comme	ents that did not fall under the above categories.	

#### Responses to Comments

#### Support

 ODOT response: We thank you for your support of the study options. Your comments will be noted and considered as we work with our partners to develop design solutions for this corridor.

#### Concerns

 ODOT response: We thank you for your comments and opinions regarding the study options. ODOT is still early in the preliminary stages of design, and your concerns will be noted and considered as we work with our partners to develop design solutions.

#### Questions

 ODOT response: We thank you for your interest and questions regarding the study options. Based on the options, there are multiple answers to these questions. Once a preferred option is chosen for the corridor, the individual characteristics will be more easily discussed and thoroughly reviewed.

#### Suggestions

 ODOT response: We thank you for your interest and suggestions regarding the study options. ODOT is early in the preliminary stages of design, and we will consider feasibility of including your suggestions in this project as we work with our partners to develop design solutions.

#### Other

ODOT response (to virtual public meeting comments): Thank you for providing your comments and concerns. The virtual meeting format was in response to potential public health concerns caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. Contact information for personal assistance with the virtual meeting room was made available in the meeting notice and from the help link within the virtual site. Two comments noting difficulties with site functionality were resolved by the development team as they were received. Your comments and concerns will be taken into consideration for future virtual meetings.