# AGENDA

## COTPA FIXED GUIDEWAY TRANSIT STUDY

## 5th Steering Committee Meeting

Thursday, December 15, 2005 – 3:00 to 5:00 P.M.
Presbyterian Health Foundation Conference Center
655 Research Parkway, Suite 100 – Oklahoma City, OK

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3:00 – 3:05 P.M. | **1. Welcome and Overview** | Mick Cornett<br>Mayor of Oklahoma City |
| 3:05 – 3:10 P.M. | **2. Purpose and Objectives of Study** | Chris Kauffman<br>COTPA Board Chairman/Steering Committee Chair |
| 3:10 – 3:15 P.M. | **3. Results of October 11-13 Public Meetings** | Tom Shelton<br>Carter & Burgess |
| 3:15 –4:00 P.M. | **4. Presentation of Fixed Guideway Study Findings and Recommendations**<br>• Fixed Guideway System Plan<br>• Phased Implementation Plan<br>• Financial Implementation Strategy<br>• Maintaining Momentum Strategies<br>• Next Steps | Tom Shelton<br>Carter & Burgess |
| 4:00 – 4:30 P.M. | **5. Questions and Discussion by Steering Committee** | |
| 4:30 – 4:45 P.M. | **6. Steering Committee Consideration of Forwarding the Fixed Guideway Study Recommendations to the COTPA Board of Trustees** | Chris Kauffman<br>Steering Committee Chair |
| 4:45 – 5:00 P.M. | **7. Concluding Comment** | Mick Cornett<br>Mayor of Oklahoma City |
| 5:00 P.M. | **8. Adjourn** | |

Carter Burgess

# Meeting Report

**PROJECT:** Fixed Guideway Study, Central Oklahoma Transportation and Parking Authority (COTPA)

**PROJECT NO.:** 023144.010.001

**PRESENT:** See attached sign-in sheets

**DATE:** October 11 – 13, 2005

The following is our understanding of the subject matter covered in this meeting. If this differs from your understanding, please notify us within five working days.

The third series of public meetings was conducted at various locations dispersed across the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area over a period of three days, from October 11 – 13, 2005. The purpose of these meetings was to present the public the initial ridership and cost data for the fixed guideway alternatives (enhanced bus, high occupancy vehicle lanes, bus rapid transit, commuter rail, and light rail streetcar), and outline the next steps of the study.

## Warr Acres Public Library
## Tuesday, October 11, 2005 12:00 PM to 1:30 PM

Tom Shelton, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and thanked everyone for coming. A slide show was presented by Mr. Shelton and Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner for Carter & Burgess, providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, technology alternatives, and preliminary cost and ridership data. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments/questions were received.

C: Light Rail in Houston gets in the way of normal traffic flow and should be elevated.

C: The east/west commuter rail alignment along the Union Pacific railroad should be along Reno.

C: Railroad companies do not want to deal with passenger rail service because of liability reasons.

C: Light rail should be located on the IH 40 bridge.

C: Enhanced bus and other fixed guideway technologies should go where the riders are.

C: Weekend transit service needs to be increased not decreased.

C: Each suburb should have its own transit station.

C: In determining the future transportation needs for Oklahoma City, the transit options need to be more practical.

Q: On the animation, there was green space in the median; is this how it would look?
R: That is one option; this is an urban design treatment.

Q: Why is light rail so expensive?
R: The main reason why light rail (LRT) is so expensive is because of the electrification and the relocation of utilities.

## Association of Central Oklahoma Governments
## 2030 OCARTS Plan Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)
## Tuesday, October 11, 2005, 3:00 PM

Leonard West, CAC Chairman, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and asked each attendee to introduce themselves. Mr. West then introduced Tom Shelton, Project Manager, and Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner, from Carter & Burgess. A slide show was presented by Mr. Shelton and Mr. McAnelly providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, technology alternatives, and preliminary cost and ridership data. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments/questions were received.

Q: How did you factor the trip figure?
R: This was based on infrastructure that's in place today and what is planned for the future. It shows total person trips, not trips by mode.

Q: In the enhanced bus option are you looking at suburban areas that currently aren't served like Moore?
R: Yes, we are looking at the entire region and where people work and live. We are not constrained by what METRO Transit serves today.

Q: What is paratransit?
R: Paratransit is an on-demand service that is federally required. This service is currently being served by METRO Lift.

Q: Why was the line to the airport not analyzed?
R: Within the model it is difficult to capitalize the ridership to and from the airport. Other factors considered in the analysis are trip length, ridership demand and capital costs.

Q: Why didn't we use the old inter-urban routes?
R: The scope of the study is to stay in the OCARTS region.

C: The Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) route would need double-tracking in some areas and an operations agreement with the BNSF.

C: Light rail in a freight right-of-way would need three times the spacing then commuter rail. Commuter rail is FRA compliant while light rail is not.

Q: Does the commuter rail cost estimate include the construction of additional track?
R: Yes, the cost estimates assumes double tracking along the entire north/south alignment and the construction of 1,000 foot sidings at stations along the east/west alignment.

Q: Will the study make finite recommendations?
R: Yes, the study will create an implementation plan and make funding recommendations.

Q: What is the federal match?
R: The current reauthorization bill, SAFETEA-LU, includes an 80/20 split (20% local match). The current administration doesn't support this and wants a 50/50 split.

## McAlpine Center
## Tuesday, October 11, 2005, 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM

Tom Shelton, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and thanked everyone for coming. A slide show was presented by Mr. Shelton and Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner for Carter & Burgess, providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, technology alternatives, and preliminary cost and ridership data. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments/questions were received.

Q: Are the numbers presented on the bus comparison table existing numbers or for 25 years from now?
R: They are existing numbers.

Q: Are you going to compare the existing bus rapid transit and light rail ridership numbers from other agencies to the projected numbers for Oklahoma City?
R: We do have those numbers, but they are not being shown at this time. The point we are trying to make is how the existing transit service in Oklahoma City relates to peer cities throughout the country. It shows that the demand for transit service in Oklahoma City is greater then the service METRO Transit currently provides.

Q: Is bus rapid transit susceptible to adverse weather conditions such as rain and snow unlike light rail?
R: Yes.

Q: Does bus rapid transit drive economic development like light rail does?
R: This is a new technology and the jury is still out on the amount of transit oriented development (TOD) that will occur around bus rapid transit (BRT) stations. However, early studies have shown that TOD is occurring around BRT stations, but at a smaller scale then what is occurring along light rail lines.

Q: Oklahoma City has old track under asphalt from the old inter-urban lines. Would it be cost effective to use these?
R: Other cities have tried that, but have found it very costly to rehabilitate the old track.

Q: When calculating the cost effectiveness for each fixed guideway technology, do you quantify the amount of money for what people are spending on auto related expenses?
R: Those calculations are available, but at this level of analysis we are normalizing the numbers for comparison purposes. The Federal Transit Administration has a more complex cost/benefit analysis that will need to be done if COTPA decides to proceed further into alternatives analysis.

C: In Oklahoma City the need for transit is greater then what is currently available. COTPA needs better funding to serve the transit needs of Oklahoma City. Cities dedicated to transit have created an independent regional transit authority with dedicated funding.

Q: How will the east/west and the north/south commuter rail lines connect?
R: This connection will be made by the creation of an intermodal center where the two lines cross.

Q: What is the time line for completion and phasing?
R: Complete build-out of the system would occur in 25 years. The consultant team will develop a phasing and implementation plan at the end of this study.

C: The modern streetcar route is in agreement with what was discussed by St. Anthony's Hospital and the Health Science Center.

C: Other cities seem to have more of a sense of community that the OKC metro area.

Q: Are you thinking a way to pay for this would be MAPS 3?
R: Yes.

## Norman Public Library
## Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 12:00 PM to 1:30 PM

Tom Shelton, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and thanked everyone for coming. A slide show was presented by Mr. Shelton and Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner for Carter & Burgess, providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, technology alternatives, and preliminary cost and ridership data. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments/questions were received.

Q: What is the distinction between home based work (HBW) and home based non-work (HBNW) trips? Why is HBNW so much greater then HBW in the Norman Corridor?
R: HBW trips are trips people make from home to work. HBNW are trips people make to the store, drop kids off at school, etc. We've made the same distinction about the large amount of HBNW trips being so much greater then the HBW trips in the Norman Corridor. We have asked ACOG for clarification on the matter. It should be noted that these trips include school trips and trips through the corridor.

C: The Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT) mentioned that no federal money can be spent on high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes.
R: We are not aware of that comment from ODOT, and federal money may be used for HOV projects.

Q: Is low transit ridership in Oklahoma City due to the lack of service or the people of Oklahoma City?
R: It is due to the lack of service in Oklahoma City. METRO Transit is provided the best service possible with the amount of funding it receives. If METRO Transit was properly funded the service would increase and as a result the ridership would increase.

Q: How do other transit agencies get money?
R: Regional transit agencies across the country receive a dedicated funding source through tax revenue or other funding sources. This study will look at how funding can be provided.

Q: Is COTPA a regional agency?
R: No, it's a department within the City of Oklahoma City that receives its funding out of the cities annual budget.

Q: What happened in Dallas?
R: First, a state level action was initiated to allow a regional transit agency to be created. Once approved by the State a referendum occurred to let voters decide to be a member city of DART and impose a 1% sales tax.

Q: Was DART bus ridership poor before the light rail (LRT) system was built?
R: Dallas' bus service wasn't properly funded, like Oklahoma City is now, and they couldn't provide the proper service the City needed.

C: Light rail induces ridership and increased density.

Q: Why would you want a bus to act like light rail?
R: Cost is the primary reason. With the cost of light rail approaching $50 million per mile it is difficult for cities to meet the federal requirements for federal funding. Bus Rapid Transit is a transit technology that can carry as many or more passengers then light rail and at a fraction of the cost. Because of the low cost it is easier to qualify for federal funding.

C: Siding the commuter rail line and making the commuter rail wait for passing freight trains would kill the route.
R: The schedules would be coordinated so no delays would occur.

C: The Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad would benefit from double tracking of the railroad.

Q: $50 million per mile for light rail doesn't seem right, what does this cost include?
R: The cost estimate includes electrification, stations, vehicles, lying of track, and utility relocation. Right-of-way costs are not included in this estimate.

C: The presentation is boring and you should be doing more "selling" of the project.

Q: Union Station and the rail yard are not usable in this study. Does the cost estimate take into account a new rail hub?
R: The cost estimate for commuter rail includes double tracking of the entire north/south route, 1,000 foot siding track along the east/west route, stations, and vehicles. Right-of-way costs is not included in the cost estimate.

Q: How would the Santa Fe Station be ADA accessible?
R: Renovation would need to occur to provide elevators and/or escalators and other improvements to bring it up to federal requirements.

Q: What is the current bus ridership in Oklahoma City?
R: Around three million riders per year.

Q: Would you have to build a second track for commuter rail?
R: The determination will come in further analysis of that corridor. However, in the cost estimate we assumed double tracking the entire north/south corridor and placing 1,000 foot sidings at stations along the east/west corridor.

Q: What is the cost per Modern Street Car Vehicle?
R: Approximately $1.3 million.

Q: To what extent are you free in your report to convey your ideas and how are you constrained by politics and not able to express your expertise?
R: No constraints have been expressed, except our professionalism.

## Edmond Public Library
## Wednesday, October 12, 2005 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM

Tom Shelton, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and thanked everyone for coming. A slide show was presented by Mr. Shelton and Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner for Carter & Burgess, providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, technology alternatives, and preliminary cost and ridership data. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments/questions were received.

Q: Does the ridership projection include where people go and their desirability of mode of transportation?
R: Yes, it has been seen across the country that people are more likely to ride rail then bus. Convenience and reliability makes rail more appealing.
Q: Current ridership in Oklahoma City is low, so increasing service will increase ridership?
R: Yes, that is true.

Q: What difference would a rider see from bus rapid transit (BRT) and modern streetcar?
R: Not sure at this time. BRT and modern streetcar are both less than five years old and statistical data is not yet available. The potential for transit oriented development exists for these technologies.

Q: Is there a next phase or step that will look at outside areas such as Guthrie?
R: The current priority is to focus on the ACOG area. A follow up study needs to be done in the future that includes outside communities such as Guthrie. Some of the technology best addresses the longer commutes of rural citizens. Rural citizens need to voice their opinion on the need for the technology to reach rural areas.

## South Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce
## Thursday, October 13, 2005 7:30 AM to 9:00 AM

Tom Shelton, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and thanked everyone for coming. A slide show was presented by Mr. Shelton and Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner for Carter & Burgess, providing an overview of the Fixed

Guideway Study objectives, technology alternatives, and preliminary cost and ridership data. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments/questions were received.

C: The rail line that runs east to Remington Park is not completely abandoned. It is leased from METRO Transit by Union Pacific and the Railroad Museum.

C: The streetcar alignment that runs along 10th to Walker needs to be looked at possible running along 13th. 13th has tracks embedded in the asphalt that could be reused. The old Capitol line could be put back into use. 10th street is a very congested street. Visibility is better on 13th then on 10th after you cross the BNSF railroad.
R: The streetcar route is not fixed, but shows the needs of tourists, residents, employers, etc. to circulate downtown.

Q: Why is the Capitol Hill bus circulator not being used anymore?
R: Due to lack of funding and declining ridership METRO Transit felt it would be best to discontinue the Capitol Hill bus circulator.

C: All of these methods seem to have a great economic impact.

C: This is a good study, you are appealing to both the blue and white collar workers.

C: Need transportation from the fairgrounds- Rock Island line, had a street car to fairgrounds good to run for conventioneers.

C: In El Reno when they did the trolley system, they had to re-do the track.

## Association of Central Oklahoma Governments
## Intermodal Transportation Technical Committee (ITTC)
## Thursday, October 13, 2005, 10:00 AM

Doug Rex, Program Coordinator with ACOG, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and asked each attendee to introduce themselves. Mr. Rex then introduced Tom Shelton, Project Manager, and Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner, with Carter & Burgess. Mr. Shelton and Mr. McAnelly gave a brief presentation providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, technology alternatives, and preliminary cost and ridership data. Due to time constraints comments and questions were not able to be solicited.

## Midwest City Public Library
## Thursday, October 13, 2005, 11:00 AM to 12:30 PM

Tom Shelton, Project Manager for Carter & Burgess, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and thanked everyone for coming. A slide show was presented by Mr. Shelton and Mike McAnelly, Senior Planner for Carter & Burgess, providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, technology alternatives, and preliminary cost and ridership data. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments/questions were received.

C: Northeast Oklahoma City is currently underserved, but right now there is no major call for mass transit.
R: Leadership needs to be vocal and proactive. It is possible that in a phase II or III outlying areas may be served.

C: Midwest City Draft Comprehensive Plan meeting is next Thursday (October 20, 2005). Anything that comes along Midwest City is a willing participant and political leadership is backing it.

Q: Does the lane for BRT have to be the same size as a car lane?
R: It has to be a minimum of 11ft.

## Urban League
## Thursday, October 13, 2005, 6:30 PM to 8:00 PM

Larry Hopper, Senior Planner METRO Transit, called the meeting to order. He welcomed the participants and thanked everyone for coming. A slide show was presented by Mr. Hopper providing an overview of the Fixed Guideway Study objectives, technology alternatives, and preliminary cost and ridership data. Subsequent to the presentation, comments and questions were invited from the participants. The following comments/questions were received.

Q: The cities that spend four times more on public transportation, are they on the coast or up north?
R: No, actually even Texas to our south does spend a lot more on transit.

Q: What is a corridor?
R: A general direction people want to travel, a long strip of land.

Q: Could we go to Stillwater?
R: There are no plans extending to Stillwater at this time.

Q: Do other cities operate (bus routes) 24 hours a day?
R: Yes, many cities around the country operate 24 hour transit service.

Q: Is this why they spend more?
R: They do spend more by at least three times.

Q: Is there a city with both underground & above ground public transit?
R: Yes, Dallas, Boston, New York, and Atlanta for example, but underground is expensive and we have no plans for that here.

Q: Was light rail the track remains I had seen somewhere near (Villa from the 60's)(not clear)
R: Yes, there was a rail toward (19$^{th}$)

Q: How would I get to Bethany?
R: There is already some service that comes near Bethany. The enhanced Bus option would go there. The funding & public support would have to be there. We might need Bethany to help pay for it or develop a transit portion of community government that would cross jurisdictions and manage the funding.

Q: What about Guthrie?
R: What makes public transit work best is population density. Guthrie does not have the population at this time. Future studies will determine if transit is feasible in this area.

Q: What about Stillwater?
R: There is a bus that runs from Quail Springs Mall or the 122nd and I-35 park & ride lot to OSU. You would have to look on OSU's website to find out details about that.

Q: Will our system help Katrina victims?
R: If they move close to busy bus routes they will be helped.

Q: I am wondering about something similar to "MetroLift"?
R: "ParaLift" is the national term; enhanced bus service is especially designed to be helpful.

Q: What about Enid?
R: We cannot go that far as a municipality. Still, there is actually another service to there that is not too expensive.

**Central Oklahoma Transportation and Parking Authority (COTPA)**

**Fixed Guideway Transit Study**
**Steering Committee**

## Purpose

The active participation of leadership from the City, COTPA, Chambers of Commerce, business leaders, and community leaders is necessary for a successful project. Public participation and involvement throughout the study will ensure that citizens contribute ideas for and will benefit from transportation improvements that add mobility choices and have a positive impact on quality of life.

The Fixed Guideway Study Steering Committee will serve an additional purpose of representing the "community-at-large" and will be the Study's voice to the community as the project progresses. The Steering Committee's participation throughout the project will better ensure that the project has majority support by the general public and business community.

## Mission Statement

The purpose of the Fixed Guideway Study and its Steering Committee is to identify, evaluate, and recommend a set of fixed guideway transit investment options that will strengthen the connections to the region's employment and activity centers. Such options should satisfy the following objectives:

- Increase the overall mobility through short-term improvements that form that backbone of a long-term transportation network and supports the transit investment that has already been made
- Provide feasible transportation links that increase access among major activity hubs
- Prioritize fixed guideway transit investments in each considered corridor with considerations of an affordable financial plan
- Consider economic, environmental, and social impacts to existing and future residences, residential areas, and businesses
- Guide future population and employment growth by leveraging transit-oriented development that supports the investments made in transportation infrastructure
- Ensure that investments are socially and environmentally sensitive and fiscally responsible, promoting a reduction in pollution and energy consumption while supporting additional growth in the region

# COTPA FIXED GUIDEWAY STUDY
# GUIDING PRINCIPLES

**Achieve Regional Consensus**

1. In conducting the Fixed Guideway Study, follow all federal, state, and local regulations, policies, guidelines, and procedures to ensure an impartial study process.
2. Proactively solicit communication with city, regional, state and federal agencies and the public in general throughout the transportation decision making process, using a variety of methods.
3. Coordinate with the City of Oklahoma City, the Central Oklahoma Transportation and Parking Authority (COTPA), the Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the Association of Central Oklahoma Governments (ACOG) on any appropriate completed or on-going studies.
4. Coordinate with the City of Oklahoma City, the Central Oklahoma Transportation and Parking Authority (COTPA), the Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the Association of Central Oklahoma Governments (ACOG) to assess the travel needs of the City of Oklahoma City.

**Enhance Mobility**

5. Develop strategies that provide additional travel choices and increase capacity to serve the major travel patterns throughout the City of Oklahoma City.
6. Develop strategies that minimize transfers and duplicative services.
7. Develop strategies that consider origins and destinations for residents and employees among specific trip generators and activity centers that:
    a. Link residents of the corridors to employment centers both within the corridors and outside the corridors.
    b. Link activity and growth centers to a regional transit system.
    c. Include transportation system management and travel demand management elements.
8. Develop strategies that recognize current and past planning efforts and commitments for transportation improvements in the corridors and consider new alternatives. Details of the current plans are in the City of Oklahoma City's Comprehensive Plan and Master Thoroughfare Plan, the Central Oklahoma Transportation and Parking Authority's Strategic Plan, and ACOG's Mobility 2025.
9. Examine ways to improve and enhance existing service as a part of strategies to meet mobility needs.

**Be Fiscally Responsible**

10. Ensure affordability based on accepted financial planning parameters and reasonable cost estimates.

**Consider Appropriate Technologies**

11. Focus on proven transportation solutions, but remain open to emerging technologies that can demonstrate advantages, while being compatible and complementary to existing modes.
12. Develop strategies with the appropriate mix of technologies that match the demand and nature of the mobility needs within the corridors and reinforces efficient system operation.

**Consider Effects on the Corridors**

13. Consider the effects of the strategies on environmentally sensitive areas, safety, quality of life, and the ability to promote transit supportive land use and economic development.
14. Consider the equity of the impacts and benefits of the transportation solutions on Oklahoma City's diverse areas and populations.

**Economic Development**

15. Further define the opportunities for economic development at growth centers identified in the City Comprehensive Plan.
16. Select station location areas for maximum opportunity for economic development.
17. Coordinate with the Oklahoma City development community and provide them with opportunities for input into the planning and station location processes.

# Central Oklahoma Transportation & Parking Authority Fixed Guideway System Plan

The 2030 System Plan presents a multi-modal vision for a fixed guideway transit system providing reliable, fast, and safe public transportation service to the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area. The plan consists of 789 miles of Enhanced Bus, 40 miles of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), 42 miles of Commuter Rail Transit (CRT), and five miles of Downtown Modern Streetcar. Also, a new downtown Oklahoma City Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC) is proposed at a location near the rail intersection of the UP and BNSF railroads. The ITC will provide a centrally located hub for transfers between bus, Bus Rapid Transit, Commuter Rail transit, and the downtown Light Rail Streetcar systems.

Enhanced Bus is an expansion of METRO Transit's current bus and paratransit services. It will offer more frequent service, broader coverage, and extended service hours. Enhanced Bus will also provide feeder bus service to the BRT, CRT and Streetcar stations.

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) is defined as buses operating on their own dedicated lane or right-of-way. BRT will serve the Northwest Expressway corridor which includes stops at Penn Square Mall, Integris Baptist and connecting to the METRO Transit Downtown Transfer Center. A second BRT line will operate along W. Reno Avenue between downtown Oklahoma City and the Kilpatrick Turnpike, and along Meridian Avenue from Reno to Will Rogers World Airport. A third BRT line will operate along W. 59$^{th}$ Street between the FAA Complex and the Crossroads Mall CRT station.

Commuter Rail Transit (CRT) will provide connections to Norman, Moore, downtown Oklahoma City, Edmond, Midwest City, and Tinker Air Force Base. The Norman to Edmond CRT line will operate in the existing BNSF railroad right-of-way. This North/South line will provide connections to the University of Oklahoma for special events, downtown Norman, downtown Moore, Crossroads Mall, downtown Oklahoma City, the State Capitol complex, and downtown Edmond. The East CRT line will operate along the existing and abandoned sections of the UP railroad right-of-way between downtown Oklahoma City and Midwest City/Tinker Air Force Base.

The Modern Streetcar system will serve the downtown Oklahoma City area. The streetcar will connect to METRO Transit Downtown Transfer Center, Santa Fe Station, and the new Intermodal Center. It will serve as a circulator within the downtown area providing connections to the Central Business District, Bricktown, Flat Iron District, Medical Center Complex, Saint Anthony's Hospital, the Federal Building, Oklahoma City National Memorial, Cox Convention Center, and Ford Arena.

Cost and ridership characteristics for the System Plan are summarized on the following page.

**Enhanced Bus**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Technology: | Conventional Diesel or CNG Bus | | |
| Annual Revenue Miles: | 8.8 million | | |
| Service Frequency: | 15 – 30 min. Peak, 30 – 45 min. Off-Peak & Weekend | | |
| Annual Operating Hours: | 550,000 | | |
| Capital Cost: | $31.8 million | Annual Operating Cost: | $60 million |
| Annual Boardings: | 7.2 million | | |
| Annualized Cost Per Annualized Rider: | $0.56 | | |

**Bus Rapid Transit**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Technology: | Conventional Diesel or CNG Bus | | |
| Annual Revenue Miles: | 600,000 | | |
| Service Frequency: | 30 min. Peak, 60 min. Off-Peak & Weekend | | |
| Annual Revenue Hours: | 20,700 | | |
| Capital Cost: | $40.2 million | Annual Operating Cost: | $35.7 million |
| Annual Boardings: | 750,000 | | |
| Annualized Cost Per Annualized Rider: | $9.80 | | |

**Commuter Rail**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Technology: | Conventional Diesel ; Modern DMU | | |
| Annual Revenue Car Miles: | 645,826 | | |
| Service Frequency: | 30 min. Peak, 60 min. Off-Peak & Weekend | | |
| Annual Revenue Car Hours: | 25,050 | | |
| Capital Cost: | $234.0 million | Annual Operating Cost: | $9.7 million |
| Annual Boardings: | 1.8 million | | |
| Annualized Cost Per Annualized Rider: | $35.48 | | |

**Modern Streetcar**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Technology: | Electric | | |
| Annual Revenue Car Miles: | 215,146 | | |
| Service Frequency: | 15 min. Peak, 30 min. Off-Peak & Weekend | | |
| Annual Revenue Car Hours: | 33,270 | | |
| Capital Cost: | $83.2 million | Annual Operating Cost: | $3.2 million |
| Annual Boardings: | 680,000 | | |
| Annualized Cost Per Annualized Rider: | $19.97 | | |

## Central Oklahoma Transportation and Parking Authority (COTPA)
## 2030 Fixed Guideway System Plan

### Potential Phased Implementation Plan

| Corridor | Mode | Limits | Length (mi) | Capital Cost 2005 $ ($M) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Phase 1 Years 2006 – 2013** | | | | |
| Enhanced Bus | Phase 1 | Systemwide | NA | $19.1 |
| Edmond Corridor | Commuter Rail | Downtown OKC to 63rd St | 5.3 | $30.3 |
| Norman Corridor | Commuter Rail | Downtown OKC to 4th St | 9.1 | $52.0 |
| Northwest Corridor | Bus Rapid Transit | Downtown Transit Center to Integris | 6.5 | $6.5 |
| Central Corridor | Modern Streetcar | Downtown Transit Center to Ballpark Sta | 1.4 | $19.6 |
| **Total Phase 1 Years 2006 – 2013** | | | | **$127.5** |
| **Phase 2 Years 2013 – 2020** | | | | |
| Enhanced Bus | Phase 2 | Systemwide | NA | $12.7 |
| Norman Corridor | Commuter Rail | 4th St to Downtown Norman | 9.7 | $41.2 |
| Northwest Corridor | Bus Rapid Transit | Integris to Council Sta | 5.2 | $5.2 |
| Yukon Corridor | Bus Rapid Transit | Downtown OKC to 15th Sta | 7.6 | $7.6 |
| Central Corridor | Modern Streetcar | Ballpark Sta to OU Medical South Sta | 1.35 | $35.4 |
| **Total Phase 2 Years 2013 – 2020** | | | | **$102.1** |
| **Phase 3 Years 2020 – 2025** | | | | |
| Edmond Corridor | Commuter Rail | 63rd St to Downtown Edmond | 8.9 | $61.0 |
| West I-44 Corridor | Bus Rapid Transit | 15th Sta to Airport Sta | 3.7 | $3.7 |
| Northwest Corridor | Bus Rapid Transit | Council Sta to Kilpatrick | 2.7 | $2.7 |
| Central Corridor | Modern Streetcar | OU Medical South Sta to Broadway Sta | 1.25 | $13.8 |
| **Total Phase 3 Years 2020 – 2025** | | | | **$81.2** |
| **Phase 4 Years 2025 – 2030** | | | | |
| MWC/Tinker Corridor | Commuter Rail | Downtown OKC to Tinker Sta | 9.5 | $49.5 |
| I-240 Corridor | Bus Rapid Transit | FAA Sta to 59th St Sta | 8.4 | $8.4 |
| Yukon Corridor | Bus Rapid Transit | Reno Sta to Sara Sta | 6.1 | $6.1 |
| Central Corridor | Modern Streetcar | Broadway Sta to Downtown Transit Center | 0.86 | $14.4 |
| **Total Phase 4 Years 2025 – 2030** | | | | **$78.4** |
| **Grand Total** | | | | **$424.8** |

**Central Oklahoma Transportation and Parking Authority (COTPA)**
**2030 Fixed Guideway System Plan**

**"Maintaining the Momentum" Strategies**

During the year 2005, the Central Oklahoma Transportation and Parking Authority (COTPA) commissioned a 12-month long feasibility study investigating needs and opportunities for a regional fixed guideway transit plan serving the Oklahoma City metropolitan area. The recommended 2030 Fixed Guideway System Plan is the result of the feasibility study efforts using thorough technical analysis supported by extensive public involvement, which recommends alternative fixed guideway transit service in multiple corridors based on population, employment, and travel demand needs projected to the year 2030.

Upon the completion of the Fixed Guideway Transit Study in 2005, it is imperative that focused efforts in the year 2006 are initiated which "Maintain the Momentum" and begin the implementation process for some of the most essential transit needs identified in the Fixed Guideway Transit Study recommendations. Following is a set of recommended strategies that COTPA and other entities throughout the Oklahoma City metropolitan area should initiate in the year 2006.

1. Appointment of a well respected, single individual that would serve as the project's "Champion" providing to the project an enhanced creditability, public awareness, and focus on the project's needs during its early implementation phase. Characteristics of this individual might include:
    a. Well-recognized with "name brand" recognition
    b. Well-respected business person known throughout region
    c. History of supporting transportation and/or public transportation initiatives
    d. No conflicts of interest with transit implementation programs
    e. Available to commit significant portion of personal time during upcoming year

2. Creation of a 5-person Oklahoma City Regional Transit Committee responsible for creating regional ownership of the Fixed Guideway System Plan and soliciting support from all affected cities and entities. The project "Champion" would serve as one of the members of this committee. The Committee would represent the following 5 cities or entities
    a. City of Oklahoma City
    b. City of Edmond
    c. City of Norman
    d. City of Midwest City
    e. City of Yukon
    f. COTPA Board of Trustees Representative
    g. Other Cities and/or entities

3. Initiation by Association of Central Oklahoma Governments (ACOG) for the creation of multi-modal mode split travel demand and ridership estimation computer model. This mode split ridership model will be a requirement for use during the starter corridor's FTA Alternatives Analysis process.

4. Fulfillment of obtaining an appropriation earmark in the FY2007 Transportation Appropriations Bill for Alternatives Analysis on the initial starter corridor.

5. Identification by COTPA of an initial corridor starter project that could move forward in the year 2006 into the next phase of FTA Alternatives Analysis initiating project implementation for potential federal funding support. Initial efforts by COTPA would include the development of a Request for Proposals for planned issuance in late 2006.

6. Obtain commitment of The Oklahoman newspaper and its editorial board to publish focus articles on the COTPA Fixed Guideway System Plan on a bi-annual (six month) basis keeping the public informed on the project's progress. Each focus article could be on a different topic, including benefits of enhanced public transportation, funding strategies, connections to the community, etc.

7. Commitment of COTPA to maintain on its agency web site all current project related information and reports for easy viewing by the public.