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## Executive Summary

The Southwest Oklahoma Regional Transportation Planning Organization (SORTPO) has developed the Roger Mills County 2036 Long Transportation Plan (LRTP). County transportation plans are being developed for one (1) or two (2) county areas at a time. Roger Mills County was selected as a project county due to its connection to Beckham County along its' southern boundary. The LRTP includes an inventory of the different modes of travel and identifies issues, opportunities, and trends that may influence transportation in the county over the next twenty (20) years. The plan also identifies existing and potential future transportation improvement needs. The plan was developed through a cooperative effort that was coordinated by SWODA, SORTPO, Roger Mills County, the member jurisdictions and the Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT).

Located in Southwest Oklahoma, the SORTPO Area is comprised of seven thousand seventy-five $(7,075)$ square miles. The SWODA region is comprised of eight (8) counties, forty-eight (48) cities and towns and nine (9) conservation districts. The region is predominately rural, with the majority of the population being within the incorporated cities of Elk City, Altus, Weatherford and Clinton.

A goal of the Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) is to develop transportation plans for each county; ultimately a regional plan will be the result. In October of 2009 by Resolution \#09-04 SWODA created the Southwest Oklahoma Regional Transportation Planning Organization (SORTPO). This action was in response to advocacy efforts by RPO America as part of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy Users (SAFETEA-LU) federal highway and transit reauthorization process.

Roger Mills County is located in the western region (Map ES1) of Oklahoma on the north boundary of the SWODA region and covers 1,141 square miles. In 2010 (U.S. Census), the County population was three thousand, six hundred and forty-seven $(3,647)$ resulting in a population density of 3.2 people per square mile, with over 36 percent of that population residing in the cities of Cheyenne and Hammon. The County includes four (4) areas designated as a city or town, the largest being the town of Cheyenne. The town of Cheyenne encompasses 1 square mile.

The second largest city (by population) is the Town of Hammon, with a land area of 0.7 -square miles and a population of 568 with a population density of $810 / \mathrm{sq}$. mi (2014 American Community Survey (ACS) estimates). Hammon is located on the eastern boarder side of the county. Hammon is west of the intersection of State Highway 33 and State Highway 34. Energy services (gas and oil production) and agriculture are the predominant industries throughout.

Map ES1: SORTPO Region

## SORTPO REGION



Source: SWODA
The LRTP establishes the goals, objectives and transportation strategies for addressing the region's transportation needs. This planning process follows the four "c's" identified by federal transportation regulations:

- Consideration means that one or more parties takes into account the opinions, actions and relevant information from other parties in making decisions or determining a course of action.
- Consultation means that one or more parties confer with other identified parties in accordance with and established process and, prior to taking actions, consider the views of the other parties and periodically inform them about action(s) taken.
- Cooperation means that the parties involved in carrying out the transportation planning programming processes work together to achieve a common goal or objectives.
- Coordination means the cooperative development of plans, programs, and schedules among agencies and entities with legal standing and adjustment of such plans, programs, and schedules to achieve general consistency, as appropriate.

Regional transportation planning is a collaborative process designed to foster participation by all interested parties, such as business community, community groups, elected officials and the general public, through a proactive public participation process. The public participation process is carried out through public outreach such as transportation surveys sent out to the public by means of website, civic organizations, entity disbursements and public meetings held throughout the region. The results of the surveys and stakeholder meetings were used to develop goals and guide the development of the long range transportation plan. SORTPO held numerous open meetings to discuss the transportation planning process. Extensive use of telecommunications was used as a means of public outreach such as social media (SWODA's Facebook page), online surveying and the development of a website dedicated to SORTPO's regional planning.

The objective of the LRTP is to coordinate with regional stakeholders and the public and identify key issues, challenges, trends and to develop goals. At the onset of the transportation planning process, the SORTPO staff, policy board and technical committee members identified key issues and trends that impact the transportation system. Key issues, challenges and trends were also identified through public surveys (Appendix 5.2, LRTP), stakeholder meetings, public comments, other plans, data sources, and reports. Rural communities have problematic transportation areas even if they do not experience congestion. Understanding the true nature of the problem at the locations and developing a plan to address them is an important part of rural planning.

## Key Issues, Trends and Challenges

Rural communities have problematic transportation areas even if they do not experience congestion. Understanding the true nature of the problem at these locations and developing a plan to address them is an important part of rural planning. Unanticipated changes may happen that can have impacts on a city, town, county or region. There are many issues facing the area that have a direct or indirect impact on the transportation system. The following information is intended to identify issues, trends and challenges in Roger Mills County.

## Key Issues:

- The population is aging.
- Accidents and number of vehicles at the intersection of State Highway 33 and 34.
- Increasing through truck traffic.


## Challenges:

- Access to healthcare and emergency services is limited.
- Grocery deserts, limited access to food stores.
- Funding limitations.
- Gross production money decline impacts schools and county government.


## Trends:

- Population density declining.
- Roger Mills County will continue to be a bedroom community to Beckham County.
- Motor vehicles will continue to be the primary means of transportation.
- New growth outside of small towns decreasing tax base.
- Young people leave the county for urban area very few individuals return to rural areas.
- Transportation technology changes.

The transportation planning process involves identification of long range goals implemented through short and long term transportation projects. These goals provide a blueprint for the development of a safer, accessible and more efficient transportation system. The primary goals of the Roger Mills Long Range Transportation Plan include: accessibility and mobility, awareness/education, economic vitality, environment, finance and funding, maintenance and preservation, and safety and security. These goals assist in the decision making process for prioritization of projects and implementation of the LRTP.

Data was collected from community members and through public meetings to identify locally funded transportation projects and areas of concern (Table ES1). Table ES2 includes projects identified in ODOT 8 Year Construction Work Program 2016-2023. Other projects include development of studies, plans, and collection of data that can be included in SORTPO's Planning Work Program (PWP).

Table ES1: Roger Mills County Locally Funded Transportation Projects and Areas of Concern

| CITY/TOWN | LOCATION | PROJECT <br> DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roger Mills County Dist. \#1 | County Rd. 1020 | Resurface |
| Roger Mills County Dist. \#1 | West of Reydon | Resurface |
| Roger Mills County Dist. \#2 | 15 miles on Farmer <br> Market Rd. | Resurface |
| Roger Mills County Dist. \#2 | 15 miles on Farmer <br> Market Rd. | Widening Road |
| Roger Mills County Dist. \#3 | County | Widen /Resurface 12 miles |
| Roger Mills County Dist. \#3 | County | Surface 4 miles <br> Roger Mills County Dist. \#3$\quad$Bridge to be constructed <br> 2019 |


| CITY/TOWN | LOCATION | PROJECT <br> DESCRIPTION |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hammon | SH 33/34 Jct. | Traffic study at intersection <br> of SH33/34 due to traffic <br> generated by casino |
| Cheyenne | SH 33 - Entrance to City <br> Park to | Vehicles traveling <br> (southbound)? May not have <br> sufficient time to stop for <br> pedestrian crossing SH33 at <br> the entrance to the City Park |
| Cheyenne |  <br> Buster Ave. | Traffic Study |
| Cheyenne | Intersection of 283 \& Hwy <br> 47 west Jct. | Traffic Study |
| Hammon | SH 33 | Pedestrians walking on the <br> roadway and shoulder at <br> night. Visibility is limited <br> due to lack of lighting. |

Source: SORTPO
Table ES2: Roger Mills County Recommended Transportation Projects

| GENERAL LOCATION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PROJECT } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | DESCRIPTION | FUNDING STATE / FEDERAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Develop procedures to identify and collect traffic count data at specific locations within the county. | SPR |
| Roger Mills <br> County | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Establish procedures that enhance the consultation and coordination of transportation planning with local, regional, state and tribal government representatives. | SPR |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Develop data collection standards. | SPR |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Conduct speed study at intersection locations with high accident severity index and corridors with major attractors. | SPR |
| Roger Mills <br> County | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Bridge US 283 over Dead Warrior Creek, 7.4 MI north of SH47 west JCT. (FFY 2017 $-27899(04))$ | 8 Year <br> Construction <br> Work Program <br> (FFY 2016- <br> 2023) |
| Roger Mills | 2016- | Right of Way begin at Texas state line and | 8 Year |


| GENERAL LOCATION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PROJECT } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | DESCRIPTION | FUNDING STATE / FEDERAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County | 2020 | extend east to the SH30 JCT. (FFY 2019 278999(05)) | Construction Work Program (FFY 2016- 2023) |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Utilities begin at Texas state line and extend east to the SH30 JCT. (FFY 2019 278999(06)) | 8 Year Construction Work Program (FFY 20162023) |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Widen, Resurface \& Bridge US283 8.0 MI north of the Beckham County line north to SH47 in Cheyenne (FFY 2020 10094(04)) | 8 Year Construction Work Program (FFY 2016- 2023) |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Grade, drainage, and surface County Rd (6514C) from 2.0 MI east of Cheyenne east 7.0 MI to County Rd 6544C (FFY 201825478(04)) | ODOT CIRB <br> Work Program 2016-2019 |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Grade, drainage and surface major Collector 65-12C beginning at SH47 extending north 5.0 MI. (FFY 2017 306914(04)) | ODOT CIRB <br> Work Program 2016-2019 |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Engineering for bridge and approaches over Canadian River (FFY 2019 30074(05)) | ODOT CIRB Work Program $2016-2019$ |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{aligned} & 2021- \\ & 2026 \end{aligned}$ | Collect traffic count data at specific locations within the county | SPR |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{gathered} 2021- \\ 2026 \end{gathered}$ | Conduct speed study at intersection locations with high accident severity index and corridors with major attractors. | SPR |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{gathered} 2021- \\ 2026 \end{gathered}$ | Widen and resurface SH 152 begin at the Texas state line and extend east to the SH30 JCT. (FFY 2022-29430(04)) | 8 Year Construction Work Program (FFY 20162023) |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2026- \\ & 2030 \end{aligned}$ | Collect traffic count data at specific locations within the county. | SPR |
| Roger Mills | 2026- | Conduct speed study at intersection | SPR |


| GENERAL <br> LOCATION | PROJECT <br> YEAR | DESCRIPTION | FUNDING <br> STATE / <br> FEDERAL |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| County | 2030 | locations with high accident severity index <br> and corridors with major attractors. |  |
| Roger Mills <br> County | $2031-$ | Conduct speed study at intersection <br> locations with high accident severity index <br> and corridors with major attractors. | SPR |
| Roger Mills <br> County | $2035-$ <br> 2035 | Collect traffic count data at specific <br> locations within the county. | SPR |
| Roger Mills <br> County | $2036-$ | Collect traffic count data at specific <br> locations within the county. | SPR |
| 2040 | SPR |  |  |
| Roger Mills <br> County | $2036-$ |  |  |
| 2040 | Conduct speed study at intersection <br> locations with high accident severity index <br> and corridors with major attractors. | SPR |  |

Source: SORTPO
This plan provides a strategic framework to ensure that the multiple agencies work continuously, cooperatively, and comprehensively to implement the Plan in a coordinated fashion. Details on the plan development, polices, strategies and supporting data are available in the Plan.

Public input is an important aspect of the transportation planning process. Please visit www.SORTPO.org for more information about the RTPO and to view the full LRTP. For more information on the 2036 Roger Mills County Long Range Transportation Plan, please contact:

Becky Cockrell, SORTPO
PO Box 569, 420 Sooner Dr.
Burns Flat, OK 73624
580-562-4882 ext. 118
becky@swoda.org

# Chapter 1: Introduction, Goals and Key Issues 

## History

In 1970, Oklahoma's governor established eleven (11) sub-state planning districts. Subsequently, the local governments served by the planning districts created the eleven (11) Councils of Governments (COGs) using the sub-state planning district boundaries. These districts make up the Oklahoma Association of Regional Councils (OARC). South Western Oklahoma Development Authority (SWODA) is one (1) of the eleven (11) COGs.

In April 2012, the Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT) entered into an agreement with OARC to oversee development of the regional transportation planning process and the regional public participation process in the non-metropolitan areas of the state. SWODA on October 13 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2009$ by Resolution 09-04 (Appendix A) created the Southwest Oklahoma Regional Transportation Planning Organization (SORTPO) illustrated on Map 1. Creation of SORTPO was in response to advocacy efforts by Regional Planning Organization (RPO) America as part of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy Users (SAFETEA-LU), federal highway and transit reauthorization process.

SWODA entered into a contract with OARC to participate in regional transportation planning efforts. SORTPO a member of the pilot project is tasked with developing a Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) for Roger Mills County. This plan will be a part of the region wide effort of SORTPO in their continuation of a regional approach to identify and examine both short and long range goals for transportation development. With lower populated towns, cities and counties, maintenance and funding of transportation projects and programs is an issue. Developing a regional plan is a process that includes preparation of eight (8) county plans. SORPTO staff's goal is to create one (1) or two (2) county long range transportation plans per fiscal year (FY). Roger Mills County was selected as the pilot project county due to shared southern boundary with Beckham County, as well as the many aspects of transportation involved throughout the county. SORTPO also serves as the point of contact, facilitator and convener of public participation meetings for local elected officials, community leaders and as a clearinghouse for transportation related data, research and information.

All aspects of the planning process are overseen by the SORTPO Policy Board. The SORTPO Technical Committee serves as the advisory group for transportation planning and policy initiatives. This committee reviews transportation planning work efforts and provides a recommendation to the SORTPO Policy Board for their consideration and action. The day-to-day
 activities of SORTPO are supported by one full-time staff member. Additional SWODA staff members contribute to the transportation planning process when needed to ensure the overall planning program is executed in a timely and efficient manner and in accordance with Federal regulations. Staff is housed within the SWODA Planning Department located in Burns Flat, Oklahoma. Staff, equipment, supplies, rent, consulting studies, and other expenses used to support staffing operations are
reimbursable to SORTPO by the FHWA State Planning \& Research (SPR) program funds at $80 \%$ of the total amount of the work effort and the local match of $20 \%$ is provided by SWODA.

Map 1.1: SORTPO Region

## SORTPO REGION



Source: SWODA

## Regional Transportation Planning

Regional transportation planning is a collaborative process designed to foster participation by all interested parties such as business communities, community groups, elected officials, and the general public through a proactive public participation process. Emphasis by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is placed on extending public participation to include people who have been traditionally underserved by the transportation system and services in the region. The purpose of the transportation system is to move people and goods in the safest and most efficient manner possible. SORTPO envisions the transportation system as a critical element of the quality of life for the citizens. A regional approach to long range transportation planning is necessary because of the rural nature and diverse characteristics of the population in Oklahoma. Transportation systems, both highway and transit, must safely, efficiently and effectively allow citizens to travel to work and to conduct their personal lives. Transportation systems must further provide for the efficient movement of goods to
markets to support the county's economic vitality. Additionally, transportation decisions should carefully consider and reflect environmental and community concerns.

Transportation planning is a process that develops information to help make decisions on the future development and management of transportation systems. It involves the determination of the need for new or expanded roads, transit systems, freight facilities and bicycle/pedestrian facilities their location, their capacity and the future needs. The process of developing the LRTP provides an opportunity for participating in the planning of the future transportation system. The process allows the community to focus their attention on transportation in the context of Roger Mills County as well as the SORTPO region. The LRTP was developed within the regulatory framework of MAP-21 and the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act).

The LRTP establishes the goals and transportation strategies for addressing the region's transportation needs. This planning process follows the four "c's" identified by federal transportation regulations:

- Consideration means that one or more parties takes into account the opinions, actions and relevant information from other parties in making decisions or determining a course of action.
- Consultation means that one or more parties confer with other identified parties in accordance with and established process and, prior to taking action, consider the views of the other parties and periodically inform them about action(s) taken.
- Cooperation means that the parties involved in carrying out the transportation planning programming processes work together to achieve a common goal or objectives.
- Coordination means the cooperative development of plans, programs, and schedules among agencies and entities with legal standing and adjustment of such plans, programs, and schedules to achieve general consistency, as appropriate.


## Purpose of Plan

The Roger Mills County 2036 LRTP is a document used by the county, cities, towns, agencies, businesses and residents as a guide to maintain and improve the region's transportation system through 2036. The plan is an important tool and assists communities in focusing their limited funds on projects that give them the best value and benefit for funding. The purpose of the long-range transportation plan is to direct investment of available resources toward meeting the region's highest priority needs. The needs are determined by comparing the plan's objectives, "What do we want to accomplish over the life of the plan?" with current conditions and forecasts, "Where are we starting, and how are demographics and economics expected to change?" The projects and policies that are included in the LRTP the plan arise from the needs and those needs also span the twenty-year planning period.

A key concept that underlies the discussion of needs is affordability. With limited fiscal resources, every jurisdiction that owns and operates part of the countywide transportation system must consider what they can afford to operate and maintain into the future. People
of all ages are making different decisions about where they choose to live, and what constitutes a positive quality of life. Whether urban or suburban, more people desire a neighborhood that is walkable and bikeable and has access to schools and shopping, and has to public transit. Others want a rural location, but one that has access to needed services. SORTPO staff distributed and collected surveys for the purpose of identifying the views of county residents. Figures 1.1 and 1.2 illustrate survey
 results. Respondents indicated that adding shoulders to two lane highways, improving existing roadways, intersection improvement, maintenance and pedestrian facilities are the most important. When selecting projects survey responses have a high preference for projects that improve safety, pedestrian access, maintenance, condition of signage, and supports economic development. The full results are included in Appendix 5.2

The year 2036 was chosen as the planning horizon year for the LRTP for the following reasons:

- The year 2036 is far enough into the future to allow for the anticipated growth of the area to be implemented and
- Allows the local governments and participating agencies to plan for long range solutions to anticipated needs.

Although this may appear to be a rather pragmatic approach in response to critical planning issues, it is a direction that will enable local governments and participating agencies to adequately plan and prepare to achieve the long-term goals while maintaining the necessary short-term vision and implementation techniques to respond to crucial short-term issues.

As a means of achieving the successful implementation of the LRTP, the plan has been developed in five year increments. The five-year increment format will offer realistic goals in Chapter 6 relative to the LRTP's short range implementation activities while still presents a "good fit" with the local governments' ability to program and commit local financial resources for transportation improvements. The incremental approach also provides a reasonable opportunity in scheduling state and /or federally funded transportation improvements within the county.

Figure 1.1: Roger Mills County Transportation System - Survey Results


Source: SORTPO
Figure 1.2: Roger Mills County Survey Priority When Selecting Projects


Source: SORTPO

## Relationship and Requirements with State and Federal Agencies

The 2036 LRTP was developed in cooperation and in collaboration with municipal, county governments, transit providers, ODOT and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The plan is the culmination of a continuing, cooperative, coordinated and comprehensive planning effort among the federal, state and local governments directed by SORTPO that provides for consideration and implementation of projects, strategies and services that should address the planning factors identified in The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) and the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST) was signed into law in December 2015. The FAST Act added two additional factors for a total of ten (Table 1.1), which SORTPO should strive to address through their LRTP planning process.

## Table 1.1: Planning Factors

1. Support the economic vitality of the United States, the States, nonmetropolitan areas, and metropolitan areas, especially enabling global competitiveness, productivity and efficiency.
2. Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users.
3. Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users.
4. Increase accessibility and mobility of people and freight.
5. Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic patterns.
6. Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system across and between modes, people and freight.
7. Promote efficient system management and operation.
8. Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.
9. Improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation.
10. Enhance travel and tourism.

Source: 23 USC Section 23 U.S.C 135 (d) (1)
In addition, The FAST Act continues Map-21 requirement to State Departments of Transportation and Metropolitan Planning Organizations to use a performance-based approach to support seven (7) national goals for the transportation system. This requirement has not been mandated to non-metropolitan areas. Though specific performance measures are not identified in this plan, SORTPO recognizes the significance
of such measures and will begin the collection of data needed to establish standards in future plans. (Appendix 1)

## Goals, Objectives and Strategies

The LRTP format follows a hierarchy that includes goals, objectives and strategies to assist Roger Mills County in planning and prioritization of transportation system projects and studies. The Goals are founded on the principals that the transportation system must serve the needs of its community today; it must be responsive to change; and it has to be affordable for all users. Goals are general statements of what we want the future to be like. The goals and objectives are used as guiding principles to choose among various options for transportation improvements. Therefore, they should be attainable and realistic. In addition, the goals should relate to present conditions and expected changes in those conditions. Objectives are specific, quantifiable steps towards the realization
 of those goals. Policies are statements that provide direction for decisions to help attain these goals and objectives. Table 1.2 identifies the goal categories for the LRTP.

Goals were developed from meetings held with stakeholders, technical committee and policy board meetings. It is important to recognize that many factors influence transportation system performance and transportation is only one component of a community. Economic development, housing, the economy and natural resources also can play a role. Implementing goals is the responsibility of local, county and state governments and the RTPO. Strategies were developed in coordination with partner agencies. The strategies developed do not fall solely under the responsibility of SORTPO. Local and community agencies should consider their roles in affecting outcomes. It will be necessary to prioritize the strategies and build the data collection and analysis, for those deemed most important, into annual programs, such as the Planning Work Program (PWP).

## Table 1.2: Roger Mills County Goal Categories

| Goal | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1. Accessibility and <br> Mobility (pg. 8) | Improve accessibility and mobility for people and freight. |
| 2. Awareness, <br> Education and <br> Cooperative Process <br> (pg. 9) | Maintain intergovernmental cooperation and coordination, <br> along with community participation and input in all stages of <br> the transportation planning process. |
| 3. Freight \& Economic <br> Vitality (pg. 9) | Support and improve the economic vitality of the county and <br> region by providing access to economic development <br> opportunities, such as business and industrial access, natural, <br> scenic and historic resources or recreational travel and tourism. |
| 4. Environment (pg. 9- <br> 10) | Reduce impacts to the county's natural environment, historic <br> areas and underrepresented communities resulting from <br> transportation programs and projects. |
| 5. Finance \& Funding <br> (pg. 10) | Seek and acquire a variety of transportation funding sources to <br> meet the many diverse system needs. |
| 6. Maintenance and <br> Preservation (pg. 10) | Preserve the existing transportation network and promote <br> efficient system management to encourage access and mobility <br> for both people and freight. |
| 7. Safety \& Security <br> (pg. 10-11) | Improve the safety and security of the transportation system by <br> implementing transportation improvement that reduce |
| fatalities and serious injuries as well as enabling effective |  |
| emergency management operations. |  |

## Goal 1: Accessibility and Mobility

Improve accessibility and mobility for people and freight.

## Strategies:

1. Support opportunities to expand the transit system(s) in the region that improves access to health care facilities, education facilities, recreation centers, cultural and tourist sites and employment centers.
2. Develop a system to collect and monitor changes in population, employment, and major employers by Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ).
3. Review transportation improvements and expansion of services to ensure that the facility for one (1) mode of transportation doesn't create barriers for the access or mobility of other modes.

## Goal 2: Awareness, Education and Cooperative Process

Maintain intergovernmental cooperation and coordination, along with community participation and input in all stages of the transportation planning process.

## Strategies:

1. Participate on state, regional, and local committees regarding County transportation issues.
2. Educate key stakeholders, businesses, local leaders and the public on the purpose and function of SORTPO.
3. Annually review the Public Participation Plan.
4. Develop a clearinghouse for regional data sets, such as pavement management systems and geographic information systems to help inform sound planning decisions.
5. Facilitate and support the coordination of regional training opportunities.
6. Develop method to track the implementation of projects and regularly update the public on the status of projects, programs and finances.

## Goal 3: Freight \& Economic Vitality

Support and improve the economic vitality of the county and region by providing access to economic development opportunities, such as business and industrial access, natural, scenic and historic resources or recreational travel and tourism.

## Strategies:

1. Coordinate with local and tribal governments on the placement of regionally significant developments.
2. Maintain local and state support for the airports.
3. Support transportation infrastructure studies, initiatives and projects that could ultimately increase job opportunities in the community.
4. Continue to coordinate transportation planning with adjoining counties, regions and councils of government for transportation needs and improvements beyond those in our region.
5. Working with area employers and stakeholders develop a database and map identifying transportation needs.
6. Identify and designate routes and connectors with heavy freight movements as freight priority corridors.

## Goal 4: Environment

Reduce impacts to the county's natural environment, historic areas and underrepresented communities resulting from transportation programs and projects.

## Strategies:

1. Consult with local, state and national agencies in the areas of environmental protection and historic preservation, in terms of transportation programs and projects.
2. Promote proper environmental stewardship and mitigation practices to restore and maintain environmental resources that may be impacted by transportation projects.
3. Promote the use of alternative fuels and technologies in motor vehicles, fleet and transit vehicles.
4. Develop database and mapping to identify the County's underrepresented communities.
5. Support designs of the transportation system that will protect cultural, historic, and scenic resources, community cohesiveness, and quality of life.

## Goal 5: Finance and Funding

Seek and acquire a variety of transportation funding sources to meet the many diverse system needs.

## Strategies:

1. Maximize local leverage of state and federal transportation funding opportunities.
2. Increase private sector participation in funding transportation infrastructure and services.
3. Encourage multi-year capital improvement planning by local, county, tribal, and state officials that includes public participation, private sector involvement, coordination among jurisdictions and modes and fiscal constraint.
4. Assist jurisdictions in identifying and applying for funds that enhance or support the region's transportation system.

## Goal 6: Maintenance and Preservation

Preserve the existing transportation network and promote efficient system management to encourage access and mobility for both people and freight.

## Strategies:

1. Identify sources of transportation data and develop a procedure to collect the data and present to the public.
2. Identify and collect transportation performance data and compare to previous years' data.

## Goal 7: Safety and Security

Improve the safety and security of the transportation system by implementing transportation improvement that reduce fatalities and serious injuries as well as enabling effective emergency management operations.

## Strategies:

1. Coordinate with local governments and other agencies to identify safety concerns and conditions, and recommend projects to address key deficiencies.
2. Coordinate county and regional actions with the Statewide Highway Safety Plan.
3. Collect and routinely analyze safety and security data by mode and severity to identify changes and trends.
4. Incorporate emergency service agencies in the transportation planning and implementation processes in order to ensure delivery of transportation security to the traveling public.
5. Assist in the designation of corridors and development of procedures to provide for safe movement of hazardous materials.
6. Make it easier for drivers and pedestrians to notice, read and understand visual information by reducing the clutter of signs and improving signs and lighting.
7. Support the Oklahoma Department of Transportation in its plans to add and improve roadway shoulders to designated two lane highways.

## Goal 8: Community \& Health

Facilitate development of transportation projects and programs that support economic development and healthy lifestyles in the county and region.

## Strategies:

1. Integrate healthy community design strategies and promote active transportation to improve the public health outcomes.
2. Support development of transportation systems that provide opportunities for populations walking, bicycling and utilizing non-motorized modes.

## Goal 9: Access to National, State and Regional Parks and Recreation Centers

The transportation system will increase opportunities and access to the region's scenic, historic and natural resources.

## Strategies:

1. Develop a regional map that identifies the region's scenic, historic and natural resources and connections to the transportation system
2. Develop a regional committee that will conduct an inventory of natural, scenic and historic resources and identify transportation recommendations that support the resources and impact on the local and regional economy.

## Key Issues, Trends and Challenges

Rural communities have problematic transportation areas even if they do not experience congestion. Understanding the true nature of the problem at these locations and developing a plan to address them is an important part of rural planning. Unanticipated changes may happen that can have impacts on a city, town, county or region. There are many issues facing the area that have a direct or indirect impact on the transportation system. Key issues, trends and challenges were obtained by the SORTPO staff through the stakeholder's meeting, technical committee meetings and SORTPO Policy Board meetings and public surveys (Appendix 5.2). The following information is intended to identify issues, trends and challenges in Roger Mills County.

## Key Issues:

- The population is aging.
- Accidents and number of vehicles at the intersection of State Highway 33 and 34.
- Increasing through truck traffic.


## Challenges:

- Access to healthcare and emergency services is limited.
- Grocery deserts, limited access to food stores.
- Funding limitations.
- Gross production money decline impacts schools and county government.


## Trends:

- Population density declining.
- Roger Mills County will continue to be a bedroom community to Beckham County.
- Motor vehicles will continue to be the primary means of transportation.
- New growth outside of small towns decreasing tax base.
- Young people leave the county for urban area very few individuals return to rural areas.
- Transportation technology changes.


## Chapter 2: Current Conditions

This chapter provides a "snapshot" of current conditions that relate to transportation in Roger Mills County. Demographics, economic conditions, environmental factors, community development and transportation and traffic data each provides information for transportation planning.

Located in western Oklahoma Roger Mills County (Map 2.1) is rural with a population density in 2010 of 3.2 persons per square mile, total square miles 1,141 . Two historic battles took place in Roger Mills County: The Battle of Antelope Hills in 1858 and the Battle of the Washita in 1868. Roger Mills County is also home to The Black Kettle National Grassland which covers 30,000 acres in the northwest portion of the County. Located west of Cheyenne is the Washita Battlefield National Historic Site which displays the history of the famous 1868 battle.

Population concentrations are in the towns of Cheyenne, Hammon and Reydon. Cheyenne is the county seat of Roger Mills County and is the largest town. It is located at the junction of U.S. Highway (US) 283 and State Highway (SH) 47 and is approximately 25 miles north of Elk City, Oklahoma. The population for Cheyenne is estimated 818 in 2014. Cheyenne's economy and the surrounding areas have
 remained strong due to the ranching and farming and is one of the nation's largest oil and gas industries. Cheyenne was the former Cheyenne and Arapaho Reservation. (The map in Appendix 2.11 illustrates tribal land in the region). The Pioneer Museums in Cheyenne City Park is a walk-through museum complex featuring various buildings and artifacts. Cheyenne has one small airport named Mignon Laird that continues to serve the community.
$>$ Hammon is located on the eastern edge of Roger Mills County on State Highway 33. The 2014 estimated population was 588. Hammon's economy is surrounded by farmlands, ranching and the oil and gas industry and a casino. Hammon is home to a K-12 school system, volunteer fire department and city government. The DorrohTrent House is listed in the National Register of Historic Places.
> Reydon is located on State Highway 30 in western Roger Mills County. Reydon is surrounded by thousands of acres of Black Kettle National Grasslands (Map 2.1) and oil and gas industry.
$>$ Strong City is located on State Highway 33 and is approximately five miles northeast of the county seat of Cheyenne. Strong City's economy is surrounded by ranching, farming and the oil and gas industry.
> Sweetwater is located five miles east of the Oklahoma-Texas state line and sits at the intersection of State Highway 152, State Highway 6 and State Highway 30. Sweetwater surrounded by farmlands, ranching and the oil and gas industry.

Transportation planning in Oklahoma has typically been limited to urban areas. Rural or regional transportation planning has begun to evolve into an opportunity to consider both the short and long term transportation needs for areas outside of urban areas. This plan will consider growth and development patterns in the county and will not address development regulations. However, critically important complements to the growth area are the locations that may generate significant demands on the transportation areas are the locations that may generate significant demands on the transportation system. Such "activity generators" include business and industrial sites, governmental, schools, universities, tourism and recreation centers. Counties in the SORTPO region are working to seek new economic growth and diversification while striving to preserve the natural, historic and culture resources.

As the population fluctuates, either through economic changes, in or out migration or shifting within the region the needs of the communities including education, health care, social services, employment, and transportation remain relatively stable. Land use and development changes that particularly affect transportation in rural areas include, but are not limited to, loss or gain of a major employer, movement of younger sectors of the population to more urban areas, tribal land development and investment.

The SORTPO Region consists of eight counties representing an estimated population of 111,493 (2014 ACS). Although much of the region is comprised of large tracts of farming and agriculture lands there are multiple areas that contain urbanized areas that feature regional medical facilities, universities, military installation and governmental offices. Each County in the region although a separate entity as far as governmental services the counties are linked through commerce, employment and regional transportation. Population growth and shifts for the SORTPO region are dependent on many factors depending on a particular county. Roger Mills County's deviations in population and employment pattern are attributed to the volatile nature of the oil and gas industry and subsequent impact to declines in prices in the oil and gas industry. Although current data indicates this decline, historical data found in Table 2.1 illustrates Roger Mills County's growth from 1980 to 2010.

Table 2.1: Roger Mills County Population 1980-2014 Estimate

|  | CENSUS POPULATION |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ <br> POPULATION <br> ESTIMATE |
| Cheyenne | 1,207 | 948 | 778 | 801 | 818 |
| Hammon (part) | 804 | 575 | 453 | 523 | 568 |
| Reydon | 252 | 200 | 177 | 210 | 217 |
| Strong City | 56 | 49 | 42 | 47 | 43 |
| Sweetwater (part) | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 26 | 27 |
| Balance of County | 2,480 | 2,375 | 1,986 | 2,040 | 3,110 |
| Roger Mills County | 4,799 | 4,147 | 3,436 | 3,647 | 3,761 |

Source: American Fact Finder, 2010-2014 ACS

With the heavy dependence on the oil and gas industry as the economic driving force for the County it is necessary to collect data from additional sources to support the idea that although there is a current downward trend in population and employment there is historical data to support that the employment does rebound. Figure 2.2 illustrates the Civilian Labor Force not adjusted seasonally. Comparing the data in Figure 2.1 and 2.2 there are similarities in the employment growth between 1990-2015. Figure 2.3 illustrates 2000 and 2014 Roger Mills County business pattern for paid employees. The figure displays the significant increase in the mining and construction industry from 2000 to 2014.

Data obtained from the 2010-2014 ACS provides additional information on the makeup of the county. From the previously stated source the following helps to illustrate this county. Additional demographic data can be found in Appendices 2.1-2.7.

- Occupied Housing Units - 1,307
o Owner Occupied Units - 990
o Renter Occupied Units 317
o $78.9 \%$ of housing units are single family detached
o $16.8 \%$ of housing units are mobile home or other type
- Educational Attainment population 25 years and Older
o High School Graduate - 38.5\%
o Some College - $24 \%$
o Bachelor's Degree - 14\%
- Commute Patterns to Work Age 16 years and Older
o Car, truck or van - 1,269
o Public Transportation - 2
o Walked-34
o Other Means - 9
o Worked at Home - 194
- Industry
o Agriculture and forestry - 472
o Construction-177
o Retail Trade - 168
o Educational Services - 289
o Public Administration - 125

The County population is almost equally distributed between male (50.2\%) and female (49.8\%) with a median age of 42 years of age. Largest concentration of population is between the ages of 15-59 $(2,042)$ while the population for ages 60 years old and over is 895. Transportation is crucial to keeping older adults independent, healthy and connected to friends, family and health providers. However, older residents' transportation needs differ based on their health, income, marital status, age, race and whether they live in a city, town or rural county area. The future needs of this segment of the population will influence the transportation needs and services for this region. Figure 2.1 illustrates the changes in the civilian labor force from 1990-2015. Figure 2.2 illustrates the 2000 through 2014 Roger Mills County Business Patterns for paid employees.

## Map 2.1: Roger Mills County Transportation System

## ROGER MILLS COUNTY TRANSPORTATION



Source: SWODA

Figure 2.1: Roger Mills County, Civilian Labor Force 1990-2015


Source: US. Bureau of Labor Statistics


Figure 2.2: Roger Mills County Business Patterns, 2000, 2010 and 2014 Estimate

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics

Figure 2.3 summarizes vehicle registration data obtained from the Oklahoma Tax Commission (OTC). Automobile and farm truck registration continues to show an increase annually. The data in the figures below confirm the primary vehicle is the automobile, which saw an increase of approximately 300 automobiles between 2011 - 2015. Data obtained from the 2010-2014 ACS reveals that 41.2\% of the population had access to three or more vehicles available; while $2 \%$ of the population did not have access to a vehicle. Commute patterns to work for Workers 16 years and older according to the 2010-2014 ACS identify that 1,269 worker drove alone, 86 carpooled, and 194 worked at home. Mean travel time was estimated at 25.8 minutes.

Figure 2.3: Roger Mills County 2011-2015 Vehicle Registration


Source: Oklahoma Tax Commission

## Traffic Analysis Zones

The Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) Program is a specialized computer program used for delineating zones in support of the Census Transportation Planning Products (CTPP). TAZ delineation follows the decennial census and is designed to allow planning agencies the ability to define areas to associate demographic data that supports transportation system analysis. Boundaries of a TAZ typically follow U.S. Census boundaries and are an aggregation of several census blocks. Data for the plan was obtained by the 2010 U.S. Census Bureau, CTPP and Oklahoma Department of Commerce. The year 2015 is the base year for the plan and 2010 U.S. Census Data was used as the base population.

TAZ delineation for the areas other than Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) are the responsibility of ODOT. Historically in non-MPO areas the TAZ boundary defaulted to the census tract boundary. This makes the process of maintaining and updating socioeconomic data much easier. However, utilizing this default for the plan did not provide SORTPO with transportation data that met the needs of the planning process. SORTPO staff reviewed the existing TAZ boundaries and after analysis of data, community boundaries and TAZ guidelines new boundaries were drafted. The revised TAZ boundaries were based on the population thresholds of 200 to 400 and employment thresholds of 300 . In the future SORTPO will work cooperatively with ODOT in designation or revision to TAZ boundaries.

Geographically, the study area is subdivided into twelve (12) TAZ's and the socio-economic data (including population and employment) are summarized for each TAZ. Map 3 illustrates the revised TAZ boundaries for the unincorporated areas of the County. Maps 48 illustrate TAZ boundaries for the towns of Cheyenne, Hammon, Reydon, Strong City and Sweetwater. The 2010 population of three thousand six hundred forty-seven $(3,647)$ and labor force of one thousand seven hundred ninety-six were distributed into the new TAZs. Appendix 2.8 provide information on the population and employment data. TAZ 200 has the largest concentration of population and TAZ 400 includes the largest employment population centers. Population changes have not changed significantly over the past twenty (20) years. Appendix 2.9 identifies the County's major employers by TAZ.

Map 2.2: Roger Mills County Traffic Analysis Zone


Source: SWODA

Map 2.3: Cheyenne Area Traffic Analysis Zones (detail)


Source: SWODA

Map 2.4: Hammon Area Traffic Analysis Zones (detail)


Source: SWODA

## Map 2.5: Reydon Area Traffic Analysis Zones (detail)



Source: SWODA

## Map 2.6: Strong City Area Traffic Analysis Zones (detail)



[^1]Map 2.7-Sweetwater Area Traffic Analysis Zones (detail)


Source: SWODA

## Physical Development Constraints, Development Conditions and Patterns

Transportation facilities, transportation, land ownership, national park, wind farms and oil and gas production sites, and existing development are features that guide growth in Roger Mills County. Roger Mills County includes U.S. Highway 283 which bisects the county running north/south and State Highways 30, 47 and 33 connect the smaller communities. Map 2.1 illustrates the location of the highways and airports. Other constraints for development include tribal land, wind farms, Washita Battlefield and the Black Kettle National Grassland containing over 30,000 acres in northwestern Rogers Mills County. These constraints both physical and manmade have shaped and impacted the development of the county. Current
 growth is concentrated in the towns of Cheyenne and Hammon. Major employers as listed in Appendix 2.9 reflect stability in the education field. The medical and health related fields also show potential for growth. Residential growth in the county continues to show growth.

Roger Mills County is home to environmental features natural and cultural resources which can influence the transportation system. There are many different types of environmentally sensitive areas and potential impacts to the natural and human environment that may be affected by various actions associated with the 2036 LRTP. These include (but are not necessarily limited to):

- Threatened and Endangered Species
- Wetlands
- Floodplains
- Surface and Ground Waters
- Stormwater Management and Erosion and Sediment Control
- Hazardous Materials
- Air Quality
- Historical/Cultural Resources
- Right-of-Way/Property Impacts, Including Impacts to Parks, Farmland and Neighborhoods
- Scenic View sheds
- Traffic and Train Noise

State and federal environmental regulations, require that environmental considerations be addressed in transportation decision making, plans and programs. Most transportation capital and maintenance projects have the potential to affect natural and human-made resources in both positive and negative ways. Appendix 2.10 provides description of significant environmental features to be considered in development of residential, commercial/industrial or transportation projects.

## Public Safety Issues

The vulnerability of a region's transportation system and its use in emergency evacuations are issues receiving new attention with the threat of intentional damage or destruction caused by terrorist events and natural disasters. Therefore, security goes beyond safety and includes the planning to prevent, manage or respond to threats toward a region and its transportation system and users. There are many programs to help manage security concerns and emergency issues. SORTPO and its member jurisdiction transportation and emergency service staff are regular participants in security planning and preparation activities including development of the Roger Mills County Hazard Mitigation Plan. Ongoing participation in these planning activities helps prepare for and to better manage transportation safety and security situations.

MAP-21 required all states to prepare and annually evaluate their Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). A SHSP is a statewide, coordinated safety plan which includes goals, objectives and emphasis areas for reducing highway fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads. More information on the Oklahoma SHSP can be found on the ODOT website (http://www.okladot.state.ok.us/oshsp/index.htm).

The safety of the traveling public, regardless of vehicle type or highway system classification, is of principal concern for ODOT and SORTPO. Safety strategies are developed based on an analysis of key contributing factors such as crash data, highway inventories, traffic volumes, and highway configurations such as geometric challenges. When undesirable patterns become evident, specific countermeasures are identified based on a more in depth and detailed analysis of crash locations and causes.

## Collisions

To help identify safety issues, traffic safety data must be analyzed. Trend analysis based upon multiple-years' worth of data provides a more accurate indication of the safety condition in the county. A review of collision records collected and maintained by ODOT was performed for the calendar years 2011-2015. A total of 311 collisions were reported in Roger Mills County during this time period. The highest concentration of collisions occurred along U.S. 283 beginning at the Beckham County Line extending north to the Ellis County Line. During this time period there were fourteen (14) collisions resulting in (11) eleven fatalities. The majority of type of collisions occurred with a fixed object (34.7\%), with overturn/rollover collisions comprising $26.7 \%$ of collisions. Figure 2.1 illustrates collision by vehicle type; with pickup trucks represent $45.3 \%$ of all vehicles involved in collisions and truck-tractor/semi-trailer represents 21.3\%. Driver condition for cause of collision includes no improper action (31\%), unsafe speed (17.7\%), inattention (15\%), DWI (6.5\%), failed to yield (6.3\%) and left of center (5.1\%). Table 2.2 identifies the number of collisions (in highest concentration), location and accident severity index for the years 2011-2015. Appendices 2.12-2.16 provides information on collision data.

Table 2.2: Roger Mills County Collision Concentration 2011-2015

| CITY | HWY | STREET | NO. OF <br> COLLISIONS | SEVERITY <br> INDEX | RANK |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n/a | US 283 | Mile Post 4.3 | 2 | 9 | 1 |
| n/a | US 283 | Mile Post 4.2 | 2 | 8 | 2 |
| n/a | SH 47 | Mile Post 5.1 | 2 | 7 | 3 |
| n/a | US 283 | Mile Post 7.49 - Dead <br> Indian Cr. | 3 | 6 | 4 |
| n/a | US 283 | Mile Post 6.10 EW 104 <br> (14) INTER | 2 | 6 | 5 |
| n/a | US 283 | Mile Post 8.90 | 2 | 6 | 6 |
| n/a | US 283 | Mile Post 12.17 | 2 | 6 | 7 |
| n/a | US 283 | Mile Post 15.65 | 2 | 6 | 8 |

Source: ODOT Traffic Engineering Div. Collision Analysis and Safety Branch
Figure 2.1: Roger Mills County Collisions by Vehicle Type, 2011-2015


Source: ODOT Traffic Engineering Div. Collision Analysis and Safety Branch

## Areas of Concern

Areas of concern were identified through surveys, holding public meetings and soliciting comments from stakeholders. Through the collective knowledge and experience of the members of the Transportation Technical Committee and Policy Board and the information obtained via public comment the data areas of concern were identified. These locations are shown in Table 2.3. The scope of the LRTP does not include solutions to the areas of concern.

Table 2.3: Roger Mills County Areas of Concern

| CITY/TOWN | LOCATION | DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Hammon | SH 33/34 Jct. | Traffic study is needed at the intersection of <br> SH33/34 due to traffic generated by casino |
| Cheyenne | SH 33 - Entrance to <br> City Park to | Vehicles traveling (southbound)may not have <br> sufficient time to stop for pedestrian crossing <br> SH33 at the entrance to the City Park |
| Cheyenne |  <br> Buster Ave. | Intersection study/ modification |
| Cheyenne |  <br> Hwy 47 west Jct. | Intersection study/modification |
| Hammon | SH 33 | Pedestrians walking on the roadway and <br> shoulder at night. Visibility is limited due to lack <br> of lighting. |

Source: SORTPO

## Existing Roadway Network

The state owned highway system in Oklahoma is comprised of the State numbered route highways, the US numbered route highways and the Interstate Highway System. The state system of highways encompasses 12,264 centerline miles as measured in one direction along the dividing stripe of two lane facilities and in one direction along the general median of multilane facilities. Transportation on our highways is also facilitated by over 6,800 bridge structures that span major rivers and lakes, named and unnamed perennial streams and creeks, other roads and highways and railroads. On the average, passenger vehicles, buses and trucks traveled more than 68.8 million vehicle miles each day (daily vehicle miles traveled) in 2014 on the state owned highway system (not including toll roads).

Oklahoma's rural nature and historically agricultural and energy based economy has witnessed the conversion of many farm-to-market roads and bridges into highways. While these roads were ideal for transporting livestock and crops to market 70 years ago, they are less than adequate when supporting today's heavier trucks, increased traffic demands and higher operating speeds. Almost 4,600 miles of Oklahoma highways are two-lane facilities without paved shoulders Appendix 2.17 illustrates the location of two lane highways with no shoulders. Appendix 2.18 illustrates the Steep Hill/Sharp Curves areas of concern (statewide).

Preserving the transportation system has emerged as a national, state and local transportation priority. Aging infrastructure continues to deteriorate, reducing the quality of the system and increasing maintenance costs. All roads deteriorate over time due to environmental conditions and the volume and type of traffic using the roadway. Without proper maintenance, roadways wear out prematurely. ODOT's annual evaluation of pavement conditions and safety features such as passing
 opportunities, adequate sight distances, existence of paved shoulders, recovery areas for errant vehicles, and the severity of hills and curves in 2015 reveals about $28 \%$ or approximately 3,466 of the State's 12,264 miles of highway rate as critical or inadequate which includes 2,858 miles of two-lane highway. The Interstate System in Oklahoma is the highest class of highway and is designed to be the critical transportation link. While the 673 miles of interstate account for only $5.5 \%$ on the centerline miles of our state system, it carries $33.6 \%$ of daily miles travelled.

## Traffic Count

Traffic count data was collected from ODOT (Appendix 2.19). Traffic counts are collected by ODOT and data included in this plan reveal that the largest volume of traffic is carried US 283 from the Beckham County Line north through Cheyenne to SH 47.

## Road Classification

Functional classification is a well-established system utilized by the FHWA for grouping streets and highways into classes based on roadway characteristics and intended services. Basic to this process is the recognition that individual roads and streets cannot serve travel independently; rather, most travel involves movement through a network of roads. Thus, it is necessary to determine how to channelize travel within the network in a logical and efficient manner. Functional classification (Appendix 2.20) defines the extent to which roadways provide for through travel versus the extent to which they provide access to land parcels. An interstate highway provides service exclusively for through travel, while a local street is used exclusively for land access. Each roadway has a classification number based on its location, access, and capacity characteristics. Functional class and jurisdiction are important not only in relation to operational and maintenance responsibility, but also in how roadway improvement projects can be funded. It is important to note that Rural Local and urban local streets which are not eligible for federal funds. Roger Mills County functionally classified roads are illustrated on the Functional Classification Map in Appendix 2.20.
Funding eligibility limitations include:

- FHWA National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) can be used only on the National Highway System, which comprises the Interstates, all other Principal Arterials, and all designated NHS Connectors.
- FHWA Surface Transportation Program (STP) can be used on any facility except Local Roads and Rural Minor Collectors.
- FHWA Highway Safety Improvement Program can be used to address safety problems on any public road.

As illustrated in Appendix 2.20, with the exception of US and State Highways many of the roads in Roger Mills County are designated as rural local.

## Bridges

Federal law requires that all bridges be inspected biennially; those that have specific structural problems may require more frequent inspections. Inspections include evaluation and rating of numerous elements of the substructure, superstructure, and deck, with special attention paid to fracture-critical members. Underwater inspections occur no less than every 5 years to check for scour around bridge piers. Bridges are composed of three basic parts: deck, superstructure and substructure. If any of these components receives a condition index value of 4 or less in the National Bridge Index, it is considered structurally deficient.

- Functionally Obsolete: A bridge term used when any of the geometric properties of a bridge are deficient such as being too narrow or load posted; any restriction of strength or weight.
- Structurally Deficient: A bridge term used when the physical condition of any of the bridge elements are lacking. These properties have a major bearing in qualifying a bridge for federal bridge replacement or rehabilitation funds.

Bridges are rated on a numerical scale of " 1 " to " 7 " that translates into a range of Poor, Fair, Good, and Excellent. Bridges are also described as "Structurally Deficient" and "Functionally Obsolete" (Appendix 2.21). The former may have any of a number of structural problems noted in the inspection; while some may be closed or load-posted, many remain safe for traffic. The latter are bridges that do not meet current design standards. They may have narrow lanes, or inadequate clearances, but they may also be structurally sound.

Roger Mills County bridge inventory includes 101 county bridge structures that are critical for regional mobility. These structures enable vehicles, bicycles, pedestrian and wildlife to cross an obstacle. More specifically, culverts are structures designed to increase water flow, while bridges are structures that span more than 20 feet between supports. Like roads, bridges and culverts deteriorate over time due to weather and normal wear-and-tear with the
 passage of vehicles. To ensure safety and minimize disruption to the transportation network these structures undergo regular inspections by qualified engineers. Inspections help locate and identify potential problems early and trigger protection mechanisms when a problem is found. The bridges and culverts in the County vary greatly in their age, with the oldest being constructed in 1937 and the most recently constructed was in 2014. Five bridges have been replaced or constructed since 2011. A recent review of non-federally owned or maintained bridges and culverts found that two bridges are identified as structurally deficient. Table 2.4 summarizes County bridges by owner and condition. Current data suggests that the majority of bridges in the County system are structurally sufficient.

Table 2.4: Roger Mills County Bridge Data

|  | Roger Mills County (off- <br> system) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Number of Bridges (includes I- <br> 40 ) | 101 |
| Structurally Deficient | 2 |

Source: Circuit Engineering District \#7

## Traffic Control

Traffic signals are a key element of traffic control. Their location and timing affects the mobility of vehicles and pedestrians. National studies demonstrate that poorly timed traffic signals are responsible for a significant proportion of urban traffic congestion. Signal timing that does not allow sufficient time for pedestrians to cross a street can contribute to safety problems and act as a barrier to walking. The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) establishes minimum warrants that are to be met for installation of a signal, and for designation of exclusive turn lanes and movements. Signal ownership is an important element, as each jurisdiction may have its own protocols for maintaining and retiming signals. Currently no collective data on ownership this is needed.

## Freight System

The Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act) repealed both the Primary Freight Network and National Freight Network and directed the FHWA Administrator to establish a National Highway Freight Network (NHFN). The FAST Act included the Interstate System-including Interstate facilities not located on the Primary Highway Freight System (PHFS) in the NHFN. All Interstate System roadways may not yet be reflected on the national and state NHFN maps (Map 2.8) and Appendix 2.22. Figure 2.2 illustrates the 2011 average daily long haul truck volume and Figure 2.3 illustrates the Oklahoma 2014 High Volume Truck Corridors. Though not shown on Map 2.8 and Figure 2.3 Roger Mills County is home to several freight corridors significant to the region. The SORTPO Policy Board recognizes the corridors listed in Table 2.5 and illustrated in Map 2.9 are significant regional highway freight corridors.


Map 2.8: National Highway Freight Network, Oklahoma

## National Highway Freight Network: Oklahoma



Source: US DOT

Figure 2.2: Average Daily Long Haul Traffic on NHS 2011


Source: Freight Analysis Framework (FAF)

Figure 2.3: High Volume Truck Corridors 2014 Analysis


Source: ODOT
Table 2.5: Roger Mills County Significant Freight Corridors

| CITY/TOWN | LOCATION/DESCRIPTION |
| :--- | :--- |
| County /Region | US 283 from the Beckham and Roger Mills County Line <br> north to US 64 |
| County | SH 33 from Hammon /SH 34 west to US 283 |
| County/ Region | SH 34 Elk City north to US 270/183 |

[^2]Map 2.9: Rogers Mills County Significant Freight Corridors

SORTPO REGIONAL FREIGHT MAP


Source: SWODA

To assist with the inspection and enforcement of truck permits Ports of Entry (POE) facilities were constructed by ODOT. This system of POE monitors freight ingress at the state line and allows better enforcement of vehicle and freight laws. Map 2.6 illustrates the location of these facilities. In western Oklahoma a POE is located on I-40 in Beckham County.

Map 2.10: Ports of Entry


Source: ODOT

## Rail

There are no railroads in the county. However, ODOT Rail Programs Division oversees and monitors five different railroad companies operating through leases on approximately 212 miles of State owned track and serves as a liaison between ODOT and rail companies for ODOT projects which involve railroads or railroad property. In August 2014, ODOT and the Stillwater Central Railroad completed a $\$ 75$ million sale of the Sooner Sub rail line between Midwest City and Sapulpa. With the sale of this 97.5 mile, ODOT announced a $\$ 100$ million initiative to improve safety at the State's railroad crossings. Most of the money for this program comes from the $\$ 75$ million sale of the Sooner Sub. Improvements are to be made to more than 300 rail crossings statewide and will add flashing lights and crossing arms to many of these crossings. Federal funding, as well as funds provided by railroad companies will also be used in completing the three to four-year program.

## Bicycle and Pedestrian Network

Bicycle and pedestrian facilities have been primarily a local issue, usually within communities. Most communities have at least a partial system of sidewalks to aid pedestrians, particularly near schools. Pedestrian travel requires a network of sidewalks
without gaps and with accommodations for people with disabilities as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). There are instances, particularly in rural areas, where a wide shoulder is an acceptable substitute for a sidewalk. Safe pedestrian travel also requires protected crossings of busy streets with marked crosswalks and pedestrian signals and appropriate pedestrian phases at signalized intersections.

## Public Transportation

Public transportation systems and services in rural areas are limited. Low population densities in the SORTPO region and the distances between activity centers complicate the delivery of public transportation in rural areas. There are limited activity generators (mostly job destinations) that produce concentrations of transit need. That is, at least one (1) end of a trip is concentrated enough that public transit may be attractive. The difficulty then becomes establishing feasible routes and scheduling service such that the trip is acceptable to the workers. Federal, state and especially local funding is limited. This limits the type and level of service that can be provided. ODOT's Transit Programs Division is responsible for the administration of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grants for rural transit operations.

Service provided within the SORTPO region is limited to demand response service. This service is provided based on a pre-arrangement or an agreement between a passenger (or group of passengers or an agency representing passengers) and a transportation provider for those needing "curb-to-curb" transportation. The prearrangement may be scheduled well in advance or, if available, on short notice and may be for a single trip or for repetitive trips over an extended period (called "subscription service"). Demand response services are provided by Red River Transportation and Cheyenne-Arapaho Transit.

Red River Public Transportation Service began operating demand response services in 1984 and serves selected cities within the counties of Roger Mills, Beckham, Custer, Washita, Kiowa, Tillman, Cotton, Jefferson and Stephens. All services are open to the public. Additional services provided include contracted services to schools, businesses, health providers, churches and private organizations. Destinations include: medical, shopping, school, employment, TANIF, Head Start, Airport and social venues. Vehicles operated in Roger Mills County include four vehicles: 2 fourteen passenger vans and 2 mini vans, which meet ADA requirements. These vehicles are operated five days a week, eight hours daily. Ridership total for 2011-2015 is 30,000. The vehicles models are 2011 and older and have 200,000 miles or more. Red River Transportation ridership is comprised of $30 \%$ elderly and $30 \%$ disabled. Vehicle replacement is anticipated in the next two years.

The Cheyenne/Arapaho Tribal Transit Program utilizes six vehicles, operating four fixed route busses, and two demand-response vans. Since the Red River Transportation and Cheyenne/Arapaho services cannot duplicate services, the Tribal Transit Program operates weekdays after 5:00 p.m., and on weekends. The Tribal Transit Program began in

December 2010 with just fixed routes, adding the demand response service in 2011.
The ODOT 2012 Transit Gap and Overview Analysis results revealed the need for coordination of existing services. Development and implementation of a coordinated system approach to delivery of transit services will enhance the opportunities for rural communities to reach destinations outside of the region.

## Aviation

The SORTPO area consists of thirteen (13) general aviation airports which are considered all civil aviation operations other than scheduled air services and non-scheduled air transport operation for remuneration or hire. General aviation covers a large range of activities, both commercial and non-commercial, including flying clubs, flight training, agricultural aviation, light aircraft manufacturing and maintenance. Roger Mills County aviation sites include: Mignon Laird Municipal Airport, Cheyenne, OK Community Airport (Map 2.1).

## Chapter 3: Future Conditions and Improvements

The objective of the Future Conditions and Planned Improvements chapter is to portray a "snapshot" of typical daily traffic conditions in the county for the year 2036. It is assumed that only those projects included in the current ODOT eight (8) year construction plan, County Improvements for Road \& Bridges Program (CIRB) and projects funded by local governments will be constructed by the year 2036.

## Future Conditions

Though growth in this County has showed decline from 1980-2000, population has increased from 2000-2014 due to increase in the oil and gas, construction, education and health care industries. Roger Mills County's proximity to regional services in Beckham County supports a premise
 that the County will continue to experience growth. The travel time of less than 30 minutes linking the towns of Cheyenne and Hammon to Elk City and Sayre (Beckham County) providing access to employment and regional services supports the role of Roger Mills as a bedroom community (county) to Beckham County. A review of historical demographic and employment data (Chapter 2) indicates a beginning decline in 2015 this decline can be described as typical in a region dependent on the oil and gas industry. It is projected that the oil and gas industry volatility will stabilize and population and employment will react accordingly. With the stabilization of the employment opportunities population will regain losses and continue to grow.

With the changing economy at the regional and state level the population projection developed for Beckham County was based on historic population growth 1990-2014 (estimate). Growth was calculated at approximately 1\% annually. The projected growth was formulated based on local development knowledge, proximity to regional employment and activity centers, and future growth in the oil and gas industries. The 2036 population projection of 4,495 and employment projection totaling 2,213 were distributed through the TAZs with primary distribution in the cities of Cheyenne and Hammon. Future employment growth is expected to be concentrated in the TAZs of $4,5,6,7,200,201$ and 400.

Table 3.1: Roger Mills County 2036 Population and Civilian Labor Force Projection

| TAZ <br> Number | 2010 <br> Population | 2036 <br> Population <br> Projection | 2010 Civilian <br> Labor Force | 2036 Civilian <br> Labor Force <br> Projection |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 294 | 275 | 100 | 115 |
| 2 | 329 | 315 | 100 | 115 |
| 3 | 352 | 352 | 175 | 250 |
| 4 | 125 | 230 | 170 | 225 |
| 5 | 274 | 375 | 165 | 200 |
| 6 | 318 | 425 | 135 | 155 |
| 7 | 374 | 525 | 145 | 175 |
| 100 | 210 | 215 | 36 | 40 |


| TAZ <br> Number | 2010 <br> Population | 2036 <br> Population <br> Projection | 2010 Civilian <br> Labor Force | 2036 Civilian <br> Labor Force <br> Projection |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 200 | 525 | 600 | 225 | 307 |
| 201 | 276 | 355 | 125 | 175 |
| 300 | 47 | 50 | 45 | 50 |
| 400 | 523 | 778 | 375 | 406 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 , 6 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 , 4 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 7 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 2 1 3}$ |

Source: SORTPO
With a projected population growth to 4,495 by 2036 it is anticipated that growth in vehicle ownership and registration will also continue. Long haul traffic is project to increase. Figure 3.1 illustrates the projected growth on the National Highway System.

Figure 3.1: Projected Average Daily Long-Haul Traffic on NHS 2040


Source: Freight Analysis Framework (FAF)

## 2036 Transportation Improvements

Not all service needs for the transportation system are for constructed improvements. In many instances additional data will need to be collected and studies developed to provide a complete list of needs. In the interim projected construction improvement needs will rely on information, data, programs implemented by state, tribal governments, rail line companies, county and city governments.

## Funded Improvements

Funded improvements in Roger Mills County include improvements to bridges, widen and resurface roadways, and general maintenance. The funded projects identified in Table 3.2 were obtained from the ODOT Eight Year Construction Program 2016-2023, CIRB Plan

2016-2019, County Commissioners, Local Governments and Transit operators. Appendix 3.1 illustrates and identifies the location of projects included in the ODOT Eight Year Construction Program 2016-2023.

Table 3.2: Roger Mills County Funded Improvements

| PROJECT ID | LOCATION | COST |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 27899(04) (FFY 2017) <br> Bridges \& Approaches | US-283, Over Dead Warrior Creek, 7.4 MI north <br> of the SH 47 JCT | $\$ 2,130,246$ |
| 29530(05) (FFY 2019 <br> Right of Way | SH-152, Widen and resurface begin at the Texas <br> S/L and extend east to the SH 30 JCT. This <br> project has a 1.2 MI exception. Right of way for <br> 29430(04) | $\$ 381,500$ |
| 29530(06) (FFY 2019) <br> Utilities | SH-152, Widen and resurface begin at the Texas <br> S/L and extend east the SH 30 JCT. This project <br> has a 1.2 MI exception. Utilities for 29430(04) | $\$ 381,500$ |


| PROJECT ID | LOCATION | COST |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Asset Preservation Plan |  |  |
| 27899(04) (FFY 2019) <br> Bridges \& Approaches | SH 30 \& SH 47 - Begin @ SH 30/SH 47 JCT SE of <br> Reydon \& Extend N to SH 30/SH 33 JCT | $\$ 2,130,246$ |

ODOT CIRB WORK PROGRAM 2016-2019

| 25478(04) (FFY 2017) <br> Grade, Drain \& Surface | CO RD (6514C) from 2.0 MI east of Cheyenne <br> east 7.0 MI to 6544C | $\$ 2,956,100$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 306914(04) (FFY 2017) <br> Grade, Drain | Grade Drain and Surface major Collector 65- <br> 12C beginning at SH 47 extending North 5.0 MI | $\$ 1,125,000$ |
| 30074(05) (FFY 2019) <br> Bridge \& Approaches | Bridge and approaches over Canadian River <br> N171E076.5 PE for 30074(04) | $\$ 90,000$ |
| Roger Mills County <br> Dist. \#1 (FY 2016) | Resurface | 72,000 |
| Roger Mills County Dist. <br> \#1 (FY 2016) | Resurface | 120,000 |
| Roger Mills County Dist. <br> $\# 2(2016-2020)$ | Resurface | $6,000,000$ |
| Roger Mills County Dist. <br> \#2 (2016-2020) | Widening Road | $7,000,000$ |


| PROJECT ID |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Roger Mills County Dist. <br> \#3 (FY 2016) | LOCATION | COST |
| Roger Mills County Dist. <br> \#3 (FY 2017) | Resurface | 120,000 |
| Roger Mills County Dist. <br> \#3 (FY 2019) | Resurface | 500,000 |

Source: ODOT, Transit Providers, County Commissioners, Local Governments

## Future Projects

At the time of the adoption there were no local projects identified.

## Chapter 4: Financial Summary

## Financial Assessment

The assessment is intended to summarize federal, state and local transportation sources.

## Federal

In general, transportation revenues continue to follow an unsustainable trajectory as multiple factors force the funding available for transportation to continue a downward trend. For example, both the Oklahoma and federal gas tax rates are fixed on a per-gallon basis, and therefore gas tax revenues are not responsive to inflation. As the cost of transportation infrastructure projects increases, the amount of revenue generated from the gas tax remains static. It is not possible to maintain past levels of transportation investments as per capita collections continue to decline. Additionally, as cars become more fuel efficient, drivers pay less in gas taxes. At the same time, the wear and tear on roadways caused by these vehicles remains the same. The federal funding levels related to highways are typically established through authorizing legislation commonly referred to as the Federal Highway Bill. This legislation normally authorizes projected funding levels for a period of six years. Consistent, long-term funding anticipations are critical in order to understand the expected annual federal funding availability and prepare projects accordingly. Each year, the legislation is funded through the Administration's budgeting and the congressional appropriations processes. The primary source for the dedicated federal transportation funding appropriation is the gasoline and diesel tax deposits directed to the Highway Trust Fund.

The department of transportation in each state is designated as the cognizant or recipient agency to interact with the representative federal agency, the Federal Highway Administration. Therefore, federal funding for roads and bridges is administered by ODOT regardless of facility ownership. All traditional, congressionally identified or discretionarily funded city street and county road projects that utilize federal highway funding are administered by and through ODOT.

Taxes on gasoline and other motor fuels are collected and distributed from the Federal Highway Trust Fund (HTF) and are distributed to the states by the FHWA and the FTA to each state through a system of formula grants and discretionary allocations. Motor fuels taxes, consisting of the 18.4-cent per gallon tax on gasoline and 24 -cent per gallon tax on diesel fuels, are the trust fund's main dedicated revenue source. Taxes on the sale of heavy vehicles, truck tires and the use of certain kinds of vehicles bring in smaller amounts of revenue for the trust fund.

Surface Transportation Program (STP) are federal funds utilized on road projects. These STP funds may provide up to eighty percent ( $80 \%$ ) of the construction costs of these projects. Counties fund the remaining twenty percent (20\%) match for construction costs, plus the costs for engineering, right of way and utility relocation through local sources or state fund. taxes. Appendix 4.1 identifies the transportation funding categories.

## State

Funding for highway improvements in Oklahoma comes primarily from two sources federal and revolving funds including federal and state motor fuel taxes directed to the Highway Trust Fund and the State Transportation Fund along with the Rebuilding Oklahoma Access and Driver Safety (ROADS) fund as initiated by House Bill 1078 in 2005. House Bill 2248 and House Bill 2249 provide funding to reduce the number of structurally deficient bridges and deteriorating road conditions on the state highway system.

In 1923, Oklahoma enacted its first state level excise tax on motor fuels. The last increase was in 1987 and the tax is currently seventeen cents ( $17 \$$ ) per gallon for gasoline and diesel at fourteen cents (14¢). There is also a transportation dedicated 5 cents per gasoline gallon equivalent excise tax on natural gas used for motor vehicle fuel Oklahoma's primary sources of funding for road and bridge construction and maintenance are derived from fuel taxes and motor vehicle tax. The motor fuel taxes that are deposited to the State Transportation Fund (STF) are gasoline excise tax, diesel fuel excise tax, special fuel use tax, and special fuel decals. The fuel tax is assessed on consumers when they purchase fuel, and the gasoline tax is the largest generator of revenue to the STF. The motor fuel tax revenues are also apportioned to municipalities and county governments for road and bridge repair and maintenance and to Native American Tribes.

In addition to the above taxes the ROADS Fund is guaranteed an annual apportionment equal to the amount apportioned for the previous year plus an additional $\$ 59.7$ million until it reaches a cap of $\$ 575$ million. In FY 2015 the Fund received $\$ 416.8$ million. In addition, the County Improvement for Roads and Bridges (CIRB) fund, as administered by ODOT was increased to $20 \%$ of motor vehicle registration fees and capped at $\$ 120$ million beginning in SFY 2016. Table 4.1 summarizes the state funding categories supporting transportation. Appendix 4.2 summarizes transportation funding categories, funding eligibility and funding limits provided at the state level.

Table 4.1: State Funding Categories

|  | FY13 Actual | FY14 Actual | FY15 Actual | FY16 Budget |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| State <br> Transportation <br> Fund | $\$ 206,405,702$ | $\$ 208,707,119$ | $\$ 197,228,227$ | $\$ 184,901,463$ |
| Motor Fuel Tax <br> - HP Bridges | $\$ 6,047,108$ | $\$ 6,130,546$ | $\$ 6,238,149$ | $\$ 6,200,000$ |
| Income Tax | $\$ 297,400,000$ | $\$ 357,100,000$ | $\$ 416,800,000$ | $\$ 476,500,000$ |
| Total <br> allocation | $\$ 509,852,810$ | $\$ 571,937,665$ | $\$ 620,266,376$ | $\$ 667,601,463$ |
| OTA Transfers | $\$ 41,340,937$ | $\$ 41,712,534$ | $\$ 44,049,331$ | $\$ 42,000,000$ |
| Total State <br> Revenue | $\$ 551,193,747$ | $\$ 613,650,199$ | $\$ 664,315,707$ | $\$ 709,601,463$ |
| CIP Debt <br> Service | $\$ 11,526,973$ | $\$ 11,358,296$ |  | $\$ 0$ |
| ROADS Debt <br> Service | $\$ 32,367,490$ | $\$ 35,971,788$ | $\$ 42,599,529$ | $\$ 36,434,743$ |


|  | FY13 Actual | FY14 Actual | FY15 Actual | FY16 Budget |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Highways and <br> Bridges | $\$ 495,399,284$ | $\$ 554,420,115$ | $\$ 612,316,178$ | $\$ 662,766,720$ |
|  <br> Industrial <br> Access | $\$ 5,000,000$ | $\$ 5,000,000$ | $\$ 2,500,000$ | $\$ 3,500,000$ |
| Passenger Rail | $\$ 2,000,000$ | $\$ 2,000,000$ | $\$ 2,000,000$ | $\$ 2,000,000$ |
| Public Transit | $\$ 3,000,000$ | $\$ 3,000,000$ | $\$ 3,000,000$ | $\$ 3,000,000$ |
| Intermodal | $\$ 1,900,000$ | $\$ 1,900,000$ | $\$ 1,900,000$ | $\$ 1,900,000$ |
| Total <br> Allocation | $\$ 551,193,747$ | $\$ 613,650,199$ | $\$ 664,315,707$ | $\$ 709,601,463$ |

Source: ODOT
Public transportation funding for rural transit agencies is as follows:

- ODOT receives FTA's Section 5311 funding.
- Subrecipients submit application for Section 5311 funds annually.
- ODOT reviews application which includes service areas. Service areas usually include multiple counties and/or city limits.
- Funds are allocated to eligible ubrecipients based on the average of their last two previous years of performance measures (i.e. revenue miles, passenger trips, etc.) within their pre-approved Section 5311 service areas.
- Subrecipients are reimbursed for eligible administrative, operational, and capital expense, at specific rates, for services performed within their total pre-approved Section 5311 service areas.

The total expenditures identified in Table 4.1 are within the total federal, state and local revenues estimated for the 2036 LRTP and are adequate to fund the projects listed. Funding of local transportation projects and programs is heavily influenced by State of Oklahoma's annual budget and federal funding. Transportation funding sources based on motor vehicle fuel taxes tend to fluctuate with changes in fuel prices and fuel consumption. While most taxes are not tied to fuel prices, when gas prices go up, consumption tends to go down and thus tax revenues decline. Oklahoma's state budget continues to experience historic downfall revenues and these downfalls have a negative impact on the transportation system. With this plan development it is anticipated that there will continue to be a downfall in available revenue for transportation programs and projects. Therefore, the coordination with local, regional and statewide agencies in the development of transportation programs and projects is significant in order to accomplish the projects.

## County

The main funding program for county roads and bridges is the county highway fund, which consists of revenues from the state taxes on gasoline and diesel fuels as well as motor vehicle registration fees and a portion of the of the state gross production tax on oil and gas in the case of counties that have oil and gas production. A county's apportionment is based on several formulas that use proportional shares of each factor as it relates to the total statewide county totals. Counties that have oil and natural gas production receive a portion of the seven percent (7\%) state tax on natural gas and oil. Counties have authority to
impose a countywide sales tax for roads and bridges with revenues earmarked for roads and bridges. Appendix 4.3 summarizes the funding categories and taxes apportioned by the Oklahoma Tax Commission (OTC) for FY 2011-2015 in addition to revenues apportioned by the OTC the recognized tribal governments who receive federal funds and may also designate their own local funds for transportation projects. Counties and tribal governments have been successful in working together to coordinate implementation of transportation projects. The opportunity to utilize a combination of funding sources for transportation projects is an opportunity that counties value. Challenges faced by local and state governments include: dependence on revenues from the state gas tax; the state's fixed rate gas tax and major disaster declarations and impact on the infrastructure.

In the summer of 2006 a law created the County Improvements for Roads and Bridges (CIRB) program. The funds apportioned to the program are in equal amounts to the eight Transportation Commission Districts. The sole purpose of the funds is for the construction or reconstruction of county roads or bridges on the county highway system that are the highest priority. Funds may accumulate annual funding for a period of up to five years for a specific project. Information obtained from a report published by the National Association of Counties, funds collected by OTC for transportation projects are distributed directly to the counties. Revenues for specifically for the CIRB category are collected from state gasoline and diesel tax, special fuel tax and state gross production tax on oil. Appendix 4.4 summarizes the CIRB for Roger Mills County. The county uses a small percentage of tax revenues for maintenance and minor improvements, relying on outside funding sources for major improvements.

The County Commissioners established Circuit Engineering Districts (CEDs) to provide common engineering and project support services. All potential transportation projects are initiated by the County Commissioners and are coordinated with the appropriate CED who directs the development of the recommended list of projects to be considered by ODOT for inclusion in the CIRB Construction Work Plan. ODOT and the Transportation Commission has the responsibility for the expenditure of the CIRB funding. When the CIRB Construction Work Plan is approved, ODOT coordinates and cooperates with the Counties and the CEDs in management of the project.

## Local

The main source of funding for community transportation projects is found in the general operating budgets. Generally, these funds are derived by city sales tax and fees. Funding for rural transportation projects may also be available through federal sources such as Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) through Oklahoma Dept. of Commerce, Economic Development Administration (EDA), and US Department of Agriculture Rural Development (USDA RD) programs. Oklahoma has limited funding available for projects through Rural Economic Action Plan (REAP) administered by Councils of Government (COG).

## Chapter 5: Public Participation

This chapter presents and describes the public participation tools the RTPOs utilize as part of the planning process. Public participation is a federal requirement outlined in MAP21 and The FAST Act. SORTPO has an adopted Public Participation Plans (PPP) that was followed.

## Environmental Justice

FHWA has long embraced non-discrimination policy to make sure federally funded activities (planning through
 implementation) are not disproportionately adversely impacting certain populations. These populations include low income persons and populations as defined by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Poverty Guidelines and minority persons and populations (Black, Hispanic, Asian American, American Indian and Alaskan Natives). As such, public involvement and outreach for the LRTP must adhere to Presidential Executive Order 12898, Environmental Justice (EJ).

Roger Mills County's racial and ethnic composition is 89.9\% White, followed by 6.9\% Hispanic or Latino, and $0.6 \%$ African American. In comparison, Oklahoma is $72.2 \%$ White, 8.9\% Hispanic or Latino and 7.4\% African American. The LRTP process identified EJ populations through a comparison of the racial and ethnic composition of the county. Additional information is in Appendix 5.1.

Low income populations were also identified for Roger Mills County. Low income populations are defined by the FHWA for transportation planning purposes as families of four (4) with a household income that is below the poverty guidelines set by HHS. The 2015 HHS poverty guideline for a family of four (4) is twenty-four thousand two hundred and fifty dollars ( $\$ 24,250.00$ ).

As part of the LRTP development and public outreach process, consultation with federally recognized tribes in the region was initiated. Several environmental laws require tribal consultation during project development. The Cheyenne-Arapaho tribe was identified and invited to participate in the planning process. In addition, a copy of the LRTP was mailed to each tribal headquarters during the public review process.

## Coordination with Other Plans

The process to identify goals and objectives for the county started with a review and comparison of goals and objectives from other related planning documents and policies to ensure general consistency. This review included:

- FAST Act Federal Planning Factors,
- MAP-21 Federal Planning Factors,
- 2012 Transit Gap Overview and Analysis
- Oklahoma Mobility Plan,
- 2012 Freight Flow Study,
- ODOT 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan, and
- Cheyenne-Arapaho Comprehensive Plan.

Conversation and consultation has been initiated and will be ongoing with the Cheyenne/Arapaho tribes and State Agencies (including, but not limited to: State Historic Preservation Office, Oklahoma Department of Transportation, Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality, Oklahoma Water Resources Board, Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation, Aeronautics Commission, and Bureau of Indian Affairs. All of the above agencies will be given an opportunity for input during the Public Review and Comment period.

Public involvement is an integral part of the transportation process. SORTPO is proactive in its efforts to effectively communicate with the public and has adopted a PPP to ensure that the transportation planning process and procedures complies with federal requirement for public involvement and participation. These procedures provide opportunities for the public to take an active role in the decision making process.


The SORTPO has hosted 15 public meetings and/or provided notice of availability for public outreach to involve interested parties in the early stages of the plan development. Notices of public hearings and/or notices of availability for public outreach for the RTPO were published in local newspapers and SORTPO website. Surveys were distributed throughout the County and were made available on at www.sortpo.org. The survey and responses are included in Appendix 5.2. Appendix 5.3 provides additional information supporting SORTPO'S public engagement and outreach in development of the LRTP.

## Chapter 6: Transportation Recommendations

This chapter identifies the recommendations and summary of improvements that were developed as a result of the previous review of demographics, growth, activity generators, transportation system and other such issues. It is assumed that only those Roger Mills County projects included in the current ODOT eight (8) year construction program and CIRB will be constructed by the year 2036 .

The projects included in the LRTP may have potential funding from a single source or multiple sources. Each project has its own unique components relative to only that project and while there are many funding programs within various state and federal agencies, each project must be evaluated on its own merits to determine which programs will apply. It should be noted that while many potential funding sources are identified for each project, these represent the primary sources and additional sources not listed may also be available. When implementing this plan, SORTPO will continue to review potential funding sources as they become available or as projects become eligible for other sources. SORTPO will expand on this effort by identifying additional projects that are needed in the county and helping local governments with the identification of funding sources for those projects. Not all of the recommendations are for constructed improvements. In some cases, studies must be conducted to determine if the improvement is warranted (installation of new traffic signals, for example). In other cases, studies should be undertaken in order to develop a comprehensive set of solutions.

## Committed Improvements

The ODOT 8 Year Construction Work Program 2016-2023 assembles projects according to anticipated state and federal fund categories. With regard to federally funded projects, the current plan is fiscally balanced in that the total project costs do not exceed the anticipated federal funds. ODOT policy prohibits start of future projects until all funding is in place and federal regulations dictate projects cannot be programmed in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program
 (STIP) unless there is a programmatic and financial game plan for completing the project within six (6) years.

Table 6.1 includes a list of projects through the year 2036. The table includes projects identified the ODOT 8 Year Construction Work Program for years 2016-2019. Funding for projects in years 2020-2023 is not in place. Other projects include development of studies, plans, and collection of data that can be included in SORTPO's Planning Work Program (PWP).

Table 6.1: Recommended List of Projects

| GENERAL <br> LOCATION | PROJECT <br> YEAR | DESCRIPTION | FUNDING STATE <br> / FEDERAL |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Roger Mills <br> County | $2016-$ <br> 2020 | Develop procedures to identify and <br> collect traffic count data at specific <br> locations within the county. | SPR |


| GENERAL <br> LOCATION | $\begin{gathered} \text { PROJECT } \\ \text { YEAR } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | DESCRIPTION | FUNDING STATE <br> / FEDERAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Establish procedures that enhance the consultation and coordination of transportation planning with local, regional, state and tribal government representatives. | SPR |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Develop data collection standards. | SPR |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Conduct speed study at intersection locations with high accident severity index and corridors with major attractors. | SPR |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Bridge US 283 over Dead Warrior Creek, 7.4 MI north of SH47 west JCT. (FFY 2017-27899(04)) | 8 Year Construction Work Program (FFY 2016-2023) |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Right of Way begin at Texas state line and extend east to the SH30 JCT. (FFY 2019-278999(05)) | 8 Year Construction Work Program (FFY 2016-2023) |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Utilities begin at Texas state line and extend east to the SH30 JCT. (FFY 2019 - 278999 (06)) | 8 Year Construction Work Program (FFY 2016-2023) |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Grade, drainage, and surface County Rd (6514C) from 2.0 MI east of Cheyenne east 7.0 MI to County Rd 6544C (FFY 2018-25478(04)) | ODOT CIRB Work <br> Program 2016- $2019$ |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Grade, drainage and surface major Collector 65-12C beginning at SH47 extending north 5.0 MI. (FFY 2017 306914(04)) | ODOT CIRB Work <br> Program 2016- $2019$ |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{aligned} & 2016- \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Engineering for bridge and approaches over Canadian River (FFY 2019 30074(05)) | ODOT CIRB Work Program 20162019 |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{aligned} & 2021- \\ & 2026 \end{aligned}$ | Collect traffic count data at specific locations within the county | SPR |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{gathered} 2021- \\ 2026 \end{gathered}$ | Conduct speed study at intersection locations with high accident severity index and corridors with major attractors. | SPR |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{aligned} & 2026- \\ & 2030 \end{aligned}$ | Collect traffic count data at specific locations within the county. | SPR |
| Roger Mills County | 2026- | Conduct speed study at intersection locations with high accident severity | SPR |


| GENERAL LOCATION | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PROJECT } \\ \text { YEAR } \end{gathered}$ | DESCRIPTION | FUNDING STATE <br> / FEDERAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2030 | index and corridors with major attractors. |  |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{gathered} 2031- \\ 2035 \end{gathered}$ | Conduct speed study at intersection locations with high accident severity index and corridors with major attractors. | SPR |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{gathered} 2030- \\ 2035 \end{gathered}$ | Collect traffic count data at specific locations within the county. | SPR |
| Roger Mills <br> County | $\begin{gathered} 2036- \\ 2040 \end{gathered}$ | Collect traffic count data at specific locations within the county. | SPR |
| Roger Mills County | $\begin{gathered} 2036- \\ 2040 \end{gathered}$ | Conduct speed study at intersection locations with high accident severity index and corridors with major attractors. | SPR |

## APPENDICES -

# Appendix A: Resolution No. 09-04 

RESOLUTION NO. 09-04<br>CREATION OF THE RURAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING<br>ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

WHEREAS, local business and community leaders have expressed a strong desire to convene and discuss transportation needs and goals in the eight-county SWODA Region, and

WHEREAS, regional transportation planning is encouraged by legislation of the Federal Highway Administration, and

WHEREAS, SWODA is the federally recognized regional planning organization for the eight-county area, and

WHEREAS, the SWODA Board of Trustees seeks to facilitate the planning process for surface, air and rail development to aid the region in economic development, workforce development, business and industry growth, tourism development and other pursuits;
now therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Trustees of the South Western Oklahoma Development Authority does hereby create the Rural Transportation Planning Organization as a standing committee of the Authority.

PASSED AND APPROVED this 13th day of October, 2009.


ATTEST:

## Mike Brown <br> MIKE BROWN, Secretary

## Appendix B: Acronyms

| ADA | Americans with Disabilities Act |
| :--- | :--- |
| CIP | Capital Improvement Program |
| COEDD | Central Oklahoma Economic Development District |
| CORTPO | Central Oklahoma Regional Transportation Planning Organization |
| EJ | Environmental Justice |
| FAST Act | Fixing America's Transportation Act |
| FHWA | Federal Highway Administration |
| FTA | Federal Transit Administration |
| FY | Fiscal Year |
| INJ | Injury |
| IRI | International Roughness Index |
| JCT | Limition |
| LEP | Levels of Service |
| LOS | Long Range Transportation Plan |
| LRTP | Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act |
| MAP-21 | Ptate Line |
| MUTCD | Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices |
| NHFN | National Highway Freight Network |
| NHS | Primary Highway Freight System |
| NODA | National Highway System |
| NORTPO | Northern Oklahoma Development Authority |
| NRHP | Northern Oklahoma Regional Transportation Planning Organization |
| OARC | National Register of Historic Places |
| ODEQ | Oklahoma Association of Regional Councils |
| ODOT | Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality |
| PHFS | PPP |


| SAFETEA-LU | Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A <br> Legacy for Users |
| :--- | :--- |
| SORTPO | Southwest Oklahoma Regional Transportation Planning <br> Organization |
| STIP | Statewide Transportation Improvement Program |
| STP | Surface Transportation Program |
| SWODA | South Western Oklahoma Development Authority |
| TAZ | Traffic Analysis Zone |
| USDA | U.S. Department of Agriculture |
| USDOT | U.S. Department of Transportation |

## Appendix C: Definitions

Accident Severity Index - A measure of the severity of collisions at a particular location, derived by assigning a numeric value according to the severity of each collision and totaling those numeric values.

Capacity - The maximum number of vehicles that can pass over a given section of a lane or roadway in one direction during a given time period under prevailing roadway and traffic conditions.

Census Tracts - Small areas with generally stable boundaries, defined within counties and statistically equivalent entities, usually in metropolitan areas and other highly populated counties. They are designed to be relatively homogeneous with respect to population characteristics, economic status and living conditions.

Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) - A comprehensive schedule of capital improvements needed within the city and establishes a program to accomplish those needs within the city's ability to pay.

Congestion - The level at which transportation system performance is no longer acceptable to the traveling public due to traffic interference.

Environmental Justice (EJ) - The fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, culture, education, or income with respect to the development, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations and policies. In transportation, this requires review of whether the benefits and burdens of transportation investments appear to be distributed evenly across the regional demographic profile and, if necessary, mitigation of such effects.

Functional Classification - Identification and categorization scheme describing streets according to the type of service they provide into one of four categories: principal arterials, minor arterials, collectors and local.

Level of Service (LOS) - Refers to a standard measurement used by planners which reflects the relative ease of traffic flow on a scale of A to F with free-flow being rated LOS A and congested conditions rated as LOS F.

Long Range Transportation Plan- Every state and MPO must develop a long range transportation plan (LRTP) for transportation improvements, including a bicycle and pedestrian element. The LRTP looks twenty (20) years ahead and is revised every five (5) years.

Multi-modal - The consideration of more than one mode to serve transportation needs in a given area. Refers to the diversity of options for the same trip; also, an approach to transportation planning or programming which acknowledges the existence of or need for transportation options.

National Highway System (NHS) - represents four percent (4\%) to five percent (5\%) of the total public road mileage in the U.S. This system was designed to contain the follow subcategories:
a) Interstate- The current interstate system retained its separate identity within the NHS along with specific provisions to add mileage to the existing interstate subsystem.
b) Other Principal Arterials- These routes include highways in rural and urban areas which provide access between and arterial route and a major port, airport, public transportation facility or other intermodal transportation facility.
c) Intermodal Connecting Links- These are highways that connect NHS routes to major ports, airport, international border crossings, public transportation and transit facilities, interstate bus terminals and rail and intermodal transportation facilities.

National and State Scenic Byways recognize highways that are outstanding examples of our nation's beauty, culture and recreational experience in exemplifying the diverse regional characteristics of our nation.

Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET). This system includes the Dwight D. Eisenhower System of Interstate and Defense Highways, identified as strategically important to the defense of the United States.

Surface Transportation Program (STP) - A category of federal transportation funds administered by the Federal Highway Administration and allocated to states and metropolitan areas based on a prescribed formula. This category of funds can provide $80 \%$ of the cost to complete transportation improvement projects. These funds are flexible, and can be used for planning design, land acquisition, and construction of highway improvement projects, the capital costs of transit system development, and up to two years of operating assistance for transit system development.

Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ) - A traffic analysis zone is the unit of geography most commonly used in conventional transportation planning models. The size of a zone varies, and will vary significantly between the rural and urban areas. Zones are constructed by census block information. Typically, these blocks are used in transportation models by providing socio-economic data. This information helps to further the understanding of trips that are produced and attracted within the zone.

## Appendix 1: Performance Measures

Transportation performance measures data/information about the condition, use and impact of the system. The performance measures (or indicators) to track progress toward established goals.

US DOT has established performance measures and state DOTS will develop performance targets in consultation with MPOs and others. The law allows the state DOT to develop performance targets for rural and urban areas. The targets must be established in coordination with MPOs and public transit operators in areas not represented by MPOs. Seven (7) areas in which performance measures will be developed:

1. Safety - to achieve reduction in facilities and serious injuries on all public roads.
2. Infrastructure Condition - to maintain highway infrastructure assets in state of good repair.
3. Congestion Reduction - to achieve reduction in congestion on the National Highway System.
4. System Reliability - performance on the Interstate/Non Interstate system.
5. Freight Movement - freight movement on the Interstate and
6. Economic Vitality - Environment Sustainability to enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the environment
7. Reduced Project Delivery Delays - to reduce project costs, promote jobs and the economy and expedite the movement of people and goods by accelerating project completion through eliminating delays in the project development and delivery process, including reducing regulatory burdens and improving agencies work practices.

As a fundamental element of a performance management framework, states, MPOs and providers of public transportation will need to establish targets in key national performance areas to document expectations for future performance. The statewide and metropolitan transportation planning processes shall provide for the use of a performancebased approach to transportation decision-making to support the national goals.

## Appendix 2: Current Conditions

Appendix 2.1: Roger Mills County Socio Economic Information, 2010-2014

| SEX AND AGE | $\begin{gathered} 2010- \\ 2014 \text { ACS } \end{gathered}$ | MARGIN OF ERROR | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2010-2014 } \\ \text { ACS } \% \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total population | 3,743 | ***** | 3,743 |
| Male | 1,878 | +/-35 | 50.2\% |
| Female | 1,865 | +/-35 | 49.8\% |
| Under 5 years | 228 | +/-21 | 6.1\% |
| 5 to 9 years | 298 | +/-41 | 8.0\% |
| 10 to 14 years | 280 | +/-45 | 7.5\% |
| 15 to 19 years | 256 | +/-42 | 6.8\% |
| 20 to 24 years | 124 | +/-30 | 3.3\% |
| 25 to 34 years | 442 | +/-22 | 11.8\% |
| 35 to 44 years | 400 | +/-21 | 10.7\% |
| 45 to 54 years | 520 | +/-36 | 13.9\% |
| 55 to 59 years | 300 | +/-45 | 8.0\% |
| 60 to 64 years | 220 | +/-37 | 5.9\% |
| 65 to 74 years | 366 | +/-7 | 9.8\% |
| 75 to 84 years | 196 | +/-28 | 5.2\% |
| 85 years and over | 113 | +/-28 | 3.0\% |
| Median age (years) | 42.0 | +/-1.6 | (X) |
| 18 years and over | 2,784 | ***** | 74.4\% |
| 21 years and over | 2,663 | +/-37 | 71.1\% |
| 62 years and over | 801 | +/-30 | 21.4\% |
| 65 years and over | 675 | +/-8 | 18.0\% |


| 65 years and over | 675 | $+/-8$ | 675 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 299 | $+/-5$ | $44.3 \%$ |
| Female | 376 | $+/-6$ | $55.7 \%$ |


|  | $\begin{gathered} 2010- \\ 2014 \text { ACS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Margin of Error | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2010-2014 \\ \text { ACS \% } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Race |  |  |  |
| Total population | 3,743 | ***** | 3,743 |
| One race | 3,461 | +/-38 | 92.5\% |
| Two or more races | 282 | +/-37 | 7.5\% |
| One race | 3,461 | +/-38 | 92.5\% |
| White | 3,392 | +/-31 | 90.6\% |
| Black or African American | 4 | +/-5 | 0.1\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native | 54 | +/-29 | 1.4\% |
| Cherokee tribal grouping | 4 | +/-5 | 0.1\% |
| Chippewa tribal grouping | 0 | +/-9 | 0.0\% |
| Navajo tribal grouping | 4 | +/-5 | 0.1\% |
| Sioux tribal grouping | 0 | +/-9 | 0.0\% |
| Asian | 1 | +/-2 | 0.0\% |
| Asian Indian | 0 | +/-9 | 0.0\% |
| Chinese | 0 | +/-9 | 0.0\% |
| Filipino | 0 | +/-9 | 0.0\% |
| Japanese | 0 | +/-9 | 0.0\% |
| Korean | 0 | +/-9 | 0.0\% |
| Vietnamese | 0 | +/-9 | 0.0\% |
| Other Asian | 1 | +/-2 | 0.0\% |
| Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander | 5 | +/-8 | 0.1\% |
| Native Hawaiian | 0 | +/-9 | 0.0\% |
| Guamanian or Chamorro | 0 | +/-9 | 0.0\% |
| Samoan | 0 | +/-9 | 0.0\% |
| Other Pacific Islander | 5 | +/-8 | 0.1\% |
| Some other race | 5 | +/-7 | 0.1\% |

[^3]Appendix 2.2: Roger Mills County Housing Occupancy 2010-2014

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}-$ <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ ACS | MARGIN <br> OF <br> ERROR | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 - 2 0 1 4}$ <br> ACS \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Housing Occupancy |  |  |  |
| Total housing units | 1,906 | $+/-28$ | 1,906 |
| Occupied housing units | 1,307 | $+/-60$ | $68.6 \%$ |
| Vacant housing units | 599 | $+/-52$ | $31.4 \%$ |
| Homeowner vacancy rate | 0.0 | $+/-2.0$ | $(\mathrm{X})$ |
| Rental vacancy rate | 0.0 | $+/-6.1$ | $(\mathrm{X})$ |

Source: 2010-2014 ACS
Appendix 2.3: Roger Mills County Educational Attainment 2010-2014

|  | TOTAL |  | \% OF ENROLLED POPULATION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | In public school |  | In private school |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 2010- \\ 2014 \text { ACS } \end{gathered}$ | MARGIN OF ERROR | $\begin{gathered} 2010- \\ 2014 \text { ACS } \end{gathered}$ | MARGIN OF ERROR | $\begin{gathered} 2010- \\ 2014 \text { ACS } \end{gathered}$ | MARGIN OF ERROR |
| Population 25 years and over | 2,557 | +/-15 | 1,291 | +/-22 | 1,266 | +/-23 |
| Less than 9th grade | 2.8\% | +/-1.2 | 3.3\% | +/-2.2 | 2.3\% | +/-1.4 |
| 9th to 12th grade, no diploma | 5.5\% | +/-1.3 | 6.5\% | +/-2.3 | 4.4\% | +/-1.5 |
| High school graduate/GED | 38.5\% | +/-3.7 | 41.4\% | +/-4.9 | 35.5\% | +/-5.0 |
| Some college, no degree | 24.0\% | +/-3.4 | 20.5\% | +/-3.8 | 27.5\% | +/-5.1 |
| Associate's degree | 8.1\% | +/-1.8 | 8.1\% | +/-2.4 | 8.1\% | +/-2.6 |
| Bachelor's degree | 14.0\% | +/-2.9 | 13.3\% | +/-4.0 | 14.6\% | +/-3.6 |
| Graduate or professional degree | 7.2\% | +/-1.8 | 6.8\% | +/-2.1 | 7.6\% | +/-2.5 |
| Percent high school graduate or higher | 91.7\% | +/-1.5 | 90.2\% | +/-2.8 | 93.3\% | +/-2.0 |
| Percent bachelor's degree or higher | 21.2\% | +/-2.8 | 20.1\% | +/-4.0 | 22.2\% | +/-3.7 |

Source: 2010-2014 ACS

Appendix 2.4: Roger Mills County Housing Units and Vehicles Available 2010-2014

|  | Occupied housing <br> units |  | Owner-occupied <br> housing units |  | Renter-occupied <br> housing units |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010- <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 4} \mathbf{A C S}$ | MARGIN <br> OF <br> ERROR | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 -}$ <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ <br> ACS | MARGIN <br> OF <br> ERROR | 2010- <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ ACS | MARGIN <br> OF <br> ERROR |
| Occupied Housing Units | 1,307 | $+/-60$ | 990 | $+/-55$ | 317 | $+/-56$ |
| Units in Structure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1, detached | $78.9 \%$ | $+/-3.5$ | $82.5 \%$ | $+/-3.9$ | $67.5 \%$ | $+/-8.5$ |
| 1, attached | $1.1 \%$ | $+/-0.8$ | $1.4 \%$ | $+/-1.0$ | $0.0 \%$ | $+/-6.1$ |
| 2 apartments | $2.3 \%$ | $+/-1.0$ | $0.0 \%$ | $+/-2.0$ | $9.5 \%$ | $+/-4.2$ |
| 3 or 4 apartments | $0.1 \%$ | $+/-0.2$ | $0.0 \%$ | $+/-2.0$ | $0.3 \%$ | $+/-0.9$ |
| 5 to 9 apartments | $0.7 \%$ | $+/-0.6$ | $0.0 \%$ | $+/-2.0$ | $2.8 \%$ | $+/-2.3$ |
| 10 or more apartments | $0.2 \%$ | $+/-0.3$ | $0.0 \%$ | $+/-2.0$ | $0.9 \%$ | $+/-1.3$ |
| Mobile home or other | $16.8 \%$ | $+/-3.1$ | $16.1 \%$ | $+/-3.7$ | $18.9 \%$ | $+/-6.9$ |


| Vehicles Available |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No vehicle available | $2.0 \%$ | $+/-1.7$ | $0.7 \%$ | $+/-0.7$ | $6.0 \%$ | $+/-6.5$ |
| 1 vehicle available | $20.7 \%$ | $+/-3.1$ | $14.7 \%$ | $+/-3.3$ | $39.1 \%$ | $+/-8.7$ |
| 2 vehicles available | $36.1 \%$ | $+/-4.8$ | $38.1 \%$ | $+/-5.7$ | $30.0 \%$ | $+/-8.4$ |
| 3 or more vehicles <br> available | $41.2 \%$ | $+/-4.8$ | $46.5 \%$ | $+/-5.6$ | $24.9 \%$ | $+/-7.7$ |

Source: 2010-2014 ACS

Appendix 2.5: Roger Mills County Employment Status and Commute to Work 2010 2014

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}-$ <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 4 ~ A C S}$ | MARGIN <br> OF <br> ERROR | PERCENT | MARGIN <br> OF <br> ERROR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Employment Status |  |  |  |  |
| Population 16 years and over | 2,884 | $+/-32$ | 2,884 | $(\mathrm{X})$ |
| In labor force | 1,659 | $+/-88$ | $57.5 \%$ | $+/-3.1$ |
| Civilian labor force | 1,659 | $+/-88$ | $57.5 \%$ | $+/-3.1$ |
| Employed | 1,616 | $+/-93$ | $56.0 \%$ | $+/-3.3$ |
| Unemployed | 43 | $+/-29$ | $1.5 \%$ | $+/-1.0$ |
| Armed Forces | 0 | $+/-9$ | $0.0 \%$ | $+/-0.7$ |
| Not in labor force | 1,225 | $+/-93$ | $42.5 \%$ | $+/-3.1$ |
| Civilian labor force | 1,659 | $+/-88$ | 1,659 | $(\mathrm{X})$ |
| Percent Unemployed | $(\mathrm{X})$ | $(\mathrm{X})$ | $2.6 \%$ | $+/-1.8$ |


| Commuting to Work |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Workers 16 years and over | 1,594 | $+/-93$ | 1,594 | $(\mathrm{X})$ |
| Car, truck, van - drove alone | 1,269 | $+/-94$ | $79.6 \%$ | $+/-4.1$ |
| Car, truck, van - carpooled | 86 | $+/-39$ | $5.4 \%$ | $+/-2.5$ |
| Public transit -not taxicab | 2 | $+/-4$ | $0.1 \%$ | $+/-0.2$ |
| Walked | 34 | $+/-19$ | $2.1 \%$ | $+/-1.2$ |
| Other means | 9 | $+/-12$ | $0.6 \%$ | $+/-0.7$ |
| Worked at home | 194 | $+/-59$ | $12.2 \%$ | $+/-3.6$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean travel time to work (min) | 25.8 | $+/-2.9$ | $(\mathrm{X})$ | $(\mathrm{X})$ |

Source: 2010-2014 ACS

Appendix 2.6: Roger Mills County Occupation and Industry 2010-2014 ACS

| Occupation | 2010- <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ ACS | MARGIN <br> OF <br> ERROR | PERCENT | MARGIN <br> OF <br> ERROR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Civilian employed population 16 years and <br> over | 1,616 | $+/-93$ | 1,616 | $(\mathrm{X})$ |
| Management, business, science, and arts <br> occupations | 493 | $+/-72$ | $30.5 \%$ | $+/-3.9$ |
| Service occupations | 189 | $+/-54$ | $11.7 \%$ | $+/-3.3$ |
| Sales and office occupations | 413 | $+/-73$ | $25.6 \%$ | $+/-4.4$ |
| Natural resources, construction, and <br> maintenance occupations | 298 | $+/-57$ | $18.4 \%$ | $+/-3.4$ |
| Production, transportation, and material <br> moving occupations | 223 | $+/-45$ | $13.8 \%$ | $+/-2.6$ |


| Industry |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Civilian employed population 16 years and <br> over | 1,616 | $+/-93$ | 1,616 | $(\mathrm{X})$ |
| Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, <br> and mining | 472 | $+/-87$ | $29.2 \%$ | $+/-4.9$ |
| Construction | 177 | $+/-53$ | $11.0 \%$ | $+/-3.2$ |
| Manufacturing | 21 | $+/-16$ | $1.3 \%$ | $+/-1.0$ |
| Wholesale trade | 19 | $+/-14$ | $1.2 \%$ | $+/-0.9$ |
| Retail trade | 80 | $+/-24$ | $5.0 \%$ | $+/-1.5$ |
| Transportation and warehousing, and <br> utilities | 39 | $+/-21$ | $2.4 \%$ | $+/-1.4$ |
| Information | 45 | $+/-22$ | $2.8 \%$ | $+/-1.4$ |
| Finance and insurance, and real estate and <br> rental and leasing | 70 | $+/-23$ | $2.5 \%$ | $+/-1.4$ |
| Professional, scientific, and management, <br> and administrative and waste management <br> services | 71 | $+/-38$ | $4.4 \%$ | $+/-2.3$ |
| Educational services, and health care and <br> social assistance | 289 | $+/-64$ | $17.9 \%$ | $+/-3.9$ |
| Arts, entertainment, and recreation, and <br> accommodation and food services | 725 | $+/-40$ | $7.7 \%$ | $+/-2.4$ |
| Other services, except public <br> administration | $+/-40$ | $4.3 \%$ | $+/-2.5$ |  |
| Public administration | $70.4 \%$ |  |  |  |


| Occupation | 2010- <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ ACS | MARGIN <br> OF <br> ERROR | PERCENT | MARGIN <br> OF <br> ERROR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Class of Worker |  |  |  |  |
| Civilian employed population 16 years and <br> over | 1,616 | $+/-93$ | 1,616 | $(\mathrm{X})$ |
| Private wage and salary workers | 920 | $+/-95$ | $56.9 \%$ | $+/-5.1$ |
| Government workers | 415 | $+/-77$ | $25.7 \%$ | $+/-4.4$ |
| Self-employed in own not incorporated <br> business workers | 228 | $+/-52$ | $14.1 \%$ | $+/-3.2$ |
| Unpaid family workers | 53 | $+/-30$ | $3.3 \%$ | $+/-1.8$ |

Source: 2010-2014 ACS

## Appendix 2.7: Roger Mills County, Mode of Travel to Work

| Mode to Work | MARGIN <br> OF ERROR | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 4}$ <br> ACS | PERCENT |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Workers | 118 | 1,583 | 100.0 |
| Drove alone | 113 | 1,294 | 81.7 |
| 2-person Carpool | 50 | 66 | 4.2 |
| 3-or-more-person Carpool | 28 | 16 | 1.0 |
| Public Transportation | 8 | 8 | 0.5 |
| Bike | 8 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Walked | 28 | 28 | 1.8 |
| Taxi, Motorcycle and Other <br> means | 18 | 19 | 1.2 |
| Worked at Home | 46 | 152 | 9.6 |

[^4]Appendix 2.8: Roger Mills County 2010 Population and Employment by TAZ

| $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ <br> $\mathbf{T A Z}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ <br> Population <br> $\mathbf{R M}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ <br> Employment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 294 | 100 |
| 2 | 329 | 100 |
| 3 | 352 | 175 |
| 4 | 125 | 170 |
| 5 | 274 | 165 |
| 6 | 318 | 135 |
| 7 | 374 | 145 |
| 100 | 210 | 36 |
| 200 | 525 | 225 |
| 201 | 276 | 125 |
| 300 | 47 | 45 |
| 400 | 523 | 375 |

Source: SORTPO

Appendix 2.9: Roger Mills County Major Employers

| MAJOR EMPLOYER | ADDRESS | CITY | TAZ <br> NO | 2015 NO. of <br> EMPLOYEES |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Cheyenne Lumber \& Steel | 321 N. L.L. Males <br> Ave. | Cheyenne | 200 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| Cheyenne Elementary School | 910 F.K. Buster Ave. | Cheyenne | 201 | 40 |
| Market Square Thriftway | 300 S. L.L. Males Ave | Cheyenne | 200 | 12 |
| Cheyenne High School | 910 F.K. Buster Ave. | Cheyenne | 201 | 25 |
| Cheyenne City Hall | 414 E. Broadway | Cheyenne | 200 | 7 |
| District County Barn \#1 | P.O. Box 708 | Cheyenne | 201 | 19 |
| Dobson Telephone Co | 200 S. L.L. Males Ave. | Cheyenne | 200 | 10 |
| Farm Supply | P.O. Box 443 | Cheyenne | 200 | 16 |
| HiPro Feed | N. US Hwy 283 | Cheyenne | 201 | 15 |
| Martin's Grocery Store | 203 W. Broadway | Cheyenne | 200 | 11 |
| M’s Motel | 401 S. Cearlock Ave. | Cheyenne | 200 | 2 |
| Roger Mills Emergency Mgt. t | 107 S. LL. Males Ave. | Cheyenne | 200 | 135 |


| MAJOR EMPLOYER | ADDRESS | CITY | TAZ <br> NO | 2015 NO. of <br> EMPLOYEES |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Roger Mills Court House | 500 E. Broadway | Cheyenne | 201 | 100 |
| Roger Mills Memorial Hosp. | 501 S. L.L. Males Ave. | Cheyenne | 201 | 40 |
| Security State Bank | 402 Broadway | Cheyenne | 200 | 20 |
| District County Barn \#2 | SH 34 | Hammon | 400 | 18 |
| Hammon Elevator | 509 Main St. | Hammon | 400 | 6 |
| Hammon Public Schools | 802 Shockey St. | Hammon | 400 | 55 |
| Sorce: |  |  |  |  |

Source: SORTPO

## Appendix 2.10: Environmental and Development Concerns

The environmental features and constraints were identified using secondary source information from the following: United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), Oklahoma Geological Survey, Oklahoma Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources, Oklahoma Department for Environmental Quality (ODEQ), United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), United States Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), United States Geological Survey (USGS), Oklahoma University Geographic Information System (GIS) and other state and local agencies

Streams are natural corridors that provide habitat for fish, insects, wildlife and recreational benefits to people such as hunting, fishing, boating, bird watching, as well as, aesthetic benefits. Streams also provide drinking water for wild animals, livestock and people. There are two (2) major rivers in the county, supplied by numerous streams; however, following years of extreme drought, many of these steams are dry. As of the origin of this plan, none are on the "watch list" of the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) and none are designated as scenic waterways.

State and federal agencies classify plants and animals as threatened or endangered when their numbers are low or declining due to direct destruction (from development or pollution, for example) or loss or degradation of suitable habitat. The presence of a threatened or endangered species in an area is an indicator of a better or good quality environment. However, there is no state or federally listed endangered species specific to Roger Mills County.

The Special Flood Hazard Area is an area designated width along a stream or river with a $1 \%$ chance of flooding annually. These areas are protected to prevent any increase in the risks or severity of possible future floods and to maintain their natural and ecological benefits.

The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) is a list of properties determined significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture, by virtue of design or architectural criteria, association with historical persons and events, and/or value for historic or prehistoric information. Under state and federal law, NRHP listed and NRHP eligible properties are afforded equal protection from impact. NRHP properties are designated to help state and local governments, Federal agencies, and others identify important historic and archaeological resources, to ensure their protection, either through preservation, or minimization and mitigation of impact.

Feature List

| Description | Location |
| :--- | :--- |
| Cheyenne City Park | Cheyenne |
| Metcalfe Museum | Cheyenne |
| Veterans Memorial | Cheyenne |
| Washita Battlefield National Historic Site | Cheyenne |
| South Canadian River | Roger Mills Co. |
| Washita River | Roger Mills Co. |
| Red Hills Wind Farm | Roger Mills Co. |
| Elk City 1 Wind Farm | Roger Mills Co. |
| Elk City 2 Wind Farm | Roger Mills Co. |
| Big Smile Wind Farm | Roger Mills Co. |

[^5]Appendix 2.11: Tribal Jurisdictions


Appendix 2.12: Roger Mills County Collision Total, 2011-2015

|  | FATALITY | INCAP INJ | NON <br> INCAP INJ | POSSIBLE <br> INJURY | PD | TOTAL |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Collisions | 14 | 39 | 72 | 46 | 140 | 311 |
| Persons | 15 | 48 | 96 | 60 | 0 | 219 |

Source: ODOT Traffic Engineering Div. Collision Analysis and Safety Branch
Appendix 2.13: Roger Mills County Collision Locations, 2011-2015

|  | HIGHWAY COLLISIONS |  |  |  | CITY STREET COLLISIONS |  |  |  | COUNTY ROAD COLLISIONS |  |  |  | TOTAL COLLISIONS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | FAT | INJ | PD | TOT | FAT | INJ | PD | TOT | FAT | INJ | PD | TOT | FAT | INJ | PD | TOT |
| 2011 | 3 | 28 | 31 | 62 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 14 | 30 | 4 | 44 | 45 | 93 |
| 2012 | 6 | 27 | 20 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 10 | 22 | 6 | 39 | 30 | 75 |
| 2013 | 1 | 22 | 17 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 9 | 19 | 2 | 31 | 26 | 59 |
| 2014 | 1 | 17 | 13 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 15 | 2 | 23 | 21 | 46 |
| 2015 | 0 | 14 | 13 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 20 | 18 | 38 |
| Total: | 11 | 108 | 94 | 213 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 48 | 46 | 97 | 14 | 15 | 14 | 31 |

Source: ODOT Traffic Engineering Div. Collision Analysis and Safety Branch
Appendix 2.14: Roger Mills County Collisions by Type of Collisions, 2011-2015

| TYPE OF COLLISION | TOTAL |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FAT | INJ | PD | TOT | PCT. |
| Rear-End (front-to-rear) | 0 | 4 | 9 | 13 | $\mathbf{4 . 2}$ |
| Head-On (front-to-front) | 1 | 2 | 5 | 8 | $\mathbf{2 . 6}$ |
| Right Angle (front-to-side) | 0 | 14 | 8 | 22 | $\mathbf{7 . 1}$ |
| Angle Turning | 0 | 9 | 14 | 23 | $\mathbf{7 . 4}$ |
| Sideswipe Same Direction | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | $\mathbf{0 . 3}$ |
| Sideswipe Other Direction | 1 | 6 | 7 | 14 | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ |
| Fixed Object | 8 | 55 | 45 | 108 | $\mathbf{3 4 . 7}$ |
| Animal | 0 | 6 | 18 | 23 | $\mathbf{7 . 4}$ |
| Overturn/Rollover | 4 | 55 | 24 | 83 | $\mathbf{2 6 . 7}$ |
| Other Single Vehicle Crash | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | $\mathbf{1 . 0}$ |
| Other | 0 | 5 | 8 | 13 | $\mathbf{4 . 2}$ |
|  | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

[^6]Appendix 2.15: Roger Mills County Collisions Vehicle by Vehicle Type, 2011-2015

| Vehicle Type | TOTAL |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FAT | INJ | PD | TOT | PCT. |
| Passenger Vehicle-2 Door | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | $\mathbf{1 . 0}$ |
| Passenger Vehicle-4 Door | 0 | 20 | 26 | 46 | $\mathbf{1 1 .}$ |
| Passenger Vehicle- <br> Convertible | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | $\mathbf{0 . 2}$ |
| Pickup Truck | 8 | 74 | 107 | 189 | $\mathbf{4 5 . 3}$ |
| Single Unit Truck (2 axles) | 0 | 4 | 3 | 7 | $\mathbf{1 . 7}$ |
| Single Unit Truck (3 or more <br> axels) | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | $\mathbf{1 . 4}$ |
| Truck/Trailer | 0 | 8 | 13 | 21 | $\mathbf{5 . 0}$ |
| Truck-Tractor (bobtail) | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | $\mathbf{0 . 7}$ |
| Truck-Tractor/Semi-Trailer | 2 | 29 | 58 | 89 | $\mathbf{2 1 . 3}$ |
| Motorcycle | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | $\mathbf{0 . 5}$ |
| Farm Machinery | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | $\mathbf{0 . 2}$ |
| ATV | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | $\mathbf{1 . 0}$ |
| Sport Utility Vehicles | 0 | 23 | 15 | 38 | $\mathbf{9 . 1}$ |
| Passenger Van | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | $\mathbf{0 . 7}$ |
| Truck More Than 10,000 lbs. | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | $\mathbf{0 . 2}$ |
| Van (10,000 lbs. or less) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | $\mathbf{0 . 5}$ |
|  | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

[^7]Appendix 2.16: Roger Mills County Collision by Driver Action, 2011-2015

| Unsafe/Unlawful | Apparently Normal |  |  | Alcohol Involved |  |  |  |  |  | Sleep <br> Suspected |  |  | Drug Use <br> Indicated |  |  | Unknown Condition |  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Ability Impaired |  |  | Odor <br> Detected |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fat | Inj * | PD | Fat | Inj | PD | Fat | Inj | PD | Fat | Inj | PD | Fa | Inj * | PD | Fat | Inj | PD | Fat | Inj * | PD | Tot | Pcnt |
| Failed to Yield |  | 16 | 9 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 | 9 | 26 | 6.3 |
| Failed to Stop |  | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 | 4 | 6 | 1.5 |
| Failed to Signal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improper Turn |  | 6 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 11 | 17 | 4.1 |
| Improper Start |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improper Stop |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improper Backing |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0.7 |
| Improper Parking |  | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1.2 |
| Improper Passing |  | 2 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 | 7 | 9 | 2.2 |
| Improper Lane Change |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Left of Center |  | 4 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 21 | 5.1 |
| Following Too Close |  | 2 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 6 | 8 | 1.9 |
| Unsafe Speed | 2 | 39 | 25 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 | 4 | 40 | 29 | 73 | 17.7 |
| DWI |  |  |  | 1 | 17 | 4 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 22 | 4 | 27 | 6.5 |
| Inattention | 1 | 25 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 9 | 5 |  |  |  | 3 | 4 |  | 5 | 38 | 19 | 62 | 15.0 |
| Negligent Driving |  | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 6 | 1.5 |
| Defective Vehicle |  | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 4 | 7 | 1.7 |
| Wrong Way |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No Improper Action | 2 | 50 | 73 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 51 | 75 | 128 | 31.0 |
| Other |  | 6 | 6 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 | 7 | 6 | 15 | 3.6 |
| Total | 5 | 160 | 174 | 3 | 18 | 8 |  | 7 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 5 |  | 1 |  | 7 | 5 | 7 | 16 | 202 | 195 | 413 | 100 |
| Percent | 1.2 | 38.7 | 42.1 | 0.7 | 4.4 | 1.9 |  | 1.7 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 2.7 | 1.2 |  | 0.2 |  | 1.7 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 3.9 | 48.9 | 47.2 | 100 |  |

Source: ODOT Traffic Engineering Div. Collision Analysis and Safety Branch

## Appendix 2.17: Two Lane Highways Without Shoulders



Source: Oklahoma Department of Transportation


Appendix 2.18: Steep Hills and Sharp Curves

Source: Oklahoma Department of Transportation

## Appendix 2.19: Roger Mills County Traffic Count Map, 2014



## Appendix 2.20: Rogers Mills County Functional Classification and Road Systems



1. The National Highway System (NHS) represents four percent (4\%) to five percent (5\%) of the total public road mileage in the U.S. This system was designed to contain the follow subcategories:
a. Interstate - The current interstate system retained its separate identity within the NHS along with specific provisions to add mileage to the existing Interstate subsystem.
b. Other Principal Arterials -These routes include highways in rural and urban areas which provide access between an arterial route and a major port, airport, public transportation facility or other intermodal transportation facility.
c. Intermodal Connecting Links -These are highways that connect NHS routes to major ports, airport, international border crossings, public transportation and transit facilities, interstate bus terminals and rail and intermodal transportation facilities.
2. The Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET). This system includes the Dwight D. Eisenhower System of Interstate and Defense Highways, identified as strategically important to the defense of the United States.
3. The National and State Scenic Byways recognize highways that are outstanding examples of our nation's beauty, culture and recreational experience in exemplifying the diverse regional characteristics of our nation.

Functional classification is the grouping of roads, streets and highways into integrated systems ranked by their importance to the general welfare, motorist and land use structure. It is used to define the role that any particular road should play in providing mobility for through movements and access adjoining land. This grouping acknowledges that roads have different levels of importance and provides a basis for comparing roads fairly.

Historically, one of the most important uses of functional classification of streets has been to identify streets and roads that are eligible for federal funds. The original federal aid primary, federal aid secondary, federal aid urban and national interstate systems all relied on functional classification to select eligible routes. In 1991, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) eliminated the primary, secondary and urban federal aid systems and created the National Highway System (NHS). ISTEA continued the requirement that a street, road or highway had to be classified higher than a "local" in urban areas and higher than a "local" and "minor collector" in rural areas before federal funds could be spent on it. The selection of routes eligible for NHS funding was also based on functional criteria. While eligibility for federal funding continues to be an important use for functional classification, it has also become an effective management tool in other areas of transportation planning.

Streets are grouped into functional classes according to the character of service they are intended to provide. Oklahoma's Functional Classification system undergoes a
comprehensive review after each decennial U.S. Census. The chart below helps depict the hierarchy of the roadway system. As the figure indicates, local streets provide the most access to the adjacent properties, but function poorly in terms of mobility. Freeways exhibit high mobility because of speeds and volumes, serve poorly as access to adjacent roads and properties. Streets that carry higher volumes of traffic should have a limited number of "curb cuts" (driveway openings, few intersections) so traffic movement will not be impeded.

The functional classification of streets includes the following functional classes: Interstate, Freeway, Rural Principal Arterial, Rural Minor Arterial, Rural Major Collector and Rural Minor Collector.

Rural Principal Arterial - A rural principal arterial road includes the following service characteristics:

- Traffic movements with trip length and density suitable for substantial statewide travel.
- Traffic movements between urban areas with populations over 25,000.
- Traffic movements at high speeds.
- Divided four-lane roads.
- Desired LOS C.

Rural Minor Arterial - A rural minor arterial road includes the following service characteristics:

- Traffic movements with trip length and density suitable for integrated interstate or inter-county service.
- Traffic movements between urban areas or other traffic generators with populations less than 25,000 .
- Traffic movements at high speeds.
- Undivided four-lane roads.
- Striped for one or two lanes in each direction with auxiliary lanes at intersections as required by traffic volumes.
- Desired LOS C.

Rural Major Collector - A rural major collector road includes the following service characteristics:

- Traffic movements with trip length and density suitable for inter-county service.
- Traffic movements between traffic generators, between traffic generators, larger cities and between traffic generators and routes of a higher classification.
- Traffic movements subject to a low level of side friction.
- Development may front directly on the road.
- Controlled intersection spacing of 2 miles or greater.
- Striped for one lane in each direction with a continuous left turn lane.
- Desired LOS C.

Rural Minor Collector - A rural minor collector road includes the following service characteristics:

- Traffic movements between local roads and collector roads.
- Traffic movements between smaller communities and developed areas.
- Traffic movements between locally important traffic generators within their remote regions.
- Two-lane undivided roads with intersections at grade and designed to take a minimum interference of traffic from driveways appropriate to a rural setting.
- Striped for one lane in each direction.
- Desired LOS B.

Rural Local Road - A rural local road includes the following service characteristics:

- Two-lane undivided roads with intersections at grade.
- Traffic movements between collectors and adjacent lands.
- Traffic movements involving relatively short distances.
- Desired LOS A.


## Level of Service

Level of Service (LOS): A phrase representative of several factors, including speed, travel time, traffic interruptions and operating cost of a traffic facility (roadway), used to measure the quality of the facility.

Level of Service Ranges from LOS A: Indicates good operating conditions with little or no delay, to LOS F, which indicates extreme congestion and long vehicle delays.

The following is a list of the various LOS with abbreviated definitions from the Highway Capacity Manual:

- LOS A: Describes a condition with low traffic volumes with little or no delays. There is little or no restriction in maneuverability due to the presence of other vehicles. Drivers can maintain their desired speeds and can proceed through signals without having to wait unnecessarily. Operating capacity can be measured as less than thirty percent (30\%) of capacity.
- LOS B: Describes a condition with stable traffic flow with a high degree of choice to select speed and operating conditions, but with some influence from other drivers. Operating capacity can be measured as less than fifty percent (50\%) of capacity.
- LOS C: Describes the beginning of the range of flow in which the operation of individual users becomes significantly affected by interactions with others in the traffic stream. LOS C is normally utilized as a measure of "average conditions" for design of facilities in suburban and urban locations. Operating capacity can be measured as less than sixtynine percent (69\%) of capacity.
- LOS D: Describes high density flow in which speed and freedom to maneuver is severely restricted even though flow remains stable. LOS D is considered acceptable during short periods of time and is often used in large urban areas. Operating capacity can be measured as less than seventy percent (70\%) to ninety percent (90\%) of capacity.
- LOS E: Describes operating conditions at or near capacity. Operations at this level are usually unstable, because small increases in flow or minor disturbances within the traffic stream will cause breakdowns. Operating capacity can be measured as between ninety percent (90\%) to ninety-nine percent (99\%) of capacity.
- LOS F: Is used to define forced or breakdown flow. This condition exists whenever the amount of traffic approaching a point exceeds the amount that can be served. LOS F is characterized by demand volumes greater than the roadway capacity. Under these conditions, motorists seek other routes in order to bypass congestion, thus impacting adjacent streets. Operating capacity can be measured above one hundred percent (100\%) of capacity.

Future increases in traffic volume can be traced to population growth and land use development patterns. Capacity and LOS can also be diminished by increasing the number of access points and median cuts on the road network.

## Appendix 2.21: Structurally Deficient and Functionally Obsolete Bridges



Structurally Deficient and Functionally Obsolete Bridges

## Appendix 2.22: National Highway Freight Network - Oklahoma

The NHFN includes the following subsystems of roadways:

- Primary Highway Freight System (PHFS): This is a network of highways identified as the most critical highway portions of the U.S. freight transportation system determined by measurable and objective national data. The network consists of 41,518 centerlines miles, including 37,436 centerline miles of Interstate and 4,082 centerline miles of non-Interstate roads.
- Other Interstate portions not on the PHFS: These highways consist of the remaining portion of Interstate roads not included in the PHFS. These routes provide important continuity and access to freight transportation facilities. These portions amount to an estimated 9,511 centerline miles of Interstate, nationwide, and will fluctuate with additions and deletions to the Interstate Highway System.
- Critical Rural Freight Corridors (CRFCs): These are public roads not in an urbanized area which provide access and connection to the PHFS and the Interstate with other important ports, public transportation facilities, or other intermodal freight facilities.
- Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFCs): These are public roads in urbanized areas which provide access and connection to the PHFS and the Interstate with other ports, public transportation facilities, or other intermodal transportation facilities.

| Primary Highway Freight System (PHFS) Routes |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| ROUTE No. | START POINT | END POINT | LENGTH <br> (MILES) |
| Creek Type | I44 | U75 | 4.9 |
| I240 | I44 | I35 | 4.61 |
| I244 | OK3R | I44 | 3.52 |
| I35 | TX/OK Line | OK/Ks Line | 236.13 |
| I40 | TX/OK Line | I35 | 151.76 |
| I40 | I35 | OK/AR line | 177.96 |
| I44 | I240 | 4.68 Miles North of I40 | 7.92 |
| I44 | I35 | OK/MO Line | 194 |
| U412 | OK6P | I44 | 6.4 |
|  | Subtotal |  |  |


| PHFS Intermodal Connectors |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FACILITY ID | FACILITY NAME | FACILITY DESCRIPTION | LENGTH <br> (MILES) |
| OK2L | Williams Pipeline Station | 21st St. (33rd W. Avenue to Burlington Northern RR at 23rd St.) | 1.27 |


| PHFS Intermodal Connectors |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FACILITY ID | FACILITY NAME | FACILITY DESCRIPTION | LENGTH <br> (MILES) |
| OK3R | Burlington Northern <br> Railroad | 23rd St. (BN Terminal to Southwest Avenue) SW Avenue (23rd St. to I-244 ramp.) | 0.56 |
| OK5P | Port of Catoosa | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SR } 266 \text { (Port to US } \\ & \text { 169) } \end{aligned}$ | 11.42 |
| 0K6P | Johnston's Port 33 <br> (Verdigris River near <br> Muskogee) | From US 412/NS 414, south 0.25 miles, east 1 mile to Terminal | 1.14 |
| Subtotal |  |  | 14.39 |
| PHFS TOTAL |  |  | 801.58 |



## Appendix 3: Future Conditions

## Appendix 3.1: ODOT 8-year Construction Work Program 2016-2023



ODOT CONST. WORK PROGRAM 2016-2023
Roger Mills County

| PROJECT ID | LOCATION | COST |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 27899(04) (FFY 2017) BRIDGE \& APPROACHES | US-283: OVER DEAD WARRIOR CREEK, 7.4 MILES NORTH OF THE SH-47 West JCT. | \$2,130,246 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 29530(05) (FFY } 2019 \\ & \text { RIGHT OF WAY } \end{aligned}$ | SH-152, WIDEN AND RESURFACE BEGIN AT THE TEXAS S/L AND EXTEND EAST TO THESH-30 JCT. THIS PROJECT HAS A 1.2 MILE EXCEPTION. Right of way for 29430(04) | \$381,500 |
| 29530(06) (FFY 2019) UTILITIES | SH-152, WIDEN AND RESURFACE BEGIN AT THE TEXAS S/L AND EXTEND EAST TO THESH-30 JCT. THIS PROJECT HAS A 1.2 MILE EXCEPTION. Utilities for 29430(04) | \$381,500 |
| 10094(04) (FFY 2020) WIDEN, RESURFACE \& BRIDGE | US-283 FR 8.0 MI NORTH OF THE BECKHAM C/L NORTH TO SH-47, IN CHEYENNE | \$9,500,000 |
| 29530(04) (FFY 2022) <br> WIDEN \& RESURFACE | SH-152, WIDEN AND RESURFACE BEGIN AT THE TEXAS S/L AND EXTEND EAST TO THESH-30 JCT. THIS PROJECT HAS A 1.2 MILE EXCEPTION. | \$6,500,000 |


| Asset Preservation Plan |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
| 27899(04) (FFY 2019) | SH 30 \& SH 47 - Begin @ SH 30/SH 47 JCT <br> BRIDGE \& APPROACHES | SE of Reydon \& Extend N to SH 30/SH 33 <br> JCT |  | 

ODOT CIRB WORK PROGRAM 2016-2019

| 25478(04) (FFY 2017) Grade, Drain \& Surface | CO RD (6514C) from 2.0 MI east of Cheyenne east 7.0 MI to 6544C | \$2,956,100 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 306914(04) (FFY 2017) <br> Grade, Drain | Grade Drain and Surface major Collector 6512C beginning at SH 47 extending North 5.0 MI | \$1,125,000 |
| 30074(05) (FFY 2019) <br> Bridge \& Approaches | Bridge and approaches over Canadian River N171E076.5 PE for 30074(04) | \$90,000 |

## Appendix 4: Financial

## Appendix 4.1: Federal Funding Categories

| STREETS \& HIGHWAYS |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Federal Highway Administration Formula Program | - Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation (BR) <br> - Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) <br> - Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) <br> - Interstate Maintenance (IM) <br> - National Highway System (NHS) <br> - Surface Transportation Program (STP) (Statewide, Urbanized Area, Enhancement and Safety) |
| Federal Highway Administration Discretionary Programs: | - American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA <br> - Demonstration Funds <br> - High Priority Projects (HPP) <br> - Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) <br> - Transportation Community Systems Preservation (TCSP) <br> - Other Discretionary Earmarks |
| Federal Transit <br> Administration <br> Formula Programs | - Sec. 5307 - Urbanized Area Funds (Oklahoma City UZA and Norman UZA) <br> - Sec. 5310 - Elderly and Persons with Disabilities Program <br> - Sec. 5311 - Non-Urbanized Area Formula Program <br> - Sec. 5316 - Jobs Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) <br> - Sec. 5317 - New Freedom (NF) <br> - Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) - Transferred from FHWA to FTA |
|  | Discretionary Programs: <br> - Sec. 5309 - Discretionary Capital Program <br> - Other Discretionary Earmarks |
| Public Transit Revolving Fund |  |
| Railroad |  |

Source: FHWA

| Appendix 4.2: Funding Category Summary |
| :--- |
| State FUNDING ELIGIBILITY <br> County Equipment <br> Revolving Fund  <br> Industrial, Historic site and <br> Lake Access Funds Can be used on city streets and county roads. <br> County Improvements for <br> Roads and Bridges, (CIRB) Only contract projects let thru ODOT <br> Federal Bridge between 50 \& 80 sufficiency rating. <br> Federal Bridge Funds <br> Bridge Replacement Funds <br> (BR) Bridge < 50 sufficiency rating \& functionally obsolete or <br> structurally deficient. <br> Bridge Rehabilitation (BH)  <br> Preventive Maintenance  <br> (PM) Must have a systematic process for project selection. <br> Safety Bridge Inspection  |
| Surface Transportation <br> Program |
| FHWdated by the Federal Highway Administration, |
| Road projects, grade, drain and surface on county major <br> and minor collectors. Funding may provide up to 80 <br> percent of the construction costs. Local governments <br> fund the remaining 20 percent match plus costs for <br> engineering, right of way and utility relocation. |
| Emergency Relief (ER) <br> Funds |
| Emergency Transportation <br> and Revolving Fund (ETR) |
| Circuit Engineering District <br> Revolving fund |
| County Road \& Bridge <br> Improvement Fund (CBR) |
| fource: ODOT |
| from the fund. |

Appendix 4.3: Apportionment of Statutory Revenues

|  | FY 2011-12 | FY 2012-13 | FY 2013-14 | FY 2014-15 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Circuit <br> Engineering <br> District <br> Revolving Fund | $\$ 4,463,612.89$ | $\$ 3,759,042.61$ | $\$ 4,257,973.22$ | $\$ 3606,553.448$ |
| Counties for <br> Bridge \& Road <br> Improvement | $\$ 29,469,291.00$ | $\$ 24,556,139.05$ | $\$ 28,025,910.64$ | $\$ 23,430,017.08$ |
| Counties for <br> Roads | $\$ 233,167,431.04$ | $\$ 224,693,222.81$ | $\$ 252,415,798.31$ | $\$ 254,470,157.23$ |
| County <br> Improvement <br> Road and <br> Bridge <br> Revolving Fund | $\$ 96,381,44.43$ | $\$ 99,297,039.31$ | $\$ 129,693,227.84$ | $\$ 138,133,545.79$ |
| County Road <br> Fund | $\$ 16,567,078.24$ | $\$ 17,075,040.15$ | $\$ 18,701,249.31$ | $\$ 17,701,249.31$ |
| County Road <br> Improvement <br> Revolving Fund | $\$ 23,162,249.21$ | $\$ 23,869,001.05$ | $\$ 26,138,425.71$ | $\$ 26,138,425.71$ |
| High Priority <br> State Bridge <br> Revolving Fund | $\$ 6,3036,200.98$ | $\$ 5,932,688.65$ | $\$ 6,159,069.25$ | $\$ 6,225,331.10$ |
| Public Transit <br> Revolving Fund | $\$ 3,850,000.00$ | $\$ 3,850,000$ | $\$ 3,850,000$ | $\$ 3,850,000$ |
| Railroad <br> Maintenance <br> Fund | $\$ 666,387.67$ | $\$ 716,415.44$ | $\$ 837,887.56$ | $\$ 826,792.79$ |
| Rebuild <br> Oklahoma <br> Access \& Driver <br> Safety Fund | $\$ 250,700,000.00$ | $\$ 292,400,000.00$ | $\$ 352,100,000.00$ | $\$ 411,800,000.00$ |
| State Hwy. <br>  <br> Maintenance <br> Funds | $\$ 2,079,421.18$ | $\$ 3,123,679.15$ | $\$ 7,246,116.42$ | $\$ 4,785,497.76$ |
| State <br> Transportation <br> Fund | $\$ 208,864,879,28$ | $\$ 204,316,899.57$ | $\$ 213,905,376.86$ | $\$ 214,115,706.14$ |

Source: Oklahoma Tax Commission, Apportionment of Statutory Revenues

## Appendix 4.4: Rogers Mills County CIRB Funding FY 2015-2019

|  | FY 2016 | FY 2017 | FY 2018 | FY 2019 | TOTAL |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roger Mills <br> County | $\$ 6,275,000$ | $\$ 4,081,100$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 90,000$ | $\$ 10,446,100$ |

Source: ODOT

## Appendix 5: Public Participation

Appendix 5.1: Roger Mills County Socio Economic Characteristics

|  | Roger <br> Mills <br> County | Oklahoma |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total Population (2010 Census) | 3,647 | $3,751,351$ |
| Average household size | 2.84 | 2.56 |
| Average household income | 468,157 | $\$ 47,529$ |
| Median age | $18.3 \%$ | $14.7 \%$ |
| Persons 65 years and over | $\$ 1,003$ | $\$ 1,150$ |
| Median selected monthly owner costs <br> with mortgage* | $\$ 496$ | $\$ 717$ |
| Median gross rent* | $12.3 \%$ | $16.6 \%$ |
| Percent in poverty* | $8.1 \%$ | $11.3 \%$ |
| Percent with a disability under age 65 <br> years* | $9.5 \%$ | $17.8 \%$ |
| Percent without health insurance <br> coverage, under 65 years | $2.4 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ |
| Percent veterans | $3.0 \%$ | $9.6 \%$ |
| Percent foreign born* | 25.8 | 21.2 |
| Language other than English spoken at <br> home, 5 years and older* | $10.6 \%$ |  |
| Mean travel time to work (min) |  |  |

Source: US Census - 2015 Census Estimates
*2010-2014 ACS

## Appendix 5.2: Roger Mills County Survey Results

1. In which City/County do you reside? Roger Mills
2. Do you work or attend school outside your home? Yes $7 \quad$ No 0
a. If so, How many days per week? $\underline{5}$
b. In which City/County do you work or attend school? Cheyenne: 6 Hammon: 1
c. What type of transportation do you use most often to go to work/school?

Drive (alone) 6 Carpool Bus $\underline{6}$ Walk Bicycle Motorcycle
Other (please specify) $\qquad$
3. How many miles do you travel (round trip) for work/school?
1-4: 4
10-14:0
20+:1
$\underline{30+: 2}$
$40+: 0$
50+:1
4. How much time does it usually take to travel to and from work/school (round trip)?
5. What are your usual methods of transportation for other trips such as shopping, appointments, social outings?

|  | Every <br> Day | $\mathbf{3 - 4}$ <br> Times a <br> Week | $\mathbf{1 - 2}$ <br> Times <br> Week | $\mathbf{1 - 2}$ <br> Times a <br> Month | Never |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Car (alone or with household <br> members) | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| Carpool with others | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Bus/Public Transportation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Motorcycle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Bicycle/Walk | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Other (specify) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

6. How many total miles do you travel for these other trips per day? (Circle your response)

| Less than 1 mile | $\underline{2}$ | $2-5$ miles $\underline{1}$ | $6-10$ miles $\underline{0}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $11-20$ miles $\underline{0}$ |  | $21-30$ miles $\underline{2}$ | $31-50$ mile $\underline{2}$ | 50 miles $+\underline{0}$ |

7. Please indicate how important each of the transportation system components is to you.

|  | Not <br> Important | Somewhat <br> Important | Important | Very <br> Important |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Improve Technology of Signals | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Intersection Improvements | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Pedestrian <br> Accommodations/Sidewalks | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Maintenance Improvements | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 |


|  | Not <br> Important | Somewhat <br> Important | Important | Very <br> Important |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bicycle Lanes | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| More Bus Service/Public transit | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Availability of Passenger Rail <br> Service | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Connection to US/State Highways | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Maintenance of Bridges | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Protecting the environment | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| Condition of traffic signage | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| Improving access to freight rail <br> service | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Providing a smooth driving <br> surface | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Improve existing roadways; <br> reconstruction of steep hills or <br> sharp curves | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Add shoulders on State or US <br> Highways | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Improve signs along existing <br> roadways | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |

8. Which do you think should be a priority when selecting transportation projects?

|  | Not <br> Important | Somewhat <br> Important | Important | Very <br> Important |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Supports Economic <br> Development | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| Improves Safety | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 |
| Reduces Congestion | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Bicycle Lanes or Facilities | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Improve Pedestrian <br> walkways | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Improves Travel Choices | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Reduces Energy <br> Consumption/Pollution | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Improves freight movement | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Other (specify) | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

9. What are some specific locations with traffic problems that you encounter? Entrance to the park, intersection of 283 \& Buster Ave. and 283 \& 47 West Jct.
10. So that we can ensure this survey has reached a variety of individuals in the community, please provide the information below (Circle your response):
$\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Your Age Group: } 18-24 & 25-34 \underline{2} & 35-44 \underline{1} & 45-54 \underline{2} & 55-65 \underline{1} & 65-74 & \underline{1}\end{array}$
Over 75
Gender: Male 4 Female $\underline{3}$
Household Income: Under \$34,000 \$35,000-\$50,000 \$50,001-\$75,000 $\underline{2}$ \$75,000+ 5
Race or Ethnicity: Caucasian 1 White 4 $\qquad$ 0__Hispanic? Yes, No
11. Please provide additional comments regarding transportation improvement needs There is no safe way to walk to the park in Cheyenne

## Appendix 5.3 Public Outreach

On January 14, 2016 a stakeholder's meeting was held at Cheyenne Senior Center in Cheyenne, Oklahoma. Prior to this meeting invitations were sent to local stakeholders.

SORTPO staff distributed a copy of the Roger Mills County 2036 LRTP on August 30, 2016 to the following agencies: Roger Mills County Courthouse in Cheyenne Oklahoma. No comments were received.

A legal notice advertising SORTPO's public hearing to adopt the Roger Mills County 2036 Long Range Transportation Plan was placed in the Cheyenne Star newspaper on September 1, 2016. The SORTPO Policy Board held a public hearing on September 29, 2016 to receive comments on the Roger Mills County 2036 LRTP prior to its' adoption. No comments were received.


[^0]:    Publication of this document was financed in part by funds provided by the United States Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. The provision of federal financial assistance should not be construed as denoting U.S. Government approval of plans, policies, programs or projects contained herein.

    The Southwest Oklahoma Regional Transportation Planning Organization (SORTPO) complies with all civil rights provisions of federal statues and related authorities that prohibit discrimination in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance. Therefore, SORTPO does not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, color, national origin, religion or disability, in the admission, access to and treatment in SORTPO programs and activities.

[^1]:    Source: SWODA

[^2]:    Source: SORTPO

[^3]:    Source: 2010-2014 ACS

[^4]:    Source: CTPP

[^5]:    Source: SORTPO, Roger Mills County, http://www.rogermills.org/Museums/Museums Index.htm

[^6]:    Source: ODOT Traffic Engineering Div. Collision Analysis and Safety Branch

[^7]:    Source: ODOT Traffic Engineering Div. Collision Analysis and Safety Branch

