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## Resolution

Resolution No. 2019-2
Adopting the McClain County 2040
Long Itange Transportation Plan
Whereas, the South Western Oklahoma Development Authority by Resolutiun 09-04 created the Southwest Ollahoma Regional Transpartation Plannims Organization (SOR'CPO); and

Whereas, Lhrough a Resolution 16-06 the Sauth Western Oklahnma Development Authorty expanded the regional transpertation planning area in include the Association of South Central Okdahoma fovernments (ASCOG), and

Whereas, SORTPO is tasked with developing a regional long range transportation planjand

Whereas, the long range transportation plan establishes goal and trensportation strategies addressing the regipn's reeds; and

Wherras, the McClain County 2040 Lung Range Transportation Plan (I. $\mathrm{K}^{1} \mathrm{I}^{\prime}$ ) was prepared by SORPTO consultatlon with member locial and state governments and lucal, state and Federal transpontation agencies; and

Whereasis, the l'lan las beer presented to the general puble for review and comment in accardance with the SORTPO Public Participation Plan in addition th the series of public meetings between December 19, 2018 and lanuary 21, 2019 and the Plan was posted on the SORTIP website for public revlew and comment; and

Whereas, the Plan has been prepared in accordance with all relative state and federal rules and regulations.

NOW, THEREFORE BE TT RESOLVED, that the SORPTO Polity Bgard hereby approves and adopts the McClaln County 2040 Long Kange Transportation Plan.
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## Chapter 1: Goal, Strategies and Issues

## SORTPO 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) and the Association of South Central Oklahoma Governments are two of the eleven (11) COGs.

In April 2012, the Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT) entered 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. Three councils of governments were selected as pilot projects: SWODA, Northern Oklahoma Development Authority (NODA) and Central Oklahoma Economic Development District (COEDD). SWODA on October 13 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2009$ by Resolution 09-04 (Appendix A) created the Southwest Oklahoma Regional Transportation Planning Organization (SORTPO) and was tasked with the responsibility of developing a regional plan that included preparation of eight (8) county plans. In Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2016, through a collaborative effort involving SORTPO, the Association of South Central Oklahoma Governments (ASCOG) and the ODOT a transportation planning pilot project comprising sixteen counties was initiated representing two Councils of Governments SWODA and ASCOG. The SWODA Board of Trustees adopted Resolution 16-06 (Appendix B) amending the SORTPO region.

Located in southwest Oklahoma, the SORTPO region is comprised of 14,180 square miles. (Map 1.1). The SORTPO region is comprised of sixteen (16) counties, one hundred-twenty (120) cities and towns and nineteen (19) conservation districts Total population for the SORTPO region according to the 2010 U.S. Census Bureau was 416,257 . Population data obtained from the 2012-2016 American Community Survey (ACS) estimates the population has increased to 421,747 . 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 installations and governmental offices. Population growth and shifts for the SORTPO region are dependent on many factors depending
 on a county. Each County in the region although a separate entity is interconnected through commerce, employment, health services, education and transportation.

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-today activities of SORTPO are supported by staff located in the SWODA (Burns Flat) and ASCOG (Duncan) offices. Staff, equipment, supplies, rent, consulting studies, and other expenses used to support staffing operations are reimbursable to SORTPO by the Federal

Highway Administration (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 FHWA and the 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 must safely, efficiently and effectively allow citizens to travel to work and to conduct their personal lives as well as 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 McClain 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, objectives and transportation strategies for addressing the region's transportation needs. The LRTP establishes the goals, objectives and transportation strategies for addressing the region's transportation needs. This planning process follows the three "c's" identified by federal transportation regulations: continuing, cooperation and comprehensive.

## Purpose of Plan

The 2040 McClain County 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 2040. The
 year 2040 was chosen as the planning horizon year for the LRTP for the following reasons:

- The year 2040 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.

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 goals, "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 strategies included in the LRTP arise from the needs and 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 how to 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. SORTPO's transportation planning process includes opportunities for the community's transportation stakeholders to participate in development of the LRTP. This process includes soliciting comments from the public on
current and future transportation needs. Appendix 4.1 illustrates survey results obtained during the planning process. Survey Question 11 includes information on the importance of selected transportation components in McClain County. Three components received the highest rating: maintenance of bridges, providing a smoothing driving surface and maintenance. When selecting projects survey respondents indicated in Question 12 a higher preference for projects that improve safety and reduces congestion.

As a means of achieving the successful implementation of the LRTP, the projects are developed in five-year increments. The five-year increment format will offer realistic goals in Chapter 5 relative to the LRTP's short range implementation activities. The incremental approach also provides a reasonable opportunity in scheduling state and /or federally funded transportation improvements within the county.

## Relationship and Requirements with State and Federal Agencies

The plan 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 nonmotorized 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 (Appendix C).

## Goals and Strategies

The planning process follows a hierarchy that includes goals and strategies to assist McClain County in planning and prioritization of transportation projects and programs. Goals are general statements of what we want the future to be like. The goals 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. Strategies are specific, quantifiable steps towards the realization of those goals. Table 1.2 identifies the goal categories for the McClain County.

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 SORTPO. 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: McClain County Goal Categories

| Goal | Description |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. Accessibility and <br> Mobility (pg. 6) | Improve accessibility and mobility for people and freight. |


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

## 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 county that improves access to health care facilities, education facilities, recreation centers, cultural and tourist sites and employment.
2. Develop a system to collect and monitor changes in population, employment, and major employers by Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ).
3. Conduct a freight assessment and study for the region.
4. 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.
5. Participate with state agencies, such as the Oklahoma Department of Transportation, Department of Commerce, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO), Regional Transportation Planning Organizations (RTPO), Regional Economic Development Agencies, rail industry and shippers of rail products to discuss and comment current rail issues affect the counties, regions and State.

## 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 and implement a bicycle and pedestrian public awareness and education program.
5. Develop a clearinghouse for regional data sets, such as pavement management systems and geographic information systems to help form sound planning decisions.
6. Facilitate and support the coordination of regional training opportunities.
7. Develop a 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. Prioritize transportation projects that serve major employment and activity centers, rail facilities and freight corridors
2. Identify the locations of major employment centers, including existing and proposed developments and identify types of transportation available.
3. Coordinate with local and tribal governments on the placement of regionally significant developments.
4. Maintain local, state and federal support for regional business airport.
5. Continue to coordinate transportation planning with adjoining counties, regions and councils of government for transportation needs and improvements beyond those in our region.
6. Working with area employers and stakeholders develop a database and map identifying transportation needs.
7. 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.
6. Develop a data file and create a map identifying location of wind farms and pipelines and relationship to communities and the transportation system.

## 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 finding and applying for funds.

## Goal 6: Maintenance and Preservation

Preserve the existing transportation network and promote system management to promote 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. Assist in the designation of corridors and development of procedures to provide for safe movement of hazardous materials.
5. Adopt best practices to provide and improve facilities for safe walking and bicycling.
6. Incorporate emergency service agencies in the transportation planning and implementation process.
7. Support the Oklahoma Department of Transportation in its plans to add and improve roadway shoulders on two lane highways.
8. Reduce the number of at grade rail highway crossings.
9. Upgrade passively protected at grade rail highway crossings.

## Goal 8: Community \& Health

Facilitate development of transportation projects and programs that support active lifestyles in the 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.
3. Identify funding opportunities and partners to increase low cost transportation opportunities.
4. Establish partnerships with local groups and agencies to provide transportation services.

## Goal 9: Tourism \& Travel

Improve travel opportunities through enhancement and preservation of access to tourism destinations or regionally significant facilities.

## Strategies:

1. Develop a regional map that identifies tourism destinations and regionally significant facilities.
2. Establish procedures to increase coordination and communication with local governments, tribal governments and state agencies to identify projects that impact the communities' transportation system.
3. Collaborate with local economic development authorities, State and Federal economic development agencies in the identification of current and future transportation projects.

## Key Issues, Challenges and Trends

There are many issues facing the area that have a direct or indirect impact on the transportation system. Rural communities have problematic transportation issues such as intersections, congestion and limited or no access to transit. This section is intended to identify these issues, challenges and trends. At the onset of the transportation planning process, the SORTPO staff, policy board and technical committee members identified key issues, trends and challenges that impact the transportation system. Key issues, challenges and trends were also identified through public surveys, stakeholder meetings, public comments, other plans, data sources, and reports.

## Key Issues:

- Maintain access to healthcare and emergency services.
- Potable water limits McClain County growth.
- Oilfield heavy truck traffic increasing wear on roads and bridges.
- Oilfield related trucks hauling liquid creating more impact to roads and bridges.
- Lack of Transit Services during the evening or weekend.
- Lack of shoulders on 2 lane highways.
- The area surrounding and including the towns of Newcastle, Blanchard, Goldsby, Cole, Dibble and Purcell are included in the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) and the Oklahoma City Area Regional Transportation Study Area (OCARTS).
- Lack of funding to adequately maintain roadway systems and bridges.
- Lack of funding for improvements of rail crossings.
- Steep hills and sharp curves.
- Problematic traffic issue locations (areas with high accidents, intersections, truck traffic generators).
- Traffic is rerouted from I-35 to local streets in Purcell and Goldsby.


## Challenges:

- Competition for medical professionals between urban and rural.
- Age of infrastructure.
- Attracting workforce to support the employment needs.
- Access to affordable high-speed internet.
- Competition for industry/business.
- Communication and coordination with Quapaw Tribe of Indiana and Chickasaw Nation development projects and transportation needs.
- Economy is dependent on the agriculture and the oil and gas industry.
- Working together regionally to attract/maintain workforce, industry and community
- Funding limitation - revenues continue to be limited to meet the transportation system needs over time.
- Lack of system to reevaluate how, when and where new roads are built versus investment in upgrade to the existing road system.
- Cities and towns in the TriCity area are commuter communities.
- I-35 congestion requires widening to from 4 lanes to 6 lanes from Norman south to access into Purcell and southbound I-35 access at Purcell north end.


## Trends:

- Growth occurring in the TriCity Area (Tuttle, Newcastle, and Blanchard) and Purcell.
- Growth continues for online shopping sales.
- Population is declining in the rural areas.
- Freight truck traffic will increase along I-35.
- Motor vehicles will continue to be the primary means of transportation.
- The energy sector and farming community will continue to rely heavily on trucks in rural areas.
- Technology impact on retail, employment and how medical services are obtained.
- Autonomous vehicle technology.
- National Household Travel Survey data reveals greater number of people are working from home.
- State of Oklahoma's budget negative impact.
- Rural population shrinking due to long term outmigration of young adults, fewer births, increased mortality among working age adults and aging population.
Increased mortality among working-age adults is recent trend contributing to lower population growth. Rising rates of prescription abuse, opioids and heroin overdose deaths contribute to this trend.


## Chapter 2: Current Conditions

This chapter provides a "snapshot" of current conditions that relate to transportation in McClain County. Demographics, economic conditions, environmental factors, community development and transportation and traffic data are included in this chapter. McClain County is in central Oklahoma (Map 1.1). The County is bordered by McClain County to the south, Canadian County to the north, Caddo and Comanche Counties to the west and McClain and Garvin Counties to the east. A portion of northern McClain County (need des

## History

McClain County is located along the eastern boundary of the SORTPO region and aaccording to the U.S. Census Bureau, the county has a total area of 580 square miles ( 571 square miles land and 9.6 square miles is water). The South Canadian River forms the northern border, draining much of the county. The Washita River flows near the southwestern corner.

The county economy has been based primarily on agriculture and cattle raising. Beginning in the early twentieth century drillers began testing for oil and gas deposits. New industry for the county includes: Duke Energy North America power plant near Newcastle and the River Wind Casino operated by the Chickasaw nation located on SH 9 in Goldsby.

McClain County's transportation systems includes highways, rail (freight), passenger rail and airports. Within the County there are two Interstate Highways: I-35 and I-44. Interstate 35 enters the county on the north at Goldsby on the McCall Bridge. The highway is parallel to
 the Canadian River through City of Purcell. This highway continues southward into Texas and north into Kansas. Interstate 44 (H.E. Bailey Turnpike) runs through the northwestern part of the county. The H.E. Bailey Turnpike Norman Spur connects this highway to the US-62/US-277/SH-9 intersection.

In addition to the interstate highways there are State and US Highways: US 62, US 77, US 177, SH 9, SH 24, SH 59, SH 74, SH 76, and SH 133

- US Highway 62 runs diagonally across the state, from the Texas state line in far southwestern Oklahoma to the Arkansas state line near Fayetteville. US-62/277/SH-9 serve as the southern terminus of SH-92 and the western terminus of SH-39. The three highways then angle northeast towards Blanchard, where they are briefly joined by State Highway 76. SH-9 splits off at a diamond interchange that also serves as the eastern terminus of the H.E. Bailey Turnpike Spur. The two U.S. routes continue north into Newcastle where the two routes encounter I-44 once again, at the northern terminus of the Bailey Turnpike. US-62 joins eastbound I-44 toward Oklahoma City, while US-277 terminates at the interchange.
- US Highway 77 runs north-south through the central part of the county, paralleling Interstate 35, connecting Texas to Kansas. It passes Wayne and Purcell, where it intersects with State Highway 39 and 74. US-77 and SH-39 split off SH-74 to head eastbound along Washington St. in downtown Purcell. Together, they cross the James C. Nance Memorial Bridge into Lexington, where SH-39 splits off. It then heads through Slaughterville and Noble before entering Norman.
- U.S. Route 177 is a spur of US 77. It is between South Haven, Kansas and Madill, Oklahoma. The route cuts across the narrow eastern tip of McClain County, where it begins concurrencies with both State Highway 59 and State Highway 3W. The three highways then cross the Canadian River into Pottawatomie County, where they meet SH-39 in Asher.
- State Highway 9 is an east-west highway crossing the center of the County. Traveling northeast from Chickasha, US-62/277/SH-9 are routed to the town of Blanchard. Four miles later, SH-9 splits away from the two U.S. routes at a diamond interchange that also serves as the eastern terminus of the H.E. Bailey Turnpike Spur.. At Interstate 35 and the McCall Bridge, SH-9 merges onto I-35 northbound to cross the Canadian River into Norman.
- State Highway 24 is a north south highway and runs for 21.1 miles almost entirely within McClain County. The highway begins where SH 74 crosses the McClain-Garvin County line, about three miles north of Maysville. From here, SH-24 runs west along the county line for three miles, where it turns due north then west again and returning to a due north course before intersecting SH-39. Continuing north and passing through the town of Washington, SH-24 turns back northward, crossing Walnut Creek. At the southern limit of the town of Goldsby, the road meets SH-74 again.
- State Highway 59 runs from north of Criner and immediately heads south ending near Wewoka. It turns east six miles crosses SH-74 and has an interchange with I-35. Then meets with US-77 south of Wayne, and passes through the small towns of Rosedale and Byars. Five miles east of Byars, the highway meets US 177 and turns north.
- State Highway 74, the southern section of SH-74 goes due north to Elmore City, where it intersects with SH-29. Continuing north of Elmore City the highway meets the southern terminus of SH 24 . Continuing into Purcell, SH-74 overlaps US-77 and SH-39 and then splits off and heads west. After its intersection with SH 24 it turns to north where it goes through the town of Goldsby and then ends at I-35.
- State Highway 76, runs north-south through central Oklahoma, begins north of the Texas border in Love County, south of the town of Leon. The highway continues through the towns of Wilson, Healdton, Ratliff City, Lindsay, Blanchard and Newcastle. SH-76 then has an interchange with the H.E. Bailey Turnpike Spur, and then meets the western terminus of State Highway 130 west of Newcastle. It then passes under Interstate 44 (but does not have an interchange with it) and ends at SH-37.
- State Highway 133 begins in Garvin County at the southern terminus is at SH-19 and crosses into McClain County and ends two miles north of the county line at SH-59 between Rosedale and Byars.

In 1996, the Atchison, Topeka \& Sante Fe railroad (ATSF) merged with the Burlington Northern Railroad to form the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway (BNSF). ATSF 's northsouth is still in use today as a main line of BNSF and is the route of the Amtrak Heartland

Flyer intercity passenger train between Oklahoma City and Fort Worth, Texas. The Heartland Flyer was launched on June 14, 1999 and provides service between Oklahoma City and Fort Worth, Texas. Map 2.1 illustrates the location of McClain County's transportation system.

Map 2.1: McClain County, Oklahoma


McClain County estimated population of 37,222 (2012-2016 ACS) equates to 64.17 people per square mile. Many county residents commute to work in the Oklahoma City area. The north quarter of the County including the cities of Blanchard, Newcastle, Purcell are included in the Oklahoma City Area Regional Transportation Study (OCARTS). The OCARTS study area also encompasses all of Oklahoma and Cleveland Counties and portions of Canadian, Logan Counties1. The OCARTS area is also designated as the Transportation Management Area (TMA) for the Oklahoma City metropolitan region. The County includes ten areas designated as a city or town, the largest being the City of Purcell.

> Blanchard is a city located in northern McClain and Grady Counties on US 62. The largest portion of Blanchard including schools, government and businesses are in McClain County. The city was organized originally by the Canadian Valley Construction Company in the fall of 1906. Blanchard is part of a rapidly growing area of northern McClain and Grady counties known as the "Tri-City Area" with Newcastle and Tuttle. Blanchard is within the OCARTS area. The City has a total area of 32.9 square miles ( 32.8 square miles of land and 0.1 square miles of water). Blanchard is described as a commuter town with much of its workforce commuting to nearby Norman and Oklahoma City. Predominant industries include education, retail, oil and gas, and agriculture. The 2012-2016 ACS population is 8,267.
$>$ Cole is a town on SH 74B approximately six miles southeast of Blanchard. In 1912 the town was surveyed and platted near the Oklahoma Central Railway (OCR). This railline was acquired by the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway in 1914. In 1942 the railroad abandoned the track between Purcell and Chickasha including the segment through Cole. Cole is within the OCARTS area. The town has a total area of 15.1 square miles of land. Cole is primarily a farm community. The 2012-2016 ACS population for the town is 625 .
$>$ Dibble is a town west of Purcell in western McClain County along SH 39 and approximately 1 mile east of SH76. The town was incorporated in 1937 and has a total area of 2.7 square miles land. Dibble is within the OCARTS area. The town is pprimarily a farming community. The 2012-2016 ACS population for the town is 977.
> Goldsby was incorporated in 1962 is a town and is located in north McClain County between SH 74 and SH 9. Goldsby is within the OCARTS area. The town has a total area of 19.3 square miles ( 19.2 square miles land and 0.04 square miles is water). The town lies within the Washington public school district and is home to the second largest casino in Oklahoma (Riverwind Casino on SH 9). Goldsby provides Washington with other resources such as fire department and water services. The Town of Goldsby maintains one airport for general aviation usage, David Jay Perry Airport, as well as several private landing fields.. Goldsby is a member of the Heart of Oklahoma Chamber of Commerce, and is at the center of a micropolitan trade area which includes the communities of Purcell, Lexington, Washington, and Wayne.

Predominant industries include education, oil and gas, Albert Engstrom Forest Regeneration Center, entertainment and retail. The 2012-2016 ACS population for the town is 2,173 .
$>$ Newcastle is at the intersection of US62/277 and SH 130 and located in northwestern McClain County. The City is nineteen miles south of Oklahoma City and part of the and is within the OCARTS area. The city has a total area of 62.5 square miles (of which, 55.8 square miles is land and 6.7 square miles is water). The city was incorporated as South Newcastle in 1962 and changed to Newcastle in 1965. The city limits of Newcastle encompassed just a few square miles until around 1960, when Oklahoma City began annexing huge chunks of land across the South Canadian river. Newcastle expanded, as did Tuttle and Blanchard, to prevent the city from trying to move across the river. In the 1980s, the city annexed the territory north of SH 9. Newcastle is considered to be part of a rapidly growing area known as the "Tri-City Area" with Tuttle and Blanchard. Retail and education are the primary industries in Newcastle. Predominant industries include education, retail, government and entertainment. The 2012-2016 ACS population for the town is 9,030.
$>$ Purcell is a city located at the intersection of I-35 and US 277 approximately thirteen miles south of Norman. Purcell is within the OCARTS area. The city has a total area of 10.5 square miles ( 10.1 square miles is land and 0.46 square miles is water). The area on the south end of Purcell is rapidly developing. Purcell is the county seat, founded as a railroad community in 1887 and incorporated in 1898. Before the land run of 1889 Purcell was the only community located on the boarder of the Unassigned lands. The Oklahoma Central Railway in 1907 reached Purcell and connected the Lehigh coal mines with Chickasha. This railway went bankrupt in 1908 and its assets were acquired by the by the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway. The train station is located on east Main Street near the old Santa Fe Depot, and has daily rail service provided by Amtrak's Heartland Flyer north to Norman and Oklahoma City, and south to Pauls Valley, Ardmore, Gainesville, and Fort Worth. Stephen Shephard Memorial Purcell Airport (Table 2.5) is located on west Chandle Road south of Purcell City Lake. Purcell is a member of the Heart of Oklahoma Chamber of Commerce, and is at the center of a micropolitan trade area which includes the communities of Goldsby, Lexington, Washington, and Wayne.

Purcell has two local medical facilities, Purcell Municipal Hospital located on the north side of the city and the Purcell Clinic. The Clinic is operated by the Chickasaw Nation Indian Health Service and owned by The Chickasaw Nation and serves members of all 530 recognized Native American Tribes with healthcare and prescriptions free of charge. Areas of interest and recreation include: four properties on the National Register of Historic Places (Hotel Love, McClain County Courthouse, U.S. Post Office and James C. Nance Memorial Bridge). Veterans Memorial Park was established downtown across from City Hall Brent and Bruehl Memorial Golf Course is located with the municipal pool near Purcell Lake. The discovery of oil and the development of thoroughbred horse ranching added to the City's small-business and agricultural base. Predominant industries include healthcare, education, manufacturing, and government. The 2012-2016 ACS population for the City is 6,349 .
> Washington is a town on SH 74 located 10 miles northwest of Purcell. The town was named after George Washington, first President of the United States. The town has a total area of 1.0 square mile. Washington is a member of the Heart of Oklahoma Chamber of Commerce, and is at the center of a micropolitan trade area which includes the communities of Goldsby, Lexington, Purcell and Wayne. Washington is within the OCARTS area. Predominant industries include education, farming and oil and gas. The 2012-2016 ACS population for the town is 677 .
$>$ Wayne is a town in McClain County is located at the intersection of US 277 and SH 59, 8 miles south of Purcell. The Town was platted in 1902. Wayne is part of the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area with a total area of 0.4 square miles. Wayne is a member of the Heart of Oklahoma Chamber of Commerce, and is at the center of a micropolitan trade area which includes the communities of Goldsby, Lexington, Purcell and Washington. Mid-America Technology Center is located near Wayne. Predominant industries include education and farming. The 2012-2016 ACS population for the town is 683 .

Table 2.1 provides population data for the cities, towns and County between 1980-2016. Additional demographic data can be found in Appendices 2.1-2.7. 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.

Transportation is crucial to keeping older adults independent, healthy and connected to friends, family, recreation, shopping and health services. 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 needs of this segment of population will continue to influence the transportation needs and services for this region.

Table 2.1: McClain County Population 1980-2016 ACS Estimate

|  | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 2012-2016 ACS <br> ESTIMATED <br> POPULATION |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Blanchard | 1,688 | 1,922 | 2,816 | 7,670 | 8,267 |
| Cole | 309 | 355 | 473 | 555 | 625 |
| Dibble | 348 | 181 | 289 | 878 | 977 |
| Goldsby | 603 | 816 | 1,204 | 1,801 | 2,173 |
| Newcastle | 3,076 | 4,214 | 5,435 | 7,685 | 9,030 |
| Purcell | 4,638 | 4,784 | 5,571 | 5,884 | 6,349 |
| Wayne | 621 | 519 | 714 | 688 | 683 |
| Washington | 477 | 279 | 520 | 618 | 677 |
| Balance of <br> McClain County | 8,531 | 9,725 | 10,718 | 8,727 | 8,441 |


|  | $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | 2012-2016 ACS <br> ESTIMATED <br> POPULATION |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| McClain County, <br> TOTAL | 20,291 | 22,795 | 27,740 | 34,506 | 37,222 |

Source: American Fact Finder, US Census
Data obtained from the 2012-2016 ACS further reveals:
$\checkmark$ Population was distributed between male (49.9\%) and female (50.1\%),
$\checkmark$ Median age - 38.3 years of age,
$\checkmark$ Race:

- White-84.1\%,
- African American - 1.0\%,
- American Indian - 6.0\%,
- Asian - 0.6\%, and
- Hispanic/Latino - 7.6\%,
$\checkmark$ Mean travel time to work - 27.0 minutes
$\checkmark$ Vehicles Available Workers 16 years and over - 16,736
- No vehicles available -1.6\%
- One vehicle available $-14.4 \%$
- Two vehicles available -45.3\%
- Three or more vehicles available -38.8\%
$\checkmark$ Total Housing Units - 14,760
- Occupied Housing Units - 13,532
- Owner Occupied Units - 10,718
- Renter Occupied Units - 2,814
- Single Family Detached Housing Units - 11,764
- Mobile Home or Other type of Home - 2,273
$\checkmark$ Educational Attainment population 25 years and Older - 24,583
- High School Graduate - 8,475
- Some College, no degree -5,719
- Associates Degree - 1,805
- Bachelor's Degree - 4,073
- Graduate or professional degree - 1,568
$\checkmark$ Commute Patterns to Work Age 16 years and Older - 16,736
- Car, truck or van, drove alone - 85.8\%
- Car, truck or van, carpooled - 6.5\%
- Public Transportation - 0.0\%
- Walked - 0.9\%
- Other Means - 1.0\%
- Worked at Home - 5.8\%
$\checkmark$ Civilian Employed Industry population 16 years and over - 17,038
- Agriculture and forestry - 1,306
- Construction - 1,561
- Manufacturing - 1,194
- Retail Trade - 2,003
- Transportation and warehousing and utilities - 981
- Finance and Insurance - 957
- Professional, scientific and management - 1,125
- Educational service and health care and social assistance - 3,757
- Arts, entertainment and recreation and accommodations - 1,172
- Other services, except public administration - 1,121
- Pubic Administration - 1,401

Annual labor force data for years 1990-2016 is in Figure 2.1 and Figure 2.2 illustrates the Civilian Labor Force between 1990-2017. The information portrayed in this graph developed by the Federal Reserve Bank illustrates a 25 -year picture of the McClain County Civilian Labor Force. Figure 2.3 contains business establishments for the years 2010 and 2015.

Figure 2.4 provides information related to vehicle registration data obtained from the Oklahoma Tax Commission (OTC). Automobile registration between 2012-2016 remains unchanged while there has been a decrease in registrations for commercial trailer, commercial truck, and commercial and truck and trailer. The data in the graph confirms that the primary vehicle is the automobile.

Figure 2.1: McClain County, Civilian Labor Force 1990-2016


Source: BLS

Figure 2.2: McClain County, County Business Patterns 1990-2017


Source: US. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Release: Unemployment in States and Local Areas (all other areas) Growth Rate Calculations | US recession dates

Figure 2.3: McClain County Business Patterns, 2010 and 2015


Source: US Census Statistics

Figure 2.4: McClain County Motor Vehicle Registration, 2012-2017


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.

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. The RTPO's are responsible for developing these zones and supporting data. As rural transportation planning continues to mature the delineation of TAZ will allow acquisition of data that supports the transportation planning process. ACOG developed TAZ maps and data for the areas of McClain County within their transportation planning area and SORTPO developed TAZ maps and data for the remaining areas of McClain. SORTPO staff developed TAZ boundaries based on county population as identified below:
$>$ Small populated counties (population $<6,000$ )

- population thresholds of $\underline{200}$ to 400 and employment thresholds of 200-300
> Medium populated counties (population 6,001-34,999)
- population thresholds of 400 to 600 and employment thresholds of $\underline{300-400}$
$>$ Large populated counties (population $>35,000$ )
- population thresholds of $\underline{600}$ to 800 and employment thresholds of $\underline{400-500}$

Geographically, the study area is subdivided into one hundred fourteen (114) TAZs and the socio-economic data (including population and employment) are summarized for each TAZ. Map 2.2 illustrates TAZ boundaries for the county. Maps 2.3 through 2.8 illustrate TAZ areas for the county, cities and towns. The 2012-2016 ACS population estimate of 38,685 and civilian employment of 21,657 were distributed into the TAZs. Appendix 2.8 provides information on the population and employment data by TAZ. The TAZ within and surrounding the cities/towns of Blanchard, Goldsby, Newcastle, Purcell and Washington have the largest concentration of population and employment. The more rural areas of the County require the Plan development to consider that a major employer is determined by the individual community. In some instances, a major employer may be identified as an employer with as few as 1-4 employees. Major employers by city/town and County by TAZ are included in Appendix 2.9.

Map 2.2: McClain County Traffic Analysis Zones


Source: SWODA

Map 2.3: Blanchard Traffic Analysis Zones


Source: SWODA

Map 2.4: Dibble Traffic Analysis Zones


Source: SWODA

Map 2.5: Goldsby Traffic Analyses Zones Need


[^1]Map 2.6: Newcastle City Traffic Analyses Zones Need


Source: SWODA

Map 2.7: Purcell Traffic Analysis Zones Need


[^2]Map 2.8: Washington Traffic Analysis Zones Need


Source: Landlocked GIS for SORTPO

## Physical Development Constraints and Conditions

There are transportation facilities, land ownership, existing development and environmental features that affect the growth of McClain County. These constraints both physical and manmade have shaped and impacted the development of the county. McClain County major constraints for development include: the Canadian River, I-35, I-44, state and US highways, railroad, large land ownership, and tribal land. Map 2.9 illustrates land under tribal jurisdiction.

Map 2.9: Tribal Jurisdictions in Oklahoma


Historic, Natural or Man Made Significant Features
McClain County is home to environmental features natural and cultural resources which can influence the transportation system. 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. 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 plan. 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 summarizes environmental concerns Appendix 2.11 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 include development of the McClain 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 State of Oklahoma Highway Safety Office's website www.ohso.ok.gov/strategic-planning-results.

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 the county. An analysis of collision records collected and maintained by ODOT was performed for the calendar years 2012-2016. Between 2012-2016 there were 3,331 collisions

in with forty (40) fatalities occurring on the highways and roads
in McClain County. The highest concentration of collisions occurred along I-35. Tables 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 provides information on total collisions, collision location by type of road and collisions by concentration and severity. Rear end collisions represented 29.6\% of collision type. Other collision types were caused by fixed object (24.0\%) and angle turning (11.3\%). Map 2.10 illustrates the location of collisions for the time 2012-2016. Appendices 2.12 and 2.13 provide supplemental information on collision data.

Table 2.2: McClain County Collision Total, 2012-2016

|  | FAT | INCAP INJ | NON INCAP <br> INJ | POSSIBLE <br> INJURY | PROPERTY <br> DAMAGE | TOTAL |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Collisions | 40 | 409 | 394 | 626 | 2,162 | 3,331 |
| Persons | 46 | 147 | 535 | 999 |  | 1,727 |

Source: ODOT Traffic Engineering Div. Collision Analysis and Safety Branch
Table 2.3: McClain County Collisions by Type of Road, 2012-2016

|  | HIGHWAY COLLISIONS |  |  |  | CITY STREETCOLLISIONS |  |  |  | COUNTY ROAD COLLISIONS |  |  |  | TOTAL COLLISIONS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fat | Inj * | PD | Tot | Fat | Inj $*$ | PD | Tot | Fat | Inj | PD | Tot | Fat | Inj * | PD | Tot |
| Rural | 19 | 251 | 412 | 682 |  |  |  |  |  | 45 | 53 | 98 | 19 | 296 | 465 | 780 |
| Blanchard | 3 | 52 | 149 | 204 |  | 15 | 66 | 81 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 67 | 215 | 285 |
| Byars |  | 3 | 1 | 4 |  | 3 | 1 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 2 | 8 |
| Cole |  | 6 | 6 | 12 |  | 3 | 4 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 10 | 19 |
| Dibble |  | 7 | 8 | 15 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 9 | 11 | 21 |
| Purcell | 6 | 209 | 345 | 560 |  | 25 | 64 | 89 |  |  |  |  | 6 | 234 | 409 | 649 |
| Rosedale |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Washington |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Wayne |  | 2 | 9 | 11 |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 11 | 14 |
| Newcastle | 7 | 390 | 769 | 1166 |  | 29 | 54 | 83 |  |  |  |  | 7 | 419 | 823 | 1249 |
| Goldsby | 4 | 76 | 199 | 279 |  | 9 | 15 | 24 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 85 | 214 | 303 |
| Total: | 39 | 997 | 1899 | 2935 | 1 | 87 | 210 | 298 |  | 45 | 53 | 98 | 40 | 1129 | 2162 | 3331 |

[^3]Table 2.4: McClain County Collision Concentration, 2012-2016

| CITY | HWY | CITY <br> STREET NAME | CITY <br> STREET NAME | MILE/ <br> ST.2 | SEV <br> INDEX | NUM <br> COLLS | RANK |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Newcastle | I-35 |  | SH 9 West /SH 9 | 25.15 | 192 | 130 | 1 |
| Goldsby | I-35 |  | Adkins Hill / SH <br> 74 | 22.97 | 105 | 75 | 2 |
| Purcell | I-35 |  | SH 74 | 09.27 | 69 | 45 | 3 |
| Newcastle | SH 37 | 179 St. S. | Council Rd./SH 76 | 00.98 | 67 | 50 | 4 |
| Newcastle | I-44 |  | SH 37/179 St. | 00.37 | 55 | 38 | 5 |
|  |  |  | I-44 OP | 12.62 | 53 | 34.6 | 6 |
| Newcastle | I-35 |  | SH 9 West | 25.15 | 41 | 32 | 7 |
| Newcastle | SH 9 |  | Bankers/Sonic | 05.62 | 40 | 30 | 8 |
| Newcastle | SH 37 | 179 th St. S. | Front Rd/TriCity | 03.70 | 39 | 27 | 9 |
| Newcastle |  |  |  | 25.35 | 39 | 24 | 10 |

[^4]Map 2.10: McClain County 2012-2016 Collision Map


## Existing Road 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 12,257 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.

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 4,500 miles of Oklahoma highways are two-lane facilities without paved shoulders Appendix 2.14 illustrates the location of two lane highways with no shoulders. Appendix 2.15 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 2017 reveals about $33 \%$ or approximately 4,038 of the State's 12,257 miles of highway rate as poor which includes 3,462 miles of two-lane highway.

## Traffic Count

ODOT collects traffic count data on a triennial basis primarily on the highway system and in rural areas. Other governmental entities may also be a source of additional traffic counts. Appendix 2.16 illustrates the 2016 Traffic Count Data collected by ODOT.

## Functional Classification and Road Systems

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 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 functional classification of streets includes the following functional classes: Interstate, Freeway, Rural Principal Arterial, Rural Minor Arterial, Rural Major Collector and Rural Minor Collector. Appendix 2.17 provides additional information on this topic. Appendix 2.18 illustrates McClain County Functional Classification system.

## 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.

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" as illustrated in Appendix 2.19. The former may have any of many 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. These structures enable vehicles, bicycles, pedestrian and wildlife to cross an obstacle. Bridges are structures that span more than 20 feet between supports and 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 bridges undergo regular inspections by qualified engineers. Inspections help locate and identify potential problems early and trigger protection mechanisms when a problem is found.

McClain County bridge inventory includes one hundred forty-five (145) On System and two hundred seventeen (217) Off System Bridges that are critical for regional mobility. The bridges in the County vary greatly in their age with the oldest constructed in 1901 and most recent construction occurred in 2016. Between 2010 - 2017 eleven (11) bridges have been replaced or constructed. County bridges (off system) with a sufficiency rating of 60 to 79 total sixty-seven
(67) and bridges with a sufficiency rating of 59 or less total one hundred twenty-seven (127). Appendices 2.20 and Appendices 2.21 includes the On and Off-System bridges for McClain County.

## Traffic Control

Traffic signals are a key element of traffic control. Their location and timing affect 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. There is currently no inventory of traffic control devices in McClain County which if developed can assist in prioritization of maintenance and scheduling upgrade.

## 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), additional information on the NHFN can be found in Appendix 2.22. The FAST Act includes 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 as shown on Map 2.11. The SORTPO Policy Board identified corridors listed in Table 2.5 and illustrated in Map 2.12 as significant statewide and regional highway freight corridors. Figure 2.5 illustrates the 2011 average daily long-haul
 truck volume and map 2.13 illustrates the Oklahoma 2014 High Volume Truck Corridors.

Table 2.5: McClain County Significant Freight Corridors

| CITY/TOWN | LOCATION/DESCRIPTION |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | $\mathrm{I}-35$ |
|  | $\mathrm{I}-44$ |
|  | US 62 |
|  | US 77 |
|  | SH 76 |
|  | SH 9 |

Source: SORTPO

## Map 2.11: National Highway Freight Network



## Map 2.12: Regionally Significant Freight Routes



Figure 2.5 Average Daily Long-Haul Traffic on NHS 2011


Map 2.13: Oklahoma High Volume Truck Corridors


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. The POE (Map 2.14) are state-of-theart facilities established as the mechanism to create a more controlled freight transportation environment on the highway system.

Map 2.14 Port of Entry


## Railroads

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 sale of the Sooner Sub rail line between Midwest City and Sapulpa. After this sale ODOT began a $\$ 100$ million initiative to improve safety at railroad crossings statewide. The state-owned tracks are leased by privately operated railroads. Statewide there are three (3) Class I railroads and nineteen (19) Class III railroads. Class


I railroad lines include Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway (BNSF), Union Pacific Railroad (UP), and Kansas City Southern Railway Co. (KCS).

McClain County is home to BNSF Class I railroad line. This line in McClain County is parallel to I-35 connecting Texas to Kansas. BNSF railroad has a network of approximately 32,500 miles in the U.S. and Canada and owns approximately 9,663 miles in Oklahoma. Additional information on BNSF can be found at
https://www.ok.gov/odot/Programs and Projects/Rail Programs/index.html.

## Bicycle \& Pedestrian System

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 and bicycle travel require protected crossings at busy intersections, marked crosswalks and pedestrian signals where warranted.

One opportunity to develop and implement bicycle and pedestrian facilities is the Transportation Alternative Projections (TAP) and Safe Routes to School (SRTS), administered by ODOT. In FFY 2016, seven TAP projects were awarded in the SORTPO region to the following communities: Apache, Bessie, Duncan, Elk City, Hobart, Lawton, Purcell, and Tuttle. Potential future TAP and SRTS projects in McClain County include:
a. Blanchard - crosswalks at $4^{\text {th }}$ St. and Main St. and $7^{\text {th }}$ St. and Main St.,
b. Blanchard - crosswalks, sidewalks and lighting to upper elementary school, middle school and high school,
c. Dibble - school zone.
d. Purcell - sidewalks to the Purcell Elementary Schools,
e. Purcell - Main St. (2nd Ave. to Sante Fe Park, Streetscape),
f. Purcell - Main St. (3 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ Ave. to Green Ave., Streetscape),
g. Purcell - Sidewalks and crossing signal (Green Ave. between Grant St. \& Hallmark Blvd., site of new Junior High School).

## Public Transit

Service provided within the SORTPO region is limited to demand response service. This service is provided based on a prearrangement 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 pre-arrangement 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"). Public transportation services are unavailable in McClain County. However, the town on Blanchard contracts with Delta Community Action Corporation to provide local transportation services transporting seniors
to the community nutrition center. Information on the demand response system operated by Delta Community Action can be obtained by contacting ODOT Transit Division or Delta Community Action Corporation.

## Airports

The Oklahoma Airport System Plan classifies airports by their functional classification: Regional Business Airport (RBA), District Airport (DA) and Community Airport (CA). These classifications were developed to characterize each airport on how they relate to each other. The concept of classification of airports is like the concept of classifying the roadway system.

A RBA serves multiple communities. Normally, it will serve:

- a community of at least 5,000 persons, generally larger,
- a county population of 10,000 or more persons,
- serve major employers (businesses with 50 or more employees),
- located near the center of a local sustaining economy, and
- closely match the local sustaining economies identified by the Oklahoma Department of Commerce.

Features of a DA include providing access to a part of the state that is not well served by a RBA. Typically, these airports will:

- have a supporter with a defined interest in promoting airport and with a demonstrated financial capability,
- about five or more based aircraft at these airports or an equivalent number of annual itinerant operations, and
- airports are attended, aviation gasoline is available and there is a public terminal building.

The CA airports are entry-level airports. These airports regularly serve

- small communities, where the city population is less than 5,000, and for many, the population is less than 2,000 ,
- normally these airports are not attended, have no services available, and
- the sponsor has limited financial capability to fund capital improvement projects.

The SORTPO area consists of twenty-two (22) general aviation airports identified in Table 2.6. McClain County is home to one public airport and is illustrated on Map 2.1.

Table 2.6: SORPTO Public Airports

| CITY | COUNTY | AIRPORT NAME | TYPE OF <br> AIRPORT | OWNER |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Sayre | Beckham | Sayre Municipal | CA | Municipal |
| Elk City | Beckham | Elk City Regional | RBA | Municipal |
| Carnegie | Caddo | Carnegie Municipal | CA | Municipal |


| CITY | COUNTY | AIRPORT NAME | TYPE OF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| AIRPORT |  |  |  |$\quad$ OWNER

Source: Oklahoma Aeronautics Commission

## 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 2.7. The scope of the LRTP does not include solutions to the areas of concern.

Table 2.7: McClain County Transportation Areas of Concern

| CITY/TOWN | LOCATION | DESCRIPTION |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 140th St. \& SH 74 | Need flashing lights. |
| Blanchard | 4th/Main St. | Need crosswalks. |
| Blanchard | 7th /Main St. | Need crosswalks. |


| CITY/TOWN | LOCATION | DESCRIPTION |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Blanchard | Main St/Elementary <br> School | Vehicle backup. Need crosswalks/lighting and <br> sidewalks to upper Elementary, Middle and High <br> Schools. |
| Blanchard | SH 76 (37-10) | Clanchard |
| US 62/Tyler | Crossing a problem. |  |
| Blanchard |  | Spencer crossing problem. |
| County | Countywide | School bus turning movements impeded by statutory <br> 33' row. |
| County | Countywide | Trucks use county roads to bypass highways. |
| Newcastle | US 62 | Speeding, schools located on either side of SH 62, need <br> median |
| Newcastle | Green Ave. | Lack of sidewalks/trails. <br> Purcell |
| Purcell | Needs sidewalks from Green Ave. to Elementary <br> School |  |
| Johnson Rd. Exit) |  |  |


| CITY/TOWN | LOCATION | DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Purcell |  | Need stoplight directly across from the Purcell High School and future Junior High Complex. |
| Rosedale | 140th St. (Lake Rd. Signal Hill Rd.) | Gravel road used as cut through to bypass Rosedale. |
| Wayne | 140th St. (E 1450) | Bus driver for west bound bus turning into Technology Center must negotiate turn in front of hill. Need flashing lights and turning lanes for east and west bound traffic into the school. No shoulders. |
| Wayne | SH 59 | a. Railroad crossing <br> b. (railline overpass) Oversized vehicles rerouted |
|  | 150th (C/L to Meridian) | Truck route - intersection conflicts |
|  | 160th / SH 59 | Bridges. |
|  | 170th St. <br> (Rockwood - <br> Railroad Crossing) | Truck crossing problems. |
|  | 280th St. \& SH76 | Steep hills, no shoulders and limited passing. |
|  | Adkin Hill Rd. (Burr Oak - Center) | New improvements impacting area. Change exits. |
| Dibble |  | School zone. |
|  | Galliamore/160th | Railroad crossing |
|  | High Ave. (SH 24) | No shoulders, narrow roadway. |
|  | I-35 | Need Interstate Dr on both sides of I-35. |
|  | I-35 \& Burr Oak | Casino northbound traffic on I35 use Burr Oak to access Casino from south. |
|  | I-35 \& Ladd | a. New Truck Stop at NE corner. <br> B Ingress/egress ramps need improvement |
|  | I-35 \& SH74 | a. West bound lanes reduced from 2 lanes to 1 lane at the truck stop on the hill. B Need off ramps |
|  | I-35 (Canadian River to South of Purcell) | Needs to be 6 lanes. |
|  | I-35/SH 9 | a. Intersection. <br> B New casino planned at NE corner |
|  | Lamar \& 24th | Truck stop. |
|  | Meridian (County line north to 180th St.) | Truck cut through route. |
|  | Meridian (north to 120th, east to Santa Fe, north to SH 59) | 20 ton limit road. Heavy trucks are damaging the road. |


| CITY/TOWN | LOCATION | DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N 2970 | Needs improved. |
|  | SH 24 | Needs to be resurfaced and shoulders |
|  | SH 24 \& Maple | Accidents. |
|  | SH 39 | Is this highway designated for HAZMAT? Needs shoulders. |
|  | SH 39 \& SH 76 | Need signal light. |
|  | SH 39 (SH 24 - I-35) | Steep hills. |
|  | SH 59 | No Shoulders |
|  | SH 59 \& 160th St. | Need new bridge and road alignment. |
|  | SH 59/US 177 west to Wayne | 2 lanes with no shoulders |
|  | SH 74 | No shoulders. Goldsby/Washington School Bus turning movements. Needs to be widened, add shoulders, turn lanes and resurface. |
|  | SH 74/140th St. | Intersection. |
|  | SH 74B | 2 lanes with no shoulders, need turn lanes. |
|  | SH 74B (SH 76 east to SH 24) | Truck route - intersection conflicts |
|  | SH 76 \& SH 24 | Intersection (steep hills on either side of intersection). |
|  | SH 76 \& SH 39 | Intersection accidents. |
|  | SH 76 (150th St. 143rd St.) | Truck accidents. |
|  | SH 76 (230th north to 280th) | No shoulders, limited passing, steep hills. |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SH } 76 \text { (330th - } \\ & \text { 320th) } \end{aligned}$ | Oil and gas traffic and impact on pedestrian and commercial traffic. |
|  | SH 76 (Cole north to SH 37) | Oil and gas traffic and trucks |
|  | SH 76 (Meridian west to SH 76) | Oil and gas traffic and trucks |
|  | SH 76/SH 39 | Intersection |
|  | SH 9 \& 24th St. | Need a signal. |
|  | SH 9 \& Truck Stop | Need a signal. |
|  | Walnut Creek | Flooding |
|  | Walnut Creek (240th to 220th) | Erosion |

[^5]
## Chapter 3: Future Conditions and Improvements

The objective of the Future Conditions and chapter is to portray a "snapshot" of future population and employment growth and transportation improvements. It is assumed that only those transportation 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 2040.

## Future Conditions

McClain County population and employment opportunities are highly dependent on the oil and gas industry, entertainment (Casinos) and proximity to the Oklahoma City Metropolitan Area. McClain County's population and employment development patterns are concentrated in the cities/towns/areas of Blanchard, Bridge Creek, Goldsby, Newcastle, Tuttle and Washington.


Projections for population and employment for McClain County (excluding the OKARTS areas) was based on data obtained from the US Census from from 1980-2012-16 ACS, local development knowledge, location of employment and activity centers and proposed development. These projections were developed based on Countywide data without consideration of the overlapping boundaries of SORTPO and OKARTS. Due to overlapping boundaries SORTPO did not assign projections to the OKARTS area. Growth was calcuated at approximately $10 \%$ per decade between years 2017 and 2035 and a $1.0 \%$ growth between years 2036 through 2040. Population by 2040 is projected to be 47,203 and civilian employment is projected at 21,657. A portion of these projections were distributed through the SORTPO region. Due to the relatively large ara covered by OKARTS distribution of employment and population projection is limited to 12 SORTPO zones. Appendix 3.1 provides the Grady County 2040 projected population and employment by TAZ.

Within McClain County, there may be areas that experience congestion such as areas near major traffic activity generators. Studies to identify specific causes and solutions for these areas will need to be considered on a case by case basis. As population changes the impact on the traffic volume and roadway capacity will need to be re-examined. Future truck freight growth is projected to continue. Development of southwest Oklahoma regional freight plan will provide the region an opportunity to look long term at the needs of the freight industry, interconnecting between regions and identification of future freight projects that will support the growth. Figure 3.1 illustrates the Projected Average Daily Long-Haul Traffic on NHS.

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


## 2040 Transportation Funding and 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.

## 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 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) is 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.

## State

The ODOT 8 Year Construction Work Program 2018-2025 assembles projects according to anticipated state and federal fund categories. Regarding 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.

Funding of local transportation projects and programs is heavily influenced by State of Oklahoma's annual budget, and the Highway Trust Fund. Three key components for Oklahoma transportation funding and investment include: House Bill 1078 (Rebuilding Oklahoma Access and Driver Safety), House bill 2248 and House Bill 2249. 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 shortfalls since 2010 continues to have a negative impact on the transportation system. In FY 2017 there was a $\$ 367$ million reduction in transportation funding. During FY $2018 \$ 156.6$ million was transferred from the State Transportation fund which led to a reduction and removal of projects under the 8 Year Construction Work Program.

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 to accomplish the projects. The total expenditures identified in Table 3.1 are within the total federal, state and local revenues estimated for the 2040 LRTP and are adequate to fund the projects listed.

## 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.

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 specifically for the CIRB category are collected from state gasoline and diesel tax, special fuel tax and state gross production tax on oil. 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 have 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). Planned improvements identified in Table 3.2 include projects submitted by the City of Purcell.

Table 3.1: State Funding Categories

|  | FY 2011-12 | FY 2012-13 | FY 2013-14 | FY 2014-15 | FY 2015-16 | FY 2016-17 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Circuit Engineering <br> District Revolving Fund | $\$ 4,463,612.89$ | $\$ 3,759,042.61$ | $\$ 4,257,973.22$ | $\$ 3,606,553.45$ | $\$ 2,454,282.96$ | $\$ 2,573,399.41$ |
|  <br> Road Improvement | $\$ 29,469,291.00$ | $\$ 24,556,139.05$ | $\$ 28,025,910.64$ | $\$ 23,430,017.08$ | $\$ 15,225,256.66$ | $\$ 16,200,387.04$ |
| Counties for Roads | $\$ 233,167,431.04$ | $\$ 224,693,222.81$ | $\$ 252,415,798.31$ | $\$ 254,470,157.23$ | $\$ 228,861,816.51$ | $\$ 233,699,714.86$ |
| County Improvement <br> Road and Bridge <br> Revolving Fund | $\$ 96,381,44.43$ | $\$ 99,297,039.31$ | $\$ 129,693,227.84$ | $\$ 138,133,545.79$ | $\$ 120,000,000.00$ | $\$ 120,000,000.00$ |
| County Road Fund | $\$ 16,567,078.24$ | $\$ 17,075,040.15$ | $\$ 18,701,249.31$ | $\$ 17,701,249.31$ | $\$ 17,933.883 .32$ | $\$ 17,212,153.19$ |
| County Road <br> Improvement <br> Revolving Fund | $\$ 23,162,249.21$ | $\$ 23,869,001.05$ | $\$ 26,138,425.71$ | $\$ 26,138,425.71$ | $\$ 25,065,890.98$ | $\$ 24,057,140.75$ |
| High Priority State <br> Bridge Revolving Fund | $\$ 63,036,200.98$ | $\$ 5,932,688.65$ | $\$ 6,159,069.25$ | $\$ 6,225,331.10$ | $\$ 6,393,096.46$ | $\$ 6,333,887.30$ |
| Public Transit <br> Revolving Fund | $\$ 3,850,000.00$ | $\$ 3,850,000$ | $\$ 3,850,000$ | $\$ 3,850,000$ | $\$ 3,640,000.00$ | $\$ 3,829,000.00$ |
| Railroad Maintenance <br> Revolving Fund | $\$ 666,387.67$ | $\$ 716,415.44$ | $\$ 837,887.56$ | $\$ 826,792.79$ | $\$ 850,452.97$ | $\$ 796,860.87$ |
| Rebuild Oklahoma <br> Access \& Driver Safety <br> Fund | $\$ 250,700,000.00$ | $\$ 292,400,000.00$ | $\$ 352,100,000.00$ | $\$ 411,800,000.00$ | $\$ 441,045,432.00$ | $\$ 508,678,655.32$ |
| State Hwy. <br>  <br> Maintenance Funds | $\$ 2,079,421.18$ | $\$ 3,123,679.15$ | $\$ 7,246,116.42$ | $\$ 4,785,497.76$ | $\$ 4,144,636.34$ | $\$ 4,110,742.06$ |
| State Transportation <br> Fund | $\$ 208,864,879,28$ | $\$ 204,316,899.57$ | $\$ 213,905,376.86$ | $\$ 214,115,706.14$ | $\$ 217,307,803.50$ | $\$ 216,795,526.28$ |

Source: ODOT

Table 3.2: McClain County Planned Transportation Projects

| CITY/TOWN | LOCATION | DESCRIPTION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Purcell | Main St (Canadian Ave. to 3 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ Ave.) | Streetscape Phase I |
| Purcell | Main Street (2 $2^{\text {nd }}$ Ave. to Santa Fe Park) | Streetscape Phase II |
| Purcell | Main Street (3 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ Ave. to Green Ave.) | Streetscape Phase III |
| Purcell | I-35 | Interchange study for site recommendation on north end. EST Inc., conducting study, paid for by City of Purcell. |
| Purcell | Signal (Green Ave. \& Hallmark Blvd.) | New Junior High and High School sites. |
| Purcell | Canadian Ave. and Main St. | Construct roundabout for safety. |
| Purcell | Green Ave. (Grant St. - 9th Ave.) | Rehab and overlay project. |
| Purcell | Green Ave. <br> (Grant St. - <br> Hallmark Blvd.) | Sidewalks and crossing signal for access to new Junior High School. |
| Purcell | Green Ave. (Jefferson Ave. 9 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Ave.) | Sidewalks to elementary schools. |

Source: SORTPO, and City of Purcell

## Chapter 4: 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).

McClain County's racial and ethnic composition for 2012-2016 ACS is 84.1\% White, 1.0\% Black or African American, 6.0\% Native American, 0.6\% Asian and 7.6\% Hispanic or Latino. Oklahoma's racial ethnic composition for 2012-2016 ACS was 72.9\% White, 7.3\% African American, 7.4\% American Indian, 2.0\% Asian and 9.8\% Hispanic or Latino. Data from 20122016 ACS identifies $9.6 \%$ of the County's population below the poverty level. 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 HHS 2018 poverty guidelines for a family of four is $\$ 25,100$.

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 Chickasaw Tribe and Comanche Tribe were 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,
- 2017 ODOT Rail Plan,
- OKCARTS 2035 Plan,
- Oklahoma Aeronautics Commission, and
- ODOT 2015-2040 Long Range Transportation Plan.

Conversation and consultation have been initiated and will be ongoing with the local 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 Chickasaw Nation, and Bureau of Indian Affairs. All 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.

SORTPO hosted fifteen (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 at www.sortpo.org. Appendix 4.1 provides a summary of the survey results. Appendix 4.2 contains information identifying the public outreach processes utilized in development of the 2040 McClain County LRTP.

## Chapter 5: Transportation Recommendations

This chapter identifies the recommendations and summary of improvements that were developed because of the previous review of demographics, growth, traffic activity generators, transportation system and other such issues. It is assumed that only McClain County projects included in the FFY 2018-2025 ODOT 8 Year Construction Work Program, FFY 2018-2021 Asset Preservation Program, FFY 2018-2022 CIRB and those identified by cities and towns will be constructed by the year 2040.

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 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 to develop a comprehensive set of solutions.

## Transportation Projects

The ODOT 8 Year Construction Work Program FFY 2018-2025 assembles projects according to anticipated state and federal fund categories. Regarding 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 5.1 identifies projects through the year 2040 and includes those identified in the FFY 2018-2025 ODOT 8 Year Construction Work Program, FFY 2018-2021 Asset Preservation Program, FFY 2018-2022 CIRB and other projects such as development of studies, plans, and collection of data identified in Chapter 1 goals and strategies. The development of studies, plans and collection of data can be included in SORTPO's Planning Work Program (PWP).

Table 5.1: McClain County Transportation Projects

| GENERAL LOCATION | PROJECT YEAR | DESCRIPTION | FUNDING STATE / FEDERAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | Develop a clearinghouse for regional data sets, such as pavement management systems and geographic information systems. | SPR/Local |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | Conduct a freight assessment for the county. | SPR/Local |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | Develop a system to collect and monitor changes in population, employment, and major employers by Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ). | SPR/Local |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | Develop data collection standards. | SPR/Local |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | Establish procedures that enhance the consultation and coordination of transportation planning with local, regional, state and tribal government representatives. | SPR/Local |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | Conduct speed study at intersection locations with high accident severity index and corridors with major attractors. | SPR/Local |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | UTILITIES FOR 29459(04) SH-59 OVER CRINER CREEK, 5.03 MI SOUTH OF SH-39. | \$395,300 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | BRIDGE REHABILITATION SH-74B: BUFFALO CREEK, 2.4 MI EAST OF JCT. SH-76. | \$1,126,741 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2018- \\ & 2022 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | RESURFACE BEGIN MM 98, EXTEND 4.91 MI TO MM 103. | \$1,217,680 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | GRADE, DRAIN \& SURFACE CO RD: EW-143 (WAYNE RD) FROM US-77 EAST 3.0 MI. TO NS321 (PHASE I) THEN SOUTH 2.0 MI TO SH59 (PHASE 2). | \$3,385,792 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | BRIDGES \& APPROACHES CO BR ON EW-147 APPROX 1.5 MI. SOUTH \& 4.4 MI. WEST OF PAYNE LOCAL NO 136 (DEL FR 09-17, ADD TO 11-17 AS PER B DUDGEON. | \$653,960 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | BRIDGES \& APPROACHES ON EW-136 OVER DIBBLE \& TRIBUTARY OF DIBBLE CREEK APPROX 0.25 MI NORTH 0.8 MI EAST \& 0.95 MI EAST OF THE SH-76/SH-39 JCT LOCAL NO. 218 \& 219. | \$940,783 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | ROW FOR 30111(04) BRIDGE \& APPROACHES ON EW-130 OVER NORTH FORK WALNUT CREEK, 0.6 MI WEST \& 2.0 MI NORTH OF COLE (LN 316). | \$ 50,000 |


| GENERAL LOCATION | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { PROJECT } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | DESCRIPTION | FUNDING STATE / FEDERAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | UTILITIES FOR 30111(04) BRIDGE \& APPROACHES ON EW-130 OVER NORTH FORK WALNUT CREEK, 0.6 MI WEST \& 2.0 MI NORTH OF COLE (LN 316). | \$ 5,000 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | BRIDGES \& APPROACHES CO BR ON EW-135 (240TH ST) (444C) OVER SANDY CREEK, 1.4 MI WEST OF WASHINGTON (DEL FROM 07-17, ADD TO 8-17 AS PER B DUDGEON) EW-147 APPROX 1.5 MI. SOUTH \& 4.4 MI WEST OF PAYNE LOCAL NO 136 (DEL FR 09-17, ADD TO 11-17 AS PER B DUDGEON. | \$1,205,184 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | ROW FOR 19314(04) I-35/SH-9 INTERCHANGE (PHASE III) (WEST=19076(04)). | \$11,208,491 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | UTILITIES FOR 19314(04) I-35/SH-9 INTERCHANGE (PHASE III) (WEST-19076(04)). | \$ 924,700 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | GRADE, DRAIN \& SURFACE I-35: RECONSTRUCT SOUTHBOUND RAMP AT SH-74 IN GOLDSBY. | \$ 2,121,800 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | GRADE, DRAINING, BRIDGE \& SURFACE I-35 UNDER LADD ROAD, 5.9 MI SOUTH OF CLEVELAND C/L (RAMP ACCELERATION \& DECELERATION IMPROVEMENT). | \$ 8,872,301 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | BRIDGE REHABILITATION I-35 UNDER SH-74, 2.76 MI SOUTH OF CLEVELAND C/L (REDECK). | \$ 1,222,706 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2018- \\ & 2022 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | ROW FOR 29671(04) SH-76: FROM SH-130, NORTH 3.0 MI TO SH-37 (ADD CAPACITY) | \$ 2,241,698 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | UTILITIES FOR 29671(04) SH-76: FROM SH-130, NORTH 3.0 MI TO SH-37 (ADD CAPACITY). | \$ 560,425 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2018 \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | RESURFACE I-35: FROM SH-59, NORTH 2.4 MI. | \$ 5,232,000 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2018- \\ & 2022 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | RESURFACE SH-37: BEGIN AT THE GRADY C/L EXTEND EAST 4.03 MI. | \$1,289,600 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | RESURFACE SH-74: BEGIN 0.96 MI NORTH OF THE JCT. OF US-77, EXTEND NORTH 1.0 MI. | \$152,000 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | CONTRACT P.E. BRIDGE AND APPROACHES OVER UNNAMED CREEK 0.4 MI. EAST OF I-35 ON LADD RD. LOCAL NO 209A. | \$ 65,000 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | CONTRACT P.E. GRADE, DRAIN, SURFACE, \& BRIDGE ON 180TH STREET FROM MAY AVE. TO 0.3 MI. PAST MERIDIAN AVE. APPROX 2.3 MI. LOCAL NO 241. | \$ 300,000 |


| $\begin{array}{c}\text { GENERAL } \\ \text { LOCATION }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { PR0JECT } \\ \text { YEAR }\end{array}$ | DESCRIPTION | $\begin{array}{c}\text { FUNDING } \\ \text { STATE / } \\ \text { FEDERAL }\end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{c}\text { McClain } \\ \text { County }\end{array}$ | $2018-$ |  |  |
| 2022 | $\begin{array}{l}\text { CONTRACT P.E. BRIDGE AND APPROACHES OVER } \\ \text { SANDY CREEK 3.0 MI. WEST AND 0.4 MI. NORTH } \\ \text { OF WOODY CHAPEL. LOCAL NO 224. }\end{array}$ | $\$ 90,000$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{c}\text { McClain } \\ \text { County }\end{array}$ | $2018-$ |  |  |
| 2022 | $\begin{array}{l}\text { CONTRACT P.E. BRIDGE AND APPROACHES OVER } \\ \text { WALNUT CREEK 1.5 MI. WEST AND 0.8 MI. } \\ \text { NORTH OF COLE. LOCAL NO 320. }\end{array}$ | $\$ 110,000$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{c}\text { McClain } \\ \text { County }\end{array}$ | $2018-$ |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{c}\text { McClain } \\ \text { County }\end{array}$ | $2018-$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { ROW FOR 31058(04) SH-24 BEGIN 3.48 MI. } \\ \text { NORTH OF JCT. SH-59, EXTEND NORTH 2.62 MI. } \\ \text { NcClain } \\ \text { County }\end{array}$ | 2022 | \(\left.\begin{array}{l}UTILITIES FOR 31058(04) SH-24 BEGIN 3.48 MI. <br>

NORTH OF JCT. SH-59, EXTEND NORTH 2.62 MI.\end{array}\right]\) \$327,000

| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { GENERAL } \\ & \text { LOCATION } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { PROJECT } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | DESCRIPTION | FUNDING STATE / FEDERAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | ROW FOR 32802(04) I-35: SOUTHBOUND RAMP AT SH-74W, IN PURCELL. | \$272,500 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | UTILITIES FOR 32802(04) I-35: SOUTHBOUND RAMP AT SH-74W, IN PURCELL. | \$272,500 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | BRIDGE AND APPROACHES ON EW-130 OVER NORTH FORK WALNUT CREEK, 0.6 MI. WEST \& 2.0 MI. NORTH OF COLE (LN. 316). | \$1,378,860 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | BRIDGE \& APPROACHES CO BR OVER UNNAMED CREEK, ON EW-141, APPROX. 5.9 MI. WEST OF CRINER. | \$ 550,000 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | UTILITIES BRIDGE AND APPROACHES OVER UNNAMED CREEK 0.4 MI. EAST OF I-35 ON LADD RD. BRIDGE AND APPROACHES OVER UNNAMED CREEK 0.4 MI. EAST OF I-35 ON LADD RD. (LOCAL 209A). | \$ 25,000 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | UTILITIES GRADE, DRAIN, SURFACE, \& BRIDGE ON 180TH STREET FROM MAY AVE TO 0.3 MI. PAST MERIDIAN AVE. APPROX 2.3 MI. LOCAL NO 241. | \$ 25,000 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | UTILITIES BRIDGE AND APPROACHES OVER SANDY CREEK 3.0 MI. WEST AND 0.4 MI. NORTH OF WOODY CHAPEL. LOCAL NO 224. | \$ 25,000 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | BRIDGE AND APPROACHES OVER WALNUT CREEK 1.5 MI. WEST AND 0.8 MI. NORTH OF COLE. LOCAL NO 320. | \$1,380,020 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | INTERCHANGE I-35/SH-9 INTERCHANGE (PHASE III) (WEST=19076(04)). | \$7,175,000 |
| McClain County | $\begin{gathered} 2018- \\ 2022 \end{gathered}$ | GRADE, DRAIN \& SURFACE SH-76: FROM SH-130, NORTH 3.0 MI. TO SH-37 (ADD CAPACITY). | \$10,515,960 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2018 \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | P.E. FOR 30108(04) CO BR, ON NS3090, OVER FINN CREEK 4.0 MI. EAST AND 0.4 MI. SOUTH OF CRINER (LOCAL NO. 246). | \$ 51,000 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | BRIDGE AND APPROACHES OVER UNNAMED CREEK 0.4 MI. EAST OF I-35 ON LADD RD. LOCAL NO 209A. | \$ 630,020 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2018- \\ & 2022 \end{aligned}$ | BRIDGE AND APPROACHES OVER SANDY CREEK 3.0 MI. WEST AND 0.4 MI. NORTH OF WOODY CHAPEL. LOCAL NO 224. | \$ 980,020 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2023- \\ & 2027 \end{aligned}$ | GRADE, DRAIN \& SURFACE SH-76: FROM 3.0 MI. NORTH OF SH-19, NORTH 5.0 MI. | \$8,267,400 |


| GENERAL LOCATION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PROJECT } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | DESCRIPTION | FUNDING STATE / FEDERAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| McClain County | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2023- \\ 2027 \end{gathered}$ | GRADE, DRAINING, BRIDGE \& SURFACE SH-24 BEGIN 3.43 MI. WEST OF JCT SH-74, EXTEND NORTH 2.62 MI. | \$786,780 |
| McClain County | $\begin{gathered} 2023- \\ 2027 \end{gathered}$ | GRADE, DRAIN \& SURFACE I-35: SOUTHBOUND RAMP AT SH-74W, IN PURCELL (FREIGHT CORRIDOR CANDIDATE). | \$12,000,000 |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2023- \\ & 2027 \end{aligned}$ | Develop procedures to identify and collect traffic count data at specific locations within the county. | SPR/Local |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2023- \\ & 2027 \end{aligned}$ | Develop method to track the implementation of projects and regularly update the public on the status of projects, programs and finances. | SPR/Local |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2023- \\ & 2027 \end{aligned}$ | Identify the locations of major employment centers, including existing and proposed developments and identify types of transportation available. | SPR/Local |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2023- \\ & 2027 \end{aligned}$ | Working with area employers and stakeholders develop a database and map identifying transportation needs | SPR/Local |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2023- \\ & 2027 \end{aligned}$ | Develop database and mapping to identify the County's underrepresented | SPR/Local |
| McClain County | $\begin{gathered} 2028- \\ 2032 \end{gathered}$ | Develop a data file and create a map identifying location of wind farms and pipelines and relationship to communities and the transportation system. | SPR/LOCAL |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2028- \\ & 2032 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Develop a regional map that identifies tourism destinations and regionally significant facilities | SPR/LOCAL |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2028- \\ & 2032 \end{aligned}$ | Collect and routinely analyze safety and security data by mode and severity to identify changes and trends. | SPR/LOCAL |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2032- \\ & 2036 \end{aligned}$ | Collect and routinely analyze safety and security data by mode and severity to identify changes and trends. | SPR/LOCAL |
| McClain County | $\begin{gathered} 2032- \\ 2036 \end{gathered}$ | Conduct study at intersection locations with high accident severity index and corridors with major attractors. | SPR/LOCAL |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2037- \\ & 2040 \end{aligned}$ | Collect and routinely analyze safety and security data by mode and severity to identify changes and trends. | SPR/LOCAL |
| McClain County | $\begin{aligned} & 2037- \\ & 2040 \end{aligned}$ | Conduct study at intersection locations with high accident severity index and corridors with major attractors. | SPR/LOCAL |

## APPENDICES

| Acronyms |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| ACS | American Community Survey |
| ADA | Americans with Disabilities Act |
| AADT | Average Annual Daily Traffic |
| ASCOG | Association of South Central Oklahoma Governments |
| BR | BRIDGE |
| C/L | County Line |
| CA | Community Airport |
| CIP | Capital Improvement Program |
| CO | COUNTY |
| COEDD | Central Oklahoma Economic Development District |
| COG | Council of Government |
| CORTPO | Central Oklahoma Regional Transportation Planning Organization |
| DA | District Airport |
| EJ | Environmental Justice |
| FAST Act | Fixing America's Transportation Act |
| FAT | Fatality |
| FHWA | Federal Highway Administration |
| FTA | Federal Transit Administration |
| FY | Fiscal Year |
| FFY | Federal Fiscal Year |
| GIS | Geographic Information System |
| HHS | Health and Human Services |
| HWY | Highway |
| INJ | Injury |
| IRI | International Roughness Index |
| JCT | Junction |
| LEP | Limited English Proficiency |
| LOS | Levels of Service |


| LRTP | Long Range Transportation Plan |
| :--- | :--- |
| MAP-21 | Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act |
| MI | Mile |
| MM | Mile Marker |
| MSA | Metropolitan Statistical Area |
| MUTCD | Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices |
| NHFN | National Highway Freight Network |
| NHS | National Highway System |
| NODA | Northern Oklahoma Development Authority |
| NORTPO | Northern Oklahoma Regional Transportation Planning Organization |
| NRHP | National Register of Historic Places |
| OARC | Oklahoma Association of Regional Councils |
| ODEQ | Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality |
| ODOT | Oklahoma Department of Transportation |
| OCARTS | Oklahoma City Area Regional Transportation Study |
| PD | Property Damage |
| PHFS | Primary Highway Freight System |
| POE | Statewide Transportation Improvement Program |
| PPP | Staf Entry |
| PWP | Public Participation Plan |
| RBA | Planning Work Program |
| ROW | Regional Business Airport |
| RTPO | Right of Way |
| S/L | Regional Transportation Planning Organization |
| SAFETEA-LU | Stanter Cor Users Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A |
| SORTPO | SLWC |


| STP | Surface Transportation Program |
| :--- | :--- |
| STRAHNET | Strategic Highway Network |
| SWODA | South Western Oklahoma Development Authority |
| TAP | Transportation Alternate Program |
| TAZ | Traffic Analysis Zone |
| TMA | Transportation Management Area |
| USDA | U.S. Department of Agriculture |
| USDA | U.S. Department of Transportation |

## Definitions

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

Base Year - The year to which the major portion of the data gathered and the first year of a planning year.

Capacity - The maximum number of vehicles that can pass over a given section of a lane or roadway in one direction during a given 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) - A 1994 Presidential Executive Order requiring agencies receiving federal funds to review if 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.

Functionally Obsolete Bridge - A bridge inadequate to properly accommodate the traffic can be due to inadequate clearances, either horizontal or vertical, approach roadway alignment, structural condition, or waterway adequacy. Any posted bridge which is not structurally deficient would be included in this category. Structures in this category could include narrow bridges.

General Aviation Airport - Provide access to the population and economic activity centers of the state.

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.

Local Sustaining Economies - Geographical regions that function with some degree of independence from the rest of the state. The Oklahoma Department of Commerce (ODOC) has identified 47 of these regions.

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.

Metropolitan Statistical Area - As designated by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget and defined by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, an MSA consists of the central county or counties containing a city or an urbanized area with a population of at least 50,000 and the adjacent or outlying counties that have close economic and social relationships with the central counties, with a total metropolitan population of at least 100,000

Multi-modal - The consideration of more than one mode to serve transportation needs in each 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.

Oklahoma City Area Regional Transportation Study (OCARTS) - refers to a geographical area within Central Oklahoma (for transportation planning) which includes all the currently urbanized area plus the surrounding area which is anticipated to become urbanized over the next 20 years. The OCARTS area encompasses all of Oklahoma County and Cleveland County and portions of Canadian, Cleveland, Grady, Logan and McClain Counties.

National Highway System - 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, airports, 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.

Primary Commercial Service Airport - An airport that receives scheduled passenger service and enplanes 10,000 or more passengers annually, as reported by the FAA.

Strategic Highway Network(STRAHNET) - Designation given to roads that provide "defense access, continuity, and emergency capabilities for movements of personnel and equipment in both peace and war." STRAHNET includes Routes (for long-distance travel) and Connectors (to connect individual installations to the Routes). This system includes the Dwight D. Eisenhower System of Interstate and Defense Highways, identified as strategically important to the defense of the United States.

Structurally Deficient Bridge - A bridge can be inadequate to carry legal loads, whether caused by obsolete design standards, structural deterioration, or waterway inadequacy. Structures in this category may include those posted to restrict load limits as well as those closed to all traffic.

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.

## Appendix A: Resolution 09-04

RESOLUTION NO. 09-04

## CREATION OF THE RURAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING 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
MIKE BROWN, Secretary

## Appendix B: Resolution 16-06

## RESOLUTION NO. 16-06 <br> EXPANSION OF THE REGIONAL 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 sixteen (16) county South Western Oklahoma Development Authority (SWODA) and Association of South Central Oklahoma Governments (ASCOG) 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 sixteen (16) county area, and

WHEREAS, the SWODA Board of Trustees seeks to facilitate the planning process for surface 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 expand the Regional Transportation Planning Organization as a standing committee of the Authority.

PASSED AND APPROVED this $8^{\text {th }}$ day of November, 2016


## ATTEST:



John Dee Butchee, Secretary

## Appendix C: Performance Measures

Performance measures for State departments of transportation (State DOT) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) were established by the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21). This Act transformed the Federal-aid highway program by establishing new requirements for performance management to ensure the most efficient investment of Federal transportation funds. Performance management increases the accountability and transparency of the Federal-aid highway program and provides a framework to support improved investment decision-making through a focus on performance outcomes for key national transportation goals. As part of performance management, recipients of Federal-aid highway funds will make transportation investments to achieve performance targets that make progress toward the following national goals:

- Safety-To achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.
- Infrastructure condition-To maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair.
- Congestion reduction-To achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the NHS.
- System reliability - To improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system.
- Freight movement and economic vitality-To improve the national freight network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development.
- Environmental sustainability-To enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment.
- 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.

State Department of Transportations and Metropolitan Planning Organizations will be expected to use the information and data generated as a result of the new regulations to inform their transportation planning and programming decisions. The new performance aspects of the Federal-aid highway program that result from this rule will provide FHWA the ability to better communicate a national performance story and to assess the impacts of Federal funding investments more reliably.

The FHWA is required to establish performance measures to assess performance in 12 areas 1 generalized as follows:
(1) Serious injuries per vehicle miles traveled (VMT);
(2) fatalities per VMT;
(3) number of serious injuries;
(4) number of fatalities;
(5) pavement condition on the Interstate System;
(6) pavement condition on the non-Interstate NHS;
(7) bridge condition on the NHS;
(8) performance of the Interstate System;
(9) performance of the non-Interstate NHS;
(10) freight movement on the Interstate System;
(11) traffic congestion; and
(12) on-road mobile source emissions.

Table 3-1 in ODOT's 2015-2040 Long- Range Transportation Plan compares the 2015-2040 LRTP Goals and Performance Measures. Below is information contained in Table 3.1 of this Plan.

Table 3-1 ODOT 2015-2040 Long Range Transportation Plan.

| 2015-2040 LRTP Goals | Recommended Performance Measure |
| :---: | :---: |
| Safe and Secure Travel | - Reduction in traffic related fatalities and serious injuries - Rate and number of traffic fatalities annually on all Oklahoma public roads <br> - Rate and number of traffic-related serious injuries annually on all Oklahoma public roads |
| Infrastructure Preservation | - Bridge Condition - Number of structurally deficient bridges <br> - Preservation of Pavement - Good/fair/poor condition index for NHS highways |
| Economic Vitality | - Freight Movement <br> - Annual freight tonnage/value for truck, rail, and barge modes - Measure of freight travel time reliability and/or speed <br> - Congestion - Travel time-based measure(s) of congestion |
| Mobility Choice, Connectivity and Accessibility | - Public Transit- Annual rural transit vehicle revenue miles <br> - Passenger Rail - Annual ridership and on-time performance for Amtrak Heartland Flyer |
| Environmental Responsibility | - Clean fuels and improved air quality - Clean fuels as a share of ODOT's total fleet fuel use in gasoline gallon equivalents <br> - Reduce roadway flooding and support improved water quality - Quantity of Litter/Debris (cubic yards or other measure of weight and volume) cleared from storm drains/culverts/roadsides |

Source: Oklahoma Department of Transportation

Appendix 2.1: McClain County, Demographic Information, 2012-2016 ACS

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2012-16 } \\ \text { ACS } \\ \text { ESTIMATE } \end{gathered}$ | MARGIN OF ERROR | PERCENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TOTAL POPULATION | 37,222 | ***** | 37,222 |
| Male | 18,563 | +/-67 | 49.9\% |
| Female | 18,659 | +/-67 | 50.1\% |
| Under 5 years | 2,293 | +/-49 | 6.2\% |
| 5 to 9 years | 2,699 | +/-180 | 7.3\% |
| 10 to 14 years | 3,014 | +/-183 | 8.1\% |
| 15 to 19 years | 2,560 | +/-97 | 6.9\% |
| 20 to 24 years | 2,073 | +/-110 | 5.6\% |
| 25 to 34 years | 4,349 | +/-82 | 11.7\% |
| 35 to 44 years | 4,938 | +/-81 | 13.3\% |
| 45 to 54 years | 5,133 | +/-103 | 13.8\% |
| 55 to 59 years | 2,447 | +/-200 | 6.6\% |
| 60 to 64 years | 2,290 | +/-199 | 6.2\% |
| 65 to 74 years | 3,314 | +/-49 | 8.9\% |
| 75 to 84 years | 1,673 | +/-134 | 4.5\% |
| 85 years and over | 439 | +/-126 | 1.2\% |
| Median age (years) | 38.3 | +/-0.6 | (X) |
| 18 years and over | 27,603 | +/-25 | 74.2\% |
| 21 years and over | 25,989 | +/-150 | 69.8\% |
| 62 years and over | 6,681 | +/-153 | 17.9\% |
| 65 years and over | 5,426 | +/-51 | 14.6\% |
| RACE |  |  |  |
| White | 31,289 | +/-248 | 84.1\% |
| Black or African American | 357 | +/-56 | 1.0\% |
| American Indian and Alaska Native | 2,222 | +/-275 | 6.0\% |
| Asian | 227 | +/-25 | 0.6\% |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander | 0 | +/-20 | 0.0\% |
| Hispanic or Latino (of any race) | 2,842 | ***** | 7.6\% |

Source: 2012-2016 ACS, Demographic and Housing

Appendix 2.2: McClain County, Occupation by Sex 2012-2016 ACS

| SUBJECT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2012-16 } \\ & \text { ACS } \\ & \text { ESTIMATE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { MARGIN } \\ \text { OF } \\ \text { ERROR } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2012-16 } \\ \text { ACS MALE } \\ \text { ESTIMATE } \end{gathered}$ | 2012-16 <br> ACS <br> FEMALE ESTIMATE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Civilian employed population 16 years and over | 17,038 | +/-411 | 54.9\% | 45.1\% |
| Management, business, science, and arts occupations: | 5,993 | +/-374 | 44.4\% | 55.6\% |
| Management, business, and financial occupations: | 2,673 | +/-308 | 59.1\% | 40.9\% |
| Management occupations | 1,922 | +/-255 | 68.8\% | 31.2\% |
| Business and financial operations occupations | 751 | +/-174 | 34.2\% | 65.8\% |
| Computer, engineering, and science occupations: | 477 | +/-133 | 78.6\% | 21.4\% |
| Computer and mathematical occupations | 131 | +/-67 | 100.0\% | 0.0\% |
| Architecture and engineering occupations | 306 | +/-104 | 74.8\% | 25.2\% |
| Life, physical, and social science occupations | 40 | +/-49 | 37.5\% | 62.5\% |
| Education, legal, community service, arts, and media occupations: | 1,628 | +/-233 | 26.5\% | 73.5\% |
| Community and social services occupations | 376 | +/-126 | 39.1\% | 60.9\% |
| Legal occupations | 99 | +/-52 | 24.2\% | 75.8\% |
| Education, training, and library occupations | 978 | +/-174 | 19.3\% | 80.7\% |
| Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media occupations | 175 | +/-77 | 40.6\% | 59.4\% |
| Healthcare practitioner and technical occupations: | 1,215 | +/-188 | 22.6\% | 77.4\% |
| Health diagnosing and treating practitioners and other technical occupations | 733 | +/-146 | 24.4\% | 75.6\% |
| Health technologists and technicians | 482 | +/-135 | 19.7\% | 80.3\% |
| Service occupations: | 2,995 | +/-356 | 44.9\% | 55.1\% |
| Healthcare support occupations | 379 | +/-100 | 14.5\% | 85.5\% |
| Protective service occupations: | 595 | +/-163 | 82.0\% | 18.0\% |


| SUBJECT | 2012-16 <br> ACS <br> ESTIMATE | MARGIN <br> OF <br> ERROR | 2012-16 <br> ACS MALE <br> ESTIMATE | 2012-16 <br> ACS <br> FEMALE <br> ESTMATE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Firefighting and prevention, <br> and other protective service <br> workers including supervisors | 291 | $+/-101$ | $75.6 \%$ | $24.4 \%$ |
| Law enforcement workers <br> including supervisors | 304 | $+/-110$ | $88.2 \%$ | $11.8 \%$ |
| Food preparation and serving <br> related occupations | 832 | $+/-201$ | $28.7 \%$ | $71.3 \%$ |
| Building and grounds cleaning <br> and maintenance occupations | 733 | $+/-158$ | $63.4 \%$ | $36.6 \%$ |
| Personal care and service <br> occupations | 456 | $+/-105$ | $21.7 \%$ | $78.3 \%$ |
| Sales and office occupations: | 3,814 | $+/-312$ | $38.4 \%$ | $61.6 \%$ |
| Sales and related occupations | 1,586 | $+/-222$ | $62.0 \%$ | $38.0 \%$ |
| Office and administrative <br> support occupations | 2,228 | $+/-237$ | $21.6 \%$ | $78.4 \%$ |
| Natural resources, construction, <br> and maintenance occupations: | 2,451 | $+/-260$ | $97.0 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ |
| Farming, fishing, and forestry <br> occupations | 127 | $+/-64$ | $98.4 \%$ | $1.6 \%$ |
| Construction and extraction <br> occupations | 1,487 | $+/-236$ | $95.3 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ |
| Installation, maintenance, and <br> repair occupations | 837 | $+/-156$ | $99.9 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| Production, transportation, and <br> material moving occupations: | 1,785 | $+/-231$ | $84.4 \%$ | $15.6 \%$ |
| Production occupations | 875 | $+/-166$ | $81.7 \%$ | $18.3 \%$ |
| Transportation occupations | 615 | $+/-138$ | $86.7 \%$ | $13.3 \%$ |
| Material moving occupations | 295 | $+/-99$ | $87.5 \%$ | $12.5 \%$ |

Source: 2012-2016 ACS, Occupation by Sex

Appendix 2.3: McClain County Industry by Sex, 2012-2016 ACS

| SUBJECT | 2012-16 <br> ACS | MARGIN | 2012-16 <br> OCS | 2012-16 <br> ACS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL <br> PERCENT <br> ESTIMATE | PRROR | MALE |  |
| PERCENT |  |  |  |  |
| FEMALE |  |  |  |  |
| ESTIMATE | ESTIMATE |  |  |  |


| SUBJECT | 2012-16 <br> ACS <br> TOTAL <br> ESTIMATE | MARGIN <br> OF <br> ERROR | 2012-16 <br> ACS <br> PERCENT <br> MALE <br> ESTIMATE | 2012-16 <br> ACS <br> PERCENT <br> FEMALE <br> ESTIMATE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agriculture, forestry, fishing and <br> hunting, and mining: | 1,306 | $+/-195$ | $82.9 \%$ | $17.1 \%$ |
| Agriculture, forestry, fishing and <br> hunting | 389 | $+/-103$ | $84.3 \%$ | $15.7 \%$ |
| Mining, quarrying, and oil and gas <br> extraction | 917 | $+/-161$ | $82.3 \%$ | $17.7 \%$ |
| Construction | 1,561 | $+/-213$ | $92.7 \%$ | $7.3 \%$ |
| Manufacturing | 1,194 | $+/-213$ | $72.4 \%$ | $27.6 \%$ |
| Wholesale trade | 440 | $+/-114$ | $73.0 \%$ | $27.0 \%$ |
| Retail trade | 2,003 | $+/-252$ | $57.2 \%$ | $42.8 \%$ |
| Transportation and warehousing, <br> and utilities: | 981 | $+/-187$ | $70.9 \%$ | $29.1 \%$ |
| Transportation and warehousing | 740 | $+/-166$ | $67.6 \%$ | $32.4 \%$ |
| Utilities | 241 | $+/-81$ | $81.3 \%$ | $18.7 \%$ |
| Information | 284 | $+/-98$ | $62.0 \%$ | $38.0 \%$ |
| Finance and insurance, and real <br> estate and rental and leasing: | 957 | $+/-178$ | $27.9 \%$ | $72.1 \%$ |
| Finance and insurance | 728 | $+/-163$ | $23.9 \%$ | $76.1 \%$ |
| Real estate and rental and leasing | 229 | $+/-79$ | $40.6 \%$ | $59.4 \%$ |
| Professional, <br> management, and administrative <br> and waste management services: | 1,138 | $+/-191$ | $62.0 \%$ | $38.0 \%$ |
| Professional, scientific, and <br> technical services | 652 | $+/-168$ | $49.2 \%$ | $50.8 \%$ |
| Management of companies and <br> enterprises | 15 | $+/-24$ | $100.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Administrative and support and <br> waste management services | 471 | $+/-129$ | $78.3 \%$ | $21.7 \%$ |
| Educational services, and health <br> care and social assistance: | 3,757 | $+/-318$ | $20.2 \%$ | $79.8 \%$ |
| Educational services | 1,484 | $+/-224$ | $23.6 \%$ | $76.4 \%$ |
| Health care and social assistance | 2,273 | $+/-249$ | $17.9 \%$ | $82.1 \%$ |
| Arts, entertainment, and <br> recreation, and accommodation <br> and food services: | 1,172 | $+/-224$ | $42.0 \%$ | $58.0 \%$ |
| Arts, entertainment, and <br> recreation | 818 | $+/-185$ | $34.5 \%$ | $65.5 \%$ |
| Accommodation and food services | 354 | $+/-120$ | $59.3 \%$ | $40.7 \%$ |


| SUBJECT | 2012-16 <br> ACS | MARGIN <br> OF <br> TOTAL <br> ERROR | 2012-16 <br> ACS <br> PERCENT <br> MALE <br> ESTIMATE | 2012-16 <br> ACS <br> PERCENT <br> FEMALE <br> ESTIMATE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Other services, except public <br> administration | 844 | $+/-159$ | $61.1 \%$ | $38.9 \%$ |
| Public administration | 1,401 | $+/-244$ | $63.2 \%$ | $36.8 \%$ |

Source2012-2016 ACS, Industry by Sex
Appendix 2.4: McClain County Educational Attainment 2012-2016 ACS

| SUBJECT | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2012-16 } \\ \text { ACS TOTAL } \\ \text { ESTIMATE } \end{gathered}$ | MARGIN <br> OF <br> ERROR | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2012-16 } \\ \text { ACS } \end{gathered}$ <br> PERCENT ESTIMATE | 2012-16 <br> ACS <br> PERCENT MALES ESTIMATE | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2012-16 } \\ \text { ACS } \\ \text { PERCENT } \\ \text { FEMALES } \\ \text { ESTIMATE } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Population 18 to 24 years | 3,020 | +/-91 | (X) | (X) | (X) |
| Less than high school graduate | 498 | +/-105 | 16.5\% | 15.8\% | 17.2\% |
| High school graduate (includes equivalency) | 1,297 | +/-187 | 42.9\% | 44.0\% | 41.7\% |
| Some college or associate's degree | 1,127 | +/-176 | 37.3\% | 37.9\% | 36.7\% |
| Bachelor's degree or higher | 98 | +/-74 | 3.2\% | 2.2\% | 4.4\% |
| Population 25 years and over | 24,583 | +/-87 | (X) | (X) | (X) |
| Less than 9th grade | 1,112 | +/-197 | 4.5\% | 4.9\% | 4.2\% |
| 9th to 12th grade, no diploma | 1,831 | +/-220 | 7.4\% | 7.0\% | 7.9\% |
| High school graduate (includes equivalency) | 8,475 | +/-522 | 34.5\% | 35.1\% | 33.8\% |
| Some college, no degree | 5,719 | +/-396 | 23.3\% | 24.3\% | 22.2\% |
| Associate's degree | 1,805 | +/-251 | 7.3\% | 7.2\% | 7.5\% |
| Bachelor's degree | 4,073 | +/-366 | 16.6\% | 14.6\% | 18.5\% |
| Graduate or professional degree | 1,568 | +/-232 | 6.4\% | 6.9\% | 5.9\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent high school graduate or higher | (X) | (X) | 88.0\% | 88.2\% | 87.9\% |


| Percent bachelor's <br> degree or higher | (X) | (X) | $22.9 \%$ | $21.5 \%$ | $24.3 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Source2012-2016 ACS, Educational Attainment

Appendix 2.5: McClain County, Housing Units and Vehicles Available 2012-2016 ACS

| SUBJECT | OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS |  | OWNER-OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS |  | RENTER-OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2012-16 } \\ \text { ACS } \\ \text { Estimate } \end{gathered}$ | Margin of Error | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 2012-16 \\ \text { ACS } \\ \text { Estimate } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Margin of Error | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2012-16 \\ \text { ACS } \\ \text { Estimate } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Margin of Error |
| Occupied housing units | 13,532 | +/-203 | 10,718 | +/-262 | 2,814 | +/-219 |
| UNITS IN STRUCTURE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1, detached | 80.9\% | +/-1.3 | 85.9\% | +/-1.5 | 61.8\% | +/-4.7 |
| 1, attached | 0.9\% | +/-0.5 | 0.4\% | +/-0.3 | 3.1\% | +/-1.9 |
| 2 apartments | 0.4\% | +/-0.3 | 0.0\% | +/-0.1 | 1.8\% | +/-1.3 |
| 3 or 4 apartments | 0.7\% | +/-0.4 | 0.0\% | +/-0.2 | 3.3\% | +/-1.8 |
| 5 to 9 apartments | 1.6\% | +/-0.6 | 0.0\% | +/-0.1 | 7.5\% | +/-2.9 |
| 10 or more apartments | 1.3\% | +/-0.4 | 0.0\% | +/-0.2 | 6.4\% | +/-2.0 |
| Mobile home or other type of housing | 14.2\% | +/-1.2 | 13.7\% | +/-1.5 | 16.2\% | +/-4.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VEHICLES AVAILABLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No vehicle available | 2.7\% | +/-0.8 | 1.8\% | +/-0.8 | 6.1\% | +/-2.3 |
| 1 vehicle available | 25.1\% | +/-2.0 | 19.3\% | +/-1.9 | 47.4\% | +/-5.6 |
| 2 vehicles available | 44.4\% | +/-2.4 | 46.8\% | +/-2.5 | 35.0\% | +/-5.0 |
| 3 or more vehicles available | 27.8\% | +/-2.1 | 32.0\% | +/-2.5 | 11.5\% | +/-2.5 |

Source: 2012-2016 ACS, Physical Housing Characteristics for Occupied Housing Units

Appendix 2.6: McClain County Means of Transportation, 2012-2016 ACS

| SUBJECT | $\mathbf{2 0 1 2 - 1 6}$ <br> ACS <br> ESTIMATE | MARGIN <br> OF ERROR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Workers 16 years and over | 16,736 | $+/-429$ |
| MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION <br> TO WORK |  |  |
| Car, truck, or van | $92.3 \%$ | $+/-1.5$ |
| Drove alone | $85.8 \%$ | $+/-1.8$ |
| Carpooled | $6.5 \%$ | $+/-1.3$ |
| In 2-person carpool | $4.9 \%$ | $+/-1.3$ |
| In 3-person carpool | $1.0 \%$ | $+/-0.4$ |


| SUBJECT | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2012-16 } \\ \text { ACS } \\ \text { ESTIMATE } \end{gathered}$ | MARGIN OF ERROR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In 4-or-more person carpool | 0.7\% | +/-0.4 |
| Workers per car, truck, or van | 1.04 | +/-0.01 |
| Public transportation (excluding taxicab) | 0.0\% | +/-0.1 |
| Walked | 0.9\% | +/-0.5 |
| Bicycle | 0.2\% | +/-0.2 |
| Taxicab, motorcycle, or other means | 0.8\% | +/-0.3 |
| Worked at home | 5.8\% | +/-1.4 |
| PLACE OF WORK |  |  |
| Worked in state of residence | 99.0\% | +/-0.4 |
| Worked in county of residence | 37.8\% | +/-2.7 |
| Worked outside county of residence | 61.2\% | +/-2.8 |
| Worked outside state of residence | 1.0\% | +/-0.4 |
| Living in a place | 73.9\% | +/-1.9 |
| Worked in place of residence | 18.3\% | +/-1.8 |
| Worked outside place of residence | 55.6\% | +/-2.5 |
| Not living in a place | 26.1\% | +/-1.9 |
| Living in 12 selected states | 0.0\% | +/-0.1 |
| Worked in minor civil division of residence | 0.0\% | +/-0.1 |
| Worked outside minor civil division of residence | 0.0\% | +/-0.1 |
| Not living in 12 selected states | 100.0\% | +/-0.1 |
| Workers 16 years and over who did not work at home | 15,773 | +/-491 |
| TIME LEAVING HOME TO GO TO WORK |  |  |
| 12:00 a.m. to 4:59 a.m. | 5.1\% | +/-1.1 |
| 5:00 a.m. to 5:29 a.m. | 3.9\% | +/-1.0 |
| 5:30 a.m. to 5:59 a.m. | 6.2\% | +/-1.2 |
| 6:00 a.m. to 6:29 a.m. | 10.9\% | +/-1.4 |
| 6:30 a.m. to 6:59 a.m. | 13.7\% | +/-1.9 |



Source: 2012-2016 ACS Commute Characteristics

Appendix 2.7: McClain County Selected Economic, 2012-2016 ACS

| SUBJECT | 2012-16 <br> ACS <br> ESTIMATE | MARGIN <br> OF <br> ERROR | PERCENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Own children of the <br> householder under 6 years | 2,808 | $+/-181$ | 2,808 |
| All parents in family in <br> labor force | 1,782 | $+/-247$ | $63.5 \%$ |
| Own children of the <br> householder 6 to 17 years | 6,483 | $+/-184$ | 6,483 |


| SUBJECT | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2012-16 } \\ \text { ACS } \\ \text { ESTIMATE } \end{gathered}$ | MARGIN OF ERROR | PERCENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All parents in family in labor force | 4,761 | +/-329 | 73.4\% |
| COMMUTING TO WORK |  |  |  |
| Workers 16 years and over | 16,736 | +/-429 | 16,736 |
| Car, truck, or van -- drove alone | 14,362 | +/-468 | 85.8\% |
| Car, truck, or van -carpooled | 1,091 | +/-226 | 6.5\% |
| Public transportation (excluding taxicab) | 0 | +/-20 | 0.0\% |
| Walked | 153 | +/-79 | 0.9\% |
| Other means | 167 | +/-66 | 1.0\% |
| Worked at home | 963 | +/-228 | 5.8\% |
| Mean travel time to work (minutes) | 27.0 | +/-1.0 | (X) |
| Class of Worker |  |  |  |
| Civilian employed population 16 years and over | 17,038 | +/-411 | 17,038 |
| Private wage and salary workers | 12,017 | +/-407 | 70.5\% |
| Government workers | 3,453 | +/-363 | 20.3\% |
| Self-employed in own not incorporated business workers | 1,516 | +/-211 | 8.9\% |
| Unpaid family workers | 52 | +/-48 | 0.3\% |
| Income and Benefits (In 2015 Inflation Adjusted Dollars |  |  |  |
| Total households | 13,532 | +/-203 | 13,532 |
| Less than \$10,000 | 601 | +/-119 | 4.4\% |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999 | 716 | +/-150 | 5.3\% |
| \$15,000 to \$24,999 | 1,234 | +/-180 | 9.1\% |
| \$25,000 to \$34,999 | 1,392 | +/-205 | 10.3\% |
| \$35,000 to \$49,999 | 1,933 | +/-247 | 14.3\% |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 2,538 | +/-235 | 18.8\% |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 1,990 | +/-241 | 14.7\% |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999 | 2,011 | +/-205 | 14.9\% |
| \$150,000 to \$199,999 | 606 | +/-141 | 4.5\% |


| SUBJECT | 2012-16 <br> ACS <br> ESTIMATE | MARGIN <br> OF <br> ERROR | PERCENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 200,000$ or more | 511 | $+/-127$ | $3.8 \%$ |
| Median household income <br> (dollars) | 58,673 | $+/-4,137$ | $(\mathrm{X})$ |

Source2012-2016 ACS, Industry by Sex, Occupation by Sex, Selected Economic Characteristics

Appendix 2.8: McClain County Population and Employment by TAZ

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CITY | TAZ 2010 | POP <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ <br> EMPL |
| Blanchard (OCARTS) | 2241.0000 | 89 | 1 |
| Blanchard (OCARTS) | 2280.0000 | 231 | 0 |
| Blanchard (OCARTS) | 2281.0000 | 249 | 0 |
| Blanchard (OCARTS) | 2312.0000 | 122 | 6 |
| Blanchard (OCARTS) | 2346.0000 | 937 | 220 |
| Blanchard (OCARTS) | 2354.0000 | 1333 | 258 |
| Blanchard (OCARTS) | 2372.0000 | 852 | 25 |
| Blanchard (OCARTS) | 2383.0000 | 487 | 58 |
| Blanchard (OCARTS) | 2384.0000 | 461 | 514 |
| Blanchard (OCARTS) | 2397.0000 | 617 | 150 |
| Blanchard (OCARTS) | 2398.0000 | 143 | 27 |
| Blanchard (OCARTS) | 2404.0000 | 40 | 60 |
| Blanchard (OCARTS) | 2415.0000 | 96 | 10 |
| Blanchard (OCARTS) | 2435.0000 | 45 | 0 |
| Blanchard (OCARTS) | 2441.0000 | 58 | 2 |
| Cole (OCARTS) | 2366.0000 | 0 | 0 |
| Cole (OCARTS) | 2372.0000 | 0 | 0 |
| Cole (OCARTS) | 2404.0000 | 159 | 13 |
| Cole (OCARTS) | 2405.0000 | 68 | 2 |
| Cole (OCARTS) | 2435.0000 | 254 | 17 |
| Cole (OCARTS) | 2436.0000 | 74 | 2 |
| Dibble (OCARTS) | 2435.0000 | 84 | 5 |
| Dibble (OCARTS) | 2441.0000 | 98 | 0 |
| Dibble (OCARTS) | 2454.0000 | 2 | 0 |
| Dibble (OCARTS) | 2455.0000 | 324 | 135 |
| Dibble (OCARTS) | 2463.0000 | 0 | 7 |
| Goldsby (OCARTS) | 2334.0000 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |


| CITY | TAZ 2010 | $\begin{gathered} \text { POP } \\ 2010 \end{gathered}$ | 2010 <br> EMPL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Goldsby (OCARTS) | 2366.0000 | 551 | 3002 |
| Goldsby (OCARTS) | 2399.0000 | 91 | 146 |
| Goldsby (OCARTS) | 2400.0000 | 478 | 171 |
| Goldsby (OCARTS) | 2405.0000 | 184 | 107 |
| Goldsby (OCARTS) | 2426.0000 | 453 | 160 |
| Goldsby (OCARTS) | 2436.0000 | 8 | 0 |
| Goldsby (OCARTS) | 2457.0000 | 36 | 4 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2212.0000 | 231 | 0 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2312.0000 | 1 | 0 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2346.0000 | 37 | 0 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2347.0000 | 0 | 0 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2366.0000 | 302 | 7 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2372.0000 | 203 | 4 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2398.0000 | 4 | 0 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2399.0000 | 0 | 0 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2400.0000 | 181 | 47 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2401.0000 | 0 | 0 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2404.0000 | 289 | 2 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2405.0000 | 144 | 5 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2415.0000 | 97 | 2 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2426.0000 | 58 | 4 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2435.0000 | 602 | 33 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2436.0000 | 314 | 23 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2441.0000 | 133 | 0 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2442.0000 | 41 | 0 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2448.0000 | 5 | 0 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2454.0000 | 54 | 0 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2455.0000 | 385 | 9 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2456.0000 | 484 | 11 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2457.0000 | 948 | 64 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2458.0000 | 54 | 0 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2463.0000 | 53 | 0 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2478.0000 | 292 | 0 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2479.0000 | 299 | 2 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2480.0000 | 171 | 0 |


| CITY | TAZ 2010 | $\begin{gathered} \text { POP } \\ 2010 \end{gathered}$ | 2010 <br> EMPL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2482.0000 | 31 | 0 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2493.0000 | 92 | 13 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2494.0000 | 206 | 0 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2495.0000 | 0 | 0 |
| McClain County (OCARTS) | 2497.0000 | 0 | 0 |
| Newcastle (OCARTS) | 2064.0000 | 449 | 628 |
| Newcastle (OCARTS) | 2115.0000 | 202 | 46 |
| Newcastle (OCARTS) | 2116.0000 | 407 | 278 |
| Newcastle (OCARTS) | 2117.0000 | 440 | 175 |
| Newcastle (OCARTS) | 2140.0000 | 319 | 6 |
| Newcastle (OCARTS) | 2141.0000 | 221 | 2 |
| Newcastle (OCARTS) | 2163.0000 | 250 | 19 |
| Newcastle (OCARTS) | 2168.0000 | 27 | 1 |
| Newcastle (OCARTS) | 2169.0000 | 768 | 260 |
| Newcastle (OCARTS) | 2170.0000 | 0 | 0 |
| Newcastle (OCARTS) | 2212.0000 | 237 | 0 |
| Newcastle (OCARTS) | 2213.0000 | 1664 | 113 |
| Newcastle (OCARTS) | 2214.0000 | 1456 | 393 |
| Newcastle (OCARTS) | 2312.0000 | 51 | 18 |
| Newcastle (OCARTS) | 2333.0000 | 685 | 19 |
| Newcastle (OCARTS) | 2334.0000 | 153 | 170 |
| Newcastle (OCARTS) | 2366.0000 | 331 | 17 |
| Newcastle (OCARTS) | 2372.0000 | 25 | 0 |
| Newcastle (OCARTS) | 2400.0000 | 0 | 0 |
| Purcell (OCARTS) | 2400.0000 | 0 | 5 |
| Purcell (OCARTS) | 2426.0000 | 3 | 10 |
| Purcell (OCARTS) | 2442.0000 | 301 | 10 |
| Purcell (OCARTS) | 2448.0000 | 1187 | 574 |
| Purcell (OCARTS) | 2457.0000 | 218 | 1 |
| Purcell (OCARTS) | 2458.0000 | 4 | 2 |
| Purcell (OCARTS) | 2459.0000 | 529 | 95 |
| Purcell (OCARTS) | 2469.0000 | 1887 | 664 |
| Purcell (OCARTS) | 2480.0000 | 167 | 82 |
| Purcell (OCARTS) | 2481.0000 | 78 | 597 |
| Purcell (OCARTS) | 2482.0000 | 1154 | 930 |


|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CITY | TAZ 2010 | POP <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ <br> EMPL |
| Purcell (OCARTS) | 2493.0000 | 313 | 60 |
| Purcell (OCARTS) | 2494.0000 | 43 | 28 |
| Washington (OCARTS) | 2436.0000 | 158 | 83 |
| Washington (OCARTS) | 2456.0000 | 6 | 0 |
| Washington (OCARTS) | 2457.0000 | 454 | 142 |
| SORTPO | Wayne(SORTPO) | 100 | 681 |
| SORTPO | County | 1 | 449 |
|  |  | 2 | 623 |
|  |  | 3 | 490 |
|  |  | 4 | 519 |
|  |  | 5 | 385 |
|  |  | 6 | 486 |
|  |  | 7 | 380 |
|  |  | 8 | 628 |
|  |  | 9 | 577 |
|  |  | 10 | 342 |
|  |  | 11 | 424 |

Source: SORTPO, US Census, American Factfinder

Appendix 2.9: McClain County Major Employers, 2018

| BUSINESS / INDUSTRY NAME | STREET ADDRESS | CITY | $2018 \text { \# }$ <br> EMPLOYEES | TAZ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BJs Oilfield Construction Inc | 722 W. Veterans Memorial Hwy. | Blanchard | 20-49 | 2383 |
| Blanchard Building Center | 700 S. Tyler Ave. | Blanchard | 20-49 | 2404 |
| Blanchard School - Middle School | 610 NE 7th | Blanchard | 20-49 | 2384 |
| Blanchard School Elementary School | 1620 N. Main St. | Blanchard | 50-99 | 2346 |
| Blanchard School - High School | 1440 N. County Line | Blanchard | 20-49 | 2384 |
| Blanchard School Intermediate | 310 N. Tyler | Blanchard | 20-49 | 2384 |
| Bonici Bros Pizza | 202 E. Veterans Memorial Hwy. | Blanchard | 10-19 | 2384 |
| Burrito Grill | 215 W. Veterans Memorial Hwy. | Blanchard | 10-19 | 2397 |
| Chevrolet Knippelmier | Hwy. 62 | Blanchard | 20-49 | 2346 |
| City of Blanchard | 122 N. Main St. | Blanchard | 10-19 | 2397 |
| City of Blanchard - Fire Dept. | 106 N. Monroe Ave. | Blanchard | 10-19 | 2397 |
| City of Blanchard Police Dept. | 117 W. Broadway | Blanchard | 20-49 | 2397 |
| Domino Food \& Fuel | 1235 NE 10th St. | Blanchard | 10-19 | 2346 |
| Domino Food \& Fuel | 416 E. Veterans Memorial Hwy. | Blanchard | 10-19 | 2397 |
| Elite Metal Polishing Service | 219 N. Main St. | Blanchard | 10-19 | 2383 |
| Free Will Baptist Church | 1300 N Main St. | Blanchard | 50-99 | 2354 |
| Healthcare Stat | 821 E. Veterans Memorial Hwy. | Blanchard | 10-19 | 2384 |
| Knippelmeir Chevrolet | 1811 E. US 62 | Blanchard | 50-99 | 2346 |
| KT's Smokehouse | 8329 N. Council Ave. | Blanchard | 10-19 | 2241 |
| Land Services Inc | 107 N. Main St. | Blanchard | 20-49 | 2397 |
| Legacy Bank | 107 NE 10th St. | Blanchard | 10-19 | 2354 |
| Liberty National Bank | 107 NE 10th St. | Blanchard | 10-19 | 2354 |
| Matador Processors | 1820 N. Council Ave. | Blanchard | 50-99 | 2346 |


| BUSINESS / INDUSTRY NAME | STREET ADDRESS | CITY | $2018 \text { \# }$ <br> EMPLOYEES | TAZ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mazzio's Italian Eatery | 869 E. Veterans Memorial Hwy. | Blanchard | 20-49 | 2346 |
| McClain Grady County EMS | US 62/Main St. | Blanchard | 10-19 | 2384 |
| M-T Septic \& Backhoe Svc. | 911 S. Mustang Rd. | Blanchard | 10-19 | 2116 |
| Oklahoma Elite Polishing | 114 NW 3rd St. | Blanchard | 10-19 | 2383 |
| Oklahoma Rolloff | 1100 N. Council Ave. | Blanchard | 10-19 | 2346 |
| Paw Paw's Steak House | 5717 N. Council Ave. | Blanchard | 10-19 | 2354 |
| Pioneer Telephone | 122 N. Main St. | Blanchard | 10-19 | 2384 |
| Saints Family Health Center | 2002 N. Council Ave. | Blanchard | 10-19 | 2346 |
| Senior Village Nursing Home | 1104 N. Madison Ave. | Blanchard | 20-49 | 2354 |
| Sonic Drive In | 1215 E. Veterans Memorial Hwy. | Blanchard | 20-49 | 2384 |
| Spencer's Supermarket IGA | 1018 N Council Ave. | Blanchard | 50-99 | 2346 |
| Wholesale Granite | 2220 N. Council Ave. | Blanchard | 20-49 | 2346 |
| Winter Creek Golf \& Country | 2300 Clubhouse Dr. | Blanchard | 10-19 | 11 |
| Byars School | 45218 10th St. | Byars | 10-19 | 11 |
| Byars Town Hall | 231 E. Main St. | Byars | 1-4 | 11 |
| US Post Office | 252 E. Ripley St. | Byars | 1-4 | 11 |
| Alon Conv Store | 22681 SH 76 | Dibble | 10-19 | 2454 |
| Dibble School District | 100 Main St. | Dibble | 50-99 | 2455 |
| Dibble Volunteer Fire Dept. | 12165 Fireman's Rd. | Dibble | 20-49 |  |
| DJs Conv Store | 22646 SH 76 | Dibble | 10-19 | 2463 |
| Dollar General | 22910 SH 76 | Dibble | 5-9 | 2455 |
| Kim \& Kevin's Store | 12283 SH 39 | Dibble | 5-9 | 2455 |
| Little People's Daycare | 22121 Old Town 1St. SH 39 | Dibble | 5-9 | 2455 |
| Town of Dibble Fire Dept. | 12165 Fireman's Rd. | Dibble | 20-49 | 2455 |


| BUSINESS / INDUSTRY NAME | STREET ADDRESS | CITY | $2018 \text { \# }$ <br> EMPLOYEES | TAZ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Comfortworks Inc. | 476 W. Interstate Dr. | Goldsby | 20-49 | 2366 |
| Floyd's RV | 912 N Adkins Hill Rd | Goldsby | 20-49 | 2347 |
| Goldsby Gaming Ctr. | 1038 Sycamore Rd. | Goldsby | 100-249 | 2347 |
| H \& H Plumbing \& Utilities Inc | 266 Industrial Blvd. | Goldsby | 50-99 | 2366 |
| Marcum's Nursery | 169 N Main Ave | Goldsby | 50-99 | 2399 |
| McDonald's | 2030 W. SH 9 | Goldsby | 20-49 | 2366 |
| Morton Building | 527 E. Center Rd. | Goldsby | 10-19 | 2347 |
| Panda Express | 1544 W. SH 9 | Goldsby | 10-19 | 2366 |
| Riverwind Casino | 1544 W. SH 9 | Goldsby | 1000-4999 | 2366 |
| Riverwind Hotel | 2901 Bankers Ave. | Goldsby | 20-49 | 2366 |
| Sleep Inn | 2601 Bankers Ave. | Goldsby | 10-19 | 2366 |
| Willows Buffet | 1544 W. SH 9 | Goldsby | 50-99 | 2366 |
| Arby's | 901 NW 32nd St. | Newcastle | 20-49 | 2116 |
| AutoZone | 945 NW 32nd St. | Newcastle | 10-19 | 2116 |
| Braum's Ice Cream \& Dairy | 414 NW 32nd St. | Newcastle | 20-49 | 2116 |
| Carlito's Cafe | 622 NW 32nd St. | Newcastle | 50-99 | 2140 |
| Chickasaw Travel Plaza | 105 NE 24th St. | Newcastle | 10-19 | 2117 |
| City Hall | 422 S. Main St. | Newcastle | 20-49 | 2117 |
| City of Newcastle Fire Dept. | 801 N. Carr Dr. | Newcastle | 10-19 | 2169 |
| City of Newcastle Police Dept. | 860 N. Carr Dr. | Newcastle | 10-19 | 2169 |
| City of Newcastle Public Library | 705 NW 10th St. | Newcastle | 10-19 | 2169 |
| City of Newcastle Water Dept. | 717 N Walker Dr. | Newcastle | 50-99 | 2170 |
| Comfort Inn | 2337 N. Main St. | Newcastle | 10-19 | 2141 |
| Dolese Bros Co | 1533 N Portland Rd. | Newcastle | 100-249 | 2170 |
| Free Will Baptist Church Day Care Ctr. | 3133 NW 24th St. | Newcastle | 10-19 | 2140 |
| Gaming Capital Group | 500 NW 32nd St. | Newcastle | 100-249 | 2140 |


| BUSINESS / INDUSTRY NAME | STREET ADDRESS | CITY | $2018 \text { \# }$ <br> EMPLOYEES | TAZ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Half Time Sports Grill | 2812 Hwy. 62 Access Rd. | Newcastle | 10-19 | 2117 |
| Jimmy's Egg | 600 NW 32nd St. | Newcastle | 10-19 | 2140 |
| Kentucky Fried Chicken | 909 NW 32nd St. | Newcastle | 20-49 | 2166 |
| Legacy Bank | 509 NW 32nd St. | Newcastle | 10-19 | 2166 |
| Little Caesars Pizza | 707 NW 32nd Pl. | Newcastle | 10-19 | 2166 |
| Loves' Travel Stop | 234 NW 24th St. | Newcastle | 20-49 | 2117 |
| Mazzio's Italian Eatery | 632 NW 37th St. | Newcastle | 10-19 | 2140 |
| Mc Donald's | 3254 Hill Star Dr | Newcastle | 20-49 | 2116 |
| Newcastle Casino | 2457 US 62 <br> Service Road | Newcastle | 500-999 | 2117 |
| Newcastle Middle School | NE 2nd St. | Newcastle | 20-49 | 2170 |
| Newcastle School - Early Childhood Ctr. | 251 NE 2nd St. | Newcastle | 20-49 | 2117 |
| Newcastle School Elementary School | 400 NW 10th St. | Newcastle | 50-99 | 2169 |
| Newcastle School - High School | 101 N Main St. | Newcastle | 20-49 | 2141 |
| Oreilly Auto Parts | 555 NW 32nd St. | Newcastle | 10-19 | 2166 |
| Physical Therapy Central | 3699 NW 32nd St. | Newcastle | 10-19 | 2115 |
| Skyline Roofing | 4389 S Penn Ave. | Newcastle | 50-99 | 2333 |
| Sonic Drive In | 855 NW 32nd St. | Newcastle | 20-49 | 2166 |
| Sonic Drive In | 921 N. Main St. | Newcastle | 20-49 | 2170 |
| Taco Bell | 909 NW 32nd St. | Newcastle | 20-49 | 2166 |
| Taco Mayo | 920 N. Main St. | Newcastle | 10-19 | 2170 |
| TriCity Family Clinic | 300 By Pass Rd. | Newcastle | 10-19 | 2140 |
| Walker \& Sons Enterprises | 105 SE 16th St. | Newcastle | 10-19 | 2170 |
| Walmart Supercenter | 3300 Tri City Dr. | Newcastle | 250-499 | 2116 |
| Willows Buffet | 1544 W. SH 9 | Newcastle | 50-99 | 2334 |
| A \& W Restaurants | 2425 SH 74 | Purcell | 10-19 | 2457 |
| American Firefighter LLC | 1711 S. Green Ave. | Purcell | 10-19 | 2469 |
| Barrett Trailers LLC | 1831 Hardcastle Blvd | Purcell | 20-49 | 2481 |
| Braum's Ice Cream \& Dairy | 1711 N. Green Ave. | Purcell | 20-49 | 2469 |


| BUSINESS / INDUSTRY NAME | STREET ADDRESS | CITY | $2018 \text { \# }$ <br> EMPLOYEES | TAZ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Braum's Ice Cream \& Dairy | 2219 SH 74 | Purcell | 50-99 | 2481 |
| Bravos Mexican Grill | 1600 N. Green Ave. | Purcell | 10-19 | 2448 |
| Carl's Junior | 503 W. <br> Washington St. | Purcell | 20-49 | 2469 |
| City of Purcell | 230 W. Main St. | Purcell | 10-19 | 2469 |
| City of Purcell Fire Dept. | 1505 N. Green Ave. | Purcell | 20-49 | 2469 |
| City of Purcell Police Dept. | 1515 N. Green Ave. | Purcell | 20-49 | 2469 |
| City of Purcell Public Library | 919 N. 9th Ave. | Purcell | 10-19 | 2469 |
| Department of Human Services | 1930 S. Green Ave. | Purcell | 20-49 | 2469 |
| Encompass Home Health | 409 N. Green Ave., \#C | Purcell | 10-19 | 2469 |
| Godfather's Pizza | 225 N. Green Ave. | Purcell | 10-19 | 2469 |
| Healthcare Innovations | 210 W Main St. | Purcell | 100-249 | 2482 |
| Horizontal Well Drillers | 2915 SH 74 | Purcell | 20-49 | 6 |
| IBC Bank | 324 W. Main St. | Purcell | 10-19 | 2481 |
| Jo's Famous Pizza | 1538 S. Green Ave. | Purcell | 10-19 | 2448 |
| Kelsey Chevrolet Buick GMC | 1601 N. Green Ave. | Purcell | 20-49 | 2459 |
| Kentucky Fried Chicken | 1718 N. Green Ave. | Purcell | 10-19 | 2448 |
| Loving Care Hospice Health Svc. | 316 W. Polk St. | Purcell | 20-49 | 2448 |
| Loving Care In Home Health Svc. | 301 W. Main St. | Purcell | 20-49 | 2482 |
| Mazzio's Italian Eatery | 2021 N. Green Ave. | Purcell | 20-49 | 2459 |
| McClain Bank | 131 W Main St. | Purcell | 50-99 | 2482 |
| McClain County Barn | 1430 Chandler Park Rd. | Purcell | 10-19 | 2480 |
| McClain County Courthouse | 121 N. 2nd Ave. | Purcell | 50-99 | 2482 |
| McClain Garvin County Youth | 118 S. 2nd Ave. | Purcell | 10-19 | 2482 |


| BUSINESS / INDUSTRY NAME | STREET ADDRESS | CITY | $2018 \text { \# }$ <br> EMPLOYEES | TAZ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| McDonald's | 2211 S. 9th Ave. | Purcell | 50-99 | 2481 |
| Multi County Counseling Inc | 112 W Main St. | Purcell | 20-49 | 2482 |
| ODOT | 23404 N. SH 74 | Purcell | 10-19 | 2458 |
| ODOT Maintenance | 2614 SH 74 | Purcell | 10-19 | 2457 |
| Oklahoma DHS | 1930 S. Green Ave. | Purcell | 20-49 | 2482 |
| Patriot Ford | 2805 N. 9th Ave. | Purcell | 20-49 | 2459 |
| Pizza Hut | 413 S. Green Ave. | Purcell | 10-19 | 2469 |
| Purcell Municipal Hospital | 1500 N. Green Ave. | Purcell | 100-249 | 2482 |
| Purcell School - Early Learning Ctr. | 715 S. 4th Ave. | Purcell | 20-49 | 2482 |
| Purcell School - <br> Elementary School | 201 Lester Ln. | Purcell | 50-99 | 2469 |
| Purcell School - Jr. High School | 201 Lester Ln. | Purcell | 20-49 | 2469 |
| Purcell School- High School | 2020 N Green Ave. | Purcell | 50-99 | 2448 |
| Purcell School - <br> Intermediate School | 711 N 9th Ave. | Purcell | 50-99 | 2469 |
| Rob's Ranch | 2389 SH 74 | Purcell | 10-19 | 2457 |
| Rodney's Pizza Place | 1627 S. Green Ave. | Purcell | 50-99 | 2481 |
| Ruby's Inn | 1737 S. Green Ave. | Purcell | 20-49 | 2481 |
| Sonic Drive In | 508 S. Green Ave. | Purcell | 20-49 | 2482 |
| Sooner State Bank | 131 W. Main St. | Purcell | 50-99 | 2482 |
| Sunset Estates of Purcell | 915 N. 7th Ave. | Purcell | 50-99 | 2469 |
| Taco Bell | 2425 SH 74 | Purcell | 20-49 | 2480 |
| Taco Mayo | 302 S. Green Ave. | Purcell | 10-19 | 2482 |
| United Supermarkets | 1600 N Green Ave. | Purcell | 50-99 | 2448 |
| US Post Office | 228 W. Main St. | Purcell | 10-19 | 2482 |
| Wadley Ambulance Svc. | 426 S. Canadian St. | Purcell | 10-19 | 2482 |
| Wadley Care Ctr. | 801 N. 6th Ave. | Purcell | 50-99 | 2469 |
| Walmart Supercenter | 2015 S Green Ave. | Purcell | 100-249 | 2481 |
| Westbrook Gardens Senior | 1215 Westbrook Blvd. | Purcell | 20-49 | 2457 |
| Axis Service Inc. | 21191 230th St. | Washington | 5-9 | 2457 |


| BUSINESS / INDUSTRY NAME | STREET ADDRESS | CITY | $2018 \text { \# }$ <br> EMPLOYEES | TAZ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| City of Washington | 204 N. Main Ave. | Washington | 1-4 | 2436 |
| DCP Midstream | 19293 SH 74B | Washington | 10-19 | 2436 |
| Forestry Division | 830 NE 12th Ave. | Washington | 50-99 |  |
| Goldsby Construction | 101 E. Kirby St. | Washington | 5-9 | 2457 |
| Goldsby Store | 434 W. Interstate Dr. | Washington | 5-9 |  |
| Hardcastle Construction | 3739 S. Main St. | Washington | 10-19 | 2426 |
| Mallard Construction | 222 W. Chestnut Rd. | Washington | 5-9 | 2366 |
| Marcum's Nursery | 169 N. Main Ave. | Washington | 50-99 |  |
| Oklahoma Vista Fire Sprinklers | 298 Industrial Blvd. | Washington | 20-49 |  |
| Spring Rain Lawn Sprinklers | 235 E. Center Rd. | Washington | 5-9 |  |
| Steel Thinking | 27699 Western Ave. | Washington | 10-19 |  |
| US Post Office | 215 N. Main St. | Washington | 5-9 | 2436 |
| Washington School Public Schools | 101 E. Kirby St. | Washington | 50-99 | 2457 |
| 1st American Bank | 212 S Seifried St. | Wayne | 50-99 | 100 |
| Aztech Lubricants | 29393 SH 59 | Wayne | 50-99 | 8 |
| Blackwell Trucking Inc | 29047 SH 59 | Wayne | 5-9 | 8 |
| County Barn | 101 Railroad St. | Wayne | 10-19 |  |
| Family Dollar | 30516 SH 59 | Wayne | 5-9 | 8 |
| Mid-American Technology Center | 27438 SH 59 | Wayne | 50-99 | 8 |
| Mid-America Technology Ctr. | 14633 Cotton Gin Ave. | Wayne | 5-9 | 8 |
| RJR Construction | 27438 SH 59 | Wayne | 50-99 | 8 |
| Rural Water District | 16599 SH 77 | Wayne | 5-9 | 8 |
| Rural Water District 8 | 105 E. Barger St. | Wayne | 5-9 | 100 |
| Sequoyah Inc. | 12951 Jenny Ln. | Wayne | 20-49 | 8 |
| Tom's Quick Stop | 105 W. Barger St. | Wayne | 5-9 | 100 |
| US Post Office | 15751 Spring Rd. | Wayne | 5-9 | 8 |
| Wayne City Hall | 117 N. Shannon St. | Wayne | 5-9 | 100 |
| Wayne Fire Dept. | 30343 SH 59 | Wayne | 10-19 | 100 |


| BUSINESS / INDUSTRY <br> NAME | STREET <br> ADDRESS | CITY | 2018 \# <br> EMPLOYEES | TAZ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wayne School - Public <br> Schools | 212 S. Seifried St. | Wayne | $50-99$ | 7 |
| Wayne Superette | 509 S. Seifried St. | Wayne | $5-9$ | 100 |

Source: Oklahoma Employment Security Commission, 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 McClain 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 valueforhistoric orprehistoricinformation. 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.

Appendix 2.11: McClain County Environmental Features

| DESCRIPTION | LOCATION |
| :--- | :---: |
| Love Hotel (NR 95001407) | Purcell |
| McClain County Courthouse (NR 84003347) | Purcell |
| U.S. Highway Bridge at the Canadian River (NR <br> 03000882), |  |
| Brewer Site |  |

Source: SORTPO

Appendix 2,12: McClain County Type of Collision Total, 2012-2016

| TYPE OF COLLISION | Fat | Inj * | PD | Tot | Pct |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rear-End (front-to-rear) | 6 | 351 | 630 | 987 | 29.6 |
| Head-On (front-to-front) | 4 | 28 | 15 | 47 | 1.4 |
| Right Angle (front-to-side) | 2 | 111 | 140 | 253 | 7.6 |
| Angle Turning | 2 | 126 | 249 | 377 | 11.3 |
| Other Angle |  | 2 | 4 | 6 | 0.2 |
| Sideswipe Same Direction | 3 | 58 | 218 | 279 | 8.4 |
| Sideswipe Opposite Direction |  | 23 | 42 | 65 | 2.0 |
| Fixed Object | 10 | 232 | 556 | 798 | 24.0 |
| Pedestrian | 2 | 11 | 1 | 14 | 0.4 |
| Pedal Cycle | 1 | 5 |  | 6 | 0.2 |
| Animal |  | 15 | 80 | 95 | 2.9 |
| Overturn/Rollover | 5 | 113 | 65 | 183 | 5.5 |
| Vehicle-Train |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Single Vehicle Crash |  | 12 | 18 | 30 | 0.9 |
| Other | 5 | 42 | 144 | 191 | 5.7 |
| Total | 40 | 1129 | 2162 | 3331 | 100 |
| Percent | 1.2 | 33.9 | 64.9 | 100 |  |

Source: ODOT Traffic Engineering Div. Collision Analysis and Safety Branch *Include incapacitating, non-incapacitating and possible injuries.

Appendix 2.13: McClain County Collision Vehicles by Vehicle Type, Total, 2012-2016

| Vehicle <br> Type | Total |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fat | Inj * | PD | Tot | Pct |  |
| Passenger Vehicle-2 Door |  | 94 | 300 | $\mathbf{3 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 8}$ |  |
| Passenger Vehicle-4 Door | 9 | 508 | 1317 | $\mathbf{1 8 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 . 7}$ |  |
| Passenger Vehicle- <br> Convertible |  | 6 | 17 | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4}$ |  |
| Pickup Truck | 11 | 307 | 1318 | $\mathbf{1 6 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 . 3}$ |  |
| Single-Unit Truck (2 axles) | 1 | 10 | 40 | $\mathbf{5 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9}$ |  |
| Single-Unit Truck (3 or more <br> axles) |  | 3 | 22 | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4}$ |  |
| School Bus |  |  | 6 | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1}$ |  |
| Truck/Trailer | 1 | 6 | 91 | $\mathbf{9 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 7}$ |  |
| Truck-Tractor (bobtail) |  | 1 | 15 | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3}$ |  |
| Truck-Tractor/Semi-Trailer | 2 | 24 | 210 | $\mathbf{2 3 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 1}$ |  |
| Truck-Tractor/Double |  |  | 5 | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1}$ |  |
| Truck-Tractor/Triple |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bus/Large Van (9-15 seats) |  | 1 | 3 | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1}$ |  |


| Vehicle <br> Type | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fat | Inj * | PD | Tot | Pct |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bus (16+ seats) |  | 1 | 4 | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Motorcycle | 5 | 47 | 7 | $\mathbf{5 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Motor Scooter/Moped |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Motor Home |  |  | 10 | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Farm Machinery |  | 1 | 2 | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ATV |  |  | 1 | $\mathbf{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sport Utility Vehicle (SUV) | 6 | 262 | 824 | $\mathbf{1 0 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 . 9}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Passenger Van | 1 | 32 | 86 | $\mathbf{1 1 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Truck More Than 10,000 lbs. |  | 1 | 22 | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Van (10,000 lbs. or less) | 1 | 12 | 45 | $\mathbf{5 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other |  | 11 | 72 | $\mathbf{8 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | 37 | 1327 | 4417 | $\mathbf{5 7 8 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| Percent | $\mathbf{0 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: ODOT Traffic Engineering Div. Collision Analysis and Safety Branch
*Include incapacitating, non-incapacitating and possible injuries

Appendix 2.14: Two Lane Highways Without Paved Shoulders


Appendix 2.15: Steep Hills and Sharp Curves
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Appendix 2.16: McClain County 2016 Annual Average Daily Traffic Count


## Appendix 2.17: Functional Classification and Road Systems

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 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.

Functional classification can be used for, but is not limited to, the following purposes:

- Provide a framework for highways serving mobility and connecting regions and cities within a state.
- Provide a basis for assigning jurisdictional responsibility according to the overall importance of a road.
- Provide a basis for development of minimum design standards according to function.
- Provide a basis for evaluating present and future needs.
- Provide a basis for allocation of limited financial resources.

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 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 intercounty 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

Street Capacity: The measure of a street's ability to accommodate the traffic volume along the street. 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.


## Appendix 2.18: McClain County Functional Classification



Appendix 2.19: Oklahoma Structurally Deficient and Functionally Obsolete Bridges


Appendix 2.20: McClain County On System Bridges with Sufficiency Rate

| FACILITY | LOCATION | SUFFICIENCY | FOSD | OWNER | YEAR <br> BUILT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BNSF R.R. | 0.5 MI. E. JCT. US77 | -2 | N | Railroad | 1936 |
| LADD ROAD | 5.9 S OF CLEVELAND C/L | -1 | - | State | 1901 |
| S.H. 59 | 5.2 S S.H. 59 | -1 | - | State | 1901 |
| S.H. 74B | 6.0 MI. E. JCT. SH76 | 2 | 0 | State | 1918 |
| S.H. 39 | 0.4 MI. W. JCT. US77 | 2 | 0 | State | 1934 |
| S.H. 74B | 5.0 MI. E. JCT. SH76 | 2 | 0 | State | 1956 |
| S.H. 74B | 1.0 MI. W. JCT. SH74 | 2 | 0 | State | 1970 |
| U.S. 62 | 4.2 MI.NE. GRADY CL | 3 | 0 | State | 1938 |
| S.H. 74B | 5.2 MI. E. JCT. SH76 | 6 | 0 | State | 1950 |
| S.H. 76 | 2.8 MI. N. JCT. US62 | 6 | 1 | State | 1950 |
| S.H. 59 | 3.6 MI. S. JCT. SH39 | 9 | 0 | State | 1949 |
| S.H. 59 | 17.1 MI. E. JCT1 US77 | 13.4 | 1 | State | 1936 |
| S.H. 24 | 3.0 MI S OF JCT SH 39 | 16.1 | 0 | State | 1919 |
| S.H. 59 | 2.2 MI. W. JCT. SH74 | 21.2 | 0 | State | 1918 |
| S.H. 59 | 2.5 MI. W. JCT. SH74 | 21.2 | 0 | State | 1967 |
| S.H. 76 | 4.7 MI. JCT. SH39 | 27.6 | 1 | State | 1950 |
| S.H. 9 | JCT I-35 \& SH 9 | 28.1 | 1 | State | 1959 |
| S.H. 24 | 7.4 MI. W-N JCT SH 74 | 34.7 | 1 | State | 1957 |
| I-44 | MCCLAIN \& CLEVELAND C/L | 36 | 0 | State | 1963 |
| I-44 | MCCLAIN \& CLEVELAND C/L | 36 | 0 | State | 1963 |
| S.H. 74B | 3.0 MI. E. JCT. SH76 | 40.5 | 1 | State | 1937 |
| U.S. 62 | 4.3 MI.NE. GRADY CL | 40.5 | 0 | State | 1938 |
| S.H. 74 | 2.7 MI. S. CLEVELAND C/L | 41 | 0 | State | 1959 |
| S.H. 59 | 0.5 MI. E. JCT. SH74 | 41.7 | 0 | State | 1918 |
| U.S. 62 | 4.3 MI.NE. GRADY CL | 41.9 | 0 | State | 1938 |
| S.H. 59 | 5.0 MI. S. JCT. SH39 | 46 | 1 | State | 1985 |
| LADD RD. | 5.9 MI S CLEVELAND C/L | 57.4 | 0 | State | 1959 |
| CO. RD. E1210 | H.E. BAILEY T.P.BR. NO.03.03 | 61 | 2 | Turnpike Authority | 1964 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { CO. RD. } \\ \text { E1200 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | H.E. BAILEY T.P.BR. NO.0.88 | 62.3 | 2 | Turnpike Authority | 1964 |
| CO. RD. | 0.2 MI. S. CLEVELAND CO | 62.4 | 0 | State | 1963 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { CO. RD. } \\ \text { N3020 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | H.E. BAILEY T.P.BR. NO.01.72 | 64.6 | 2 | Turnpike Authority | 1964 |
| I-35 | 6.2 MI S CLEVELAND. C/L | 65 | 2 | State | 1959 |
| S.H. 9 | 4.0 MI. E. JCT. US62 | 65.7 | 0 | State | 1976 |


| FACILITY | LOCATION | SUFFICIENCY | FOSD | OWNER | YEAR <br> BUILT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-35 | 5.2 MI. S. CLEVELAND. C/L | 66 | 2 | State | 1959 |
| I-35 | 4.4 MI. S. CLEVELAND. C/L | 66 | 2 | State | 1959 |
| I-35 | 1.4 MI. S. CLEVELAND. C/L | 66 | 2 | State | 1959 |
| I-35 | . 8 MI. N. JCT. SH74 | 66 | 2 | State | 1968 |
| S.H. 74 | 2.7 MI. S. JCT. SH 59 | 66.4 | 2 | State | 1950 |
| U.S. 77 | N. SIDE OF JCT. SH39 | 68.8 | 0 | State | 1967 |
| U.S. 77 | N. SIDE OF JCT. SH 39 | 68.8 | 0 | State | 1967 |
| I-35 | 8.5 MI. N. GARVIN C/L | 70 | 0 | State | 1967 |
| I-35 | 2.9 MI. N. GARVIN C/L | 70 | 0 | State | 1968 |
| I-35 | 3.3 MI. N. GARVIN C/L | 70 | 0 | State | 1968 |
| S.H. 9 | 5.6 MI. E. JCT. US62 | 70 | 0 | State | 1976 |
| S.H. 9 | 3.4 MI. E. JCT. US 277 | 70.4 | 0 | State | 1976 |
| S.H. 74 | . 6 MI. W. JCT US77 | 70.5 | 0 | State | 1949 |
| S.H. 76 | 5.8 MI. N. JCT. US62 | 73 | 2 | State | 1958 |
| S.H. 59B | 1.0 MI. N. GARVIN C/L | 73.8 | 0 | State | 1957 |
| I-44 | MCCLAIN \& CLEVELAND C/L | 73.9 | 0 | State | 2000 |
| S.H. 74 | 1.4 MI. S. JCT. I35 | 74.7 | 2 | State | 1949 |
| S.H. 76 | 5.0 MI. N. JCT. US62 | 75 | 2 | State | 1958 |
| S.H. 74 | 1.4 MI. S. JCT. SH59 | 75.1 | 2 | State | 1950 |
| S.H. 74 | 0.8 MI. S. JCT. SH59 | 75.1 | 2 | State | 1950 |
| N3175 | 3.1 MI. N. GARVIN C/L | 75.1 | 0 | State | 1968 |
| S.H. 59 | 0.7 MI. W. JCT. US177 | 75.5 | 0 | State | 1931 |
| S.H. 9 | 0.4 MI. E. JCT. US 277 | 75.7 | 0 | State | 1976 |
| I-35 <br> FRONTAGE <br> RD. | 2.8 MI. S. CLEVELAND C/L | 77.8 | 2 | State | 1959 |
| I-35 NB | JCT. I-35 \& SH 74G | 78.4 | 0 | State | 1967 |
| S.H. 59 | 4.7 MI. W. OF BYARS | 78.8 | 0 | State | 1931 |
| S.H. 74 | 7.3 MI. S \& E. JCT. I35 | 79.5 | 0 | State | 1949 |
| S.H. 37 | 1.0 MI. S. CLEVELAND CO | 79.8 | 0 | State | 1963 |
| U.S. 62 | 1.66 MI. S. OF JCT. 130/US62 | 79.8 | 2 | State | 1999 |
| E1420 | 7.5 MI. N. GARVIN C/L | 79.9 | 0 | State | 1967 |
| S.H. 59 | 9.2 MI. SE. JCT. SH39 | 80.7 | 0 | State | 1985 |
| S.H. 74B | 4.2 E. OF SH76 | 81 | 0 | State | 2009 |
| S.H. 74B | 5.0 MI. E. JCT. SH76 | 82.3 | 0 | State | 1995 |
| E1351 | 11.1 MI. S. CLEVELAND C/L | 82.8 | 0 | State | 1959 |


| FACILITY | LOCATION | SUFFICIENCY | FOSD | OWNER | YEAR BUILT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-35 | JCT I-35 \& SH39 | 82.8 | 2 | State | 1968 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { I-35 SB } \\ & \text { RAMP S.H. } 9 \end{aligned}$ | S. OF NORMAN | 82.9 | 0 | State | 2006 |
| S.H. 9 | SH9 W. OVER I-35 | 84.6 | 0 | State | 2010 |
| U.S. 62 | 5.9 MI. N. JCT. SH9 | 84.8 | 0 | State | 1949 |
| S.H. 74B | 2.4 MI. E. JCT. SH76 | 85.4 | 0 | State | 1980 |
| S.H. 9 N SD | 4.0 MI. E. JCT. US62 | 86 | 0 | State | 1940 |
| S.H. 37 | 1.3 MI. W. JCT. US62 | 86.7 | 0 | State | 1991 |
| S.H. 24 | 3.0 MI. S .OF JCT. SH 39 | 86.9 | 0 | State | 1996 |
| S.H. 59 | 2.5 MI. W. JCT. SH74 | 88.5 | 0 | State | 1995 |
| S.H. 76 | 4.7 N. JCT. SH39 | 89 | 0 | State | 2017 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { BAILEY A } \\ & \text { TP (I-44) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 3.0 MI. S. SH37 | 89.4 | 0 | Turnpike Authority | 1963 |
| S.H. 24 | 0.7 MI. W. SH74 | 89.7 | 0 | State | 1991 |
| CHANDLER RD. | . 3 MI. N. JCT. SH74 | 90.4 | 0 | State | 1968 |
| U.S. 62 | 2.0 MI. S. CLEVELAND CO | 90.5 | 2 | State | 1963 |
| S.H. 24 | 1.1 MI. W. SH74 | 91.7 | 0 | State | 1969 |
| U.S. 77 | 2.8 MI. S. JCT. SH39 | 92.1 | 0 | State | 1926 |
| S.H. 59 | 0.5 MI. W. OF BYARS | 92.3 | 0 | State | 1931 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { BAILEY A } \\ & \text { TP (I-44) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | H.E. BAILEY T.P. BR. NO.00.92 | 92.6 | 0 | Turnpike Authority | 1964 |
| S.H. 59 | 3.2 MI. W. JCT. US177 | 93.4 | 0 | State | 1931 |
| I-35 | 2 MI. N. GARVIN C/L | 93.6 | 2 | State | 1968 |
| I-35 | 2 MI. N. GARVIN C/L | 93.6 | 2 | State | 1968 |
| S.H. 59 | 3.6 MI. S. JCT. SH39 | 93.7 | 0 | State | 1998 |
| U.S. 77 | 1.4 MI. S. JCT. SH39 | 93.8 | 0 | State | 1951 |
| I-35 | JCT. I-35 \& SH74 | 93.9 | 0 | State | 1967 |
| I-35 | JCT. I-35 \& SH74 | 93.9 | 0 | State | 1967 |
| I-35 | JCT. I-35 \& SH39 | 93.9 | 2 | State | 1968 |
| S.H. 76 | 2.8 MI. N. JCT. US62 | 94.4 | 0 | State | 2016 |
| S.H. 24 | 4.1 MI. N. JCT. SH39 | 94.7 | 0 | State | 1993 |
| S.H. 74 EB | JCT. I-35 \& SH74 | 94.9 | 0 | State | 1968 |
| S.H. 74 WB | JCT. I-35 \& SH74 | 94.9 | 0 | State | 1968 |
| S.H. 59 | 9.5 MI. S. \& E. OF JCT./SH39 | 95 | 0 | State | 1940 |
| S.H. 59 | 6.8 MI. S. JCT. SH39 | 95 | 0 | State | 1959 |
| S.H. 24 | 4.5 MI. N. JCT. SH39 | 95 | 0 | State | 1993 |


| FACILITY | LOCATION | SUFFICIENCY | FOSD | OWNER | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YEAR } \\ & \text { BUILT } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| U.S. 77 | 4.9 MI. S. JCT. SH39 | 95.2 | 0 | State | 1926 |
| S.H. 39 | 2.7 MI. W. JCT. US77 | 95.2 | 0 | State | 1934 |
| S.H. 59 | 1.6 MI. W. JCT. US177 | 95.3 | 0 | State | 1972 |
| U.S. 62 | 0.6 MI. NE. GRADY C/L | 95.4 | 0 | State | 1932 |
| BAILEY <br> NORMAN <br> SPUR | MP 3.55 | 95.7 | 0 | Turnpike Authority | 2000 |
| BAILEY NORMAN SPUR | MP 4.49 | 95.7 | 0 | Turnpike Authority | 2000 |
| BAILEY NORMAN SPUR | MP 6.67 | 95.7 | 0 | Turnpike Authority | 2000 |
| BAILEY NORMAN SPUR | MP 8.206 | 95.7 | 0 | Turnpike Authority | 2000 |
| QUAIL HAVEN RD. | MP 6.46 | 95.8 | 0 | Turnpike Authority | 2000 |
| ROCKWELL AVE. | MP 4.79 | 95.9 | 0 | Turnpike Authority | 2000 |
| I-35 | . 7 MI. N. JCT. SH 39 | 96 | 0 | State | 1967 |
| I-35 | . 7 MI. N. JCT. SH 39 | 96 | 0 | State | 1967 |
| BAILEY NORMAN SPUR | MP 5.34N | 96 | 0 | Turnpike Authority | 2000 |
| BAILEY NORMAN SPUR | MP 5.34S | 96 | 0 | Turnpike Authority | 2000 |
| S.H. 39 | . 4 W. OF JCT. U.S. 77 | 96.5 | 0 | State | 2002 |
| I-35 | 9.2 MI. S. CLEVELAND C/L | 96.9 | 0 | State | 1959 |
| I-35 | 9.2 MI. S. CLEVELAND C/L | 96.9 | 0 | State | 1959 |
| I-35 | 1.2 MI. N. JCT. SH39 | 96.9 | 0 | State | 1967 |
| I-35 | 1.2 MI. N. JCT. SH39 | 96.9 | 0 | State | 1967 |
| S.H. 24 | 0.5 MI. N. JCT. SH39 | 97.4 | 0 | State | 1970 |
| U.S. 62 | 0.6 MI. NE. GRADY CL | 97.5 | 0 | State | 2005 |
| I-35 | . 3 MI. S. CLEVELAND. C/L | 97.7 | 0 | State | 1988 |
| I-35 | . 3 MI. S. CLEVELAND. C/L | 97.7 | 0 | State | 1988 |
| I-35 | 4.4 MI. N. GARVIN C/L | 97.8 | 0 | State | 1968 |
| I-35 | 4.4 MI. N. GARVIN C/L | 97.8 | 0 | State | 1968 |


| FACILITY | LOCATION | SUFFICIENCY | FOSD | OWNER | YEAR <br> BUILT |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S.H. 74B | 7.0 MI. E. JCT. SH76 | 97.8 | 0 | State | 1995 |
| S.H. 74B | 1.0 MI. W. JCT. SH74 | 97.8 | 0 | State | 1995 |
| I-35 | .6 MI. N. JCT. SH39 | 97.9 | 0 | State | 1967 |
| I-35 | .6 MI. N. JCT. SH39 | 97.9 | 0 | State | 1967 |
| S.H. 74B | 6.0 MI. E. JCT. SH76 | 98.1 | 0 | State | 1995 |
| S.H. 74B | 5.2 MI. E. JCT. SH76 | 98.4 | 0 | State | 1995 |
| BAILEY <br> NORMAN <br> SPUR | JCT. SH76 | 99 | 0 | Turnpike <br> Authority | 2000 |
| BAILEY <br> NORMAN <br> SPUR | JCT. SH76 |  |  |  |  |
| S.H. 59 | 2.8 MI. W. JCT. SH74 | 99 | 0 | Turnpike | 2000 |
| S.H. 59 | 2.2 MI. W. JCT. SH74 | 99.6 | 0 | State | 1973 |
| S.H. 59 | 0.5 MI. E. JCT. SH74 | 99.6 | 0 | State | 1999 |
| S.H. 24 | 7.4 W. JCT. SH74 | 99.6 | 0 | State | 2006 |
| U.S. 62 | 4.2 MI. NE. GRADY CL | 99.9 | 0 | State | 1995 |
| U.S. 62 | 4.2 MI. NE. GRADY CL | 99.9 | 0 | State | 1995 |
| U.S. 62 | 4.3 MI. NE. GRADY CL | 99.9 | 0 | State | 1995 |
| U.S. 62 | 4.3 MI. NE. GRADY CL | 99.9 | 0 | State | 1995 |
| U.S. 62 | 7.8 MI. NE. SH74B | 99.9 | 0 | State | 2000 |
| U.S. 62 | 7.8 MI. NE. SH74B | 99.9 | 0 | State | 2000 |
| I-35 | 8.5 MI. N. GARVIN C/L | 100 | 0 | State | 1967 |
| FR0NTAGE <br> RD. |  |  |  |  |  |
| S.H. 24 | 3.4 S. OF JCT. SH59 EAST | 100 | 0 | State | 2003 |

Source: ODOT

## Appendix 2.21: McClain County Off System Bridges

| FEATURE <br> INTERSECTION | LOCATION |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |$\quad$ SUFFICIENCY | FOSD | YEAR <br> BUILT |
| :---: | :---: |
| NORTH FORK <br> WALNUT CREEK | .5 MI. E., .2 MI. N., \& 1.1 W. of <br> COLE |
| CREEK | 280TH ST. 1.8 MI. W. of <br> WESTERN |
| BUFFALO CREEK | 1 MI. S.,. .MI. E. of JCT. <br> SH76/SH74B |
| SAND CREEK | 3N.9W of SH24/39 |


| FEATURE INTERSECTION | LOCATION | SUFFICIENCY | FOSD | YEAR <br> BUILT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIBBLE CREEK | .5E 6.5S .8E of BLANCHARD | -1 | - | 1901 |
| DIBBLE CREEK | .5E 6.5S .9E of BLANCHARD | -1 | - | 1901 |
| BEAR CREEK TRIB. | 1.5S 4.4W of PAYNE | -1 | - | 1901 |
| CREEK | . 5 S of BYARS | -1 | - | 1901 |
| CREEK | .5E1S1E1S1E.3N-WASHINGTON | 4.5 | 1 | 1939 |
| CREEK | 1W 1.9N OF BYARS | 4.5 | 1 | 1940 |
| CREEK | .8 MI. W OF BLANCHARD | 5.4 | 1 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 1S OF BYERS | 9.9 | 1 | 1948 |
| TURKEY CREEK | 2. MI. W \& . 5 MI. N OF STEALY | 10.7 | 0 | 1939 |
| CREEK | 1 MI. N \& . 6 MI W OF WASHINGTON | 11.7 | 1 | 1940 |
| CANADIAN SANDY CREEK | 3.7 MI E \& 1.4 MI S OF ROSEDALE | 16.4 | 0 | 1940 |
| NORTH FORK WALNUT CREEK | 1.8 MI N \& . 5 MI. W COLE | 18.6 | 0 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 3.0 S, 2.6 E NEWCASTLE | 18.9 | 1 | 1940 |
| PANTHER CREEK | 2W 2.4S OF CRINER | 18.9 | 1 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 6S 2.9W OF CRINER | 18.9 | 1 | 1948 |
| CREEK | .4 E 3.4 W OF BLANCHARD | 19.1 | 0 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 2.1 W 1.9 N OF WASHINGTON | 19.1 | 0 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 2. W 1.9 N OF WASHINGTON | 19.1 | 0 | 1940 |
| CRINER CREEK | .2E 1.5S .1E OF PAYNE | 19.2 | 0 | 1913 |
| STINSON CREEK | .5N1.5E2N.3E OF BLANCHARD | 19.2 | 1 | 1940 |
| CREEK | .6E 1.N OF COLE | 19.2 | 0 | 1940 |
| CREEK | .5E3.5S1.1E OF BLANCHARD | 19.2 | 1 | 1940 |
| CREEK | . 5 W 1.9 N OF WASHINGTON | 19.2 | 0 | 1940 |
| CRINER CREEK | 3S .5E OF CRINER | 19.2 | 1 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 5W .1N OF CRINER | 19.2 | 1 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 4S 2W .3S OF STEALY | 19.2 | 1 | 1940 |
| PANTHER CREEK | 3S 1W .3S OF CRINER | 19.2 | 1 | 1988 |
| CREEK | .7W 3.4S OF CHISM | 19.4 | 1 | 1940 |
| CREEK | E1440N3130007 | 20.1 | 0 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 0.8 MI E OF GOLDSBY | 20.3 | 0 | 1940 |
| SECOND CREEK | 3W 1N .2E OF STEALY | 20.3 | 0 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 2.6N 2.3E OF BLANCHARD | 21.1 | 0 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 2.3 W . 4 N OF DIBBLE | 21.2 | 0 | 1940 |


| FEATURE INTERSECTION | LOCATION | SUFFICIENCY | FOSD | YEAR <br> BUILT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CREEK | 2.5S 7.2W OF PAYNE | 21.3 | 1 | 1938 |
| CREEK | 1.2W 3.S OF NEWCASTLE | 21.3 | 0 | 1940 |
| CREEK | .1W .1N OF ROSEDALE | 21.4 | 0 | 1939 |
| TURKEY CREEK | 2. N 1.6 W OF STEALY | 22.3 | 0 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 3S 5.7 W OF CRINER | 23.2 | 1 | 1948 |
| CREEK | .9E 1.6N WAYNE | 23.3 | 0 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 2.3 W 1.2 N OF DIBBLE | 23.3 | 0 | 1940 |
| STINSON CREEK | 2.8W, 3.S OF NEWCASTLE | 23.4 | 0 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 1N1.5E1S.5E OF WASHINGTON | 23.4 | 1 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 3S OF CHISM | 23.4 | 1 | 1940 |
| CREEK | .4S 2.9E OF BYARS | 23.8 | 0 | 1940 |
| POND CREEK | 1.0 N, 0.4 E NEWCASTLE | 24.2 | 1 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 2.5W 2N .8E OF WASHINGTON | 24.3 | 1 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 2S 1.2W OF WOODY CHAPEL | 24.3 | 1 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 2.N 1.9W OF GOLDSBY | 24.4 | 0 | 1939 |
| CREEK | 2.S 3.1W OF NEWCASTLE | 24.4 | 0 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 4.0 S, 3.9 E NEWCASTLE | 24.4 | 1 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 1.5 E 1N .5E OF COLE | 24.4 | 1 | 1940 |
| CREEK | .6S OF PAYNE | 24.4 | 1 | 1940 |
| CREEK | . 4 W . 8 N OF DIBBLE | 28.4 | 0 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 2.1 N 2. W OF PURCELL | 29.2 | 0 | 1940 |
| GADDIS CREEK | 1.8S 1.7W OF WAYNE | 29.9 | 1 | 1956 |
| WALNUT CREEK | .2N OF WASHINGTON | 30.2 | 1 | 1927 |
| TURKEY CREEK | 2E .5N OF STEALY | 31.2 | 1 | 1999 |
| TOMIKE CREEK | .8E 1.3S OF ROSEDALE | 31.5 | 0 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 6E 2S .9W OF CRINER | 32.9 | 1 | 1939 |
| CREEK | 4. W 5. N NEWCASTLE | 33.7 | 0 | 1940 |
| FINN CREEK | 3.9 MI E OF CRINER | 33.8 | 0 | 1948 |
| TURKEY CREEK | 2.2 MI W OF STEALY | 33.9 | 1 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 3.3E .6N OF WAYNE | 34.9 | 1 | 1939 |
| CREEK | 1.5S 3.5W OF PAYNE | 35.8 | 1 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 1.E OF STEALY | 36.4 | 1 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 1.7W GOLDSBY3 | 36.8 | 0 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 2.E . 3N OF WOODY CHAPEL | 36.9 | 0 | 1940 |
| SECOND CREEK | 2.6W OF STEALY | 38.9 | 0 | 1939 |
| CREEK | 3.5 E 2. N OF PAOLI | 38.9 | 1 | 1940 |


| FEATURE INTERSECTION | LOCATION | SUFFICIENCY | FOSD | YEAR <br> BUILT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TURKEY CREEK | 1.5W 1.N OF STEALY | 39 | 0 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 2S .4W OF STEALY | 39.9 | 1 | 1940 |
| TURKEY CREEK | 2.S 1.8W OF STEALY | 40 | 0 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 1S .7W OF CHISM | 41 | 1 | 1939 |
| WOLF CREEK | .1E 1.5N 1.5W OF PAYNE | 41 | 1 | 1940 |
| N. FORK WALNUT CREEK | . 5 N .7 W 1.6N OF BLANCHARD | 41 | 1 | 1986 |
| CREEK | 1.6 S OF PAYNE | 41.3 | 1 | 1950 |
| CREEK | 2.1 E 2. S OF GOLDSBY | 41.5 | 0 | 1940 |
| FINN CREEK | 2.S 2.2W OF STEALY | 42.7 | 1 | 1940 |
| SAND CREEK | 3N .9W OF SH24/39 | 43.3 | 1 | 1960 |
| RED BLANKET CREEK | 1.4E 1.5S OF WASHINGTON | 43.3 | 0 | 1993 |
| CREEK | .5E 6.5S .9E OF BLANCHARD | 43.5 | 1 | 1995 |
| TURKEY CREEK | 1W 2N .3W OF STEALY | 44.2 | 0 | 1940 |
| CREEK | .4E OF I-35 ON LADD ROAD | 44.4 | 1 | 1997 |
| CREEK | 2S.1W OF STEALY | 48.3 | 1 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 2E 1.5S OF GOLDSBY | 48.5 | 0 | 1990 |
| CREEK | 1.5S 4.4W OF PAYNE | 49.1 | 1 | 1992 |
| WALNUT CREEK | 1.5W .8N OF COLE | 49.3 | 1 | 1988 |
| DIBBLE CREEK | .5E 6.5S .8E OF BLANCHARD | 50 | 1 | 1988 |
| CREEK | 2W 2.9S OF CRINER | 50.4 | 1 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 2.8E 4S OF WAYNE | 50.9 | 1 | 1939 |
| CREEK | .5E 2N 1.1W OF COLE | 54.2 | 1 | 1990 |
| GADDIS CREEK | 2.3S 2.2W OF WAYNE | 55.2 | 0 | 1939 |
| WALNUT CREEK | .2S2.5W2N.4EOF WASHINGTON | 56.4 | 1 | 1913 |
| BUFFALO CREEK | 1.5W .5N OF COLE | 56.9 | 0 | 1985 |
| CREEK | .5W OF STEALY | 57.5 | 1 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 2.6W 1S OF COLE | 58.5 | 2 | 1988 |
| DIBBLE CREEK | .2N OF DIBBLE | 60.3 | 0 | 1940 |
| RED BLANKET CREEK | .5E1S1E.4N OF WASHINGTON | 62.2 | 0 | 1993 |
| STINSON CREEK | 2S 3.3W OF NEWCASTLE | 62.7 | 1 | 1985 |
| CREEK | 1N 3.2E.1N OF 74/74B | 64.9 | 0 | 1996 |
| CREEK | 1.1S2.3W1N .1W OF PURCELL | 66.7 | 0 | 1989 |
| N. FORK WALNUT CREEK | .5N 1.3E 2N OF BLANCHARD | 67.2 | 2 | 1988 |


| FEATURE INTERSECTION | LOCATION | SUFFICIENCY | FOSD | YEAR BUILT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CREEK | E1420N3160007 | 68.2 | 0 | 1939 |
| CREEK | E1420N3160008 | 68.2 | 0 | 1939 |
| BUFFALO CREEK | 2.5W .4S OF COLE | 68.6 | 0 | 1985 |
| SANDY CREEK | 3W 1N .5W OF WOODY CHAPEL | 69.3 | 0 | 1991 |
| CREEK | . 3 N OF CHISM | 69.5 | 2 | 1939 |
| FINN CREEK | 4E .4S OF CRINER | 69.7 | 0 | 1940 |
| CREEK | . 5 S 4.8 E OF BYARS | 70 | 1 | 1939 |
| STINSON CREEK | 2S 2W 2S .1W OF NEWCASTLE | 70.4 | 0 | 1985 |
| CREEK | . 4 W . 5 S 1 W 1 S .1W OF DIBBLE | 71.6 | 0 | 1992 |
| CRINER CREEK | 2W OF CRINER | 72.7 | 0 | 1964 |
| CREEK | . 5 N . 5 E OF DIBBLE | 73 | 0 | 1985 |
| CREEK | .5E 2S 3.6E OF WASHINGTON | 74.3 | 2 | 1940 |
| STINSON CREEK | . 5 N 1.3 E 2 N .1 EOF BLANCHARD | 74.9 | 0 | 1985 |
| CREEK | . 4 W . 5 S 2W OF DIBBLE | 75 | 0 | 1986 |
| BUFFALO CREEK | .5E2.5S1E.6S OF BLANCHARD | 75 | 0 | 1990 |
| CREEK | 3.4E .1S OF ROSEDALE | 75.3 | 1 | 1940 |
| SECOND CREEK | 1W 1N 1.8W OF STEALY | 76.7 | 0 | 2002 |
| WALNUT CREEK | .5E1.5S1W.9S OF BLANCHARD | 76.8 | 0 | 1987 |
| POND CREEK | 1.0 W, 1.3 N NEWCASTLE | 77.5 | 0 | 1985 |
| CRINER CREEK | 3W .7N OF CRINER | 77.5 | 0 | 1990 |
| SANDY CREEK | 3W 1.4N OF WOODY CHAPEL | 77.9 | 0 | 1988 |
| SECOND CREEK | 2.6W OF STEALY | 78.1 | 0 | 2001 |
| WASHINGTON CREEK | 2N 3.4E OF PAOLI | 78.4 | 0 | 2001 |
| TURKEY CREEK | 2.2W OF STEALY | 78.8 | 0 | 2003 |
| CREEK | .3E .5S .2E OF BLANCHARD | 79.2 | 0 | 1990 |
| N. FORK <br> WALNUT CREEK | . 5 W 2N .9E OF COLE | 80.2 | 0 | 1988 |
| CREEK | 1E 2.6S OF CRINER | 80.5 | 2 | 1940 |
| CRINER CREEK | .2E 1.5S .1E OF PAYNE | 80.8 | 0 | 2003 |
| WALNUT CREEK | 1N .5W .7N OF WASHINGTON | 81.1 | 0 | 1985 |
| WALNUT CREEK | . 5E1.5S1W.3S OF BLANCHARD | 81.8 | 0 | 1990 |
| CREEK | . 5 N .7 W 2.3 N OF BLANCHARD | 82.1 | 0 | 1985 |
| CREEK | 2.7 S, 3.0 E NEWCASTLE | 83 | 0 | 1987 |
| FINN CREEK | 3.4 MI S WOODY CHAPEL | 83.1 | 0 | 2016 |
| NORTH FORK CREEK | .5E .4N OF COLE | 83.3 | 0 | 1986 |


| FEATURE INTERSECTION | LOCATION | SUFFICIENCY | FOSD | YEAR <br> BUILT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DIBBLE CREEK | . 5 S . 5 E . 3 N OF DIBBLE | 84.3 | 0 | 1985 |
| CREEK | . 4 S 2.9 E OF BYARS | 84.7 | 0 | 1999 |
| CREEK | .5E3.5S1E.1SOF BLANCHARD | 84.8 | 0 | 1985 |
| CREEK | .1E OF COUNTY LINE RD | 85.8 | 0 | 1983 |
| CREEK | 1S, .7W OF CHISM | 85.8 | 0 | 2007 |
| CREEK | 1.5E 1N .5E OF COLE | 85.8 | 0 | 2009 |
| CREEK | 1.6E 1.7N OFSH59/US77 | 86 | 0 | 2004 |
| CREEK | 1.6E 1.6N OF SH59/US77 | 86 | 0 | 2004 |
| POND CREEK | 1.0 N, 0.4 E NEWCASTLE | 86 | 0 | 2013 |
| CREEK | 5.5S OF NEWCASTLE | 88.2 | 0 | 1939 |
| RED BLANKET CREEK | .5E 2S .6E OF WASHINGTON | 88.9 | 0 | 1991 |
| CREEK | 1.0 E, 0.1 N NEWCASTLE | 89 | 0 | 1985 |
| CREEK | 1E OF STEALY | 89.1 | 0 | 2005 |
| CREEK | 4E .2S OF CRINER | 89.7 | 0 | 1939 |
| CREEK | 4E 1.7S OF CRINER | 89.7 | 0 | 1939 |
| CREEK | 2.6W, 1S OF COLE | 89.8 | 0 | 2009 |
| COLBERT CREEK | 8.W 1.6S PAYNE | 90.7 | 0 | 1940 |
| CREEK | 0.5M S 4.8M E OF BYARS | 91 | 0 | 2005 |
| CREEK | 3E 2.5S OF SH24/SH74 | 91.1 | 0 | 1938 |
| CREEK | 4S 3.1W OF STEALY | 91.1 | 0 | 1939 |
| CREEK | 2S OF STEALY | 91.1 | 0 | 1950 |
| WALNUT CREEK BRANCH | .9N, .6W OF WASHINGTON | 91.1 | 0 | 2009 |
| COLBERT CREEK | 4W 1S .1W OF CRINER | 92 | 0 | 1985 |
| CREEK | .9E OF STEALY | 92 | 0 | 2005 |
| TOMIKE CREEK | . 5 E 1.3S .3E OF ROSEDALE | 93.1 | 0 | 2002 |
| CREEK | 2S .1W OF STEALY | 93.1 | 0 | 2006 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { RED BLANKET } \\ & \text { BRANCH } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | .5E 2S .7E OF WASHINGTON | 93.9 | 0 | 1991 |
| FINN CREEK | 3E 0.4N OF CRINER | 93.9 | 0 | 1992 |
| CREEK | 2N 2.5W OF PURCELL | 93.9 | 0 | 1999 |
| FINN CREEK | 3E 0.3 N OF CRINER | 94 | 0 | 1992 |
| CREEK | .5E 3.5S 1.1E BLANCHARD | 94.1 | 0 | 2009 |
| TURKEY CREEK | 2. N 1.6 W OF STEALY | 94.3 | 0 | 2000 |
| SECOND CREEK | 6E 1S .1E OF CRINER | 94.9 | 0 | 1940 |


| FEATURE INTERSECTION | LOCATION | SUFFICIENCY | FOSD | YEAR BUILT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WALNUT CREEK TRIB. | 2.5W2N.5E OF WASHINGTON | 95 | 0 | 1995 |
| TURKEY CREEK | 1W 1N .5W OF STEALY | 95 | 0 | 2001 |
| WILDCAT CREEK | .4E OF CRINER | 95.1 | 0 | 1955 |
| FINN CREEK | 2S 2.2W OF STEALY | 95.1 | 0 | 2013 |
| DIBBLE CREEK | .5E 2.9S OF COLE | 95.2 | 0 | 1987 |
| CREEK | .1S 6W OF WASHINGTON | 95.7 | 0 | 1940 |
| POND CREEK | 1.0 N, 1.4 W NEWCASTLE | 95.8 | 0 | 1986 |
| CREEK | 1N 1.3W OF GOLDSBY | 96.9 | 0 | 1989 |
| FINN CREEK TRIB. | 2S 1.2W OF S.H. 24/S.H. 39 | 96.9 | 0 | 2008 |
| WALNUT CREEK | 2.5W 1.5N OF WASHINGTON | 96.9 | 0 | 2013 |
| CREEK | 1.5 N OF GOLDSBY | 97 | 0 | 1939 |
| CREEK | 3.S OF PURCELL | 97 | 0 | 1939 |
| TOMIKE CREEK | .5E 2.5S OF ROSEDALE | 97 | 0 | 1940 |
| BEAR CREEK | 6S 2W 1.6S OF CRINER | 97 | 0 | 1942 |
| CREEK | 1N .2E OF WASHINGTON | 97 | 0 | 1984 |
| CREEK | 1N .3E OF WASHINGTON | 97 | 0 | 1984 |
| CREEK | 1.1 E NEWCASTLE | 97 | 0 | 1985 |
| DIBBLE CREEK | .5E6.5S1E.1S OF BLANCHARD | 97 | 0 | 1985 |
| SANDY CREEK | 4W .7N OF WOODY CHAPEL | 97 | 0 | 1985 |
| CREEK | 3S .6W OF STEALY | 97 | 0 | 1988 |
| CREEK | .9E 1.6N OF WAYNE | 97 | 0 | 1993 |
| TURKEY CREEK | 2S 1.8W OF STEALY | 97 | 0 | 1998 |
| CREEK | 2S .4W OF STEALY | 97 | 0 | 2006 |
| COLBERT CREEK | 2W 3N .5W S.H.76/S.H. 24 | 97 | 0 | 2007 |
| WOLF CREEK | .1E,1.5N 1.5W OF PAYNE | 97 | 0 | 2009 |
| CREEK | 1N, 2.4E OF SH 59 / US 77 | 97 | 0 | 2009 |
| CREEK | 3.3E .6N OF WAYNE | 97 | 0 | 2009 |
| CREEK | .5W OF STEALY | 97 | 0 | 2011 |
| WALNUT CREEK BRANCH | 2E OF WASHINGTON | 97 | 0 | 2012 |
| FINN CREEK | 4S 1W OF STEALY | 98 | 0 | 1982 |
| CREEK | .3E 1.1S OF BLANCHARD | 98 | 0 | 1982 |
| STINSON CREEK | 3W 3S .2E OF NEWCASTLE | 99 | 0 | 1996 |
| BIG CREEK | 3S OF CHISM | 99 | 0 | 2004 |
| CRINER CREEK | 3S .5E OF CRINER | 99.4 | 0 | 2008 |


| FEATURE <br> INTERSECTION | LOCATION | SUFFICIENCY | FOSD | YEAR <br> BUILT |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NORTH CRINER <br> CREEK | 1.1 MI W OF CRINER | 99.9 | 0 | 1987 |
| CREEK | .6N 2.8E OF WAYNE | 100 | 0 | 1986 |
| TOMIKE CREEK | 1.2E .3S OF ROSEDALE | 100 | 0 | 1987 |
| CREEK | 1.7N .5 W OF WAYNE | 100 | 0 | 1989 |
| PANTHER CREEK | 3S 1.5W OF CRINER | 100 | 0 | 1991 |
| CANADIAN <br> SANDY CREEK | 3.7E 1.4S OF ROSEDALE | 100 | 0 | 1995 |
| FINN CREEK | 3.9E OF CRINER | 100 | 0 | 1996 |
| CREEK | 2S 3.1W OF NEWCASTLE | 100 | 0 | 1998 |
| COLBERT CREEK <br> TRIB. | 3.5 NE OF BRADLEY | 100 | 0 | 2013 |
| N. FORK <br> WALNUT CREEK | 2.2N .8W OF BLANCHARD | 100 | 0 | 2016 |

Source: ODOT

## 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 nonInterstate 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 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | START ROUTE No <br> 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 |
|  |  |  | 787.19 |


| 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 |
| OK3R | Burlington <br> Northern <br> Railroad | 23rd St. (BN Terminal to Southwest Avenue) SW Avenue (23rd St. to I-244 ramp.) | 0.56 |
| 0K5P | Port of Catoosa | $\begin{gathered} \text { SR } 266 \text { (Port to US } \\ 169 \text { ) } \end{gathered}$ | 11.42 |
| 0K6P | Johnston's Port 33 (Verdigris River near Muskogee) | From US 412/NS 414, south 0.25 miles, east 1 mile to Terminal | 1.14 |
| Subtotal |  |  | 14.39 |
| PHFS TOTAL |  |  | 801.58 |


| Interstate Not on the <br> PHFS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ROUTE No. | START POINT | END POINT | LENGTH <br> (MILES) |  |
| I235 | I 40 | I 44 | 5.14 |  |
| I 240 | I 35 | I 40 | 11.68 |  |
| I 244 | S. 21st St. | I 44 | 12.24 |  |
| I44 | TX/OK Line | I 240 | 114.91 |  |
| I44 | 0.35 miles S. of <br> S66 | I 35 | 7.7 |  |
| I444 | I244 S | I 244 N | 2.5 |  |
| Subtotal |  |  | 154.15 |  |

Appendix 3.1: McClain County 2040 Population and Employment Projection by TAZ

| SORTPO CITY | TAZ2010 | POP <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ <br> Empl | POP <br> $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | TOT <br> EMP <br> $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 100 | 681 | 255 | 300 | 255 |
| County | 1 | 449 | 85 | 400 | 85 |
|  | 2 | 623 | 115 | 623 | 115 |
|  | 3 | 490 | 155 | 300 | 155 |
|  | 4 | 519 | 25 | 300 | 25 |
|  | 5 | 385 | 10 | 325 | 10 |
|  | 6 | 486 | 55 | 400 | 55 |
|  | 7 | 380 | 125 | 300 | 125 |
|  | 8 | 628 | 220 | 585 | 220 |
| Rosedale area | 9 | 577 | 25 | 300 | 25 |
|  | 10 | 342 | 45 | 150 | 45 |
|  | 11 | 424 | 45 | 200 | 45 |


| OCARTS CITY | TAZ2010 | POP <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ <br> Empl | POP <br> $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | TOT <br> EMP <br> $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Blanchard | 2241.0000 | 89 | 1 | 231 | 1 |
| Blanchard | 2280.0000 | 231 | 0 | 303 | 0 |
| Blanchard | 2281.0000 | 249 | 0 | 381 | 0 |
| Blanchard | 2312.0000 | 122 | 6 | 449 | 7 |
| Blanchard | 2346.0000 | 937 | 220 | 1602 | 276 |
| Blanchard | 2354.0000 | 1333 | 258 | 1959 | 448 |
| Blanchard | 2372.0000 | 852 | 25 | 1184 | 26 |
| Blanchard | 2383.0000 | 487 | 58 | 498 | 60 |
| Blanchard | 2384.0000 | 461 | 514 | 465 | 638 |
| Blanchard | 2397.0000 | 617 | 150 | 673 | 166 |
| Blanchard | 2398.0000 | 143 | 27 | 437 | 82 |
| Blanchard | 2404.0000 | 40 | 60 | 220 | 74 |
| Blanchard | 2415.0000 | 96 | 10 | 165 | 10 |
| Blanchard | 2435.0000 | 45 | 0 | 72 | 0 |
| Blanchard | 2441.0000 | 58 | 2 | 61 | 2 |
| Cole | 2366.0000 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Cole | 2372.0000 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Cole | 2404.0000 | 159 | 13 | 196 | 13 |
| Cole | 2405.0000 | 68 | 2 | 178 | 2 |
| Cole | 2435.0000 | 254 | 17 | 278 | 17 |


| OCARTS CITY | TAZ2010 | POP <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ <br> Empl | POP <br> $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | TOT <br> EMP <br> $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cole | 2436.0000 | 74 | 2 | 120 | 2 |
| Dibble | 2435.0000 | 84 | 5 | 118 | 6 |
| Dibble | 2441.0000 | 98 | 0 | 114 | 4 |
| Dibble | 2454.0000 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 4 |
| Dibble | 2455.0000 | 324 | 135 | 368 | 251 |
| Dibble | 2463.0000 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 13 |
| Goldsby | 2334.0000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Goldsby | 2366.0000 | 551 | 3002 | 1046 | 3422 |
| Goldsby | 2399.0000 | 91 | 146 | 128 | 146 |
| Goldsby | 2400.0000 | 478 | 171 | 562 | 181 |
| Goldsby | 2405.0000 | 184 | 107 | 302 | 107 |
| Goldsby | 2426.0000 | 453 | 160 | 591 | 193 |
| Goldsby | 2436.0000 | 8 | 0 | 18 | 0 |
| Goldsby | 2457.0000 | 36 | 4 | 50 | 4 |
| McClain County | 2212.0000 | 231 | 0 | 298 | 0 |
| McClain County | 2312.0000 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| McClain County | 2346.0000 | 37 | 0 | 82 | 0 |
| McClain County | 2347.0000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| McClain County | 2366.0000 | 302 | 7 | 365 | 46 |
| McClain County | 2372.0000 | 203 | 4 | 438 | 4 |
| McClain County | 2398.0000 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| McClain County | 2399.0000 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 0 |
| McClain County | 2400.0000 | 181 | 47 | 290 | 127 |
| McClain County | 2401.0000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| McClain County | 2404.0000 | 289 | 2 | 363 | 2 |
| McClain County | 2405.0000 | 144 | 5 | 381 | 37 |
| McClain County | 2415.0000 | 97 | 2 | 102 | 2 |
| McClain County | 2426.0000 | 58 | 4 | 101 | 25 |
| McClain County | 2435.0000 | 602 | 33 | 728 | 75 |
| McClain County | 2436.0000 | 314 | 23 | 516 | 23 |
| McClain County | 2441.0000 | 133 | 0 | 159 | 0 |
| McClain County | 2442.0000 | 41 | 0 | 165 | 14 |
| McClain County | 2448.0000 | 5 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| McClain County | 2454.0000 | 54 | 0 | 61 | 0 |
| McClain County | 2455.0000 | 385 | 9 | 476 | 37 |
| McClain County County | 484 | 11 | 598 | 11 |  |
|  |  | 648 | 64 | 2550 | 127 |


| OCARTS CITY | TAZ2010 | POP <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ <br> Empl | POP <br> $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | TOT <br> EMP <br> $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| McClain County | 2458.0000 | 54 | 0 | 183 | 74 |
| McClain County | 2463.0000 | 53 | 0 | 60 | 0 |
| McClain County | 2478.0000 | 292 | 0 | 448 | 0 |
| McClain County | 2479.0000 | 299 | 2 | 366 | 2 |
| McClain County | 2480.0000 | 171 | 0 | 461 | 16 |
| McClain County | 2482.0000 | 31 | 0 | 120 | 52 |
| McClain County | 2493.0000 | 92 | 13 | 167 | 41 |
| McClain County | 2494.0000 | 206 | 0 | 225 | 40 |
| McClain County | 2495.0000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| McClain County | 2497.0000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Newcastle | 2064.0000 | 449 | 628 | 747 | 630 |
| Newcastle | 2115.0000 | 202 | 46 | 298 | 46 |
| Newcastle | 2116.0000 | 407 | 278 | 506 | 292 |
| Newcastle | 2117.0000 | 440 | 175 | 817 | 251 |
| Newcastle | 2140.0000 | 319 | 6 | 574 | 6 |
| Newcastle | 2141.0000 | 221 | 2 | 454 | 2 |
| Newcastle | 2163.0000 | 250 | 19 | 574 | 19 |
| Newcastle | 2168.0000 | 27 | 1 | 52 | 1 |
| Newcastle | 2169.0000 | 768 | 260 | 1089 | 305 |
| Newcastle | 2170.0000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Newcastle | 2212.0000 | 237 | 0 | 394 | 0 |
| Newcastle | 2213.0000 | 1664 | 113 | 2275 | 312 |
| Newcastle | 2214.0000 | 1456 | 393 | 2232 | 801 |
| Newcastle | 2312.0000 | 51 | 18 | 88 | 18 |
| Newcastle | 2333.0000 | 685 | 19 | 1035 | 141 |
| Newcastle | 2334.0000 | 153 | 170 | 180 | 170 |
| Newcastle | 2366.0000 | 331 | 17 | 384 | 17 |
| Newcastle | 2372.0000 | 25 | 0 | 172 | 0 |
| Newcastle | 2400.0000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Purcell | 2400.0000 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| Purcell | 2426.0000 | 3 | 10 | 23 | 10 |
| Purcell | 2442.0000 | 301 | 10 | 466 | 11 |
| Purcell | 2448.0000 | 1187 | 574 | 2305 | 778 |
| Purcell | 2457.0000 | 218 | 1 | 810 | 106 |
| Purcell | 4 | 2 | 90 | 2 |  |
|  |  | 529 | 95 | 926 | 197 |
| Purcell | 1887 | 664 | 2000 | 846 |  |


| OCARTS CITY | TAZ2010 | POP <br> $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ <br> Empl | POP <br> $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ | TOT <br> EMP <br> $\mathbf{2 0 4 0}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Purcell | 2480.0000 | 167 | 82 | 206 | 540 |
| Purcell | 2481.0000 | 78 | 597 | 133 | 1219 |
| Purcell | 2482.0000 | 1154 | 930 | 1258 | 1409 |
| Purcell | 2493.0000 | 313 | 60 | 647 | 158 |
| Purcell | 2494.0000 | 43 | 28 | 49 | 43 |
| Washington | 2436.0000 | 158 | 83 | 254 | 128 |
| Washington | 2456.0000 | 6 | 0 | 48 | 4 |
| Washington | 2457.0000 | 454 | 142 | 659 | 206 |

Source: SORTPO, US Census
*The SORTPO 2040 projection for McClain County was developed using the 2012-16 ACS population data. The assignment of growth for the SORTPO region cannot absorb the total projected growth; therefore the assumption is made that the additional growth will be in the OCARTS area.

## Appendix 3.2 ODOT 8 Year Construction Work Program FFY 2018-2025 Map



## Appendix 4: Public Participation.

## Appendix 4.1: Public Survey




Q3 If you work or attend school outside the home, how many days per week?


Q4 In which county do you work or attend school?



Q6 What type of transportation do you use most often to go to work/school?


Q7 Number of miles traveled (round trip) for work/school?


Q8 How much TIME does it usually take to travel (round trip) to work/school?


Q9 What is your usual method of transportation for OTHER trips such as shopping, appointments, or social outings?


Q10 How many miles do you usually travel for these other trips (per outing)?


Q11 Please indicate how important each of these transportation system components is to you:


Q12 Which do you think should be a priority when selecting transportation projects?


Question 13: What are some specific locations with traffic problems that you encounter

| Traffic Problems |
| :--- |
| Shannon Springs, Chickasha |
| Highway 19 from Chickasha to Pauls Valley needs shoulders. |
| Congestion at 4th and Choctaw, Chickasha |
| 4th Street (US 81) in Chickasha |
| 4th Street (US HWY 81) and Country Club Road in Chickasha OK. Trucks fly through that <br> intersection on yellow and red lights making it extremely dangerous. |
| Highway 81 and Highway 277 |
| Highway 81 and Grand Avenue in Chickasha |
| South 16th overpass |
| 4th and grand avenue, Chickasha |
| Highway 81 south and 277 west |
| Congestion on Choctaw through Chickasha, but especially between 6th St to the Fairground area. |
| 4th \& Choctaw need road improvement, 4th \& Grand open up intersection to the east. Big Trucks <br> on 4th running over curbs. Chickasha |
| Almar \& 81 Highway, no lanes marking east or west and need light. Chickasha |
| Intersections of Choctaw and 4th St. lots of trucks. <br> Flooding along 4th Street, need sidewalks. Chickasha |
| Grady County roads large oil trucks are damaging the roads. |


| Traffic Problems |
| :--- |
| 4th \& Chickasha |
| Grand \& 4th, Chickasha |
| 17th Street, Chickasha |
| 6th, 7th, 8th, Chickasha |
| Highway 37 from Minco to Tuttle has no shoulder at all and is very dangerous. It also has the <br> worst patch job on it at the moment. Hwy 81 from Union City to Chickasha is also very dangerous <br> as it is a high traffic highway and should really be 4 lanes. Hwy 152 West of Minco should also <br> have shoulders. Often 152 and 37 are used as wide load highways, which makes no sense being <br> there is no shoulder at all. <br> On grand, Choctaw and 4th street in town. Then on the way to Minco from Chickasha should be 2 <br> lanes. Always major congestion <br> highway 92 \& highway 62 intersection and east to Cimarron Trailers. Speed limit should be <br> reduced from 65 to 50 or less. this 1/3 mile stretch has numerous entry/exit points for the 2 <br> businesses that employ many people and the 11 houses along the highway. The highway does not <br> have shoulders and drivers slow to 3-5 miles per hour to exit into driveways. Also there have been <br> several accidents and near accidents with traffic traveling west on 62 and the <br> employees/customers/deliveries into and out of Cimarron Trailers. Postal carriers have to stop in <br> lane of traffic at each of the 11 mailboxes, no shoulder. <br> 4 lanes are sufficient without shoulders, we just need the speed limit lowered to 50 or less in this <br> stretch. Even if the motorist does not slow down the lower speed limits signs alert them that there <br> is a need ahead to drive slower <br> 4th Street, Chickasha <br> Constant congestion and not ease of getting to businesses. <br> Main St. <br> US-62 \& US-81 intersection to traffic lights, Chickasha <br> I-35 in Norman <br> highway 9 and I35 <br> I-44/I-40 junction in OKC <br> Council Road and Main Street intersection <br> US 81 \& Hwy 62 intersection. Chickasha <br> 29th Street from Country Club to US 62, Chickasha <br> Country Club and US 81 eastbound light, Chickasha <br> Country Club and OK 92 (Norge Rd) road condition, Chickasha <br> Hwy-81 \& Hwy-62 in Chickasha - too much truck traffic <br> I-35 off ramp onto Highway 9 West; Highway 9 West off ramp onto Highway 62 South |

## Traffic Problems

Some idiot designed improvements to 4th and Grand in Chickasha that are terrible. Trucks can't make the turns without jumping the curb, lanes are too narrow when they could easily have been wider, too many signal lights for travel ( 4 signals for 3 lanes). Terrible design.

## Country roads

Potholes in county roads.
Highway 62 (Choctaw Ave) and Highway 81 (4th Street) in Chickasha
County Street 2940
Hwy 39
Highway 62
Highway 17 between Rush Springs and Elgin. Many, many speeding trucks. Very narrow roadway.
Hwy 92 needs shoulders and would be nice to be four lane or at least a turning lane and the work done between Amber and Chickasha is horrible
I drive Highway 277 between Cement and Ninnekah to the junction with Highway 81 daily, would be nice to have the highway wider in areas and with a shoulder. The highway is a lot heavier traveled now. Also, the Highway 81 between Minco and Chickasha needs help. There are multiple fatality accidents on this stretch of road every year. I think this stretch of highway has dangerous spots that should be looked into and I feel it needs to be more heavily traveled by highway patrol or local law enforcement due the use of excessive speed by many of the daily travelers on this highway. Thank you.

HWY 62 AND TURN PIKE EXIT AND ENTER
US81/277 at S. 4th St (Chickasha) ODOT approving wide loads through the intersection that require complete shut down

US81 at I-44 underpass not high enough for the oversize loads being routed through by ODOT
US81 at Country Club Road, large trucks disregarding red signal (Fatalities at this intersection)
highway 17 and highway 81, highway 277 and highway 81, highway 19 and highway 81
Highway 81 from north end of Chickasha to Rush Springs, trucks running lights constantly, trucks and oversized loads taking up the entire highway, trucks tearing up the roads
School zones, narrow streets in residential areas, poor maintaining of streets causing slowdowns and damage to cars and suspensions. Poor management of city streets and employees that have bad work ethics and poor direction.
Bottle necking-need more lanes to handle current traffic
U.S. Highway 81 between Chickasha and Union City.
gravel roads in the country between Chickasha and amber, as well as the railroad crossing blocking the road for hours at a time. and bridges between Chickasha and Pocasset falling apart and needing serious repair

| Traffic Problems |
| :--- |
| Hwy 17 and railroad in Rush Springs |
| S.H. 37 and Morgan Rd. in Tuttle. Very difficult to see oncoming traffic when coming off North or <br> South Morgan. |
| 4th and grand Chickasha Oklahoma |
| Highway 4 and Fox Lane too many accidents and it's too dark |
| There needs to be a stop light installed at the intersection of Hwy 62 and the Grand Ave. extension. <br> Also a stop light at the intersection of Hwy 81 \& Hwy 277 in Ninnekah. The Hwy 81 service roads <br> in Chickasha needs to be repaved. |
| Horrible Roads |
| Highway 76 and highway 39 |
| With a 7 mile drive one way, all rural, my biggest problem is the occasional tractor. So, I rarely <br> encounter traffic problems. It would be nice to have a center turn lane through Dibble, but I doubt <br> that it's a necessity, could even be considered a luxury, so I can't complain. Thanks for asking <br> though. |



Q17 Which race/ethnicity best describes you? (Please choose only one.)


Question 18: Additional comments regarding transportation improvement needs:

| Responses |
| :--- |
| heavy oilfield vehicles are causing extra deterioration of secondary roads in McClain County |
| Need for bus transportation to Norman or OKC from the countryside |
| better roads |
| Lots and lots of bicyclist use Highway 77 - please maintain the shoulder to give them a safe place to <br> exercise. <br> The bridges over I-35 between Purcell and Norman are for the most part in Bad need of repair. <br> Law Enforcement in Wayne, Trucks on Highway 59 drive at an extremely high rate of speed and use <br> their "jake brake" Jake brakes are Prohibited in Wayne, but the current Law Enforcement will do <br> nothing about it. <br> State highway 74 between Purcell and Maysville needs a shoulder and it needs to be four lanes <br> between Purcell and Washington. <br> I think encouraging ride share opportunities within the community would be greatly beneficial. <br> Blanchard needs a traffic light at 10th and main. <br> Highway 76 North from Blanchard to highway 37 need to be four lane and at least 65 mph <br> I think we need to focus on bettering what we already have. Improving our current roadways and <br> bridges by widening and resurfacing. <br> I would like to see bike lanes to encourage better fitness in our community <br> We would love walkways to school! Walkways to parks, walkways to the library, walkways to <br> downtown. This town needs to be more walkable! it's better for our overall health. <br> I am a runner, and all of my long distance runs are on the road, usually Highway 62. I have had <br> people swerve at me, I see people constantly on their phones. I use all pedestrian traffic laws. <br> However, I can tell a lot of people don't know the laws. Or maybe they just don't care. A refresher <br> would be great to educate people. <br> The public transportation in Blanchard is good but could be expanded to include more hours. <br> Smooth roads and bridges would be nice. Also would like a better way to get from Blanchard to <br> Norman and OKC; don't like the traffic at entrance ramp to I-35 and lights in Newcastle, especially. <br> West Redbud Rd needs to be resurfaced with a strong hard surface <br> Need an interstate exit on the north end of Purcell |

## Responses

Just fix our potholes. We don't want three year projects we just want a road. Turn it to gravel if you must but just let us have roads. We aren't picky
Chestnut/290th in Goldsby to Blanchard need to be widened to have room for two cars and assigned traffic lanes.
County roads in the Wayne area are very bad.
Dangerous getting onto I-44 Northbound from 62, near Newcastle casino. Other location I frequent is State Hwy 4 and Fox Lane. Many Wrecks there, Need Stoplight, speed limit 65???
I think improving the roads are important. However, I also believe there should be better time management into road projects, and the budget given to DOT should be looked at and reconfigured for better use of funds, before asking for more funds.
McClain Co has started to dump dirt on paved roads instead of fixing potholes. That is a stupid waste of money as now they need to send a grader down several times a month along with new dirt to replace the dirt that washed into the creaks contaminating them. Specifically Canadian Ave
Norman streets are particularly difficult to traverse in a timely manner. Purcell is becoming more difficult as the regional population increases. Loops similar to Chickasha's eastern loop are beneficial to do business cross town.
So many people could benefit from a bus or train system, it would also cut wreaks and traffic congestion down.
I would love to see light rail service out to the suburbs.
I ride motorcycles a lot and a smooth surface is so important. Surfaces that bulge or that are uneven up are like small speed bumps that hurt your spine and pot holes are so dangerous.
Side Roads, county roads are full of potholes and or rough putting wear and tear on vehicles More public transportation I despise the number of semi-trucks that now use highway 76 from highway 39, north to the highway 62 junction. The highway doesn't feel big enough and they scare me regularly by crossing left of center. This road could use a muffle turn lane and bigger shoulders at a minimum
So glad new bridge connecting Lexington and Purcell is starting! Hope it gets completed!
Commuter rail transportation would be AMAZING from Purcell to Norman/OKC and back.
I know LOTS of people that would benefit.
Please work with ACOG to include Purcell in their 20 year plan for this!!!!
Please do NOT ruin the way of life for country folks though. Do NOT expand the intermodal railway for freight on private lands. The continental gateway authority is comprised of greedy thieves and they are NOT welcome here.
Would like to see Highway 76 with shoulders from Blanchard to Lindsay. You have a good start on it.
the actual roads and bridges in Purcell need more attention than the medians, I mean seriously Please do something about the increasing number of oil trucks driving through Blanchard. They need to be bypassed for the safety of the citizens.
The traffic stop signs at 37 and 76 actually adds to the traffic congestion in the mornings.
Highway 76 needs a turning lane or 4 lanes. Traffic is a constant on this road.

## Appendix 4.2: Public Outreach

On November 14, 2017, a stakeholder's meeting was held at Mid America Technology Center, Wayne, Oklahoma. Prior to this meeting invitation were sent to local stakeholders. SORTPO staff distributed a copy of the 2040 McClain County Long Range Transportation Plan on August 28, 2018 to the following agencies: McClain County Commissioners, ASCOG and city/town halls.

A legal notice advertising SORTPO's public hearing to adopt the 2040 McClain County Long Range Transportation Plan was advertised on January 10, 2019. The SORTPO Policy Board held a public hearing on January 24, 2019 to receive comments on the 2040 McClain County Long Range Transportation Plan prior to its' adoption.


October 30, 2017

The Southwest Oklahoma Regional Transportation Planning Organization ("SORTPO") is the regional transportation planning organization for southwest Oklahoma. Within this region are 16 counties, including the eight counties within the SouthWestern Oklahoma Development Authority (SWODA) Council of Government and the eight counties comprising the Association of South Central Oklahoma Government (ASCOG).
SORTPO is in the process of developing a regional long-range transportation plan for the sixteen counties.
A stakeholder meeting is scheduled to introduce the long range transportation planning process and to engage you in the early stage of this plan development.

Date: Tuesday November 14, 2017<br>Time: 9:00am<br>Location: Mid-America Technology Center Rm. 318 27438 OK-59, Wayne, OK 73095

This meeting will present opportunities for you to share your areas of concern as well as to help identify transportation programs to meet the needs of the future. Please share this invitation with your associates, as all are welcome, and the meeting is open to the public. We look forward to seeing you there!


September 5, 2018
Honorable Tom Cole
Congressman
2424 Springer Dr., Ste. 201
Norman, OK 73069

Dear Congress Cole,
The Southwest Oklahoma Regional Transportation Planning Organization (SORTPO), is a regional transportation planning organization involving a collaboration between the Association of South Central Oklahoma Governments (ASCOG), the South Western Oklahoma Development Authority (SWODA) and the Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT). SORTPO is responsible for the development of long range transportation plans for 16 counties in southwest Oklahoma.

At their October 25, 2018 SORTPO Policy Board meeting a 30 -day public review and comment period for (September 4, 2018 - October 3, 2018) was approved for the purpose of obtaining public comments on the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plans for the following counties: Grady and McClain. These plans are the principal of a transportation planning document for each county. During this comment period we are encouraging individuals, agencies, and organizations to review the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plans for both counties and submit written comments.

The plans are available for public review on the www.sortpo.org website and hard copy is available in the County Commissioners office of each county starting September 5, 2018. If you are unable to attend the public hearing meeting on January 24, 2019 to give your input on the important transportation issues on the two counties please submit comments no later than January 21, 2019 at the address below:

## Becky Cockrell

Transportation Director
South Western Oklahoma Development Authority
PO Box 569
98 Frontier
Burns Flat, OK 73624
580-562-4885
becky@swoda.org


[^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: Landlocked GIS for SORTPO

[^3]:    Source: ODOT Traffic Engineering Div. Collision Analysis and Safety Branch

    * INCLUDES INCAPACITATING, NON-INCAPACITATING, AND POSSIBLE INJURIES

[^4]:    Source: ODOT Traffic Engineering Div. Collision Analysis and Safety Branch

[^5]:    Source: Stakeholder Meetings, Surveys, SORTPO

