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## APPENDIX A: RESOLUTION

Grand Gateway Regional Transportation Planning Organization (GGRTPO)

## Resolution Adopting the Mayes County 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan

Whereas, The Grand Gateway Regional Transportation Planning Organization is the designated Regional Transportation Planning Organization for the Grand Gateway Economic Development Association organized for the express purpose of carrying out the transportation planning requirements of U.S. C. Title 23, Chapter 134 and U.S.C. 49, Subtitle III, Section 5303; and

Whereas, the Mayes County 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) has been prepared by the RTPO in consultation with local and state governments and local, state and federal transportation agencies in a continuing, cooperative, coordinated and comprehensive planning process; and

Whereas, the Plan has been presented to the general public for review and comment in accordance with the GGRTPO Public Participation Plan in addition to the series of public meetings over a six month period and the Plan is posted on the GGRTPO website for public review and comment.

Whereas, the Plan is consistent with local, regional, and state transportation and other planning goals and objectives and has been prepared in accordance with all relative state and federal rules and regulations, and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the GGRTPO Policy Board hereby approves and adopts the Mayes County Long Range Transportation Plan. Be it further resolved that the GGRTPO Policy Board recommends that the Plan be accepted by the Oklahoma Department of Transportation, the Federal Highway Administration, and the Federal Transit Administration as the official long range transportation plan for the above cited area.

Approved and Adopted by GGRTPO Policy Board and signed this __21 day of _November_, 2019.

GGRTPO Policy Board Chairman

## ATTEST:

## APPENDIX B: ACRONYMS

| AASHTO | American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials |
| :---: | :---: |
| ACS | American Community Survey (a US Census Bureau product) |
| ADA | Americans with Disabilities Act |
| CIRB | County Improvement, Roads and Bridges construction plan |
| GGEDA | Grand Gateway Economic Development Association |
| GGRTPO | Grand Gateway Regional Transportation Planning Organization |
| EPA | United States Environmental Protection Agency |
| FHWA | Federal Highway Administration |
| FRA | Federal Railroad Administration |
| FTA | Federal Transit Administration |
| GIS | Geographic Information System |
| LEP | Limited English Proficiency |
| LOS | Levels of Service |
| LRTP | Long Range Transportation Plan |
| NHS | National Highway System |
| NRHP | National Register of Historic Places |
| ODEQ | Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality |
| ODOT | Oklahoma Department of Transportation |
| PPP | Public Participation Plan |
| RTPO | Regional Transportation Planning Organization |
| SA | Study Area |
| SRTP | Statewide Long Range Transportation Plan |
| STIP | Statewide Transportation Improvement Program |
| TAP | Transportation Alternative Program |
| TAZ | Traffic Analysis Zone |
| TIP | Transportation Improvement Program |
| USDOT | U.S. Department of Transportation |

## APPENDIX C: DEFINITIONS

## ACCESSIBILITY

Accessibility refers to the ability of an individual to reach goods, services, employment, activities and destinations (opportunities).

ACCIDENT SEVERITY INDEX
A measure of the severity of collisions at a particular location, derived by assigning a numeric value according to the severity of each collision and totaling those numeric values.

## AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990 (ADA)

Federal law which requires accessible public transportation services for persons with disabilities, including complementary or supplemental paratransit services in areas where fixed route transit service is operated. ADA of 1990 expanded the definition of eligibility for accessible services to persons with mental disabilities, temporary disabilities, and the conditions related to substance abuse. See also Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

## CAPACITY

The maximum number of vehicles that can pass over a given section of a lane or roadway in one direction during a given time period under prevailing roadway and traffic conditions. The number or quantity of people or things that can be conveyed or held by a vehicle or container.

## CENSUS TRACTS

Small areas with generally stable boundaries, defined by the US Census Bureau within counties and statistically equivalent entities. They are designed to be relatively homogeneous with respect to population characteristics, economic status, and living conditions.

## CONGESTION

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

## CONNECTIVITY

The density of connections in path or road networks and the directness of links. As connectivity increases, travel distances decrease and route options increase, allowing more direct travel between destinations. In other words, the number of points of entry onto a road or path and the number of destinations that can be reached directly from those routes.

## ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE (EJ)

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

FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED
A term used to describe the financial requirement stating all projects must have an identified funding source.

## 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 (FO) BRIDGES

Bridges that do not have lane widths, shoulder widths, or vertical clearances adequate to serve modern traffic demand. While it is not unsafe for all vehicles, older design features cannot adequately accommodate current traffic volumes or vehicle sizes and weights. In order to be classified as functionally obsolete, the bridge must be more than 20 feet long, more than 10 years old, and have a rating of 3 or less for the deck geometry or under-clearances, or approach roadway alignment, or a rating of 3 or less for structural evaluation or waterway adequacy. The rating is on a scale of 0 to 9 with 0 being the worse condition and 9 being the best condition. (See also Structurally Deficient Bridges)

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.

## LIVABILITY

A reference to how pleasant a place is to live in, after basic needs are met. Pleasant living might include such amenities as fresh air, clean spaces, good jobs, ease of travel, stable neighborhoods, good schools, casual recreational options, safety and security.

## 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 20 years ahead and is revised every five years.

## MOBILITY

How efficiently, quickly or directly a desired destination can be reached - the efficient movement of people or goods. The concept of mobility in transportation assumes that an increase of miles travelled or decrease in trip duration benefits society. In cases of auto-focused development, transportation mobility is limited, in that people and goods may be mobile only by driving vehicles; non-drivers cannot efficiently move around the area, and the relative mobility of the community is thus reduced.

## MULTIMODAL

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

NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM (NHS)
A nation-wide system of approximately 155,000 miles of major roads. The entire Interstate System is a component of the National Highway System. The NHS includes a large percentage of urban and rural principal arterials; the strategic-defense highway.

## RESILIENCE

Resilience is a form of security, which refers to a system's ability to accommodate variable and unexpected conditions without catastrophic failure.
In Transportation, at a design level it means that facilities can withstand extreme demands and unexpected conditions. At an individual level, it means that people have transportation options needed to satisfy their transportation needs even under unusual and unexpected conditions.
At an economic level, it means that transportation services can be provided if a particular resource, such as petroleum, becomes scarce and expensive.
At a strategic planning level it means that a transportation system can meet long-term economic, social and environmental goals under a wide range of unpredictable future conditions (Sustainable Development).

## SAFETY

Protection against hazards. Safety can also be defined to be the control of recognized hazards to achieve an acceptable level of risk.

## SECURITY

Protection against threats; the state of being protected or safe from harm.
STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (STIP)
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.

## STRUCTURALLY DEFICIENT BRIDGES

Structural deficiency ratings are based on the National Bridge Inventory ratings scale. A highway bridge is classified as structurally deficient if the deck, superstructure, substructure, or culvert is rated in "poor" condition ( 0 to 4 on the NBI rating scale). A bridge can also be classified as structurally deficient if its load carrying capacity is significantly below current design standards
or if a waterway below frequently overtops the bridge during floods. (See also Functionally Obsolete Bridges)

## TRAFFIC ANALYSIS ZONES

A traffic analysis zone (TAZ) 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. Typically these blocks are used in transportation models by providing socioeconomic data. This information helps to further the understanding of trips that are produced and attracted within the zone.

## VOLUME-TO-CAPACITY RATIO (V/C)

A measurement of the quality of roadway travel; the ratio of the existing amount of vehicular travel for a roadway to the amount of designed capacity on the roadway. The capacity of the facility can be calculated using methods described in the Highway Capacity Manual. The v/c is the percentage of the capacity that is being consumed by the volume of traffic. A v/c ratio above 1.0 means that the volume of traffic exceeds capacity and the road segment or intersection is becoming congested.

## APPENDIX 1

## FIXING AMERICA'S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT

On December 4, 2015, President Obama signed into law the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act, or "FAST Act." It is the first law enacted in over ten years that provides longterm funding certainty for surface transportation, meaning States and local governments can move forward with critical transportation projects, like new highways and transit lines, with the confidence that they will have a Federal partner over the long term.

As Secretary Foxx said, "After hundreds of Congressional meetings, two bus tours, visits to 43 states, and so much uncertainty - and 36 short term extensions - it has been a long and bumpy ride to a long-term transportation bill. It's not perfect, and there is still more left to do, but it reflects a bipartisan compromise I always knew was possible."

Overall, the FAST Act largely maintains current program structures and funding shares between highways and transit. It is a down-payment for building a 21st century transportation system, increasing funding by 11 percent over five years. This is far short of the amount needed to reduce congestion on our roads and meet the increasing demands on our transportation systems. In comparison, the Administration's proposal, the GROW AMERICA Act, increases funding by 45 percent.
The law also makes changes and reforms to many Federal transportation programs, including streamlining the approval processes for new transportation projects, providing new safety tools, and establishing new programs to advance critical freight projects.
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PROJECT DELIVERY: DOT has been a leader in reducing the bureaucratic red tape that can stall and delay critical transportation projects from moving forward. The FAST Act adopted a number of Administration proposals to further speed the permitting processes while still protecting environmental and historic treasures and also codifying the online system to track projects and interagency coordination processes.

FREIGHT: The FAST Act would establish both formula and discretionary grant programs to fund critical transportation projects that would benefit freight movements. These programs are similar to what the Administration proposed and will for the first time provide a dedicated source of Federal funding for freight projects, including multimodal projects. The Act emphasizes the importance of Federal coordination to focus local governments on the needs of freight transportation providers.

INNOVATIVE FINANCE BUREAU: The FAST Act establishes a new National Surface Transportation and Innovative Finance Bureau within the Department to serve as a one-stop shop for state and local governments to receive federal funding, financing or technical assistance. This builds on the work of the Department's Build America Transportation Investment Center and provides additional tools to improve coordination across the Department to promote innovative finance mechanisms. The Bureau is also tasked with responsibility to drive efficiency in the permitting process, consistent with our request to establish a dedicated permitting office.

TIFIA: The TIFIA Loan program provides important financing options for large projects and public-private partnerships. The FAST Act includes organizational changes that will provide an opportunity for important structural improvements with the potential to accelerate the delivery of innovative finance projects. However, FAST's cut to the TIFIA program could constrain growth in this area over the course of the bill.

SAFETY: The FAST Act includes authority sought by the Administration to prohibit rental car companies from knowingly renting vehicles that are subject to safety recalls. It also increased maximum fines against non-compliant auto manufactures from $\$ 35$ million to $\$ 105$ million. The law also will help bolster the Department's safety oversight of transit agencies and also streamlines the Federal truck and bus safety grant programs, giving more flexibility to States to improve safety in these areas. However, we know the bill also took a number of steps backwards in terms of the Department's ability to share data with the public and on the Department's ability to exercise aggressive oversight over our regulated industries.

TRANSIT: The FAST Act includes a number of positive provisions, including reinstating the popular bus discretionary grant program and strengthening the Buy America requirements that promote domestic manufacturing through vehicle and track purchases.

LADDERS OF OPPORTUNITY: The Act includes a number of items that strengthen workforce training and improve regional planning. These include allocating slightly more formula funds to local decision makers and providing planners with additional design flexibilities. Notably, FAST
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makes Transit Oriented Development (TOD) expenses eligible for funding under highway and rail credit programs. TOD promotes dense commercial and residential development near transit hubs in an effort to shore up transit ridership and promote walkable, sustainable land use.
Updated: Tuesday, January 12, 2016

- See more at: https://www.transportation.gov/fastact\#sthash.GSsYkLjJ.dpuf


## APPENDIX 2 - TABLES OF FINANCIAL SUMMARIES

## TABLE 1 - STATE FUNDS

## 1. County Equipment Revolving Fund

a) Administered by the County Advisory Board, CAB
b) One time funding that revolves as loans pay back. No new revenue. $\$ 1$ million funding was removed in 2016.
2. Industrial, Historic site and Lake Access Funds, HB 1061xx
a) 2.5 million, FY 2009, industrial access, as available.
b) 2.5 million, FY 2009, lake/historic access, as available.
c) Can be used for surface only on city streets and county roads.
3. County Bridge and Road Improvement, CIRR, Funds
a) Averages 20 million/year (as of 2007) (105C account)
b) Force Account and contract projects at the local level, also use for maintenance
4. County Improvements for Roads and Bridges, (CBRI)
a) Funding raised to $20 \%$ of Motor Vehicle Fees in 2015 anticipating revenue of $\$ 120$ million per year, capped at $\$ 120$ million per year in 2017 budget. $\$ 50$ million removed from the plan three years in a row starting in 2016 budget, funding reduced to $16 \%$ of Motor Vehicle Fees in 2018 budget. It is anticipated in 2018 to provide $\$ 100$ million in funding.
b) Only contract projects let thru ODOT

TABLE 2 - FEDERAL FUNDS - FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION (FHWA)

## 1. Federal Bridge Funds

a) Overall Funding available for bridge length structures, 20' or longer
b) Programs
i. Bridge Replacement (BR)
ii. Bridge Rehabilitation (BH)
iii. Preventive Maintenance (PM)
iv. Safety Bridge Inspection
c) Funding eligibility
i. Bridge Replacement (BR) eligibility, bridge $<50$ sufficiency rating \& Obsolete or Deficient
ii. Bridge Rehabilitation (BH) eligibility, bridge between 50 \& 80 sufficiency rating.
iii. Preventive Maintenance (PM) you must have a systematic process for project selection
iv. Safety Bridge Inspection mandated by FHWA, on bridge length structures.
d) Funding limits
i. BR, BH and PM together limited to 17.2 million in odd numbered years and 20 million in even years
ii. Safety Bridge Inspection funded with 2.8 million in odd numbered years.
2. Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funds
a) Surface Transportation Program
i. Road projects, grade, drain and surface on county major and minor collectors.
ii. 6 million/year
3. Emergency Relief (ER) Funds
a) Disaster funding on Major Collectors
(CIRB, 2019)

APPORTIONMENT OF STATUTORY REVENUES - TABLE 3

HISTORIC OKLAHOMA TAX COMMISSION DATA

|  | FY 2017 |
| :--- | ---: |
| General Revenue | $4,756,515,647$ |
| County Improvement Bridge and Road <br> Fund | $120,000,000$ |
| County Road Fund |  |
| CRIRF County Road Improvement Rev | $17,212,153$ |
| Fund | $24,057,141$ |
| High Priority State Bridge Rev Fund | $4,684,780$ |
| Public Transit Revolving Fund | $3,829,000$ |
| Railroad Maintenance Revolving Fund | 796,861 |
| State Transportation Fund | $2,003,923$ |
| State Highway Construction \& | $2,110,742$ |
| Maintenance Funds |  |
| CBRIF |  |
| Improvement Fund |  |


| To Counties for Roads | $233,699,715$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| To Participating Tribes | $20,821,574$ |

Source: Oklahoma Tax Commission

TABLE 4 - CIRB FUNDING OKLAHOMA, DIVISION 8 - FY 2019-2023

| FY 2019 | FY 2020 | FY 2021 | FY 2022 | FY 2023 | 5-year total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 28,562,752$ | $\$ 41,072,475$ | $\$ 52,031,000$ | $\$ 23,176,000$ | $\$ 6,085,000$ | $\$ 150,927,227$ |

Source: ODOT

TABLE 5-2017 Poverty comparison

| OK State | Mayes |
| :--- | :--- |
| $16.2 \%$ | $19.2 \%$ |
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## APPENDIX 6- MAYES COUNTY CENSUS TRACTS
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MAYES COUNTY POPULATION \& MAJOR EMPLOYERS BY TAZ ZONE CHART 1

| 505 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 479 |  |
| 520 | Pryor Public Schools |
| 672 |  |
| 491 | Pryor Public Schools |
| 581 |  |
| 487 |  |
| 579 |  |
| 498 |  |
| 472 | Pryor Public Schools |
| 497 |  |
| 533 |  |
| 501 |  |
| 469 | Wal-Mart |
| 416 |  |
| 497 |  |
| 521 |  |
| 494 |  |
| 482 |  |
| 503 |  |
| 527 |  |
| 464 |  |
| 567 |  |
| 652 |  |
| 564 |  |
| 427 |  |
| 366 | Google |
| 471 | Grand River Dam Authority - GRDA |
| 630 |  |
| 572 |  |

## APPENDIX 7 COMMUTING PATTERNS

The graphs below display the percentages of a county's employed population that either; (1) live and work in the same county, (2) work in the region, but not the same county as they reside, or (3) commute outside the region for employment. Commuting patterns are based on data from the 2010 Census.

## Commuter Data - Chart 2

## Commuter Data

- According to the commuting data, $63.3 \%$ of the people in Northeastern Oklahoma work in the county they live, however, nearly a third leave the region when commuting to their workplace.
- All five counties have more than $10 \%$ of the population travel outside the region for work.
- Ottawa County is home to the largest city in the region (Miami) but has the second highest percentage of people who live and work in the same region, and the second lowest percentage of people who commute outside of the region.
- More than half of the workforce in Nowata County leaves the region for work.
- As a whole, the majority of people live and work in the same region, however there is a large percentage of people who leave their county or
 region for work. This data illustrates that while residents would prefer to stay within close distance to their homes when commuting to their workplaces, if there are jobs available outside of their county or region, people will commute.

CENSUS COMMUTE DATA
Table 6

| MAYES COUNTY | 2016 | 2017 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| COMMUTING TO WORK |  |  |
| Workers 16 years and over | 16,629 | 16,893 |
| Car, truck, or van -- drove alone | $82.5 \%$ | $81.1 \%$ |
| Car, truck, or van -- carpooled | $10.8 \%$ | $12.0 \%$ |
| Public transportation (excluding taxicab) | $0.1 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| Walked | $1.2 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ |
| Other means | $0.9 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ |
| Worked at home | $4.5 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| Mean travel time to work (minutes) |  | 24.0 |
|  |  |  |

## COMMUTE BY MODE

An estimated 82.5 percent of Mayes County, Oklahoma workers drove to work alone in 2013-2017, and 10.8 percent carpooled. Among those who commuted to work, it took an average of 23.7 minutes to get to work.

## APPENDIX 8 - HIGHWAYS (MAPS, GRAPH AND REFERENCES)

HIGHWAYS - MAP 7


Table 7 - Mileage of Road Types in Mayes County

Public Roadway Mileage Chart


COUNTY NAME COUNTY NUMBER MAINTENANCE DIV CONCRETE MI ASPHALT MI GRAVEL MI BRICK MI GRADE_DRAIN MI PRIMITIVE MI TOTAL MILES

| MAYES | 49 | 8 | 76.06 | 911.24 | 366.84 | 0 | 1.17 | 0.34 | $1,355.65$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Mileage distribution including toll roads


- CONCRETE MILES
- ASPHALT MILES
- GRAVEL MILES

Other

Map 8 - Road Types and Locations within Mayes County


Appropriate rumble strip placement adds value to the sustainability and resilience of the regional transportation system. FHWA has published guidelines for improved rumble strips. The graphic below shows preferred placement. Placement on or near the right edge line can provide additional seconds of warning to both drivers and bicyclists traveling in the same direction that a vehicle has strayed over the edge line. Proper placement of rumble strips also provides a wider riding surface between the roadway and the unimproved roadside (ditch). Please visit the FHWA website at https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/roadway_dept/pavement/rumble_strips for more comprehensive information about the safety effects of appropriately placed rumble strips, and guidance on installation of these improvements (FHWA, 2017).

## Chart 3 - Rumble Strip Placement

## Edgeline Rumble Strip <br> Note: No "A" Distance



TRAFFIC COUNT - MAP 9


Annual Average Daily Traffic Oklahoma Highway System Mayes County (49)

Count Site Type

- Continuous
- Short Term
_-State Highway System




## APPENDIX 10 - ACCIDENT DATA

Table 8 Mayes County Collisions (2013-2017)


Table 9 Ranked Collision Report (2013-2017)



Map 12

APPENDIX 11 - ODOT 8-YEAR PLAN: 2019-2026 PROJECTS -TABLE 10

| JOB \# | Scope | Miles | Location | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FY-2019 |  |  |  |  |
| 31884(04) | Bridge Rehabilitation | 1.25 | Pensacola Dam \& Spillways | \$5,123,000.00 |
| FY-2020 |  |  |  |  |
| 23270(05) | Right of Way | 4.75 | SH-28: Beg. Approx. 8.1 Mi. E of Jct SH-28/US-69 ext. E 4.75 miles | 4,556,305.03 |
| 23270(06) | Utilities | 4.75 | SH-28: Beg. Approx. 8.1 Mi. E of Jct SH-28/US-69 ext. E 4.75 miles | 1,704,315.34 |
| 24382(05) | Right of Way | 7.00 | SH-28: Beg. US-69/SH-28 JCT. ext. East 7 miles | 4,448,036.84 |
| 24382(06) | Utilities | 7.00 | SH-28: Beg. US-69/SH-28 JCT. ext. East 7 miles | 4,099,670.42 |
| 28891(05) | Right of Way | 5.85 | SH-28 from east end of the I-44 interchange, ext. East 5.85 mi . | 518,337.94 |
| 28891(06) | Utilities | 5.85 | SH-28 from east end of the I-44 interchange, ext. East 5.85 mi . | 298,974.55 |
| FY-2021 |  |  |  |  |
| 30370(05) | Right of Way | 6.50 | SH-82 From: Cherokee C/L North approx. 6.5 miles | 2,802,122.64 |
| 30370(06) | Utilities | 6.50 | SH-82 From: Cherokee C/L North approx. 6.5 miles | 1,569,188.68 |
| FY-2022 |  |  |  |  |
| 32693(05) | Right of Way | 6.70 | US-69 SB From 8 miles N of SH-20, ext. N 8 | 54,500.00 |
| 32693(06) | Utilities | 6.70 | US-69 SB From 8 miles N of SH-20, ext. N 8 | 54,500.00 |
| FY-2023 |  |  |  |  |
| 31091(04) | Pavement Rehab | 6.04 | US-69 SB only, from Mayes/Wagoner CL north 6.04 mi . | 15,000,000.00 |
| 33823(05) | Right of Way | 1.98 | SH-28 From 2.82 miles north of SH-20, ext N to SH-28 \& SH-28 from SH-82 N to SH82 S (Grand River to 28 W ) | 250,000.00 |
| 33823(6) | Utilities | 1.98 | SH-28 From 2.82 miles north of SH-20, ext N to SH-28 \& SH-28 from SH-82 N to SH82 S (Grand River to 28 W) | 100,000.00 |

GGRTPO - MAYES COUNTY 2040 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN - APPENDICES

| FY-2024 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23270(04) | Grade, Drain \& Surface | 4.75 | SH-28: Beg. Appx. 8.1 mi. E. of JCT SH-28/US-69 \& ext. E. 4.75 mi . | 10,000,000.00 |
| 28026(05) | Right of Way | 7.25 | SH-20: From 0.75 mi. N of Salina, N approx. 7.25 mi . | 4,000,000.00 |
| 28026(06) | Utilities | 7.25 | SH-20: From 0.75 mi. N of Salina, N approx. 7.25 mi . | 1,587,200.00 |
| 31963(04) | Pavement Rehab | 8.0 | US-69: From SH-20 ext. N 8 mi. | 20,000,000.00 |
| FY-2025 |  |  |  |  |
| 21910(08) | Landscaping | 0.4 | Wetland Mitigation Site for JP(S) 27074(04), 21909(04), 21910(04), 21911(04), 24147(04) \& 28856(04) | 500,000.00 |
| 28891(04) | Widen \& Resurface | 5.85 | SH-82 from E end of the I-44 interchange, ext. E. approx. 5.85 mi . | 15,500,000.00 |
| 30370(04) | Grade, Drain \& Surface | 6.5 | SH-82: From Cherokee C/L ext. N. 6.5 mi . | 19,500,000.00 |
| 32693(04) | Pavement Rehab | 8.0 | US-69 SB from 8.0 mi . N of SH-20, ext. N . 8.0 mi . | 20,000,000.00 |
| 33861(05) | Right of Way | 3.5 | US-69: From Mayes C/L ext. N. 3.5 mi., row for future construction of JP 33861(04) | 700,000.00 |
| 33861(06) | Utilities | 3.5 | US-69: From Mayes C/L ext. N. 3.5 mi., UT for future construction of JP 33861(04) | 200,000.00 |
| FY-2026 |  |  |  |  |
| 33821(04) | Pavement Rehab | 5.33 | SH-412B From SH-69A to US-412 | 9,600,000.00 |
| 33823(04) | Widen \& Resurface | 1.98 | SH-82 from 2.82 mi . N. of SH-20, ext. N to SH-28 \& SH-28 from SH-82 N to SH-82 S (Grand River to 28 W ) | 3,500,000.00 |

```
APPENDIX 12-COUNTY IMPROVEMENT ROADS & BRIDGES (CIRB)
PROJECTS (2019 - 2023)
```

NOTES: There are a total of 230 bridges in Mayes County*. 42 bridges are structurally deficient*.
Five bridges are included in the CIRB 5 Year Plan that have received funding approvals by the Transportation Commission of Oklahoma. The following represents the CIRB Projects for Mayes County as approved by ODOT in 2018. *Sources: National Bridge Inventory; www.fhwa.dot.gov/bridge/nbi.cfm; ODOT.

## TABLE 11

| Job \# FY-2019 | Phase | Dist. | Location | Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30486(06) | ROW | 2 | NS 427 Rd Taylor Ranch Bridge | \$40,000 |
| 30486(07) | UTL | 2 | NS 427 Rd Taylor Ranch Bridge | \$76,000 |
| 30687(06) | ROW | 3 | Wyandotte St., Locust Grove | \$45,000 |
| 30687(07) | UTL | 3 | Wyandotte St., Locust Grove | \$100,000 |
| 31161(06) | ROW | 1 | True Rd.-EW 44 | \$50,000 |
| 31161(07) | UTL | 1 | True Rd.-EW 44 | \$85,000 |
| FY-2020 |  |  |  |  |
| 30687(04) | CONST | 3 | Wyandotte St., Locust Grove | \$540,000 |
| 31147(06) | ROW | 2 | EW 530 BR85 \& BR89 | \$60,000 |
| 31147( 07) | UTL | 2 | EW 530 BR85 \& BR89 | \$300,000 |
| FY-2021 |  |  |  |  |
| 30486(04) | CONST | 2 | NS 427 Rd Taylor Ranch Bridge | \$600,000 |
| 31147(04) | CONST | 2 | EW 530 BR85 \& BR89 | \$650,000 |
| 31166(06) | ROW |  | NS 4370 BR104 | \$40,000 |
| 31166(07) | UTL | 2 | NS 4370 BR104 | \$80,000 |
| FY-2022 |  |  |  |  |
| 31161(04) | CONST | 1 | NS 435 TRUE ROAD | \$1,450,000 |
| 31166(04) | CONST |  | NS 4370 | \$800,000 |

FY-2023

| 30487(05) | ENG | 1 | EW 350 Over Little Pryor Creek | \$120,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31167(05) | ENG | 1 | EW 350 Over Little Pryor Creek | \$100,000 |
|  |  |  |  | \$1,150,000 |
| 32202(06) | ROW | 3 | EW 55 Anderson Road |  |
| 32202(07) | UTL | 3 | EW 55 Anderson Road | \$600,000 |



Wickliffe Creek Bridge, Mayes County Cherokee Nation \& Mayes County

## APPENDIX 13 - BRIDGES; STRUCTURALLY DEFICIENT AND

## FUNCTIONALLY OBSOLETE

(Please also see Appendix C: Definitions) This is a summary of all bridges in the County more than 20 feet long that have been determined to be Structurally Deficient or Functionally Obsolete (FOSD). Some of these locations appear to be duplicated, due to double sets of bridges or even single bridges having a lane in each direction.

Map 13


## APPENDIX 14 - CITY OF PRYOR CREEK TRANSPORTATION PLANS

The City of Pryor Creek has developed a comprehensive long range transportation plan. The Community Development Department has for over 20 years analyzed and planned for future transportation needs of the growing City.

## APPENDIX 15 - AGING DATA

OKLAHOMA AGING
The proportion of Oklahoma's population that is over 60 is growing, while the proportion that is under 60 is shrinking. The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that more than 24 percent of Oklahoma's population will be over age 60 by the year 2030, an increase of nearly 7 percent from 2020. In 2020, the over-age-60 population was around one-fourth ( $1 / 4$ ) of total population. By 2040, that group is projected to be about the same.

TABLE 12

| Projected trends: Aging population in Oklahoma |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Year | 2020 | 2030 | 2040 |
| Age Group |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{0}$ to 19 | $26.44 \%$ | $25.75 \%$ | $25.46 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ to 39 | $26.50 \%$ | $25.85 \%$ | $25.52 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{4 0}$ to 59 | $24.33 \%$ | $24.12 \%$ | $24.37 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{6 0 +}$ | $22.73 \%$ | $24.27 \%$ | $24.64 \%$ |
| S |  |  |  |

Source: U.S. Census Projections Populations 2014 to 2060

## APPENDIX 16 - TRIBAL TRANSPORTATION

Cherokee Nation Combined Routes 2015

Legend

- Cherokee Nation Roads
Highways
Cities
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| BIA Route \# | Cherokee Nation/BIA Inventory Route Name | County | Mileage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0601 | Sequoyah East Part Road | Mayes | 5.00 |
| 0602 | Cedar Crest South | Mayes | 2.70 |
| 0603 | Ear Bob Road (Coleman Hollow) | Mayes | 7.00 |
| 0604 | Peggs Northwest | Mayes/Cher. | 1.90 |
| 0605 | Clear Creek II Part | Mayes | 1.70 |
| 0606 | Clear Creek I Part | Mayes | 1.00 |
| 0607 | Cavalier Road II (Locust Gr. South II) | Mayes | 2.50 |
| 0608 | Indian Springs Road (update) | Mayes | 7.10 |
| 0609 | Cherokee Heights | Mayes | 1.50 |
| 0610 | Blackie Hills | Mayes | 0.70 |
| 0611 | Snake Creek | Mayes | 8.20 |
| 0612 | Cedar Crest Road | Mayes | 3.00 |
| 0613 | Cavalier Road I (Locust Gr. South I) | Mayes | 2.40 |
| 0614 | Spavinaw Y | Mayes | 0.50 |
| 0615 | Strang | Mayes | 10.40 |
| 0616 | Salina-Kenwood | Mayes | 9.60 |
| 0617 | Strang East | Mayes | 4.50 |
| 0618 | Deer Trails Estates Road | Mayes | 0.80 |
| 0619 | Saline Creek Part | Mayes | 1.50 |
| 0620 | Disney Road Part | Mayes | 1.90 |
| 0621 | Cabin Creek Road | Mayes | 2.00 |
| 0622 | Salina Clinic | Mayes | 0.20 |
| 0623 | Iron Post Road (Snake Creek Loop) | Mayes | 7.50 |
| 0624 | Rose North | Mayes | 3.20 |
| 0625 | Little Spring Creek | Mayes | 4.20 |
| 0626 | NS-4470 Road | Mayes | 2.00 |
| 0627 | Rose South | Mayes | 3.00 |
| 0628 | Snake Creek Extension I Part | Mayes | 1.00 |
| 0629 | Snake Creek Extension II Part | Mayes | 1.00 |
| 0630 | Lindsey-Mayes Road | Mayes | 7.60 |
| 0631 | NS-4440/EW-0544 | Mayes | 0.90 |
| 0632 | Chimney Rock Hollow I | Mayes | 4.70 |
| 0633 | Chimney Rock Hollow II | Mayes | 2.30 |

0634
0635
0636
0637
0638
0639
0640
0641
0642
0643
0644
0645
0646
0647
0648
0649
0650
0651
0652
0653
0654
0655
0656
0657
0658
0659
0660
0661
0662
0663
0664
0665

| Pumpback Road | Mayes | 1.40 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Little Saline-Kenwood I Part | Mayes | 2.50 |
| Little Saline-Kenwood II Part | Mayes | 3.50 |
| EW-0510/D0510 Part | Mayes | 1.60 |
| D4467 Road | Mayes | 2.50 |
| Wickliffe School | Mayes | 4.50 |
| Wickliffe Creek | Mayes | 4.60 |
| NS-4440 Road | Mayes | 1.60 |
| D4438 Road | Mayes | 2.80 |
| D4416 Road | Mayes | 1.50 |
| EW-0483 Road | Mayes | 1.00 |
| NW-4435 Road | Mayes | 0.50 |
| NS-4450/EW0440 | Mayes | 1.80 |
| Saline Creek Loop | Mayes | 0.50 |
| EW-0560 Road | Mayes | 1.00 |
| EW-39 Road | Mayes | 2.50 |
| Kings Road | Mayes | 4.00 |
| Elm Creek Road | Mayes | 3.50 |
| NS444-EW38 Road | Mayes | 1.10 |
| NW Spavinaw Loop | Mayes | 4.30 |
| Requah-Lynch Road | Mayes | 1.70 |
| NS446 Road | Mayes | 1.80 |
| EW522 Road (Boatman Road) | Mayes | 1.00 |
| Quail Road | Mayes | 1.40 |
| D0650-EW65 Road | Mayes | 1.00 |
| EW 61-NS431 Road | Mayes | 2.80 |
| Murphy Road | Mayes | 1.80 |
| Murphy South Road | Mayes | 3.00 |
| Ross-Coverdale Road | Mayes | 5.60 |
| Four Corners | Mayes | 5.40 |
| Earbob South Extension | Mayes | 0.30 |
| Jerico Road | Mayes | 3.70 |
| Bob Davis Road | Mayes | 1.20 |
| Nellie Downing Road | Mayes | 1.30 |
| Sam's Corner (North Murphy Road) | Mayes | 3.90 |
| Anderson Road (EW55 Road) | Mayes | 3.90 |


| 0670 | NS438 Road | Mayes | 1.90 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0671 | NS439 Road | Mayes | 2.00 |
| 0672 | Wyandotte Road | Mayes | 2.10 |
| 0673 | Joel Koelsch Drive | Mayes | 1.70 |
| 0674 | NS441 Loop Road | Mayes | 1.00 |
| 0675 | Sanders Road (NS442 Road) | Mayes | 1.00 |
| 0676 | NS4425 Road | Mayes | 1.00 |
| 0677 | NS443 Road | Mayes | 1.10 |
| 0678 | Ewing Road (EW53 Road) | Mayes | 2.80 |
| 0679 | Webster Road (Iron Post Road) | Mayes | 1.40 |
| 0680 | NS439.2 Road | Mayes | 2.60 |
| 0681 | Rowland Road | Mayes | 0.40 |
| 0682 | NS4418 Road (NS4415.8 Road) | Mayes | 0.80 |
| 0683 | NS442 Road (NS4420 Road) | Mayes | 0.30 |
| 0684 | EW480 Road (EW48 Road) | Mayes | 1.80 |
| 0685 | DO498 Road | Mayes | 1.10 |
| 0686 | Highway 20 - Part 1 | Mayes | 3.80 |
| 0687 | Highway 20 - Part 2 | Mayes | 5.20 |
| 0688 | Highway 20 - Part 3 | Mayes | 3.70 |
| 0689 | Highway 20 - Part 4 | Mayes | 4.00 |
| 0690 | Highway 82 - Part 1 | Mayes | 4.60 |
| 0691 | Highway 82 - Part 2 | Mayes | 3.90 |
| 0692 | Highway 82 - Part 3 | Mayes | 3.60 |
| 0693 | Highway 82 - Part 4 | Mayes | 2.20 |
| 0694 | Highway 412 - Part 1 | Mayes | 4.00 |
| 0695 | Highway 412 - Part 2 | Mayes | 4.00 |
| 0696 | Highway 412 - Part 3 | Mayes | 4.20 |
| 0697 | Highway 412 - Part 4 | Mayes | 3.00 |
| 0698 | EW50.6 Road | Mayes | 0.70 |
|  |  |  | M |

Source: Cherokee Nation Long-Range Transportation Plan, 2017

## CHART 4



Mayes County West 500 Road - Cherokee Nation Project

## APPENDIX 17 - COMMUNITY TRANSPORTATION SURVEY RESULTS

A Survey was created by the Mayes County Long Range Transportation Plan Working Group. Utilization of the online services of SurveyMonkey.com was chosen for the survey processing. A twenty-eight question survey was placed online and opened for responses on November 19, 2018 and officially closed on March 30, 2019 after all responses were input into the program. Hard copies of the survey were also distributed to multiple locations within Mayes County to collect responses from the public including but not limited to: Mayes County Clerk, City Clerks/City Halls of City of Pryor Creek, Chouteau, Adair, Langley, Disney, Spavinaw, Salina, Locust Grove and Sportsman Acres. Senior Citizens’ Centers, Public Libraries and Grand Gateway EDA were also provided with hard copies.

The Survey solicitation were presented at many public meetings held in Mayes County as well as
civic and business organization meetings. A total of 38 surveys were completed. The responders' locations were diverse throughout Mayes County.

A Survey link to the online survey was also created at the grandgateway.org website for the public to easily locate a pathway to find the survey. A QR code was also created to enable those with the app on their mobile phones to easily go to the survey.

Some questions were quantifiable with statistical responses, however, some data fields allowed the responders to make comments and those along with the entire Survey results have been uploaded to our website, www.grandgateway.org.

## APPENDIX 18 - THE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Goal 1- Maximize Finance \& Funding

Objectives
A. Consistent regional applications for all available transportation opportunities maximizes annual funding
B. Local agencies, municipalities, tribal governments, state officials and private interests effectively collaborate in the pursuit and funding of transportation improvements
C. Expansion of transportation modes that utilize private funding or have a higher proportion of user-borne costs, such as private roads and rail; fees for service

Policy

Preservation of existing
1.1 levels of service among all modes of travel is the first priority

Continue to expand Multi-
1.2 jurisdictional collaboration

Allocate an annual portion of public employee labor 1.3 to be used as in-kind funds for transportation grants

Action steps

Monitor and apply for all available transportation grant opportunities each year

Engage in long term Fiscal Planning to balance
A.1.2 long-term transportation needs with sustainable solutions

Explore and implement alternative funding opportunities used in other jurisdictions

Goal 2 - Prioritize maintenance and preservation of existing infrastructure
Objectives
A. The current
transportation system is
maintained with stable
funding
B. Regional pavements are preserved through growth
of intermodal rail freight
C. New development is directed to appropriate roads and infrastructure

Coordinate with State and Federal agencies to
2.1 stabilize funding; ensure that current levels of service on roads, rail and transit systems, do not fail
Consistent investment in alternative modes to improve resilience Use public-private
2.3 agreements to maintain vulnerable county roads

Identify preferred
A.2.1 development corridors and plan for preservation; Map
A.2.2 Evaluate and post weight limits on roads

Develop long-term
A.2.3 strategies in coordination with industry, waste

|  |  | disposal and oil field <br> companies to preserve and <br> maintain vulnerable <br> county roads |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| D. Private companies with <br> heavy truck traffic <br> collaborate to maintain <br> vulnerable county roads |  |  |  |
| Goal 3 - Enhance Economic Vitality | Policy |  |  |
| Objectives |  | Action steps |  |

Plan continued, next page . . .

## Goal 4 - Improve Accessibility, Mobility, Connectivity

## Objectives

A. Funding is balanced among modes to ensure sustainable mobility solutions
B. Highway improvements are coordinated with other transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects and rail facilities according to the policies of the 2015-2040 ODOT LRTP
C. Reliable access to the transportation system is ensured for disadvantaged persons
D. Transit is a preferred method of travel for a wider segment of the populace
E. Bike routes are indicated with signage for improved regional mobility
F. Park-and-ride lots are available in locations where potential ridership warrants
G. Planning efforts result in continuous bikeways throughout the multicounty region
H. Right of way (ROW) areas are preserved for transportation purposes; including abandoned, existing and future road and railroad corridors

Policy
Recognize and respond to opportunities to include
4.1 pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure on or adjacent to state routes

Integrate alternative
$4.2 \quad$ transportation solutions into all new developments

Choose transit when
$4.3 \quad$ possible to support long term sustainability

Action Steps

Identify and minimize
A.4.1 transportation barriers for non-drivers

Appoint an individual to act as a Railroad contact
A.4.2 to improve industrial access to rail and facilitate the mobility of freight

Develop a proposed Bike
A.4.3 route map with a focus on regional connectivity

Add signage to direct Bike and Pedestrian travelers to preferred routes
Plan and implement walkways and bike facilities in small town areas

Evaluate existing town
A.4.6 sidewalks and pursue rehabilitation

Designate specific areas
A.4.7 as Park-and-Ride lots for commuters

Plan continued, next page . . .

| Goal 5 - Increase Safety \& Security |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Objectives | Policy |  | Action Steps |  |
| A. Structurally deficient bridges are prioritized for repair or replacement |  |  | A.5.1 | Prioritize bridge improvements where weight limits are too low for emergency vehicle response; |
| B. Local site development standards address safety for all legal road users | 5.1 | Promote the use of alternative modes of transportation to reduce dependency on singleoccupancy vehicles | A.5.2 | Map appropriate routes for tanker response according to bridge sufficiency ratings |
| C. Bicyclists have improved safety in rural areas |  |  | A.5.3 | Improved signage: alert motor vehicles to watch for bikes on the road; |
| D. Crosswalks have appropriate signage and visibility |  |  | A.5.4 | Evaluate and prioritize crosswalks for improvement |
| E. Persons using handicap mobility vehicles have safe access to common destinations |  |  | A.5.5 | Place rumble strips appropriately for enhanced safety between motorized vehicles and bikes using the shoulder in accordance with FHWA standards |
| F. A transportation system which is sustainable and resilient supports long term needs |  |  | A.5.6 | Use signage to alert motorists to the possible presence of bicycles on the road |
| G. Improved modal options reduce reliance on single-occupancy vehicles |  |  | A.5.7 | Evaluate and prioritize underpasses, overpasses and bridges for low-cost improvements for nonmotor vehicle travel safety |

Incorporate sustainability and
A.5.8
resiliency into transportation system projects

## APPENDIX 19 -ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE \& POVERTY

Public involvement in development of the Plan must comply with Presidential Executive Order 12898, Environmental Justice. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) also follows federal policy to ensure federally funded activities (including planning, through implementation) do not have a disproportionate adverse effect on disadvantaged populations.

Following the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Statistical Policy Directive 14, the Census Bureau uses a set of money income thresholds that vary by family size and composition to determine who is in poverty. If a family's total income is less than the family's threshold, then that family and every individual in it is considered in poverty. The official poverty thresholds do not vary geographically, but they are updated for inflation using Consumer Price Index (CPI-U). The official poverty definition uses money income before taxes and does not include capital gains or noncash benefits (such as public housing, Medicaid, and food stamps). HUD calculations of Lowincome households is based on census data, but breaks the levels of income into different categories of relative poverty.


## APPENDIX 20 - PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Notice: Public Comment Period
October 21, 2019
The Grand Gateway Regional Transportation Planning Organization (GGRTPO) has opened a 30 day public comment period for the draft Mayes County Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

The draft LRTP will be available for public comment from Monday, October 21, 2019 through Thursday, November 21, 2019. The Mayes County Long Range Transportation Plan 2040 includes goals and policies based on a twenty year planning horizon, that lead to the development of an integrated, intermodal transportation system that facilitates safe and efficient movement of people and goods, while addressing current and future transportation demands.

The draft LRTP document and the technical reports that make up the plan are available in the GGRTPO/GGEDA Planning office at 333 South Oak Street, Big Cabin, Oklahoma, or can be viewed on the Transportation Planning portion of the Grand Gateway website under the heading "Mayes County LRTP" located at grandgateway.org.

The LRTP complies with the intent of the ten (10) planning factors of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and with the legislation known as Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21).

GGRTPO welcomes public comment and feedback on regional transportation issues, and will furnish reasonable auxiliary aids and services to individuals with disabilities upon request.
Individuals with disabilities requiring auxiliary aids for services should contact the Planning staff below.

Comments may be submitted by calling 800/482-4594, ext. 233 or contacting us at the following address:

Marion Stinson, RTPO Director

GGRTPO/GGEDA, 333 S. Oak Street, Big Cabin, OK 74332

## APPENDIX 21 - COORDINATION WITH OTHER PLANS AND AGENCIES

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:

- FHWA Guide - Planning for Rural Transportation
- FAST Act, Federal Planning Factors
- ODOT Freight \& Rail Plan
- ODOT Oklahoma Statewide Intermodal Transportation Plan 2005-2030
- ODOT Waterway Plan
- ODOT Circuit Engineering District 1
- Pryor Creek Community Development Division
- Mayes County Commissioners
- Cherokee Nation Transportation and Safety Plans

Consultation with Tribes and State Agencies: Oklahoma Department of Transportation, Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality, Oklahoma Water Resources Board, Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation, Aeronautics Commission, and Bureau of Indian Affairs.
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