



### RTA West and Airport Corridors: RTA Board Update

Prepared for the Regional Transportation Authority of Central Oklahoma Board of Directors

Prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates

October 18, 2023



# Agenda

- August Board Meeting Recap
- Equity Index
- Detailed Evaluation
  - Methodology
  - Key Metrics: Constraints to Dedication, Travel Time Estimates
- Engagement Updates



## **Alternatives Analysis Process**





## **Project Schedule**

	2023			We	are here	ə!		2024					
Task	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
Board and TWG													
Technical Work													
Engagement Activities			<b>東</b> ▲▲			\ ₩ ■					臝		

Discover Phase



TWG & Board Meetings

Refine Phase Select Phase



Online Survey



Targeted Stakeholder Engagement



Open House & Town Halls

# August Board Meeting Recap





### Alternative Screening Criteria

Goal	IS		Screening Criteria
	•	Mobility and Connectivity	<ul> <li>Alternative connects:</li> <li>To other planned high-capacity transit projects</li> <li>Major activity centers and employment centers</li> </ul>
ŔŔŔ ŔŔŔŔŔŔ ŔŔŔŔŔŔŔ	%	Equity and Accessibility	<ul> <li>Alternative reasonably serves:</li> <li>Areas with high equity index</li> <li>Areas of persistent poverty</li> <li>Justice 40 communities</li> </ul>
		Land Use & Economic Development	<ul> <li>Alternative reasonably serves:</li> <li>Areas with high activity index</li> <li>Areas projected for future growth</li> <li>Areas with capacity for future growth</li> </ul>
<b>8</b> 6-8	A	Sustainability and Viability	<ul> <li>Alternative minimized costs by:</li> <li>Utilizing existing high-capacity transportation infrastructure</li> <li>Minimizing right-of-way expansions</li> </ul>



#### **Alternatives Screening Process**

Universe of Alternative All reasonable routes for high-capacity transit

**Universe screened through Goals** 



Mobility and Connectivity

### E

**Equity and Accessibility** 

Land

Land Use & Economic Development

**B A** Sustainability and Viability

High-Potential Alternatives Most feasible routes for high-capacity transit



**Technical Working Group and Stakeholder Feedback** 



#### **West Corridor Universe of Alternatives**





#### **West Corridor Alternatives for Refine Phase**





#### **Airport Corridor Universe of Alternatives**





#### **Airport Corridor Alternatives for Refine Phase**



# High-Capacity Regional Transit Modes





### **Modes for Detailed Analysis**



Operates on exclusive, typically electrified, right of way

#### **Bus Rapid Transit**



Operates within designated lane or fixed guideway (50% or more)



## **Characteristics of Light Rail**



TRAX, Utah Transit Authority, UT









#### **Key Features**:

Station spacing: 0.75 – 1 miles Seating capacity: ~75 to 130+ seats per car Economic development: Significant around stations

#### **Operations**

Typical Frequency: Every 15 to 60 minutes Maximum operating speeds: 59mph

Costs Capital Costs: High Operating cost: Medium



### **Characteristics of Bus Rapid Transit**











Costs

Capital Costs: Medium to High Operating cost: Medium to High

#### **Key Features**:

Station spacing: 0.5 – 1 miles
Seating capacity: 30 to 60 seats per car
Economic development: Significant along corridor

#### **Operations**

**Typical Frequency:** Every 5 to 15 minutes Operates either in dedicated guideway or mixed-traffic



## **Transition from Bus Rapid Transit to Rail Transit**

#### • BRT Investment

- Growth in ridership opportunity
- Establish a transit culture
- Spur economic growth along corridor

#### Does Not Preclude Rail

- As ridership grows and funding is available
- Ability to leverage an existing RR corridor



# Equity Index





#### **Equity Index**





## **Equity Index Inputs**



Number of Non-White and Hispanic Residents



Persons with a disability between 18 and 64 + persons above 65



Households with zero cars available

Households with Income Below Poverty Level

2021 Household poverty level in Oklahoma City: ~\$20,000

#### These inputs align with the RTA RAISE Grant Agreement

# Alternatives for Detailed Analysis





#### **West Corridor Alternatives for Refine Phase**





#### **Airport Corridor Alternatives for Refine Phase**



# Detailed Evaluation Framework





#### **Goals and Objectives**





### **Detailed Evaluation Framework**

Project Goal	Criteria	W1	W2	W3	A1	A3	A4
	Connections to existing bike and pedestrian infrastructure						
Mobility and	Connections to existing transit network						
Connectivity	Estimated end-to-end travel time						
	Existing trips between station areas						
	Persons with disabilities + over 65 population						
	Non-white or Hispanic Population						
Equity and	Households below poverty line						
Accessibility	Zero-car households						
•	Number of OCHA Properties						
	Number of activity centers served						
	Ongoing and planned developments						
Land Use and	Acreage of undeveloped and underdeveloped land						
Economic Development	Projected population growth according to ACOG's regional model						
Development	Projected employment growth according to ACOG's regional model						
Sustainability and	Ability to accommodate increases in ridership						
	Estimated capital costs						
	Estimated operations and maintenance cost						
	ROW requirements and acquisition costs						
Viability	Traffic implications on existing roadways						
	Feasibility of future LRT (major capital cost elements)						



#### **Detailed Evaluation Methodology**



<u>Evaluated</u> alternatives by station analysis areas for each metric



**Scored** quantitative and qualitative metrics on a 5-point scale



Scoring was designed to facilitate decision making and establish differences between alternatives

# Corridor Widths and Width Requirements





## **Characteristics of Light Rail**

#### Light Rail Station Area Cross Section

#### Light Rail Non-Station Area Cross Section



80'+ Roadway Width

70'+ Roadway Width



### **Characteristics of Bus Rapid Transit**

#### Bus Rapid Transit Station Area Cross Section

#### Bus Rapid Transit Non-Station Area Cross Section





70'+ Roadway Width

60'+ Roadway Width



#### **Example Cross Section – Existing Conditions**

#### Four Lane Divided Road



50'+ Roadway Width ~70' Drainage Feature

Segments of: Reno Ave



#### **Example Cross Section – Existing Conditions**

#### Four Lane Undivided Road



40'+ Roadway Width

Segments of: Reno Ave, 10<sup>th</sup> St, Meridian Ave, 29<sup>th</sup> St, Western Ave



#### **Example Cross Section – Existing Conditions**

#### Six Lane Undivided Road



60'+ Roadway Width

Segments of: Broadway Ave/Gaylord Blvd

# West Corridor Existing Roadway Conditions





#### Two Lane Roadway





### **On-Street Parking**





### **Existing Bridges**





#### Sharp Turns





#### **Highway Interchanges**





#### **At-grade Railroad Crossings**





#### **Roadway Constraints Summary**







### Roadway vs. Right-of-Way



This is an example cross-section with high-capacity transit, not representative of a specific roadway



### West Corridor Roadway Widths

Street	Roadway Width	metery Rd ch'Hall Rd ustang Rd ustang Rd Sara-Rd Arthur Blvd Arthur Blvd May Ave May Ave Ivania Ave estern Ave
10 <sup>th</sup> St.	50'	
Reno Ave.	50'*	-10th-St 50'
15 <sup>th</sup> St.	20' - 40'	
Sara Rd.	20'	15th St 29th-St 15th St 29th-St 29th-St 29th-St 29th-St 29th-St 29th-St 29th-St 29th-St 29th-St 29th-St
N Council Rd.	50'	44th-St W3 — Minimal Some
N Broadway Ave.	60'	MUSTANG Significant
*Portions of Reno Ave ~70' drainage feature included in roadway w	enue contain a that is not vidth	152 40 42



#### West Guideway Takeaways



All West alternatives would require some level of roadway expansion or travel lane conversion for LRT or BRT



Segments of Alternatives 1 and 2 would require significant roadway expansion for LRT or BRT



Segments of 10<sup>th</sup> Street and Reno Ave are highly constrained



# West Corridor Travel Times





#### **Travel Times**

# Estimating travel times allow for a comparison between transit and driving for all high potential alternatives

#### Driving Time Estimates Assumptions

PM Peak Travel Times





#### **West Corridor Estimated Travel Times**

1 . 1

			TA SAIL
Alignment	Alternative Length	Travel Time	netery Rd stang Rd stang Rd stang Rd stern Ave May Ave May Ave stern Ave
W1 – 10 <sup>th</sup>	13.9	30-35 min.	Point Roc Count Count WI
W1 – Reno	13.9	25-30 min.	1-10th-St
W2 – 10 <sup>th</sup>	17.0	35-40 min.	Reno Ave
W2 – Reno	15.0	30-35 min.	15th St 29th-St 29th-St
W3 – 10 <sup>th</sup>	12.9	30-35 min.	44th-St - West Corridor Alternatives for Detailed Analysis Corridor Connections for
W3 – Reno	11.0	25-30 min.	MUSTANG
			46



### West Alternative Travel Times – PM Peak

Alternative	Estimated Driving Time	Estimated Transit Travel Time	Tak	aways	
West 1 – 10 <sup>th</sup>	20-25 min.	30-35 min.		All alternatives competitive with	
West 1 – Reno	25-30 min.	25-30 min.		driving	
West 2 – 10 <sup>th</sup>	35-40 min.	35-40 min.	$\sim$	10 <sup>th</sup> Street alternatives generally slower than	
West 2 – Reno	25-30 min.	30-35 min.		Reno Ave alternatives	
West 3 – 10 <sup>th</sup>	25-30 min.	30-35 min.	$\overline{(1)}$	West 1-Reno and West 3-Reno have the	
West 3 – Reno	25-30 min.	25-30 min.		fastest average speed	

# Airport Corridor Existing Roadway Conditions





#### **Two Lane Roadway**





### **On-Street Parking**





### **Existing Bridges**





#### Sharp Turns



Chentres Margare Disastra.



### **Highway Interchanges**





### **At-grade Railroad Crossings**







### **Roadway Constraints Summary**







### Roadway vs. Right-of-Way



#### This is an example cross-section with high-capacity transit, not representative of a specific roadway



#### **Airport Corridor Roadway Widths**





#### **Airport Guideway Takeaways**



All Airport Corridor alternatives would require some level of roadway expansion or travel lane conversion for LRT or BRT

A

All Airport Corridor alternatives have sharp turns and bridges

Linit

Significant roadway widening would be required to reach FAA Complex



# Airport Corridor Travel Times





#### **Travel Times**

# Estimating travel times allow for a comparison between transit and driving for all high potential alternatives

#### Driving Time Estimates Assumptions

PM Peak Travel Times





Alignment

**A1** 

**A3** 

**A4** 

#### **Airport Corridor Estimated Travel Times**



\*Does not include segment between Airport Terminal and FAA Complex



#### **Airport Alternative Travel Times**

## Takeaways

				All alternatives
Alternative	Estimated Driving Time	Estimated Transit Travel Time		driving
Airport 1	20-25 min.	20-25 min.	Ā	All alternatives
Airport 3	20-25 min.	20-25 min.		competitive with one another
Airport 4	20-25 min.	20-25 min.		Serving FAA Complex
				additional 5-10 min.

# Engagement Updates





## **Engagement Recap**

- 7 Stakeholder Interviews
- 246 Survey Responses (237 Virtual and 9 Paper)
- 27 Attendees at the In-Person Open House
- 24,555 Engagements on RTA's social media accounts since June of 2023 (including views, clicks, shares, likes, and comments)





### **Transit Needs Survey - By the Numbers**





#### **Transit Needs Survey – Key Destinations**





## **Key Engagement Takeaways**





Interest in a regional transit link between Yukon and Downtown OKC



More connections to the bike and pedestrian network



Support for a high-capacity transit link to the airport



Balance station frequency with quick travel times



Desire to reduce congestion



Promote development on the west side of Oklahoma City



## **November Town Hall**

- Planned for <u>November 14</u>
- Virtual Format
- Goals
  - Deliver project updates and analysis
  - Introduce high-potential alignments
  - Gauge public sentiment before full evaluation of alternatives



# Next Steps







# Thank You

