

**FAST Forward Regional Transit System Plan
Regional Task Force Meeting #2 Summary
March 8, 2011, 6:00 – 7:30pm
Buddy Lafortune Community Center**

Attendance: 22

Group 1 Summary of Discussion

Group 1 identified several critical goals essential for RTSP development including:

- Access to employment centers and activity centers like schools, jobs, and training centers
- Mode choice and accessibility from one mode to another
- Infill development – dense development
- Concern for affordable housing for seniors
- Environment ranked last, but conversation indicated concern for the environment, but that transit would have more positive than negative effects on the environment, therefore it was not a group concern

General conversation addressed the length of some corridors which may encourage sprawl and limit transit effectiveness regionally. Public relations and outreach was stressed as an important aspect of a transit system's success. Group members indicated they wanted the agency to collaborate with major businesses and employers to attract patrons to use the system.

Corridors identified as having the greatest need were mostly based on growth patterns or population and employment as well as congestion levels. Group members indicated Broken Arrow to Downtown (5 & 19), Owasso (14), 169 Corridor (20) as the main corridors demonstrating the greatest need.

Corridors with the greatest potential success represented corridors which lacked obvious existing need but show signs of potential growth. Corridors with the most potential success were Osage Prairie Trail (13), Riverside (18) and Yale/Harvard (8).

Group 2 Summary of Discussion

Needs

- Access to employment (i.e. schools, job training centers)
- Choice – intermodal connections and mode choice
- Infill development – dense development
- Concern for affordable housing for seniors

1) On the potential corridor map, For Corridor 4 (91st), it appears the lengths of the two segments are reversed (Segment A should be 3.6 and B should be 5.9?)

2) Farhod Daroga (Broken Arrow planner) wants us to consider adding 61st Street from Yale to Lynn Lane. This puts St. Francis Hospital/Lafortune Park on the west end and the new St. John's Hospital and Bass Pro Shops retail center/area on the east end, with Triad Center office complex (61st and Memorial) and the light industrial area around 129th Street within. Going further east to 23rd Street would bring in Broken Arrow High School, but not sure that justifies extending it from Lynn Lane.

3) Consider adding N. Cincinnati from downtown to 36 Street North (connects OSU on the south with Million Dollar Elm Casino & St. Simeon's Home/Suburban Acres Shopping Center. Also provides another N-S corridor serving N. Tulsa.)

Notes:

- Environmental concerns ranked last in goals
- Longer corridors encourage further sprawl
- Tulsa can support high capacity corridors for transit
- Population & employment are important
- Safety first
- Agencies need to collaborate with businesses (better communication)

Corridors of Greatest Need

- #5 and #19 – Broken Arrow and SH 51 Corridors
- #14 – Owasso; lots of growth and commuter traffic
- #20 – US 169 Corridor; congested corridor, population & employment

Corridors of Greatest Potential Success

- #13 – Osage Prairie Trail Corridor; potential to boom in growth
- #16 – Sand Springs Corridor
- #21 – U.S. 75 Corridor
- #18 – S. Peoria/Riverside Drive
- #14 – Owasso Corridor
- #5 – Broken Arrow
- #8 – Harvard/Yale

Group 3 Summary of Discussion

On prioritization of objectives, the group discussed the difference between “Meeting demand created by increases in population and employment” and “Encouraging and supporting development.” These two objectives seemed to have tension due to the fact that some saw transit as a way to serve existing population and employment while others saw transit as a method to help guide new development.

Corridors of Greatest Need (and reasons for success)

- #7 - Downtown Circulator; encourages transit-oriented development
- #12 & #18 - N. and S. Peoria/Riverside; Largest current transit ridership
- #5 - Broken Arrow Corridor; Population, existing rail line, employment centers
- #3 - 71st Street; Tulsa Hills & Woodland Hills traffic generators
- #8 - Harvard/Yale; Educational (TCC Northeast & TU) and employment (St. Francis) generators

Corridors of Greatest Potential for Success

- #5 - Broken Arrow Corridor

Group 4 Summary of Discussion

Frequency vs. Route coverage
Daytime vs. Nighttime needs
Work vs. play trip purposes
Choice vs. Dependent riders

Top-Ranked Objectives

Goal #1 (Enhance Transportation Mobility & Accessibility)

Objective #1 (Meet Demand Created by Increases in Population & Employment)
5 votes

Goal #4 (Guide Economic Development)

Objective #2 (Encourage & Support Development)
4 votes

Top-Ranked Corridors for Success

- #1 - 21st Street Corridor
- #18 - South Peoria/Riverside Drive
- #12 - North Peoria
- #7 - Downtown Circulator
- #20 - US 169 Corridor

Regional Task Force
Meeting - March 8, 2011

Goal and Objective Ranking Results

| GOALS | Goal Rank | Objectives | Objective Rank |
|---------------------------------|-----------|--|----------------|
| Mobility / Accessibility | 1 | Meet Demands Created by Increases in Population and Employment | 1 |
| | | Improve Access to Major Activity Centers | 2 |
| | | Improve Mode Choice Availability | 5 |
| Efficiency & Safety | 3 | Improve Transit Reliability | 4 |
| | | Improve Multimodal Connectivity | 6 |
| | | Safety | 8 |
| Environmental Benefits | 4 | Minimize Environmental Impact | 9 |
| Economic Development | 2 | Incorporate Local Goals & Objectives | 7 |
| | | Encourage and Support Development | 3 |

Corridors of Greatest **Need** based on group responses.

| Corridor No. | Name | Total | Percent of Total Responses |
|---------------------|---|--------------|-----------------------------------|
| 5 | Broken Arrow Corridor | 12 | 15% |
| 18 | South Peoria/Riverside Dr Corridor | 11 | 13% |
| 12 | North Peoria Corridor | 7 | 9% |
| 14 | Owasso Corridor | 7 | 9% |
| 20 | US 169 Corridor | 7 | 9% |
| 7 | Downtown Circulator | 6 | 7% |
| 8 | Harvard/Yale Corridor | 5 | 6% |
| 19 | State Highway 51 Corridor | 5 | 6% |
| 1 | 21st Street Corridor | 4 | 5% |
| 6 | Central Corridor | 3 | 4% |
| 3 | 71st Street Corridor | 2 | 2% |
| 13 | Osage Prairie Trail Corridor | 2 | 2% |
| 16 | Sand Springs Corridor | 2 | 2% |
| 17 | Sapulpa Corridor | 2 | 2% |
| 21 | US Highway 75 Corridor | 2 | 2% |
| 2 | 41st Street Corridor | 1 | 1% |
| 4 | 91st Street Corridor | 1 | 1% |
| 9 | Historic Street Car Corridor | 1 | 1% |
| 10 | Jenks/Bixby Corridor | 1 | 1% |
| 15 | Pine Street Corridor | 1 | 1% |
| 11 | Memorial Drive Corridor | 0 | 0% |
| | | 82 | |

Corridors with Greatest Potential for **Success** based on group responses.

| Corridor No. | Name | Total | Percent of Total Responses |
|---------------------|---|--------------|-----------------------------------|
| 5 | Broken Arrow Corridor | 9 | 19% |
| 18 | South Peoria/Riverside Dr Corridor | 7 | 15% |
| 12 | North Peoria Corridor | 5 | 11% |
| 13 | Osage Prairie Trail Corridor | 4 | 9% |
| 1 | 21st Street Corridor | 3 | 6% |
| 14 | Owasso Corridor | 3 | 6% |
| 19 | State Highway 51 Corridor | 3 | 6% |
| 7 | Downtown Circulator | 2 | 4% |
| 8 | Harvard/Yale Corridor | 2 | 4% |
| 16 | Sand Springs Corridor | 2 | 4% |
| 17 | Sapulpa Corridor | 2 | 4% |
| 2 | 41st Street Corridor | 1 | 2% |
| 3 | 71st Street Corridor | 1 | 2% |
| 10 | Jenks/Bixby Corridor | 1 | 2% |
| 20 | US 169 Corridor | 1 | 2% |
| 21 | US Highway 75 Corridor | 1 | 2% |
| 4 | 91st Street Corridor | 0 | 0% |
| 6 | Central Corridor | 0 | 0% |
| 9 | Historic Street Car Corridor | 0 | 0% |
| 11 | Memorial Drive Corridor | 0 | 0% |
| 15 | Pine Street Corridor | 0 | 0% |
| | | 47 | |