



# CITY OF NORMAN, OK AIM NORMAN COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TRANSPORTATION SUB-COMMITTEE

Development Center, Room B, 225 N. Webster Ave., Norman, OK 73069  
Wednesday, May 8, 2024 at 1:00 PM

## MINUTES

*It is the policy of the City of Norman that no person or groups of persons shall on the grounds of race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, age, place of birth, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, familial status, marital status, including marriage to a person of the same sex, disability, relation, or genetic information, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or otherwise subjected to discrimination in employment activities or in all programs, services, or activities administered by the City, its recipients, sub-recipients, and contractors. In the event of any comments, complaints, modifications, accommodations, alternative formats, and auxiliary aids and services regarding accessibility or inclusion, please contact the ADA Technician at 405-366-5446, Relay Service: 711. To better serve you, five (5) business days' advance notice is preferred.*

### CALL TO ORDER

Chair Jim Adair called the meeting to order at 1:04 pm.

### INTRODUCTION/ROLL CALL

#### PRESENT

Jim Adair	David Riesland (Staff)
Trey Bates	Taylor Johnson (Staff)
Chuck Thompson	Awet Frezgi (Staff)
Adam Ross	Beth Muckala (Staff)
Olivia Dailey	Marty Shukert (RDG)
Chris Nanny	Bret Cabiness (Garver)
Karleene Smith	Mike Spayd (Garver)
BJ Hawkins	Ashley Maggio (Garver)
Amanda Nairn (Steering Committee)	James Walden (Garver)
Shavonne Evans (Steering Committee)	

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MARCH SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING

- Approved unanimously with no changes

### PRIORITIZATION MATRIX

- Completion of a prioritization matrix criteria survey had been assigned as homework for the members. A miscommunication prevented some members from completing the survey. A few minutes were allowed for some members to complete the survey before moving on to discussion of the matrix.
- The purpose of the prioritization matrix is to have a framework for deciding which projects are the most important and assigning a ranking to those projects

- This will help to make sure that transportation funds are allocated in the most effective manner.
- The fifteen priority criteria will be put into a matrix depending on how they rank among the sub-committee members. Input from the sub-committee members will help to assign a weighting to each of the prioritization criteria.
- In the survey, members assign a weight of “10” to those criteria they value most and a weight of “1” to those criteria they value least.
- Garver went through the rankings to date for each of the prioritization criteria. There was some confusion about what the numbers met and significant discussion ensued. Garver stressed that the rankings represent how each criteria ranks in relation to one another. Looking at the individual rankings may be confusing when we need to see all the rankings together. That is coming but is not available today.
- There were observations that it may be just as important to note what ranked high as well as what ranked low.
- Garver will take the input from the sub-committee members to a future discussion with Staff. The criteria ranking will be part of a larger decision on what projects may be selected in the future for submission for various funding opportunities.

## **ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION**

- RDG spoke to many elements of Active Transportation that the city has in place but may not be complete
- Trails in drainage ways could be problematic from a ROW acquisition standpoint
- Power line easements parallel much of the Little River that make excellent trail corridors
- The current survey questions were on a map that has been completed by a number of the members. A number of responses were received relative to transportation issues.
- RDG pointed out a few inaccuracies on the existing Bike Map
- RDG put the Bike Map into Google Earth which is an effective tool for identifying feasibility of future enhancements to the network.
- Basic routes should have pedestrian facilities on it.
- Advanced routes are not for all users given the nature of the roads where they exist. Many are on narrow, two-lane roads with significant vertical alignment challenges.
- Trails can serve both recreational uses as well as basic transportation uses.
- Most users are opposed to on-street bike facilities unless they are located in very low traffic areas.
- Sidepaths along arterial roadways where they serve basic transportation needs should be a priority. Sidepaths should be incorporated into new construction.
- Access management is critical to the success of sidepaths. A lack of access management can be detrimental to the success of sidepaths.
- Basic routes are currently the subject of much interruption. Discontinuous routes don't help riders. Many basic routes are often circuitous. Priorities would be to modify routes to fill gaps or to provide better continuity.
- Wayfinding is an issue with bike facilities. Existing bike route signs have very little use.
- Bicycle boulevards incorporate bike facilities, sidewalks, and traffic calming measures into a single package.
- Protected crossings for pedestrians and bicycles should be considered.

- The City doesn't have many bike lanes, but the ones that we do have are rather disconnected. They don't form a substantial network. There was some discussion regarding the green treatment of bike lanes. Finances and maintenance issues need to be considered. Bike symbols are good and can be more cost effective than continuous green bike lanes.
- On-street bike lanes without separation is becoming a nationwide issue. Policies would be to develop complete routes with spot green treatment and considerations for separation.
- There have been excellent examples recently whereby the bike lanes are integrated into the sidewalk and cross intersections at the crosswalk with the pedestrians and then merge back into bike lanes on the other side of the intersection.
- Sidepaths, like other facilities, tend to be rather segmented and offer little connectivity. Policies would include improving design standards and to provide clear crosswalks with some signage.
- Not very many trails exist in Norman. Lack long distance, regional trails. Legacy Trail is probably the longest and real trail in Norman. Policies include expanding park trails to connect with other trails, to coordinate connections between trails and sidepaths, and to incorporate HOA trails into the citywide network. We need to investigate future opportunities for trail development.
- RDG displayed the potential beginning of an Active Transportation Network with future RTA Stations shown. This spurred significant discussion among sub-committee members regarding what is important and where opportunities may lie.

## INTERACTIVE MAP

- Map was developed as a means to communicate with one another outside of physical meeting times.
- Map shows roadway classifications (for now as defined in the 2014 CTP), transit routes, sidewalk completion maps, greenway development priorities, bike and pedestrian facilities, parking, and committed projects from the 2014 CTP. Potential land use is also shown though not finalized, yet. All projects identified in the 2014 CTP are either in the map or will be added to the map. The proposed Turnpike routes will also be shown. Traffic volumes are also shown in the areas.
- Garver went through the process of how to add comments. Some comments may be specific to a certain area or may be generalized to the entire plan. Must hit "Save" to have your comments recorded. You can make as many or as few comments as you need to add.
- The Access Oklahoma Turnpike network in Norman is critical to the development of the CTP update. The map also has significant benefit to the other plan development/update initiatives.
- There was significant discussion regarding how land use will/does show up on this map. Important to consider how development to the east could impact existing roads. For example, does an existing classification change from rural to urban or from minor to principle?
- Any additional recommendations can be added to the map as a comment.

## SUB-COMMITTEE HOMEWORK AND FUTURE MEETINGS

- Those that did not complete the priority criteria survey should do so by May 10.
- Each member is asked to add a minimum of ten comments to the interactive map by June 5.
- Each member is asked to review the Transit recommendations from the existing Transit Plan and to offer comments back to Chair Adair.
- Next meeting will be on June 12, 2024, at 1:00 PM. The sub-committee will add at least one additional meeting beginning on July 10, 2024, at 1:00 PM.
- We have held one micro-committee meeting to discuss specific issues that may be of interest to a smaller subset of the committee. More of those meetings will be scheduled in the near future.
- Garver has anticipated listening sessions with OU, ODOT, Cleveland County, and perhaps OTA before completing CTP Update.

## CLOSING COMMENTS

- Chair Jim Adair thanked the subcommittee members for their participation.

## ADJOURNMENT

This meeting was adjourned at 3:04 pm.

Passed and approved on this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2024.

---

**Jim Adair, Chair**

*All AIM Sub-Committee Meetings are not regular meetings of the AIM Norman Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee, but the Steering Committee will be invited to attend, and this notice is being posted in compliance with the Oklahoma Open Meetings Act in the event of a quorum.*