



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

Development Center, Room B, 225 N. Webster Ave., Norman, OK 73069  
Thursday, February 20, 2025 at 11:30 AM

---

## MINUTES

The AIM Norman Comprehensive Plan Transportation Sub-Committee of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in Regular Session at the Development Center in Conference Room B, on Thursday, February 20, 2025 at 11:30 PM and notice of the agenda of the meeting was posted at the Development Center at 225 N. Webster Ave, Norman Municipal Building at 201 West Gray, and on the City website at least 24 hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

### CALL TO ORDER

Chair Jim Adair called the meeting to order at 11:36 am.

### INTRODUCTION/ROLL CALL

#### PRESENT

Jim Adair	Hal Cantwell
BJ Hawkins	Chuck Thompson
Adam Ross	Trey Bates
Karleene Smith (Zoom)	Chris Nanny (Zoom)
Olivia Dailey (Zoom)	AshLynn Wilkerson (Staff)
Awet Frezgi (Staff)	David Riesland (Staff)
Bret Cabbiness (Garver)	James Walden (Garver Zoom)
Ashley Maggio (Garver Zoom)	

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM NOVEMBER 13 SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING

- A quorum was present
- Minutes were unanimously approved with no changes

### ROADWAY PLAN UPDATE

- The Land Use Plan as it currently exists serves as the basis for the CTP Update.
- The Land Use Plan will require an additional 23,000 residential units to accommodate population projections.
- Where this growth will need to occur drives the decisions in this CTP Update.
- Public input, either in person or through a number of surveys, played a significant role in the development of this plan update.
- Trends in Norman are away from vehicle-centric improvements to more multi-modal improvements.
- Consistently, we heard of the importance of connectivity.
- Proposed Transportation Plan Map
  - Most of the typical sections were carried forward from the 2014 CTP.

- Principal arterial (urban) has two options.
- Principal arterial (rural) has two options.
- Minor arterial (urban) has two options with two alternatives with sidepaths and/or bike lanes vertically separated from the travel lanes. Can also adapt typical sections to accommodate cycle tracks. Applications involving cycle tracks can be born from road diet candidates.
- Minor arterial (rural) has two options.
- Collector (urban) show two options with on-street parking and optional bike lanes. FOG lanes (or paved shoulders) can be a low-cost traffic calming measure and can eliminate some of the conflicts between bike lanes and on-street parking. The options can be adapted to include cycle tracks.
- Collector (rural) remain unchanged from the 2014 CTP.
- Local streets reduce lane widths and have curb and gutter in urban sections and drop the curb and gutter in rural sections.
- Mixed use streets have been added to the sections shown in the 2014 CTP with two options.
- Garver showed the proposed functional classification map.
  - I-35 should show up as a freeway and Hwy 9 should show up as an expressway.
  - Much discussion ensued regarding to potential collector street network such as who would pay for it and what happens when proposed collector crosses multiple property owners.
    - Obviously, the collector network is shown as a desired option only.
    - Need to keep in mind that some things, as shown, may not be able to be constructed as shown on the map.
    - City Council will have the ultimate say as to what gets built and what will be required. This CTP Update is merely meant to be a guiding document.
    - Pushback can be expected as the idea of connecting neighborhoods gets out there and some may not want it.
  - Sub-committee focused specifically on a collector shown north of Indian Hills Road and west of I-35. Multiple ownerships and a linear park that exists were discussed. Approved plats may not be consistent with what is shown with this particular collector. Some discussion continued regarding aspirational goals showed on a map. Garver agreed to take this collector off. The plan could also have a disclaimer that the intent is to achieve connectivity. A collector network shown in proximity to 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE (St. James Park) was also discussed but it was acknowledged that these followed what has developed.
- The Principal Arterial sections were revisited. There was discussion about maintenance efforts associated with additional 20' trail easements as well as the general cost of acquiring right-of-way.
- List of Roadway Projects
  - Not completed portion of 2019 Transportation Bond was discussed. Discussion ensued regarding the incomplete projects from the 2012 Transportation Bond (36<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW). It was decided that slide should be changed to reflect incomplete Bond projects that would allow it to also show the incomplete 2012 Bond project.

- Two 2019 Projects on Indian Hills were discussed. With the turnpike work, these projects likely fall off the list and those funds could be allocated elsewhere.
- Non-committed list from the 2014 CTP was discussed. This list will be carried forward as potential projects. Not all projects are City of Norman projects but include ODOT projects. Title needs to reflect that these are 2014 non-committed projects and not necessarily City of Norman projects.
- Developed 2025 List of Projects was discussed. Most of these tie back either to the Land Use Plan or to citizen input in the process. Projects were broken down in short-term, mid-term, and long-term. List was developed without considering costs. Garver pointed out, again, that 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue East will be a major north/south corridor and is consistent with the ACOG Encompass 2045 Transportation Improvement Plan.
- Alameda Street special corridor was discussed including sidepaths and intersection improvements. Safety is a huge part of this special corridor designation.
- Need for 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue East being a major north/south route was discussed. Depending on how development occurs could dictate a lot about how this road develops. The Land Use Map is currently showing development east of 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue East which helps to support this CTP Update showing improvement to 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue East. ACOG's Encompass 2045 Plan also supports an improved 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue East. The improvement of 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue East is shown incorrectly on the 2025 improvement map.
- The potential bridge over I-35 on Franklin Road was discussed. Whether it shows up on the map was discussed. Garver said it is there but is difficult to show on the scale of map used. Need to depict that it may not necessarily be a City of Norman project. Franklin Road becomes important for east/west movements because of the absence of frontage roads along the turnpike through Norman.
- The project on Tecumseh Road between Flood Avenue and 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW was discussed. The fact that the project is not in the ACOG TIP has made the project ineligible for Federal funding was discussed. This hurdle should be removed soon.
- Special corridor on Lindsey Street was discussed. This could actually be removed because it is funded and under design.
- Special corridor on Flood Avenue between Robinson Street and Main Street was discussed. This is still viewed as a long-term project even with the development of James Garner Avenue.
- Special corridor on Berry Road between Robinson Street and Imhoff Road was discussed.
- Traffic Plan Update
  - Most of what Garver presented has been shared before.
  - Looked at crash history, traffic growth areas, etc.
  - Some data were gleaned from interactive traffic map.
  - List of improvements include both projects and studies. 15 projects were identified. Numerous studies were identified including spot studies as well as generic studies such as speed studies. Studies would serve to develop list of future projects, too. Studies could be put through a matrix to develop priorities for each.
- Proposed Active Transportation Map Update

- One map shows a spine network of either sidepaths of greenways and is consistent with the Parks Master Plan.
- The other map shows all improvements broken out by facility type (bike routes, bike lanes, sidepaths, etc.).
- Sidepaths will form the large component of this plan.
- Right-of-way requirements of plan was discussed. If right-of-way becomes an issue, then options will be evaluated. Standards used in the development of the plan were also discussed. Option to reduce the stress level for users will always play into the ultimate decision as to how to proceed.

**DRAFT 2025 COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE (Full Document)**

- Document Outline
  - Overall umbrella of AIM Norman process
  - How this CTP Update relates to other plans
  - Reiterating that this is an update and not necessarily a new plan
  - Some elements of the plan (transit, aviation, etc.) were carried into this plan update and were not revisited.
- Discussion of Project Prioritization
  - Significantly simplified from what was seen previously.
  - Valuable tool to prioritize projects both within this update as well as in the future.
- Review comment process and deadlines

**PLAN UPDATED SCHEDULE**

- February 20, 2025, Transportation Sub-Committee Meeting
- February 25, 2025, DRAFT 2025 Comprehensive Transportation Plan Update presentation to City Council (Study Session). Today’s presentation will be shared with Council but in a condensed, very high-level version.
- February 26, 2025, Final review comments due back from Sub-Committee members
- March 4, 2025, Transportation Sub-Committee Meeting (in-person) to vote on approval of the 2025 Comprehensive Transportation Plan Update
- March 6, 2025, submittal of AIM Norman 2025 Comprehensive Transportation Plan Update to Steering Committee
- Steering committee takes it forward to Planning Commission and Council

**CLOSING COMMENTS**

**ADJOURNMENT**

- Meeting was adjourned at 1:28 pm.

**Passed and approved on this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2025.**

---

**Jim Adair, Chair**