

## CITY COUNCIL STUDY SESSION MINUTES

March 31, 2015

The City Council of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in a Study Session at 5:30 p.m. in the Municipal Building Conference Room on the 31st day of March, 2015, and notice and agenda of the meeting were posted at the Municipal Building at 201 West Gray, and the Norman Public Library at 225 North Webster 24 hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

PRESENT:

Councilmembers Allison, Castleberry, Heiple, Holman, Jungman, Lang, Miller, Williams, Mayor Rosenthal

ABSENT:

None

Item 1, being:

**PRESENTATION BY DAN SCHEMM, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE NORMAN CONVENTION AND VISITORS BUREAU, OF THE PHASE ONE FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS FOR A POTENTIAL CONVENTION/EXPO CENTER DEVELOPMENT IN NORMAN.**

Mr. Dan Schemm, Executive Director, Norman Convention and Visitors Bureau (NCVB), thanked Council for the opportunity to make tonight's presentation on the Phase I Feasibility Analysis for a Potential Convention/Expo Center Development (Study) in Norman. He said today's presentation is a draft from the consultant, Conventions, Sports, and Leisure (CS&L) and CS&L will make any changes needed before presenting the final report.

### **Phase 1 Market Demand Analysis**

Mr. Schemm said Phase 1 of the Analysis looked at local market conditions; industry trends and characteristics; competitive and comparable facilities; market surveys; market demand; supportable building program; and development options. He highlighted the location and accessibility of driving distance to regional cities. He said the drive time radius used was 30 minutes, 90 minutes, and 180 minutes and according to the demographics, Norman looked very good; thus, having the potential of gaining a lot of population according to the drive-time map and being close to many different metro areas that could potentially drive here for conferences, conventions, sporting events, etc.

Mr. Schemm highlighted Norman's hotels and meeting facilities stating Norman has 19 hotels and five (5) key meeting facilities that can host larger events. Mr. Schemm said the NCVB Board did not want to confine the study to a certain type of facility to make certain all options were considered. He said the five (5) key meeting facilities include Marriott Conference Center at National Center for Employee Development (NCED), Cleveland County Fairgrounds, Embassy Suites Norman, University of Oklahoma (OU) OK Memorial Union, and Riverwind Casino. He said Sooner Legends and The Norman Hotel are not part of the key meeting facilities, as they are smaller in size, but could be considerations as well. Mr. Schemm highlighted exhibit space, ballroom space, meeting rooms, sellable space, and hotel rooms for each of the five (5) key meeting facilities.

Mr. Schemm explained the industry term for "prime space" under the category of exhibit space and said this terminology means state of the art exhibit space that people are looking for when planning events. He said the Cleveland County Fairgrounds does not fall under the "prime space" due to portions of the facility having dirt floors with low ceilings rather than high ceilings for arena events and not being column free; therefore, the facility is classified as "other space." However, Mr. Schemm felt Norman definitely has some unique sellable assets such as the Marriot Conference Center at NCED having the most hotel rooms under one roof (964) in the state, other than the casino located south of Norman near the Texas state line, and Embassy Suites Norman having the largest amount of ballroom space (28,800 square feet) in the state.

Item 1, continued:

### **Selected Competitive State Facilities**

Next, CS&L researched Norman's competitive facilities located within the state, which Norman competes with on a daily basis and the top cities were ranked as follows:

1. Oklahoma City (OKC) – Cox Business Services Convention Center, 18 miles from Norman;
2. OKC – Sheraton Oklahoma City Hotel, 18 miles from Norman;
3. Midwest City – Reed Conference Center, 21 miles from Norman;
4. OKC – Biltmore Hotel, 22 miles from Norman;
5. Edmond – Nigh University Center, 31 miles from Norman;
6. Ardmore – Ardmore Convention Center, 79 miles from Norman;
7. Stillwater – Wes Watkins Center, 81 miles from Norman;
8. Clinton – Frisco Conference Center, 101 miles from Norman;
9. Enid – Enid Event and Convention Center, 114 miles from Norman; and
- 10-14. Tulsa – Cox Business Center; Tulsa Doubletree Downtown; Tulsa Marriott Southern Hills; Double Tree by Hilton Hotel Tulsa-Warren Place; and Tulsa Renaissance Hotel, all 120 to 126 miles from Norman.

Mr. Schemm said the Cox Business Services Convention Center in OKC and the Enid Event and Convention Center both had significant exposition space.

### **Selected Comparable National Facilities**

CS&L also looked at competitive facilities around the country, stating the facilities/cities were selected for a number of reasons such as having similar demographics to Norman; being a university city; distance to highways and/or airports; etc. Mr. Schemm said the Study compared prime exhibit space by square foot; ballroom space; break-out meeting space; total sellable space; largest contiguous space; rooms at headquarter hotel; hotels within walking distance (one-half mile); total hotel rooms in market; and demographics comparison.

### **Market Surveys**

Mr. Schemm said CS&L completed a demographics comparison of Norman versus State comparable facilities, as well as National comparable facilities. CS&L also completed follow-up telephone interviews and in-person interviews of local groups and individuals; held focus groups with Norman Leadership and event facility representatives; conducted telephone interviews with state and regional convention planners representing more than 100 potential rotating events; and completed telephone interviews with national convention event planners of more than 90 potential rotating events.

Mr. Schemm said potential convention/conference center events include: conventions; conferences; tradeshow; public/consumer shows; meetings, banquets, and receptions; civic events and uses; and special events and other. He said people are driving to OKC and further for such events because Norman does not have adequate convention/conference space and Norman is missing out on such events as gymnastic competitions, film festivals, Red Earth Festival, quilt and craft shows, cheer competitions, home and garden shows, gun shows, etc. Mr. Schemm said hosting events in Norman will not only bring a lot of money to the merchants at the events, but into our community as well.

### **State and Regional Organization Survey Results**

Mr. Schemm highlighted the survey results for the likelihood of state/regional organizations utilizing Norman if convention/conference space were available and said the overall positive response was 60% and felt the hard part is getting organizations to consider a venue; however, if an organization shows interest by indicating they would likely consider and/or possibly consider Norman, the odds that particular organization can be sold on Norman after a site tour is very high.

Item 1, continued:

Norman is above average, as well as above median, regarding strength of interest from the state and regional convention planners and was higher than CS&L expected. Mr. Schemm highlighted past events previously held in Norman and said 63% of the state/regional planners had not been to Norman, which is essentially a huge untapped market for Norman.

### **National Organization Survey Results**

The survey results for the likelihood of national organizations utilizing Norman was an overall positive response of 32% which doesn't seem high; however, from a sales perspective one (1) in three (3) of the national groups spoken to would consider Norman as a venue and he felt those numbers are outstanding. He said these numbers were also higher than CS&L expected.

Mr. Schemm said the total exhibit space and total ballroom space required for qualified events were good; however, when looking at the total combined exhibit/ballroom space required Norman moved significantly down the list. He said Norman did not have enough total break-out meeting space required and felt that is a piece (of the equation) our City is missing.

### **Market Demand Conclusions**

1. Unmet market demand exists to support a new convention/expo product development in Norman;
2. Market demand is characterized as moderate-high; measured survey interest in Norman was higher than the average and median measured through more than 60 comparable surveys conducted;
3. There are important limitations in the mix and quality of existing Norman convention facility product;
4. Significant new visitation (including new midweek, shoulder season and off-peak season) and hotel room nights would be generated;
5. Appropriate attached headquarters hotel and proximate ancillary hotel support will be critical along with sufficient adjacent/proximate parking;
6. OU could be involved on several levels, particularly in terms of sponsorship/recruitment, satellite presence, having expanded/improved local venue to host OU-affiliated or academic events; and
7. A site that is proximate to existing convention and hotel infrastructure that leverages private sector investment could create substantial synergy and cost efficiency.

Mr. Schemm said the study indicates Norman could support an exhibit hall having 35,000 square feet of sub-dividable, column free, concrete floor with 30 foot or higher ceilings, utility floor grids, independent loading/public access, and climate control; a ballroom having 20,000 square feet sub-dividable, column free, carpeted, upscale space, with 25 foot or higher ceilings, utility floor grids, independent loading/public access, climate control; and break-out meeting rooms with 15,000 square feet of break-out meeting space that is sub-dividable and upscale. He said Norman would also support sufficient parking, pre-function, support and storage space; 250-room or larger full-service hotel attached, adjacent or closely proximate; 400 or more total hotel rooms in immediate area; and full-service headquarter hotel that will also require its own controlled meeting space.

Mr. Schemm said based on the comparison with industry typical private sector projects, using Norman Embassy Suites as an example, Norman exceeds on ballroom space, close on the exhibit space and break-out space, but does not have the exhibit hall space required.

### **Develop Scenarios**

Mr. Schemm said the study did not reveal Norman needed to start from scratch since Norman has the number of hotel rooms needed in multiple places and significant space, i.e, ballroom, break-out space, etc. He said two (2) scenarios to consider include:

#### Scenario 1: Stand-Alone Convention Center

Public sector builds and owns convention center;

Private sector manages via contract; and

Public sector funds operating shortfall.

Item 1, continued:

Mr. Schemm used a fairgrounds facility as an example and said such a facility could accommodate more agriculture type events such as livestock and equestrian shows.

Scenario 2: Public/Private Convention Center

Public sector builds and owns new convention/expo product attached to hotel;

Hotel partner operates via lease agreement; and

No on-going public sector operating subsidy.

Mr. Schemm said under Scenario 2, the City would build the facility then a hotel and/or third party would operate and/or sell the facility; however, the City would benefit from the additional sales tax and guest tax dollars. He said another positive aspect of this scenario is there are no continuing costs to the City after building the facility. He said once the facility is built there would be no operating subsidy, i.e., whoever is operating the facility would also be paying for any maintenance as well as selling the space.

Important site characteristics include: proximity to quality full-service hotel inventory and restaurants, retail, nightlife, and entertainment; pedestrian-friendly walking environment; ability to leverage existing facility investment/infrastructure; requirements/preferences of hotel partner (if applicable); size, cost and ownership complexity of site; parking and site availability; ingress/egress; synergy with other public sector initiatives/master plans; and compatibility with surroundings.

Mr. Schemm said a 35,000 square foot space would need to include some break-out rooms for award ceremonies or other similar events. He said the space will also need to include back of house space; therefore, the 35,000 square feet will not be the entire footprint but rather the floor plan for the space when selling the center to groups, etc.

He said the next steps for Phase 2, Site and Cost/Benefit Analysis include: 1) site analysis; 2) event/utilization analysis; 3) construction cost estimates; 4) financial operating estimates; 5) economic impacts (ROI); 6) cost/benefit conclusions; and 7) funding/ownership/management.

Mr. Schemm said a convention/expo center is part of a package by Norman Forward; however, if a center were to be located near Embassy Suites Norman in the University North Park (UNP) Tax Increment Finance (TIF) District, TIF monies could potentially be utilized. Currently land in the UNP TIF District is set aside for a cultural facility and Mr. Schemm said he spoke to Ms. Erinn Gavaghan, Executive Director, Norman Arts Council, who is excited about a potential convention/expo center for Norman. Mr. Schemm said the Norman Arts Council as well as all the arts organizations and Norman Parks Department would benefit from Room Tax collected.

Gathering community input regarding what a cultural facility might include will be very important. Mr. Schemm said discussions with Ms. Gavaghan included the possibility for installation of office space for the smaller Norman art organizations that currently do not have it and/or dedicated rehearsal space. He said either would be a great use for the center and the possible collaboration of the space with the arts community would be great as well, i.e., arts organizations would bring in events as well as help with maintenance of the expo center.

Councilmember Williams asked whether an expo center would need to be designed a particular way to attract specific types of events, i.e., agriculture events, sporting and/or youth events, and Mr. Schemm said yes, that would be a possibility, stating the Phase 2 process includes researching what type(s) of groups would attend as well as the economic impact and cost benefit for the community. Mr. Schemm said a stand-alone, agricultural type of building would attract more of the swap meets, horse and dog shows, etc., but felt the space would be limited if not connected to other types of space, i.e., hotel, ballroom, break-out meeting spaces.

Councilmember Holman asked whether the study took into account Oklahoma City's (OKC) future/new convention center and Mr. Schemm said no, the study took into account OKC's current facility, the Cox Convention Center. Mr. Schemm said OKC's new convention product will be significantly larger (300,000+ square feet) as well as more expensive; however, this will give Norman an opportunity to obtain groups that do not need that large of a space and/or

Item 1, continued:

cannot afford OKC's space. He said CS&L also conducted OKC's convention center/expo project study and is very familiar with the market regarding OKC's plans, activity, etc. Mr. Schemm felt this is an opportune time for Norman to add this component to our City so that more organizations/groups can be secured. Councilmember Holman asked whether OKC's plans were to keep the Cox Convention Center once a new convention center is built and Mr. Schemm said he has heard multiple rumors so he could not say definitively one way or another. Mr. Schemm said he is meeting with Mr. Mike Carrier, Executive Director, OKC Convention and Visitors Bureau, and will ask about the future of the OKC Cox Convention Center.

Councilmember Miller said she has concerns regarding an expo center being able to support itself since OKC currently has the Cox Convention Center and future plans are to build another convention center. She said the state/regional group's results of "32% possible use" are a red flag for her and requested more information. Mr. Schemm said no city will get all the organizational groups every time. He said some organizations have members located all over the state rather than one area and will need to accommodate the members by going to different venues around the state; therefore, Norman often gets "lumped in" with the OKC metro area. Mr. Schemm felt it is NCVB's job to sway organizations to stay in Norman if they are deciding between Norman and OKC.

Mr. Schemm said another issue to consider is that the distance from Norman to Will Rogers Airport in OKC is the same as the distance it is to downtown OKC; however, guests will pay to park in OKC and/or have trouble finding parking versus Norman having plentiful parking that is free. Another consideration is the traffic and it is easier to drive around Norman and he felt Norman is a more family-friendly community. Mr. Schemm said it is ultimately what the organization is looking for; however, he felt Norman has a niche that OKC cannot fill.

Councilmember Allison said meeting planners/conferences are very competitive and felt most that took the survey may say one thing; however, would not want to commit to one city or another in order to keep their competitive position.

Councilmember Jungman asked how much more convention events would Norman get if an adequate space for an exhibit hall was constructed and Mr. Schemm said Phase 2 will quantify the number of groups that can be brought into Norman, the economic impact of the additional/incremental business being brought to Norman and what impact will be on sales tax, guest tax, etc. Mr. Schemm said the NCVB currently has a list of 10-20 events that we cannot bid on and/or lost out to because Norman does not have the space and added both the Marriott and Embassy Suites Norman provide NCVB a list of approximately 10-20 groups each month that are also being missed because Norman does not have the space.

Mayor Rosenthal said Phase 2 includes asking comparative and/or metro cities (that have built exhibit halls) whether or not the facilities are self-supporting and felt additional measures will help quantify conclusions. She said she is uncomfortable with basing demand solely on surveys (of meeting planners) and requested CS&L also research whether or not the facilities are profitable as well as what their bookings look like, i.e., how much of the space is vacant in the facilities.

Mayor Rosenthal said regarding the state/regional comparable convention centers; she said Norman being above average is something to celebrate; however, Norman is not anywhere near the high matrix cities. She asked what distinguishes Norman from the high matrix cities and what makes Norman stand out compared to other cities. Mayor Rosenthal said the study determined 35,000 square feet was needed for exhibit space; however, of the 60 surveys the average for a regional organization is 9,900 square feet and only 10,600 square feet at the state level. She was concerned with taking 60 potential candidates (a relatively small number) to conduct a survey for the high end big space and is looking forward to Phase 2, specifically getting questions answered regarding utilization overall. Mr. Schemm agreed and he too wants to make certain this is a demand that Norman can fill. He said CS&L determined from not only the surveys, but also by looking at the utilization analysis, the 35,000 square foot fill space would be supported by the market.

Item 1, continued:

Mayor Rosenthal said the study may need to include whether the 20,000 to 30,000 square foot spaces are being utilized elsewhere or is there a gap and she felt just because another city has that particular size facility does not mean it makes good sense for Norman to build one too. She said her opinion is that the City should not be in the convention business and she has a strong prejudice for Scenario 2 because the private sector knows the business and operations of convention centers and they have skin in the game. Mr. Schemm said he was leaning that way as well, but wanted to give more than one option to consider. He felt both options needed to be looked at carefully to determine the economic impact and use the research to base a decision of what would be best for Norman.

Mr. Schemm said Phase 2 of the study will come back to Council in mid-April and should answer many of the questions asked today.

Ms. Joy Hampton, *The Norman Transcript*, asked about using public money for private profit and Mr. Schemm said that will be part Phase 2, economic impact analysis return on investment (ROI) for the City. He said the ROI will also depend on the terms of the lease and felt much of the money will be paid back with increased sales tax and guest tax revenues.

Ms. Cindy Rogers, 633 Reed Avenue, asked whether CS&L can provide how beneficial their (previous) survey data has been regarding the utilization of space.

Items submitted for the record

1. PowerPoint presentation entitled, "Phase One Feasibility Analysis of Potential Convention/Expo Center Development in Norman, Oklahoma, Summary of Findings, Draft Copy" prepared by Conventions, Sports, & Leisure (CS&L), dated March 31, 2015

\* \* \* \* \*

Item 2, being:

#### DISCUSSION REGARDING THE TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS FOR THE UNIVERSITY NORTH PARK TAX INCREMENT FINANCE DISTRICT PREPARED BY GARVER ENGINEERS.

Mr. Shawn O'Leary, Public Works Director, said two (2) topics will be covered tonight; first, an update on the preferred option for Interstate 35 (I-35) and Robinson Street, on the west side of Norman and second, an updated Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for the University North Park (UNP) Tax Increment Finance (TIF) District. He said to date only 35% of the UNPTIF District is developed and stated approximately 2,000 vehicles per day traveled through the 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W. and Robinson Street intersection when the area was a vacant piece of land compared to 20,000 vehicles today.

Mr. O'Leary said Staff is trying to determine what is going to happen at full build-out of UNP and whether the traffic patterns are different than what was initially projected/suggested.

Mr. O'Leary introduced Mr. Mike Spade, Garver Engineering, L.L.C., (Garver) and said he has been working closely with Staff from the beginning of this process. Council approved Contract K-1213-50 on November 13, 2012, between Norman Tax Increment Finance Authority (NTIFA) and Garver for the Robinson Street and I-35 West Alternative Analysis and Functional Plan. Findings were presented to the Community Planning and Transportation Committee on September 30, 2013; presented to the UNPTIF Oversight Committee on October 15, 2013; and Garver submitted a final report in March, 2014.

Mr. Spade said the City contacted Garver requesting the contract be amended to look more broadly at the entire UNPTIF area and validate some assumptions previously made. He said on July 22, 2014, Amendment No. 1 to Contract K-1213-50 with NTIFA and Garver was approved by Council which provided additional consulting engineering services to prepare a new University North Park (UNP) Addition Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA). Garver submitted a UNP TIA Phase A report on January 23, 2015.

Item 2, continued:

Mr. Spade said the primary study area was Robinson Street, from Crossroad Boulevard to 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W.; however, as future impact volumes from the east side of the interchange were discovered, the study was expanded to include the secondary study area on Robinson Street from I-35 to 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W. He said some of the existing issues of the primary study area include two (2) closely spaced intersections, (Crossroads Boulevard and Interstate Drive); the westbound, single left lane to enter I-35 and/or Interstate Drive can experience extremely heavy traffic and backs up to the Robinson Street Overpass; all movements compete for green (signal) time and there is almost no space in between to store a car, which wastes a lot of green time. Mr. Spade said timing for eight (8) traffic signals are programmed as best as possible, but there is not a lot that can be done for the area. He said there are geometric concerns for the area that include a speed transition issue, i.e., vehicles having to reduce highway speed relatively quickly to make a much slower left turn when driving southbound on I-35, exiting just north of the Robinson Street overpass onto Interstate Drive (north). An unconventional intersection exists causing a site distance issue for vehicles exiting from Interstate Drive (north) trying to enter Robinson Street. Mr. Spade said the secondary study area is slightly below traffic capacity except during the PM peak period and he said it can be problematic due to heavy turns and/or overall traffic movement in the area.

Mr. Spade said the I-35 and Robinson Street concepts include:

- Initial 2035 projections with 100% UNP;
- Relied on assumptions for UNP from prior studies (2002-2008);
- Included two (2) build-out levels: 2025 projections and 50% remaining UNP after assessing impact;
- Considered seven (7) initial concepts for west side of interchange including extremely complex to major impact to major costs to more contained and less expensive.
- Selected three (3) alternatives to handle 2025 demand; and
- Recommended additional concepts to meet 2035 demand outside study area.

Councilmember Heiple asked if the flow at 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W. and Robinson Street is being looked at to make it more walkable because pedestrians cannot cross safely. Mr. Spade said an update to the timing plan was done about a year ago to modernize the crossing times for the walk buttons. Councilmember Heiple felt the crossing times were not working properly and Staff said they would follow up on this issue.

Councilmember Miller felt it would be very difficult to predict future travel impacts and asked whether specific formulas were used to accommodate possible transportation changes, i.e., more mass transit, more bicycles, fewer cars, etc. Mr. O'Leary said Garver has done some elaborate projections, much more so than the early days of the UNPTIF District based on current industry standards. He said frankly, the UNPTIF area is isolated from commuter rail line and is already served by bus traffic; therefore, Staff anticipates those wanting to get to UNPTIF District now and in the future will do so by driving a car.

Mr. Spade said the preferred alternative for the west side interchange will have two main advantages to include shifting North Interstate Drive 225 feet to the east in order to get separation in the area so more cars can "store" between the intersections and secondly, saving costs by restriping the bridge rather than widening the bridge to contain two (2) receiving lanes that will continue past where North Interstate Drive continues. Mr. Spade said a third lane will be picked up traveling eastbound prior to Crossroads Boulevard which will turn into a dedicated right and some additional left turn lanes and overhead signage will assist as well.

Mr. Spade highlighted a simulated 2025, or 50% build-out, for the PM and peak period traffic on the west side of the Robinson Street overpass and stated 2035 AM traffic would be okay and 2035 PM traffic would be poor.

Mr. Spade said the study showed results of significant 2035 congestion on the east side of the interchange and the City requested Garver to study full build-out of UNP across a larger study area. He said Phase A study includes the existing conditions (Fall 2014); trip generation for full UNP build-out (2035); and assessment of existing plus committed network (2035). Phase B study will include alternative testing and conceptual layouts.

Item 2, continued:

Data collection included September, 2014 traffic counts for 22 different intersections (post Main Street interchange construction); looked at most current land use plan on the south side of the UNP, south of Rock Creek Road; looked at the north side of UNP current and modified land use plans; looked at prior study for Legacy Business Park; gathered on-going construction plans for Interstate Drive Extension and Corporate Drive; and field observations. Mr. Spade highlighted remaining parcels south of UNP and current parcels on the north side of UNP, as well as remaining (modified) parcels on the north side.

Mr. Spade provided an overview of the trip generation totals stating current land use has 85,519 gross trips and modified land use has 119,219 gross trips. The trip generation methodology included:

- Internal trips; interaction varies on different land use intensity (office, retail, restaurant, residential, hotel, and entertainment). Internal quadrant trips and quadrant to quadrant trips.
- Primary trips (coming outside of study area) and pass-by/diverted link trips.
- Multiple trip distribution patterns; south side development; north side development; and internal capture and pass-by.

Councilmember Lang asked whether Garver was looking at areas just outside the study that could dramatically impact the traffic and Mr. Spade said yes; however, no background growth rate was assumed for 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W.; the approaches that feed into the UNP from Robinson Street, Tecumseh Road, and 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W. Mr. Spade said for the other movements in the study area such as the intersection of Robinson Street and 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W., that particular movement is not affected at all by the UNP; however, predicting forward Garver assumed a small growth rate for this particular intersection. He said for 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W., the growth rate was also bumped up a little because of historic volumes that also show the outlying areas are growing at a higher rate.

Councilmember Holman asked when the Robinson Street and Tecumseh Road overpasses were built and Staff said the Robinson Street overpass was built in approximately 1990 and the Tecumseh Road overpass was built in approximately 2001. The traffic volumes include developed 2035 volumes for the study area, 2014 traffic and background growth and excluded all direct UNP movements. Assumed driveway connections on UNP North and applied UNP trips and trips from Legacy Business Park. Mr. Spade highlighted the two-way traffic volumes for PM peak period, giving the existing, 2025 current land use, and 2035 proposed land use. He said committed improvement projects will assist with the 2035 network to include Robinson Street at I-35 interchange (west); Tecumseh Road at Flood Avenue; Tecumseh Road at 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue N.W.; and Extension of Interstate Drive to Corporate Drive.

The 2035 analysis indicates major capacity issues for both land use plans; Robinson at 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue; 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue is very heavy; Tecumseh Road at Flood Avenue; Tecumseh Road at N. Interstate Drive; and I-35 will have significant congestion in 2035. Mr. Spade highlighted the total delay and delay per vehicle for the AM and PM peak periods for the 2035 simulation scenarios for existing traffic and 2025 current and modified land use plans. He said to meet the 2035 demand the City will need significant traffic modifications in the study area.

Mr. Spade said Phase B will consist of testing potential improvements to include the following:

- New interchange at Rock Creek Road;
- Extension of Interstate Drive to Tecumseh Road;
- Major interchange upgrades at Robinson Street and at Tecumseh Road;
- Additional improvements along Robinson Street per original study;
- Additional improvements along Tecumseh Road per 2006 TEC study;
- Improvements within UNP Development-maximize turn lanes throughout;
- Finalize drive locations and level of access; and
- Develop concept drawings and cost estimates for feasible alternatives.



City Council Study Session Minutes

March 31, 2015

Page 9

Item 2, continued:

Mr. O'Leary said the City of Moore is facing some of the same issues at 19<sup>th</sup> Street. He said Norman will be partnering with the Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the City of Moore to conduct a corridor study to look at the I-35 from Robinson Street in Norman to 4<sup>th</sup> Street in Moore. Mr. O'Leary said this will allow Norman to get ahead of some of the issues and get ODOT assistance and guidance. He said ODOT is the only entity that can do anything about interchanges and if any of Garver's suggestions on potential improvements are approved, they will be future partnerships with ODOT. Mr. O'Leary said the City will be sharing this study with ODOT before ODOT even begins their study.

Mr. O'Leary said he would like to schedule Phase B as an agenda item for Council consideration on April 14, 2015, and Councilmember Heiple said Phase B needs to consider alternative transportation options. Mr. O'Leary said one projection for transit is a commuter rail station at Tecumseh Road.

Mayor Rosenthal said she has concerns about some of the additional commitments Council is being asked to look at and said Council needs to have all the information and a suggested plan in order to make these decisions because they will (significantly) impact transportation.

Items submitted for the record

1. PowerPoint presentation entitled, "Traffic Impact Study for University North Park Addition," presented by Garver Engineering, dated March 31, 2015

\* \* \* \* \*

The meeting adjourned at 6:53 p.m.

\* \* \* \* \*

ATTEST:

---

City Clerk

---

Mayor