

UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM
FYE 2005
TASK 2.01, SUBTASK 9 A,B

Financial Element of the 2030 OCARTS Plan

ASSOCIATION OF CENTRAL OKLAHOMA GOVERNMENTS

February 9, 2006

PRELIMINARY Not For Publication

This report is the product of a project (study) financed in part by the Federal Transit Administration and the Federal Highway Administration of the U.S. Department of Transportation.

The contents of this report reflect the views of the Association of Central Oklahoma Governments (ACOG), the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Oklahoma City Area Regional Transportation Study (OCARTS) Transportation Management Area. ACOG is responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect official views or policy of the U.S. Department of Transportation. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

ASSOCIATION OF CENTRAL OKLAHOMA GOVERNMENTS

21 East Main Street, Suite 100
Oklahoma City, OK 73104-2405
Telephone: (405) 234-ACOG (2264)
www.acogok.org

ASSOCIATION OF CENTRAL OKLAHOMA GOVERNMENTS

Zach D. Taylor..... Executive Director

Transportation Planning & Data Services

Holly Massie..... Principal Author - Special Programs Officer

John Sharp..... Program Coordinator

Douglas Rex..... Program Coordinator

Andrea Weckmueller-Behringer..... Associate Planner

Melissa Baldwin..... Associate Planner

Randy Entz..... Associate Planner

Pong Wu..... Associate Planner

Darla Hugaboom..... Associate Planner

Lisa Kehoe..... Associate Planner

Beverly Garner..... Administrative Assistant

Ellen Owens..... Department Secretary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATE STREET AND HIGHWAY NETWORKS	1
Alternate One - Present Plus Committed Network	1
Alternate Two - 2025 OCARTS Plan Network.....	1
Alternate Three – Revised 2025 OCARTS Plan Network	2
Alternate Four-A – Revised 2025 OCARTS Plan as Modified by Local Governments	2
Alternate Four-B – Recommended 2030 OCARTS Plan Network	3
DESCRIPTION OF COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE INTERMODAL ELEMENT	4
CALCULATION OF ESTIMATED COSTS.....	5
ESTIMATED COSTS FOR CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR STREETS AND HIGHWAYS	5
ESTIMATED COSTS FOR URBAN AND RURAL TRANSIT SERVICES	8
ESTIMATED COSTS FOR BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS	12
TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS FOR THE 2030 OCARTS PLAN	14
CALCULATION OF PROJECTED REVENUES	15
Federal Revenue Sources.....	15
State Revenue Sources.....	15
Local Revenue Sources.....	16
HIGHWAY FUNDING SOURCES	18
Federal Revenues	18
State Revenues	21
Taxes and Fees Distributed Directly to Counties, Cities and Towns.....	23
Local Revenues	25
TRANSIT FUNDING SOURCES.....	27
Federal Revenues	27
State Revenues	28
Local Revenues	28
ADOPTION OF THE FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED 2030 OCARTS PLAN.....	31
ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTED REVENUES AMONG MODES.....	31
FUNDING STRATEGY FOR APPROVED 2030 OCARTS PLAN	32
Highway Element.....	32
Intermodal Element.....	33
GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS	49
EARMARKED SALES TAX.....	50

TABLES

Table 1:	Right-of-Way Widths and Costs Used for the 2030 OCARTS Plan.....	7
Table 2:	Unit Costs per Lane Mile for 2030 OCARTS Plan Alternate Street and Highway Networks	8
Table 3:	Estimated Transit Revenue Available to the OCARTS Area From Federal, State and Local Sources 2030 OCARTS Plan	11
Table 4:	Estimated Unit Costs for Bicycle Facilities in the OCARTS Area	12
Table 5:	Estimated Total Costs for Implementing Planned Bicycle Facilities in the OCARTS Area.....	13
Table 6:	Total Estimated Costs for the 2030 OCARTS Plan	14
Table 7:	Estimated Revenue for Implementation of the 2030 OCARTS Plan	17
Table 8:	OCARTS Area Federal-Aid Highway Funds - 30-Year Estimate - 2030 OCARTS Plan	20
Table 9:	OCARTS Area State Funds - 30-Year Estimate - 2030 OCARTS Plan	22
Table 10:	State Assessed Taxes and Fees - 30-Year Estimate - 2030 OCARTS Plan.....	24
Table 11:	Estimated Local Transportation Revenues - 2030 OCARTS Plan	26
Table 12:	Estimated Transit Revenue Available to the OCARTS Area From Federal, State and Local Sources - 2030 OCARTS Plan.....	29
Table 13:	Anticipated Revenues and Estimated Costs for the 2030 OCARTS Plan	33

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1:	Estimated Turnpike Costs 2030 OCARTS Plan	35
Attachment 2:	Estimated Costs For Alternates One Through Four-A.....	37
Attachment 3:	Background on Average Annual Revenues From Highway Funding Sources	39
Attachment 4:	Cover Letter and Form for Survey of Local Transportation Revenues	45
Attachment 5:	Background on Average Annual Revenues From Transit Funding Sources	53

INTRODUCTION

This report provides a summary of the data sources and procedures used to estimate the costs of the alternates considered for the 2030 OCARTS Plan and to project available revenues for implementing the adopted Plan.

The 2030 OCARTS Plan was developed in conformance with the previous surface transportation law, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). On August 10, 2005, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Equitable Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) replaced TEA-21, and continues the requirement that Metropolitan Planning Organizations develop a long-range plan with at least a 20-year horizon that considers all modes for transporting people and goods. The long-range plan must be financially realistic by demonstrating that the cost of improvements included in the plan (both capital and maintenance) can be paid for from revenues anticipated to be reasonably available over the planning period.

The 2030 OCARTS Plan covers a 30-year planning period, from 2000 to 2030. The modes addressed in the plan include the street and highway network; goods movement by truck, rail, and air; and alternate forms of personal transportation by transit, walking, and bicycling. Each was considered, both from a cost standpoint and in determining the revenues needed to implement the multimodal recommendations included in the Plan.

Throughout the long-range plan development process, a series of alternates was developed and tested to determine the ability of each to meet the projected needs of the traveling public through the year 2030. An estimated cost, by mode, was developed by the MPO for each alternate as part of the analysis and comparison process. A total of five street and highway networks were included in the evaluation of the alternates. A brief description of each network and associated cost factors is provided below.

DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATE STREET AND HIGHWAY NETWORKS

Alternate One - Present Plus Committed Network

Alternate One included all streets and roads as they existed in the 2000 base year plus any improvements expected to be funded through October 2005. This was a "bare bones" approach which would allow the region to complete projects underway, but virtually all remaining street and highway funds through the year 2030 would be used to maintain the base year (present) plus committed system. This network would have been relatively inexpensive in terms of money, but costs would be borne by the user in terms of increased congestion, longer travel times, and more vehicle emissions that would affect air quality.

Alternate Two - 2025 OCARTS Plan Network

The 2025 OCARTS Plan network included the present plus committed network (Alternate One), plus the expansion of the street and highway network as indicated in the 2025 OCARTS Plan. It also included consideration of intelligent transportation systems (ITS), travel demand management (TDM), and traffic system management (TSM) improvements on specified congestion corridors. The ITS, TDM, and TSM strategies include techniques such as traffic signal coordination, changeable message signs, improved bus service and incident management/alternate routes.

In addition to substantial maintenance work, the network called for the widening of several interstates and section line roads. Also included in the 2025 OCARTS Plan was the continuation of an outer loop highway connecting to the Kilpatrick Turnpike near I-40 and Sara Road and extending southeast to I-35 near Indian Hills Road north of Norman. In the 2025 Plan, it was estimated that this new construction would be a toll way. This network represented considerable expansion to the current street network, requiring substantial maintenance and capital investments for an increased overall cost over Alternate One.

Alternate Three – Revised 2025 OCARTS Plan Network

This network included the present plus committed network (Alternate One) and the 2025 OCARTS Plan network (Alternate Two), as well as the following projects:

Approved 2025 OCARTS Plan Amendments:

- SH-9 from 168th Ave E to Cleveland/ Pottawatomie County line. Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
- SH-74 (Portland) from Waterloo Road (NW 248th Street) to Memorial Road (NW 136th Street). Widen from 2 to 4-lanes
- Kelly Avenue from Waterloo Road (N. 248th) to Coffee Creek Road (N. 220th). Widen from 2 to 4-lane divided

Oklahoma City General Obligation Bond Projects:

- NE 122nd Street from Broadway Extension to Kelley Avenue. Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
- Morgan Road from SW 15th Street to SW 29th Street. Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
- SW 29th Street from MacArthur Avenue to Meridian Avenue. Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
- Hefner Road (N. 108th) from County Line Road to Council Road. Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
- Wilshire Blvd. (N. 78th) from Northwest Expressway to Rockwell Avenue. Widen 2 to 4 lanes
- Britton Road (N. 93rd) from County Line Road to Council Road. Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
- SW 15th Street from Morgan Road to County Line Road. Widen from 2 to 4 lanes

Alternate Four-A – Revised 2025 OCARTS Plan as Modified by Local Governments

Alternate Four-A included all improvements reflected in Alternate Three. Additionally, it included the following improvements suggested for inclusion in the 2030 OCARTS Plan by local government members:

- US-77, from Etowah Rd (S. 329th) to Purcell east city limits. Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
- Covell Road (N 206th), from Pennsylvania Ave. to Western Ave. Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
- SH-74, from I-35 to 5.50 miles south of I-35 near Goldsby. Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
- Broadway Ave, from Waterloo Rd. (N 248th) to Coffee Creek Rd. (N 220th). Widen 2 to 4 lanes
- Lindsey Street, from 24 Ave E (Air Depot) to 36th Ave E (Midwest Blvd.). Widen 2 to 4 lanes
- Waterloo Road (N 248th), from Kelley Ave to I-35. Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
- Main Street, from Carter Road to 12th Ave E (Sooner). Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
- 12th Ave SE (Sooner), from SH-9 to Cedar Lane Rd (S. 299th). Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
- Rock Creek Road (S. 224th), from 36th Ave W (Kelley Ave.) to 24th Ave W (Eastern Ave.). Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
- Rock Creek Road (S. 224th), Grandview Ave. (0.5 miles west of 36th Ave W) to 36th Ave W (Kelley Ave.). Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
- Mustang Road, from Wagner Rd (N. 50th) to SH-66. Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
- N 23rd Street/Vandament Ave., from Mustang Road to Sara Road. Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
- Sara Road, from S. 15th Street to S. 74th Street. Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
- S. 29th Street, from Sooner Road to I-40. Widen from 4 to 5 lanes
- SH-9, from 24th Ave E (Eastern Ave.) to 12th Ave E (Sooner Rd.). Widen from 4 to 6 lanes

- S. 15th St, from I-40 to Sooner Road. Widen from 4 to 5 lanes
- Reno Ave, from Air Depot Blvd. to Douglas Blvd. Widen from 4 to 5 lanes
- MacArthur Blvd., from Wilshire (N. 78th) to N. 36th Street. Widen from 4 to 5 lanes

Alternate Four-A also includes the following projects recommended for more modest improvements than those shown in the 2025 Plan:

- Reno Avenue, from Bryant Ave. to Air Depot Blvd. Change from planned 6 to 5 lanes
- 84th Ave E (Anderson Rd.), from Bethel (S. 164th) to Franklin Road (S. 194th). Change from planned 4 to 2 lanes
- 120th Ave E (Choctaw Rd.), from Stella Rd (S 149th) to Alameda Street (S 254th). Change from planned 4 to 2 lanes
- Franklin Rd (S 194th), from 24th Ave W (Eastern Ave.) to 48th Ave W (Douglas Ave.). Change from planned 4 to 2 lanes
- Alameda Street (S. 254th), from 0.5 miles W of 36th Ave E (Midwest Blvd.) to 120th Ave E (Choctaw Rd). Change from planned 4 to 2 lanes
- MacArthur Blvd., from S. 104th Street to S. 119th Street. Change from planned 4 to 2 lanes
- Robinson Avenue, from Main Street to Sheridan Avenue. Change from planned 4 to 2 lanes
- Sheridan Avenue, from E.K. Gaylord to Lincoln Blvd. Change from planned 4 to 2 lanes

Alternate Four-B – Recommended 2030 OCARTS Plan Network

Alternate Four-B is the recommended 2030 OCARTS Plan Street and Highway Network. It includes all improvements listed in Alternate Four-A with the following additions:

- I-35, from Waterloo Rd (N. 248th) to SH-66. Widen from 4 to 6 lanes
- I-40, from Choctaw Rd to Pottawatomie Rd. Widen from 4 to 6 lanes
- Indian Hills Road (S. 179th), from 48th Ave W (Santa Fe) to 36th Ave W (Kelley). Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
- Franklin Road (S. 194th), from 48th Ave W (Santa Fe) to I-35 Frontage Rd. Widen 2 to 4 lanes
- I-35, from SH-9 West Interchange to SH-74/Goldsby Exit. Widen from 4 to 6 lanes

DESCRIPTION OF COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE INTERMODAL ELEMENT

The Intermodal Element (IME) of the 2030 OCARTS Plan addresses the following modes of transportation: passenger transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and goods movement by truck, rail and air. (There are no navigable waterways or ports within the OCARTS area.). The *2030 OCARTS Plan Intermodal Element Component* was prepared by the MPO and presented to Technical, Citizens and Policy Committees in March 2005. The purpose of the IME was to assess the 2000 base year conditions for each of the above modes and to identify preliminary recommendations for the forecast year 2030.

Improved goods movement, via truck and access to rail and airport terminals, is provided through the street and highway network. Therefore, the costs associated with improved goods movement were ultimately reflected in the estimated costs of the street and highway network alternates. Estimated costs for OCARTS area transit services were based on historical federal, state, and local revenues provided to the area for transit improvements and maintenance. The estimated cost for implementing a regional bicycle network was based on unit costs included in recent trails studies and actual costs provided by local governments.

The intermodal element cost estimates were considered in conjunction with each of the above described street and highway network alternates. A more detailed description of those recommendations and their estimated costs are described in the following section.

CALCULATION OF ESTIMATED COSTS

ESTIMATED COSTS FOR CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR STREETS AND HIGHWAYS

Estimated costs for the alternate street and highway networks for the 2030 OCARTS Plan were based on unit costs derived from the *2003 State Highway System Needs Assessment Study and Sufficiency Rating Report*, prepared by the Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT). The 2003 Study provided unit costs, per lane mile, for construction, maintenance and right-of-way acquisition (where applicable) necessary to ensure the adequacy of all state highways across the State of Oklahoma. The only exception was for maintenance costs on streets that are maintained by local governments (i.e. non-state highway facilities). All unit costs were converted to year 2000 dollars, the base year for the long-range plan. Revenue projections also utilized the same value in order to maintain consistency between the cost and revenue estimates, with no inflation factor applied to either.

Unit costs for construction included costs for engineering, grading, drainage, surface and base improvements, utility relocation, sodding, signing, and structure costs¹ (such as interchanges, curbs and gutters). Unit costs for maintenance involved resurfacing with a two-inch asphalt-concrete overlay. The unit cost for construction of each segment of road varied according to its functional classification. The four functional classifications considered as part of the OCARTS network included: interstates/freeways, principal arterials, minor arterials, and urban collectors. Since the costs for construction and maintenance of interstates and freeways is significantly greater than the other classifications, separate unit costs were applied to those facilities.

In addition to functional classification, unit costs for construction, maintenance, and right-of-way acquisition were also dependent upon the designation of each segment of roadway as either being urban or rural. The urban/rural designation was based on the Oklahoma City Urban Area Boundary and Functional Classification maps, which were approved by the Federal Highway Administration on November 7, 2002. Each segment of road located within the Urban Area boundary was assigned an urban unit cost for the appropriate improvement and each segment outside of the boundary was assigned a rural unit cost for the appropriate improvement. Likewise, the width, and resulting total cost of right-of-way deemed necessary for a particular roadway improvement, was dependent upon its functional classification and its urban or rural designation. The estimated cost of right-of-way for the urban area was \$245,700/acre for interstates and freeways and \$204,700/acre for all other facilities. The estimated cost of right-of-way for the rural portions of the OCARTS area was \$163,800/acre for interstates and freeways and \$98,700 for all others.

A unit cost of \$56 per square foot was used for bridge construction, for bridges that would be constructed separately from a roadway improvement. Where bridges would be required as part of the construction of a network facility, the costs of these improvements were included as part of the unit costs for or the freeway other appropriate functionally classified facility.

¹Fifteen percent of the arterial lane miles and 100 percent of the interstate lane miles were assumed to include structures, and the structure costs were estimated to be 20 percent and 35 percent of the total construction cost for the arterial and interstate facilities, respectively. Twenty-five percent of turnpike construction costs is attributed to structures.

All of the street and highway alternates, beyond the Alternate One Present Plus Committed Network, included cost estimates for the reconstruction of major interchanges within the OCARTS area. Cost estimates for these projects were obtained from the Roadway Design Division of ODOT and included:

- I-240/I-35 (Crossroads Interchange)
- I-44/I-235 (also includes widening of I-44 from N. 36th to N. 63rd Streets from 4 to 6 lanes, and widening of Santa Fe from N. 50th to N. 63rd)
- Broadway Extension/Memorial Road
- I-40/Morgan Road
- I-35/Shields Avenue

In addition, Alternates Two through Four-B included two major construction projects—the southwest outer loop and the realignment of the I-40 Crosstown.

The southwest outer loop corridor reflected in the previous (2025) plan was used as a placeholder in the 2030 OCARTS Plan. The corridor extends from the Kilpatrick Turnpike near I-40 and Sara Road southeast to I-35 near the city limits between Moore and Norman. Each of the street and highway alternates considered reflected the southwest outer loop as a toll facility. The estimated construction cost of the loop was based on cost information from the *Outer Loop Corridor Major Investment Study (MIS) Draft Report*, which was updated to year 2000 dollars, and estimated maintenance costs were provided by the Oklahoma Turnpike Authority (OTA). As of the date of this report, the Outer Loop MIS has not been finalized, and a final alignment and funding mechanism have not been determined. Although the outer loop was assumed to be a toll facility for planning purposes, this is not intended to preclude consideration of other funding methods. Attachment 1 summarizes the estimated construction, right-of-way, and maintenance costs developed for the toll facilities included in the 2030 OCARTS Plan. Since the costs of toll facilities will be paid from revenues generated by the sale of bonds by the OTA, the toll way costs and the revenues to build and maintain them were assumed to be the same in analyzing the financial feasibility of the 2030 Plan.

The estimated cost for the I-40 Crosstown realignment project was provided by ODOT. Once the Crosstown segment of I-40 has been reconstructed along a new right-of-way, the existing elevated structure (roughly between I-235 and Agnew Ave.) will be removed. An at-grade boulevard will be constructed in its place, which will provide direct access to downtown Oklahoma City and Bricktown. The overall project estimate included \$289 million for construction and \$71 million for right-of-way acquisition, for a total of \$360 million. At the time of Plan adoption, Congress had earmarked approximately \$180 million, through special appropriations since 1992, for use on the I-40 Crosstown realignment project.

Table 1 provides the minimum urban and rural right-of-way widths and the average urban and rural costs per acre used in estimating right-of-way acquisition costs for the 2030 OCARTS Plan street and highway network alternates. For OCARTS network locations (links) that already met these right-of-way (ROW) minimums, no additional costs were assigned for ROW. For network links in which an improvement was recommended (such as widening from 2 to 4 lanes) and the current ROW was less than the recommended minimum, the cost of the additional ROW needed to reach the minimum was included. For links reflecting new construction, the estimated cost for acquisition of the full ROW width was included only if there was no current right-of-way reflected in the network; otherwise, only the additional width needed was considered.

**Table 1:
Right-of-Way Widths and Costs Used for the 2030 OCARTS Plan**

Functional Classification & Number of Lanes	Urban Area	Rural Area
Interstates:		
4 Lanes	300 ft.	300 ft.
6 Lanes	300 ft.	300 ft.
8 Lanes	300 ft.	300 ft.
ROW (per acre)	\$245,700	\$163,800
Principal Arterials:		
2 Lanes	80 ft.	80 ft.
4 Lanes	130 ft.	200 ft.
6 Lanes	150 ft.	200 ft.
ROW (per acre)	\$204,700	98,700
Others:		
2 Lanes	80 ft.	80 ft.
4 Lanes	130 ft.	150 ft.
ROW (per acre)	\$204,700	98,700

Source: ODOT Planning Division, "Urban and Rural Highway Design Standards"

Maintenance costs for both urban and rural street and highway facilities were calculated assuming a useful pavement life of 10 years. Therefore, each existing link on the network was assumed to require maintenance over the 30-year planning period (2000-2030) a total of three times. However, construction of a new link, through new construction, reconstruction or widening, would require fewer maintenance cycles, since the improvement should not need to be maintained for the first 10 years. In order to determine the appropriate number of maintenance cycles, the staging of improvements into short-range and long-range projects was used as the basis. Short-range projects were assumed to require two maintenance cycles, since the local governments or ODOT estimated they would be constructed during the first 10 years after plan adoption (2005-2014). Long-range projects were assumed to require one maintenance cycle since they likely would not be constructed for 15-20 years after the base year of the plan (2015-2030).

Maintenance costs for existing facilities and planned facilities were calculated for those streets and highways that are a part of the OCARTS 2030 network, which is comprised of a total of 2,354.53 linear miles and 7,946.97 lane miles. Thus, maintenance costs for streets, which are not a part of the regional network, including local residential streets, were not included in the overall cost of each alternate street and highway network. It was assumed that city and county governmental entities, using local funding sources, would maintain such streets. Likewise, the projected revenues identified for determining the affordability of the long-range plan did not include all local revenues used by local governments for local street maintenance. This is further explained in the portion of this report dealing with the calculation of projected revenues.

Table 2 provides a summary of the unit costs that were used for estimating construction and maintenance for the 2030 OCARTS street and highway network alternates.

**Table 2:
Unit Costs per Lane Mile
for 2030 OCARTS Plan Alternate Street and Highway Networks**

Improvement Type	Interstates & Freeways	Others*
Urban Area:		
Reconstruction or widening on existing alignment, with access roads	\$3,590,800	N/A
Reconstruction or widening on existing alignment, no access roads	\$2,650,800	\$697,500
Construction on new alignment	\$2,755,300	\$668,700
Maintenance (roadways under ODOT jurisdiction)	\$93,590	\$70,500
Maintenance (roadways under local jurisdiction)	N/A	\$40,000
Bridges (if constructed separately) - <i>per square foot</i>	\$56	\$56
Right-of-way - <i>per acre</i>	\$245,700	\$204,700
Rural Area:		
Resurface on existing alignment and add shoulders (no addnl. lanes)	N/A	\$295,200
Reconstruction along existing alignment (add lanes)	\$1,316,000	\$557,000
New construction on new alignment	\$1,316,000	\$570,000
Parallel construction (add lanes; no improvement on existing lanes)	\$996,000	\$417,600
Parallel construction (add lanes; widen and resurface existing lanes)	N/A	\$391,200
Maintenance (roadways under ODOT jurisdiction)	65,800	43,240
Maintenance (roadways under local jurisdiction)	\$82,400	\$82,400
Bridges (if constructed separately) - <i>per square foot</i>	\$56	\$56
Right-of-way - <i>per acre</i>	\$163,800	\$98,700

*Principal arterials, minor arterials, and collectors

Sources: ODOT Planning Division and Local Governments

ESTIMATED COSTS FOR URBAN AND RURAL TRANSIT SERVICES

Public transportation services in the OCARTS area are provided in accordance with the Federal Transit Administration's urban and rural transit programs. The Central Oklahoma Transportation and Parking Authority (COTPA) and the University of Oklahoma provide transit services in Central Oklahoma through the Oklahoma City and Norman METRO Transit bus systems. The service provided in Norman on the university campus is also known as CART (Cleveland Area Rapid Transit).

Prior to FFY 2003, which began Oct. 1, 2002, all transit services in the OCARTS area were administered by COTPA. As a result of the 2000 Census and revisions to the U.S. Census Bureau's criteria for determining urban and rural territories, on May 1, 2002 the Census Bureau delineated two urbanized areas (UZAs) within the OCARTS area—the Oklahoma City UZA and the Norman UZA. In terms of transit funding, the separate UZA designations resulted in the Norman area becoming a direct recipient of Federal Transit formula funds for the first time. Therefore, the 2030 OCARTS Plan reflects transit cost and revenue projections for both COTPA and CART.

Federal funds provide a significant portion of the capital needed for planning, equipping and maintaining public transit services throughout the country. These funds are supplemented with state and local funds that are used to match the federal funds and increase service levels to satisfy public demand for transit within individual metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas.

Federal funding sources include the FTA Sec. 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program, the Sec. 5309 Discretionary Capital Program, the Sec. 5311 Non-Urbanized Area Formula Program, and the Sec. 5310 Program to assist the elderly and persons with disabilities. An additional federal source used in the OCARTS area is the Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) Program. CMAQ funds are provided by the Federal Highway Administration and are considered flexible funds because federal law allows them to also be used for transit capital improvements. For the past several years, a small portion of the CMAQ funds available to the State of Oklahoma have been provided to ACOG and transferred to FTA for use by COTPA.

At the state level, the Oklahoma Legislature annually appropriates funding to the Public Transit Revolving Fund to assist with the provision of urban and rural transit services throughout the state. The level of funding received by the CART system in Norman, First Capital Trolley in Guthrie and Delta Public Transit in Purcell is based on their previous year's revenue miles. COTPA's share is limited to roughly 20 percent of the statewide fund, even though its revenue miles would justify a greater portion.

Locally, fares are collected from patrons who ride the buses and these farebox revenues assist with funding transit services. The City of Oklahoma City also budgets a portion of its General Fund each year for transit services operated by COTPA. The City of Norman and other municipalities and universities that receive transit service from either COTPA or CART also provide local funds. These include the Cities of Edmond and Midwest City, the University of Central Oklahoma (UCO) in Edmond, and the University of Oklahoma (OU) in Norman. Many non-profit organizations contract with COTPA and participate in the funding of special programs that assist their elderly and disabled clients.

The transit revenues described on the following page were used as the basis for estimating the long-term revenues and costs for maintaining the current level of urban and rural transit services in the OCARTS area over the 30-year planning period (2000-2030). Information was gathered from the Federal Transit Administration, COTPA, CART, the Transit Programs Division of ODOT, and others to arrive at an annual funding level, which was then multiplied by 30. It was assumed that projected transit revenues would equal future transit costs, since all projected revenues are available just for transit, and additional transit costs cannot be incurred without additional revenue sources.

Table 3 provides an estimated 30-year transit revenue and cost projection of just over \$661 million based on the federal, state and local funding sources described above. These estimates assume current service levels using constant (year 2000) dollars. Additional dedicated funding sources would have to be developed in order to increase transit service beyond current levels.

The Central Oklahoma Transportation and Parking Authority adopted its Long Range Transit Plan in April 2001, which was prepared by the consultant team MultiSystems, Inc. The Plan contains short, medium and long-term recommendations for enhancing transit's image in Central Oklahoma and describes a family of transit services within the region to meet various travel needs. Some of the Plan's recommendations promote increased frequency of service, extended hours of service, and expanding the service area by creating a "multi-hub" network where transit

routes and park-and-ride facilities converge. However, a new, long-term funding base, dedicated for transit, would be required in order to implement all of the recommendations included in the COTPA long range plan.

In 2003, a *Transportation Needs Assessment* was conducted to identify unmet transportation needs within the Norman area. Similar issues emerged from this study including local desire for increased frequency of service, expanded routes, demand response service in rural areas, and better coordination between CART and social service agencies.

Table 3 provides the estimated transit revenues available to the OCARTS area for implementation of the 2030 OCARTS Plan from federal, state and local sources.

Table 3:
Estimated Transit Revenue Available to the OCARTS Area
From Federal, State and Local Sources
2030 OCARTS Plan

(Transit costs are assumed not exceed estimated transit revenues)

Funding Category	Estimated Annual Average	Estimated 30-Year Total
FEDERAL FUNDING SOURCES:		
FTA Sec. 5307 Urbanized Area Formula:		
COTPA	\$4,422,211	\$132,666,330
CART	\$1,200,000	\$36,000,000
FTA Sec. 5309 Capital Program - Discretionary:		
COTPA*	\$2,536,946	\$19,027,095
CART*	\$800,000	\$6,000,000
FTA JARC Program*	\$839,234	\$6,294,255
FTA Sec. 5310 Elderly and Disabled	\$210,868	\$6,326,040
Section 5311 Non-Urban Area Formula:		
First Capital Trolley (Guthrie)	\$355,304	\$10,659,120
Delta Public Transit (Purcell)	\$129,149	\$3,874,470
FHWA Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ)	\$400,000	\$12,000,000
Subtotal	\$10,893,712	\$232,847,310
STATE FUNDING SOURCES:		
Public Transit Revolving Fund:		
COTPA	\$590,482	\$17,714,460
CART	\$70,000	\$2,100,000
First Capital Trolley	\$42,991	\$1,289,730
Delta Public Transit	\$11,646	\$349,380
Subtotal	\$715,119	\$21,453,570
LOCAL FUNDING SOURCES:		
COTPA:		
OKC General Fund	\$6,746,486	\$202,394,580
Other Municipal and County Funds	\$201,352	\$6,040,560
Farebox and Ticket Revenues	\$1,788,811	\$53,664,330
Other Revenues	\$2,780,541	\$83,416,230
CART:		
City of Norman	\$180,000	\$5,400,000
University of Oklahoma	\$850,000	\$25,500,000
Farebox and Private Sector Funds	\$125,000	\$3,750,000
First Capital Trolley - Fares, donations, etc.	\$642,857	\$19,285,710
Delta Public Transit - Fares, donations, etc.	\$226,194	\$6,785,820
Local Match for FTA Sec. 5310 Funds	\$43,190	\$1,295,700
Subtotal	\$13,584,431	\$407,532,930
Total Federal, State and Local Funds	\$25,193,262	\$661,833,810

* Revenue projection assumes one-fourth of the FY 2001 - FY 2004 annual average.

Sources: COTPA, CART, ODOT Transit Programs Division and OCARTS Area Sec. 5310 Applications to DHS

Note: Figures for rural transit systems reflect actual FY 2003 costs provided by the ODOT Transit Programs Division.

ESTIMATED COSTS FOR BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS

Bicycle and pedestrian transportation is an important component of the 2030 OCARTS Plan. Federal law encourages metropolitan areas to develop a regional trails network through coordinated planning and implementation among jurisdictions.

In recent years, bicycle and pedestrian facilities have become more prevalent in the OCARTS area. However, OCARTS communities have traditionally planned and implemented bicycle and pedestrian improvements independent of one another. Currently, the cities of Edmond, Norman, Oklahoma City, Choctaw, Guthrie, Harrah and Moore have developed Trails Master Plans, and are working towards implementation of those plans using various funding sources. In addition, several other communities throughout the region have demonstrated significant interest in trails by planning and constructing trails in their jurisdictions with local, state, federal, and private funding. As of March 2005, there were 198 miles of existing bicycle facilities and 429 miles of planned facilities² within the region.

In estimating a total cost for developing the 429 miles of planned bicycle facilities in the OCARTS area, locally adopted master trails plans were referenced and estimated unit costs were determined from cost information detailed in those plans. Table 4 lists the estimated unit costs per mile, in Year 2000 dollars (the base year of the 2030 OCARTS Plan), for various types of bicycle facility development in the region.

**Table 4:
Estimated Unit Costs for Bicycle Facilities in the OCARTS Area**

Bicycle Facility Type	Estimated Cost per Mile
BL – Bike Lane	\$300,000
BPE – Bike Path Exclusive to Bicycles	\$225,000
BPS – Bike Path Shared with Pedestrians	\$225,000
SH – Bike Route using Roadway Shoulder	\$110,000
SOR – Signed-On-Road Bike Route	\$130,000
STR – Share-the-Road Bike Route	\$15,000

Note: The costs were based on unit costs reflected in the trails plans adopted by Edmond, Moore, and Oklahoma City and were adjusted to Year 2000 dollars for bicycle facility types included in this report.

These figures do not include maintenance costs associated with existing bicycle facilities. Typical maintenance cost for a one-mile paved trail is approximately \$8,600. Resurfacing of an asphalt trail, which typically occurs on a ten-year cycle, is estimated to cost between \$50,000-\$60,000/mile.³ Additional information on the locations of planned trails and detailed unit costs for trails improvements and amenities is included in the 2030 OCARTS Plan Intermodal Element Component available from ACOG.

In total, the MPO estimates approximately \$98.5 million is required to implement all planned bicycle facilities within the OCARTS area. This figure includes cost estimates listed in local master trail plans for specific facility development. The total also includes general calculations for planned bicycle facilities that lacked formal cost estimates at the local level. Calculations were derived by applying estimated unit costs by facility type to each mile of planned improvements. It should be noted that many of these projects are considered long-term and may not be deemed

² Planned facilities are those officially adopted by a local governing body through a trails master plan or resolution and facilities approved for funding under the STP Enhancement Program or other federal, state or local funding sources.

³ LandPlan Consultants, Inc., 1999

feasible both financially and in terms of connectivity, for many years to come. Table 5 details the estimated costs for implementing planned bicycle facilities in the OCARTS area.

**Table 5:
Estimated Total Costs for Implementing Planned Bicycle Facilities in the OCARTS Area**

Entity	Estimated Cost
Choctaw	\$10,983,600
Edmond	\$24,575,813
Guthrie	\$5,024,250
Harrah	\$1,460,250
Moore	\$4,913,300
Norman	\$6,295,100
Oklahoma City	\$41,836,242
All Other Entities	\$3,381,750
Estimated Total	\$98,470,305

Additionally, a 2030 “extended vision” network was identified, which consists of approximately 459 miles of bicycle routes and multi-use trails beyond those currently existing or planned. Future development of extended vision facilities depends on the willingness of local governments to add these routes to their master trails plans, local planning priorities, and the availability of funds. By applying the same unit cost estimates listed in Table 4 above, approximately \$77.5 million would be required to implement all 2030 extended vision facilities.

The total cost for developing all OCARTS area planned bicycle facilities and 2030 extended vision facilities is estimated at \$176 million.

Pedestrians may share some of the trails described above. Sidewalks exclusively for pedestrians have traditionally been financed with local revenues or constructed by private developers and builders, when required by local governments. Numerous communities in Central Oklahoma currently do not require sidewalk construction as part of the land development or building permit process. A total estimated capital cost for pedestrian improvements in the OCARTS area is not included in this report due to the lack of consistency in sidewalk construction requirements among jurisdictions and lack of regional standards upon which to base a recommendation. However, the 2030 OCARTS Plan includes several recommendations for improving pedestrian access throughout the region, as described in the Intermodal Element of the Plan.

The costs identified for the planned bicycle network were considered in conjunction with the evaluation of each street and highway network, and the cost of continued transit services, to ensure that the overall 2030 OCARTS Plan would be financially constrained. The 30-year revenue projection for all modes of the 2030 Plan yielded a total of approximately \$5.9 billion. (Revenue projections will be described in a later section of this report.) Of this total, it was assumed for planning purposes that \$100 million, or 1.7 percent, would be available solely for bicycle and pedestrian improvements over the planning period.

The \$100 million planning estimate is adequate for implementation of all planned bicycle facilities (estimated at nearly 98.5 million). Thus most extended vision routes would not be affordable under this Plan. However, these routes provide a guide for improving connectivity throughout the region. Additional refinements to the OCARTS bicycle network will occur in future plan updates. As part of the regional planning process, local implementation and funding priorities must be continually re-examined.

TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS FOR THE 2030 OCARTS PLAN

As previously described, the Alternate Four-B Street and Highway Network was adopted by the MPO for inclusion in the 2030 OCARTS Plan. This network included improvements to increase safety, capacity, and access to benefit the movement of both people and goods. Additionally, the Intermodal Element recommendations and estimated costs for transit services and trails improvements over the 30-year planning period were adopted as part of the region's long-range transportation plan. The estimated costs, by mode, for the adopted 2030 OCARTS Plan are presented in Table 6. Tables summarizing the estimated costs of Alternates One, Two, Three and Four-A are provided in Attachment 2 of this report.

**Table 6:
Total Estimated Costs for the 2030 OCARTS Plan**

Functional Classification	Linear Miles	Lane Miles	COST (in thousands)					Total
			Const.	Maint.	R.O.W.	Major Interchgs.	Non-Trad'l Imprv'ts ^d	
HIGHWAY ELEMENT:								
Turnpikes ^a	80.00	320.00	424,961	84,036	6,164	7,000		522,161
Interstate & Freeway ^b	173.33	1,005.72	1,154,580	202,825	84,000	^c 245,969	18,995	1,706,329
Principal Arterials	456.90	1,863.87	330,216	225,228	132,039		17,745	705,228
Minor Arterials	1,424.84	4,154.91	905,705	402,282	388,238		3,630	1,699,855
Collectors	219.47	602.47	76,266	63,641	40,146			180,053
Subtotal	2,354.53	7,946.97	\$2,891,728	\$978,012	\$650,587	\$252,969	\$40,330	\$4,813,625
INTERMODAL ELEMENT:								
Transit								661,834
Bicycle	429.00							98,470
Subtotal								760,304
TOTAL PLAN COST:								5,573,929

Notes: Street and highway construction cost figures include bridges and other structures. Maintenance costs are for a 2-inch asphalt-concrete overlay every 10 years over the planning period (2000-2030).

^aSouthwest Outer Loop was considered a toll facility for planning purposes only. The cost figures were based on the Outer Loop Corridor MIS (updated to 2000 dollars) and information provided by OTA.

^bConstruction (\$289 million) and ROW acquisition (\$71 million) for the I-40 Crosstown realignment project was based on information provided by ODOT.

^cMajor Interchanges include I-240/I-35, I-44/I-235 (project also includes widening of I/44 from N 63rd St. to N 36th St from 4 to 6 lanes; Widening of Santa Fe from N 50th St. to N 63rd St.), Broadway Extn./Memorial Road, I-40/Morgan Rd, and I-35/Shields Boulevard.

^dThe non-traditional improvements in the aggregate are expected to cost approximately \$40 million, and they will be implemented for the most part on freeways and principal arterials. Non-traditional improvements include the deployment of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), Travel Demand Management (TDM), and Traffic System Management (TSM).

CALCULATION OF PROJECTED REVENUES

In order to gauge the financial feasibility of the 2030 OCARTS Plan alternates, a 30-year projection of revenue was developed by the MPO for comparison with the estimated costs of each alternate. Transportation revenues historically available to, or spent within, the OCARTS area were identified from a variety of federal, state, and local sources. The federal sources included funding categories administered by both the Federal Highway and the Federal Transit Administrations, covering a wide variety of eligible street, bicycle, pedestrian and transit improvements, and specific safety and transportation enhancement activities.

The following funding categories were used to develop a total revenue projection of just over \$5.9 billion for the 2030 OCARTS Plan. Based on historical information, an annual funding average was determined for each category and projected over the 30-year planning period (2000-2030).

Federal Revenue Sources

- *Highways – Federal Highway Administration:*
 - Interstate Maintenance (IM)
 - National Highway System (NHS)
 - Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation (BR)
 - Surface Transportation Program (STP)
(Includes STP Safety, STP Enhancement and STP Urbanized Area funds)
 - Minimum Guarantee (MG)
 - Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ)
 - Competitive Funding Sources (ITS, TCSP, NCPD, Demonstration funds)
 - Discretionary Earmarks
- *Transit – Federal Transit Administration:*
 - Sec. 5307 – Formula Funds for Urbanized Areas
(Capital and planning funds for METRO Transit Oklahoma City and capital, planning and operating funds for METRO Transit Norman/CART)
 - Sec. 5309 – Discretionary Capital Program
 - Sec. 5310 – Elderly and Persons with Disabled Program
 - Sec. 5311 – Non-Urbanized Area Formula Program
 - Jobs Access and Reverse Commute (JARC)

State Revenue Sources

- *Highways:*
 - State Highway Operating and Maintenance Funds
 - Industrial Access Program
 - Lake Access Program
 - Capital Improvements Program (CIP)
 - Oklahoma Turnpike Authority (OTA)
- *Transit:*
 - Public Transit Revolving Fund

Local Revenue Sources

- *Highways:*
 - General Fund (as budgeted by local governments)
 - Street and Alley Fund
 - General Obligation Bonds (dedicated for street and bridge improvements)
 - Dedicated Sales Tax (earmarked for street and bridge improvements)
 - Contributions by Developers (improvements to arterial street network)
 - State Funds Returned Directly to Counties for Roads (fuel taxes, gross production taxes and motor vehicle collections)
 - State Funds Returned Directly to Cities and Towns (admission fees, alcoholic beverage taxes, gas excise taxes & motor vehicle collections)

- *Transit:*
 - Oklahoma City General Fund Subsidy
 - Funds from Cities and Universities served by transit
 - Farebox and Ticket Revenues
 - Donations and other revenues

Table 7 summarizes all funding sources and the projected revenues, by source, that were used to develop the \$5.9 billion revenue estimate for implementation of the 2030 OCARTS Plan. This table is followed by background information on each revenue source and the methodologies used to arrive at an OCARTS total for each category of funds.

**Table 7:
Estimated Revenue for Implementation of the 2030 OCARTS Plan**

STREETS AND HIGHWAYS, BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN MODES:	Estimated 30-Year Total
Federal Sources (Plus Matching Funds):	
Federal-aid Funds (Includes IM, NHS, BR, STP, STP Enhancement, STP-UZA, CMAQ and MG funds)	\$2,077,081,401
Federal Discretionary Earmarks (1999 - 2005) (Includes Demonstration, HPP / I-40 earmarks, ITS, NCPD and other discretionary funds)	\$206,865,882
Future Federal Discretionary Earmarks (Assumes \$2.5 mil./yr. for 2006-2030, \$180 mil. for I-40 Crosstown Relocation, and \$34,500,000 to implement ITS Deployment Plan)	\$274,500,000
GARVEE Bond Debt Service*	(\$13,300,000)
State Sources:	
State Highway Maintenance, Industrial Access and Lake Access Funds	\$165,608,160
Capital Improvements Program Funds (Through 2004)	\$109,247,122
Oklahoma Transportation Authority (Equals estimated turnpike costs)	\$518,660,609
CIP Bond Debt Service**	(\$101,311,081)
State Assessed Taxes and Fees:	
State Taxes and Fees Distributed Directly to Counties (Includes gasoline, diesel & special fuel taxes; gross production taxes; and motor vehicles collections including County Road and Bridge Improvement funds)	\$613,544,400
State Taxes and Fees Distributed Directly to Cities and Towns (Includes gasoline excise tax, motor vehicle collections)	\$285,858,840
Local Sources: (Includes funds for transportation improvements from: general fund, street and alley fund, developer contributions, bond issues and local sales tax revenues)	\$1,101,569,010
Subtotal	\$5,238,324,343
TRANSIT MODE:	
Federal Sources: (Includes FTA Sec. 5307, Sec. 5309, JARC, Sec. 5310, Sec. 5311 and CMAQ)	\$232,847,310
State Sources: (Transit Revolving Funds for COTPA, CART, First Capital Trolley and Delta Public Transit)	\$21,453,570
Local Sources: (Includes municipal, county, university and private funds for urban and rural operators)	\$407,532,930
Subtotal	\$661,833,810
TOTAL ESTIMATED REVENUES FOR 2030 OCARTS PLAN	\$5,900,158,153

* Approximately \$40 million in GARVEE bond funds will be spent within the OCARTS area and will be repaid with Federal Funds. Therefore, the GARVEE revenues are not reflected in the total revenues above. The debt service on these bonds will also be repaid with Federal funds.

** Debt service on CIP bonds are based on OCARTS area CIP-funded projects only. Debt service will be repaid with State funds and includes payments between 2000 to 2015.

HIGHWAY FUNDING SOURCES

Federal Revenues

As listed in the previous section, several categories of federal-aid highway funds are distributed to the State of Oklahoma on an annual basis in accordance with federal law. The federal funds used in the 2030 revenue projection were provided under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), which was replaced by the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) in August 2005. The federal-aid highway funds are administered by the Oklahoma Department of Transportation, in consultation with metropolitan planning organizations, and are used statewide on eligible transportation facilities.

In order to estimate the amount of funds from these sources that could reasonably be anticipated to be available to the OCARTS area over the planning period, the MPO reviewed the historical funding levels spent within the region from each funding category during TEA-21 (FFY 1998 to FFY 2003). This information was obtained from the monthly project lettings awarded by the Oklahoma Transportation Commission. An annual average was prepared for each funding category and multiplied over the 30-year planning period. Information on cost overruns (or underruns) incurred after the initial obligation of federal funds was not readily available, so an additional 10 percent contingency for overruns was assumed.

Federal law requires that each state provide a portion of its Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds to urbanized areas with a population of 200,000 or greater. The level of funding received by each urbanized area is based upon its population, as determined by the decennial Census. Projects funded with the STP suballocation are selected by the metropolitan areas and must be spent on the approved Federal-aid system, which includes numerous principal arterials, minor arterials and urban collectors. The obligation authority associated with the STP funds provided to the OCARTS area MPO during TEA-21 was included in the calculation of federal funds available to the region for estimating future revenues.

In addition, between FFY 1999 and 2005, numerous Congressional earmarks were approved for projects that would be constructed as part of the 2030 OCARTS Plan. Therefore, these one-time discretionary earmarks were added to the revenue projection for the region. These included funding for a wide range of projects including \$180 million for the realignment of the I-40 Crosstown Bridge between Agnew and I-235 near downtown Oklahoma City. Assumptions were also made about future discretionary funding for the region, including a modest annual estimate of \$2.5 million for the remainder of the Plan period, additional funding for the I-40 Crosstown and funding to implement the region's Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Deployment Plan.

According to the ODOT Programs Division, it was assumed that approximately \$40 million would be spent in the OCARTS area during the Plan period using GARVEE (Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicle) bond funds. The GARVEE program allows the bonds to be repaid with future federal funds; thus, the GARVEE revenue was already accounted for in the projected federal highway revenues. Since the bonds will incur issuance costs and interest that will also be repaid with future federal funds, these costs were *deducted* from the federal revenue projection. The ODOT Comptroller's office estimated that the interest and issuance costs to repay the \$40 million would be an additional \$13.3 million, repaid over 15 years, and this amount was deducted from the revenue projection.

Table 8 provides a summary of the average annual revenues and 30-year projection of revenues from the recurring federal highway funding categories described above. Attachment 3 details the annual revenues that were used as the basis for this projection.

**Table 8:
OCARTS Area Federal-Aid Highway Funds - 30-Year Estimate
2030 OCARTS Plan**

HISTORICAL FEDERAL-AID EXPENDITURES WITHIN OCARTS:						
Funding Category:	Basis of Suballocation to OCARTS Area	Fed. Share	FFY 1998-2004 Average	Matching Funds**	Total	30-Yr. Estimate
Interstate Maintenance	State Discretion	90%	\$24,645,606	\$1,834,728	\$26,480,334	\$794,410,033
National Highway System	State Discretion	80%	\$1,108,277	\$82,505	\$1,190,782	\$35,723,462
Bridge Program	State Discretion	80%	\$2,976,992	\$221,621	\$3,198,613	\$95,958,375
STP *, Statewide & Safety	State Discretion	80%	\$8,050,621	\$599,324	\$8,649,945	\$259,498,350
STP, Enhancement	State Discretion	80%	\$3,058,830	\$339,870	\$3,398,700	\$101,961,000
STP, UZA Suballocation	TEA-21 Formula	80%	\$14,805,442	\$1,645,049	\$16,450,491	\$493,514,733
Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality	State Discretion	80%	\$100,000	\$11,111	\$111,111	\$3,333,333
Minimum Guarantee	State Discretion	80-90%	\$3,115,696	\$346,188	\$3,461,884	\$103,856,533
Subtotal			\$57,861,464	\$5,080,397	\$62,941,861	\$1,888,255,820
10% Contingency for Cost Overruns			\$5,786,146	\$508,040	\$6,294,186	\$188,825,582
Total			\$63,647,610	\$5,588,436	\$69,236,047	\$2,077,081,401

* Surface Transportation Program **Match for IM, NHS, BR and STP-State reduced by 1/3. Assumes Soft Match will continue for 10 years.

NON-RECURRING FEDERAL REVENUES	
	FFY 1999-2005 Total
Demonstration Funds	\$1,840,250
High Priority Proj./I-40 Earmarks	\$180,795,251
Intelligent Transp. Systems	\$4,041,126
ITS CVISN Projects	\$1,787,470
Nat'l Corridor Planning & Devel.	\$2,239,950
Transp Comm System Preserv.	\$1,606,807
Other Discretionary Funds	\$4,363,361
FFY 2004 Earmarks*	\$2,800,000
FFY 2005 Earmarks**	\$7,391,667
Total	\$206,865,882

* Includes FFY 2004 earmarks for Turner TP Gate near Luther, Lake Draper road improvements and NE 23rd St. improvements

** Includes FFY 2005 earmarks for I-40/Morgan intchg., Broadway Ext., Hudiburg Dr. in MWC, RR grade sep. in Norman & other OCARTS area projects

Sources: Oklahoma Transportation Commission Agendas / Awards Lists, ODOT Programs Division and ODOT Planning Division

State Revenues

In addition to federal funding sources, the Oklahoma State Legislature appropriates funding for several statewide programs aimed at improving county roads and bridges, enhancing access to area lakes and industrial developments to bolster economic development, and maintaining the Oklahoma State Highway System. Specifically these categories of state-appropriated funds include the following:

- State Highway Operating & Maintenance Funds
- Industrial Access Program
- Lake Access Program

Information on historical revenues provided to the OCARTS area from the Lake Access, Industrial Access, and State Highway Operating & Maintenance programs was obtained from ODOT, for the period from FY 1998 to FY 2004. The annual average funds from these categories were projected over the 30-year planning period.

In addition to these recurring revenue sources, the MPO included estimated revenues to cover turnpike construction and maintenance within the region over the planning period. This includes maintenance of the existing OCARTS portions of the Turner Turnpike, H.E. Bailey Turnpike and Kilpatrick Turnpike; and construction, right-of-way and maintenance of the H.E. Bailey Turnpike spur (constructed after the 2000 base year), the Southwest Outer Loop, and partial funding of a new gate to the Turner Turnpike near Luther. As stated previously in this report, estimated turnpike costs were based on information obtained from the Oklahoma Turnpike Authority and the Outer Loop Corridor Major Investment Study, and it was assumed that turnpike revenues from bond sales would be equal to these costs. It should also be noted that, although this Plan assumed the southwest outer loop would be constructed as a turnpike, the final funding mechanism has not been determined.

In recent years, the State of Oklahoma also constructed several road improvement projects with bond funds under the Statewide Capital Improvement Program (CIP), which was approved in two phases by the Oklahoma Legislature in May 1997, under HB 1629, and in May 2000 under HB 2259. The CIP program included specific projects for which the funds could be utilized, including some within the OCARTS area. Based on information received from ODOT, a little over \$109 million in CIP revenues would be spent within the OCARTS area between the 2000 base year and 2004. ODOT also estimated that a little over \$101 million in CIP bond debt service would be attributable to our region through 2015, and this amount was deducted from the overall projected state revenues for the OCARTS area.

A summary of the state revenue sources described above is provided in Table 9. More detailed information on the annual funding levels for these categories is included in Attachment 3.

**Table 9:
OCARTS Area State Funds - 30-Year Estimate
2030 OCARTS Plan**

MAINTENANCE FUNDS:		
County	FY 1998-2004 Annual Avg.	Estimated 30-Year Total
Canadian	\$465,820	\$13,974,600
Cleveland	\$838,009	\$25,140,270
Grady	\$37,756	\$1,132,680
Logan	\$333,670	\$10,010,100
McClain	\$258,729	\$7,761,870
Oklahoma	\$2,930,121	\$87,903,630
Total		\$145,923,150
OTHER STATE FUNDS:		
Fund	FY 1998-2004 Annual Avg.	Estimated 30-Year Total
Ind. Access	\$595,222	\$17,856,660
Lake Access	\$60,945	\$1,828,350
Total		\$19,685,010
Total Maintenance, Indus. and Lake Access		\$165,608,160
Other	OCARTS Total	One-Time Est.
CIP Program	\$109,247,122	\$109,247,122
Turnpike Revenues*	\$518,660,609	\$518,660,609
Total Estimated Revenue		\$793,515,891

* Includes \$3.5 million for the Turner TP Gate near Luther. Additional funds for the gate will come from an FFY 2004 federal earmark (included in Non-Recurring Federal Revenues), Oklahoma City and Oklahoma County.

Sources: ODOT Programs Division and OTC Awards Lists
Oklahoma Transportation Authority, SW Outer Loop MIS, Oklahoma County

Taxes and Fees Distributed Directly to Counties, Cities and Towns

The Oklahoma Tax Commission collects various taxes and fees on motor vehicles, fuels, and other items. A portion of the taxes and fees collected are returned directly to the counties for roads and/or directly to the cities and towns located within the counties. The amount of revenue returned to local entities is documented in an annual report prepared by the Tax Commission entitled *State Payments to Local Governments*. The categories of taxes and fees returned to the counties include gasoline, diesel and special fuel taxes; gross production taxes; and motor vehicle collections, including County Road and Bridge Improvement funds. The categories of taxes and fees returned directly to cities and towns include: admission fees (for cities with racetracks); alcoholic beverage tax; gasoline excise tax (6 cents) and motor vehicle collections.

Information on these taxes and fees was obtained for the six-county area that encompasses the OCARTS area for the years FY 1998 through FY 2004. In order to arrive at a feasible estimate of funds attributable to OCARTS, the MPO utilized each county's percent of population located within the OCARTS boundaries, and assumed a similar share of that county's funds would be spent within OCARTS. The historical estimated annual average funds were then projected over the 30-year planning period.

Table 10 provides a summary of the FY 1998-2004 average annual revenue and the 30-year revenue projection for the OCARTS area from these sources. Attachment 3 includes documentation of the specific categories of state assessed taxes and fees which are returned directly to counties and directly to cities and towns, respectively.

**Table 10:
State Assessed Taxes and Fees - 30-Year Estimate
2030 OCARTS Plan**

TAXES AND FEES DISTRIBUTED DIRECTLY TO COUNTIES:		
<small>(Fuel Taxes, Gross Production Taxes and Vehicle Motor Collections, including County Road & Bridge Impr. Funds)</small>		
County	FY 98-04 OCARTS Annual Average	Estimated 30-Year Total
Canadian	\$2,731,800	\$81,954,000
Cleveland	\$3,794,821	\$113,844,630
Grady	\$1,237,361	\$37,120,830
Logan	\$1,783,559	\$53,506,770
McClain	\$1,491,073	\$44,732,190
Oklahoma	\$9,412,866	\$282,385,980
Totals	\$20,451,480	\$613,544,400
TAXES AND FEES DISTRIBUTED DIRECTLY TO CITIES AND TOWNS:		
<small>(Admission Fees, Alcoholic Beverage Tax, Gas Excise Tax and Motor Vehicle Collections)</small>		
County	FY 98-04 OCARTS Annual Average	Estimated 30-Year Total
Canadian	\$468,230	\$14,046,900
Cleveland	\$1,539,663	\$46,189,890
Grady	\$78,511	\$2,355,330
Logan	\$151,526	\$4,545,780
McClain	\$161,845	\$4,855,350
Oklahoma	\$7,128,853	\$213,865,590
Totals	\$9,528,628	\$285,858,840

Note: The above figures are based on each county's percent of population in the OCARTS area
Source: "State Payments To Local Governments," FY 1998 - FY 2004, Oklahoma Tax Commission

Local Revenues

In an effort to determine the level of revenue generated by municipalities for regional transportation improvements, beyond any federal or state funds spent within those jurisdictions, the MPO mailed a survey to the city manager/administrator of each local government within the OCARTS area. The survey requested information on current and anticipated (through 2030) revenues, attributed to transportation improvements on arterial streets and trails projects (bicycle and pedestrian) from the following sources:

- General Fund Revenues
- General Obligation Bonds
- Earmarked Sales Tax
- Paving Districts
- Street Improvements Required of Local Developers
- Street and Alley Fund Revenues (received from the State)
- Other (i.e. special capital improvements fund, etc.)

The survey was mailed to all OCARTS area communities, and responses were received from 12. A copy of the cover letter and survey form is included in Attachment 4 of this report.

The survey results revealed that local governments utilize a variety of funding sources to construct and maintain both OCARTS network streets and local streets. The survey responses also revealed that a few communities are dedicating local revenues to build sidewalks and trails, as well as requiring developers to construct sidewalks along arterials in conjunction with new residential and commercial developments. Because the estimated 30-year costs for the five alternate street and highway networks did not include costs for maintaining local streets, the MPO was careful not to over estimate the local revenues. In many instances, only a portion of the revenues reported by the communities from local sources was included in the 2030 revenue projection in order to keep the local revenues attributable to the Plan network realistic. It was also recognized that some of the local funds are used to match federal funds to accomplish network improvements.

Several cities, with a history of successful G.O. bond or sales tax elections dedicated to transportation improvements, included an estimate for future revenues during the Plan period from these funding sources. The MPO used these future projections as part of its overall revenue estimate, even though they will require voter approval.

Several communities also reported that they require developers to widen arterial streets that their developments abut as part of the platting process. This results in a savings to the local government, which allows available federal and local tax dollars to be spent on other locations. An estimate of the developer contributions reported by the local governments was included as another revenue source for implementing the long-range plan.

Table 11 provides a summary of the local revenue estimates and sources used to develop the total projection of transportation revenues from local entities over the 30-year planning period.

**Table 11:
Estimated Local Transportation Revenues
2030 OCARTS Plan**

OCARTS Entity	Current General Fund	Future General Fund	Street & Alley Fund	Developer Contrib.	Current G. O. Bond Revenues	Proposed G. O. Bond Revenues	Current Sales Tax Revenues	Proposed Sales Tax Revenues
Choctaw	\$0	\$0	\$480,000	Unknown			Unknown	Unknown
Del City	\$6,375,000	Included in Current	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$1,200,000	\$3,000,000
Edmond	\$86,000,000	\$87,500,000	Varies	\$12,000,000 for S&H \$3,000,000 for Sidewalks	\$0	\$0	\$5,335,500 for S&H \$4,250,000 for Trails	\$21,342,000
Guthrie	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Harrah	\$250,000 S&H \$750,000 Trails	Included in Current	\$3,600,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$250,000 S&H \$150,000 Trails
Midwest City	\$66,077,760 (Includes Future)	\$1,500,000 CIP Fund for Sidewalks	\$15,000,000	N/A	\$23,400,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Moore	\$30,000,000	Included in Current	\$9,625,000	\$0	\$5,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Mustang	\$180,000	\$2,500,000	\$0	Sidewalks required on new Res. and Comm. Developments	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Nichols Hills						Pending March 2005 Vote		
Noble	\$100,000	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$320,000	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$0
Norman	\$24,000,000	Included in Current	\$0	\$47,500,000 for S&H \$2,500,000 for Sidewalks	\$0	\$19,300,000	Unknown	Unknown
Oklahoma City	\$180,000,000	Included in Current	\$150,000,000	Unknown	\$65,475,000	\$120,600,000	\$0	\$0
The Village	\$2,083,750	\$12,125,000	\$4,800,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Yukon	\$39,000,000	Included in Current	\$0	\$10,000,000	\$32,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Woodlawn Park	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTALS	\$434,816,510	\$104,625,000	\$183,505,000	\$75,000,000	\$126,195,000	\$141,900,000	\$10,785,500	\$24,742,000
GRAND TOTAL \$1,101,569,010								

Source: ACOG Survey of Local Revenue Sources for Street Improvements for 2030 OCARTS Plan Financial Capacity Analysis, September 2004

TRANSIT FUNDING SOURCES

Federal Revenues

Each year the Central Oklahoma Transportation and Parking Authority (COTPA) receives an allocation of Section 5307 funds from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Sec. 5307 funds are allocated to transit operators in urbanized areas on a formula basis. Following the 2000 Census and a change in the Census Bureau's criteria for determining urban and rural areas, the Census Bureau designated a separate Norman urbanized area (UZA) within the OCARTS planning area. This resulted in a reduction in the size and population of the Oklahoma City UZA. Beginning in FFY 2003 (October 1, 2002), under FTA guidelines, the Norman UZA also became a recipient of Sec. 5307 formula funds, and the University of Oklahoma, which had previously operated the CART (Cleveland Area Rapid Transit) / METRO Transit Norman bus system, was designated as grant recipient and administrator of the Norman UZA system.

COTPA, which serves the Oklahoma City UZA having a population greater than 200,000, may use its formula funds for capital and planning expenses only, but CART, which serves the Norman UZA with a population less than 200,000 is allowed to also use its formula funds for operating expenses.

Additional sources of FTA funds include the Sec. 5309 Capital Program and the Jobs Access Reverse Commute (JARC) Program, which was created under TEA-21. Sec. 5309 funds are distributed on discretionary basis, using Congressional earmarks within the annual appropriation bills. These funds are generally tied to a specific project and are not considered a recurring revenue source. Since 2000, transit in Central Oklahoma has received a significant amount of discretionary funding, a trend not considered likely to continue through 2030. Therefore, the annual revenue projection from this source assumed only one-fourth of the annual average that was received between FY 2001 and FY 2004. Congress also distributed much of the JARC funds through discretionary earmarks during the plan preparation period, and Central Oklahoma received a significant portion of these funds as well. JARC funds can be used to assist with operating expenses at a 50 percent federal / 50 percent local matching ratio. Projections of these funds were similarly scaled down to avoid an unrealistic revenue estimate through 2030. (Under SAFETEA-LU, approved August 10, 2005, the JARC program was changed from a discretionary to a formula program, which will provide a steady revenue stream at a smaller annual amount.)

As mentioned under the previous section on federal highway sources, a small distribution of Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funds is distributed to the OCARTS area each year and the majority of these funds have been used by COTPA. This source of "flexible" funds can be used for either eligible highway or transit improvements. For the purpose of projecting transit revenues for this plan, it was assumed that 80 percent of the OCARTS CMAQ funds (approximately \$400,000/year) would continue to be used for transit improvements to enhance the region's air quality.

Each state also receives an annual amount of funds under the FTA Section 5310 Program, which may be used to assist with the purchase of accessible vehicles to transport the elderly and persons with disabilities. These funds are distributed statewide to eligible non-profit organizations that apply for such assistance. In order to estimate future Section 5310 revenues for the OCARTS area, the average annual Section 5310 funds approved for organizations within the OCARTS area during FFY 2001 through FFY 2005 was projected over the 30-year planning period.

The final source of federal transit revenues applicable to the OCARTS area includes a portion of the FTA Section 5311 Rural Public Transportation Program. These funds are provided to non-urbanized areas with a population of less than 50,000 to assist with capital and operating expenses to provide public transportation services within rural areas across the state. The State of Oklahoma administers approximately 20 such rural public transportation programs. Two of them, the First Capital Trolley located in Logan County (operated by the Logan County Historical Society) and Delta Public Transit in McClain County serve portions of the OCARTS area. Therefore, the funding required to operate these services was included in the overall revenue projection for the 2030 OCARTS Plan. Their average annual capital and operating revenues from federal, state and local sources, throughout the TEA-21 period, were assumed to continue throughout the 2030 Plan period.

State Revenues

In addition to the above-described federal sources of transit revenue, the Oklahoma State Legislature has established a Public Transit Revolving Fund to assist in the operation of urban and rural transit programs. Within Central Oklahoma, these funds are distributed annually to assist with the operation of the METRO Transit bus systems in Oklahoma City and Norman and the rural public transit systems in Logan and McClain Counties. The METRO Transit Oklahoma City system receives approximately 20 percent of the statewide total. Funding for the Norman METRO Transit/CART system and the rural operators varies annually based on the previous year's annual revenue miles. The average annual Public Transit Revolving Fund revenues received by these agencies during TEA-21 was used as the basis of the 30-year revenue projection.

Local Revenues

Locally, fares are collected from patrons who ride the buses and these farebox revenues assist with funding transit services. The Cities of Oklahoma City and Norman also budget funds each year toward operation of METRO Transit Oklahoma City and METRO Transit Norman, respectively. The University of Oklahoma in Norman also provides a significant portion of the funding for METRO Transit/CART. The University of Central Oklahoma (UCO) in Edmond and suburban communities that receive local and express bus service also help fund METRO Transit Oklahoma City. These include the Cities of Edmond and Midwest City. Many non-profit organizations contract with COTPA and participate in the funding of special programs that assist their elderly and disabled clients.

A summary of the projected federal, state and local transit revenues for the OCARTS area are provided in Table 12. The annual revenues, upon which the average annual revenue estimates were based, are provided in Attachment 5.

**Table 12:
Estimated Transit Revenue Available to the OCARTS Area
From Federal, State and Local Sources
2030 OCARTS Plan**

(Transit costs are assumed not to exceed estimated transit revenues)

Funding Category	Estimated Annual Average	Estimated 30-Year Total
FEDERAL FUNDING SOURCES:		
FTA Sec. 5307 Urbanized Area Formula:		
COTPA	\$4,422,211	\$132,666,330
CART	\$1,200,000	\$36,000,000
FTA Sec. 5309 Capital Program - Discretionary:		
COTPA*	\$2,536,946	\$19,027,095
CART*	\$800,000	\$6,000,000
FTA JARC Program*	\$839,234	\$6,294,255
FTA Sec. 5310 Elderly and Disabled	\$210,868	\$6,326,040
Section 5311 Non-Urban Area Formula:		
First Capital Trolley (Guthrie)	\$355,304	\$10,659,120
Delta Public Transit (Purcell)	\$129,149	\$3,874,470
FHWA Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ)	\$400,000	\$12,000,000
Subtotal	\$10,893,712	\$232,847,310
STATE FUNDING SOURCES:		
Public Transit Revolving Fund:		
COTPA	\$590,482	\$17,714,460
CART	\$70,000	\$2,100,000
First Capital Trolley	\$42,991	\$1,289,730
Delta Public Transit	\$11,646	\$349,380
Subtotal	\$715,119	\$21,453,570
LOCAL FUNDING SOURCES:		
COTPA:		
OKC General Fund	\$6,746,486	\$202,394,580
Other Municipal and County Funds	\$201,352	\$6,040,560
Farebox and Ticket Revenues	\$1,788,811	\$53,664,330
Other Revenues	\$2,780,541	\$83,416,230
CART:		
City of Norman	\$180,000	\$5,400,000
University of Oklahoma	\$850,000	\$25,500,000
Farebox and Private Sector Funds	\$125,000	\$3,750,000
First Capital Trolley - Fares, donations, etc.	\$642,857	\$19,285,710
Delta Public Transit - Fares, donations, etc.	\$226,194	\$6,785,820
Local Match for FTA Sec. 5310 Funds	\$43,190	\$1,295,700
Subtotal	\$13,584,431	\$407,532,930
Total Federal, State and Local Funds	\$25,193,262	\$661,833,810

* Revenue projection assumes one-fourth of the FY 2001 - FY 2004 annual average.

Sources: COTPA, CART, ODOT Transit Programs Division and OCARTS Area Sec. 5310 Applications to DHS

Note: This table is the same as Table 3 on page 11 of this report.

ADOPTION OF THE FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED 2030 OCARTS PLAN

ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTED REVENUES AMONG MODES

The 2030 OCARTS Plan includes recommendations for improving various modes of travel within the OCARTS area. As described previously, specific cost estimates were developed for the 2030 Plan street and highway network, continuation of urban and rural transit services, and improved bicycle/pedestrian facilities through the year 2030. The street and highway element of the plan includes improvements that will enhance goods movement by truck, rail and air by providing improved access to truck terminals, rail yards and airports, as well as improvement of roadways and interchanges.

The total revenues projected for implementation of the 2030 OCARTS Plan resulted in approximately \$5.9 billion to finance preservation of the existing transportation infrastructure, as well as the improvements planned for all modes. Because the Plan is multimodal, it was necessary to break down the total revenue projection by mode to ensure that it would be financially constrained when compared to the estimated 30-year costs. This was done to provide a realistic financial balance between the overall estimated costs of the Plan and the overall projected revenues, with no single mode consuming all projected revenues.

The Intermodal Transportation Policy Committee approved the following revenue breakdown for the 2030 OCARTS Plan, for planning purposes, during its May 26, 2005 meeting:

Mode	Percent	Estimated 30-Year Total Revenues
Streets and Highways	87.1	\$5,138,324,343
Bicycle and Pedestrian	1.7	\$100,000,000
Transit	11.2	\$661,833,810
Totals	100.0	\$5,900,158,153

The 2030 OCARTS Plan Intermodal Element identified an estimated cost of \$98.5 million to implement all of the trails identified by local governments over the 30-year planning period. The above revenue breakdown accommodates that estimated expenditure.

The historical cost of providing public transit in the OCARTS area was used as the basis for developing the revenue projection for the transit element of the 2030 OCARTS Plan. Considering the region's history of relatively flat transit funding (and service) levels, and service requests that exceed available/affordable supply, the Intermodal Element assumed future transit costs would be equal to the 30-year revenue total of nearly \$662 million. Because federal law requires financial constraint for metropolitan transportation plans, a new dedicated revenue source for transit would have to be reasonably available in order to project transit growth beyond current levels.

The previous 2025 OCARTS Plan identified the following projected revenue distributions for planning purposes: 90 percent for streets and highways, 8.5 percent for transit, and 1.5 percent for bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Thus, the revenue breakdown assumed for the 2030 OCARTS Plan represents an increase in the estimated revenues for alternate modes of transportation.

FUNDING STRATEGY FOR APPROVED 2030 OCARTS PLAN

In May 2005, ACOG's Intermodal Transportation Policy Committee (ITPC) approved the revenue projection for the 2030 OCARTS Plan. The final revenue projection of \$5.9 billion is reflected in Table 7 of this report. On August 18, 2005, the ITPC approved the financially constrained 2030 OCARTS Plan, which included the Alternate Four-B street and highway network and the Intermodal Element recommendations. The estimated cost of the adopted plan totaled approximately \$5.57 billion, as reflected in Table 6. The ITPC's action was preceded by favorable recommendations from the Citizens Advisory Committee and the Intermodal Transportation Technical Committee.

Below is a summary of the major components of the Alternate Four-B network and the related cost estimates for each:

Highway Element

- **Street and highway network** - Includes costs for preservation of the existing street and highway network, and costs for construction, maintenance, and right-of-way acquisition to implement the additional improvements called for by Alternate Four-B, based on input from OCARTS area communities and the public. Facilities include freeways, principal arterials, minor arterials, collectors, and ramps and bridges. Includes the cost to realign the I-40 Crosstown Expressway, between approximately Agnew Avenue and I-235, as well as the cost to remove the current elevated structure and replace it with a six-lane boulevard.
(Estimated 2030 Plan Cost - \$3,998,166,000)
- **Major Interchanges** - The 2030 OCARTS Plan includes the reconstruction of five interchanges: These are I-240/I-35, I-44/I-235 (includes widening of I-44 from N. 63rd to N. 36th Streets and widening of Santa Fe from N. 50th to N. 63rd Streets), Broadway Extension (US-77)/Memorial Road (N. 136th), I-40/Morgan Road, and I-35/Shields Blvd.
(Estimated 2030 Plan Cost - \$252,969,000)
- **Turnpike Facilities** - Includes costs for right-of-way acquisition, construction and maintenance of an approximate 20-mile outer loop⁴ in the southwest portion of the OCARTS area, as well as the construction and maintenance of the H.E. Bailey Turnpike Spur, which was completed between the 2000 base year and adoption of the Plan in 2005. Also included, is the construction cost of the new Turner Turnpike gate near Triple X Road, which will be funded by Oklahoma County, Oklahoma City and the Oklahoma Turnpike Authority. For the southwest outer loop, the general alignment reflected in the previous 2025 OCARTS Plan was maintained as a placeholder, pending completion of the Outer Loop Corridor Major Investment Study. Maintenance costs for portions of other OCARTS area turnpike facilities (Turner Turnpike, H.E. Bailey Turnpike and Kilpatrick Turnpike) were also reflected in the Plan's estimated costs and revenues.
(Estimated 2030 Plan Cost - \$522,161,000)

⁴ Although the 2030 OCARTS Plan, assumes the SW outer loop will be constructed as a toll facility, this is not intended to preclude consideration of other funding sources in the future.

- **Non-traditional Improvements** - The 2030 OCARTS Plan includes funding of non-traditional improvements, primarily on freeways and principal arterials, and includes deployment of intelligent transportation systems (ITS), travel demand management (TDM), and traffic systems management (TSM) strategies throughout the region.
(Estimated 2030 Plan Cost - \$40,330,000)

Intermodal Element

- **Transit** - Includes the capital, operating & maintenance, and planning costs for the urban and rural transit services described in Table 3. (Estimated 2030 Plan Cost - \$661,833,810)
- **Bicycle** - Includes capital costs for implementing the planned bicycle network described in Table 5. (Estimated 2030 Plan Cost - \$98,470,305)

Table 13 provides a summary of the estimated costs of the adopted 2030 OCARTS Plan, as described above, and the revenues projected to be available for implementation of the Plan. This information demonstrates that the 2030 OCARTS Plan is financially feasible due to the fact that the estimated revenues distributed to each mode meets or exceeds the estimated costs of implementing the proposed improvements.

**Table 13:
Anticipated Revenues and Estimated Costs
for the 2030 OCARTS Plan**

Mode	Percent	Estimated 30-Year Total Revenues	Estimated 30-Year Total Costs	Difference
Streets & Highways	87.1%	\$5,138,324,343	\$4,813,625,000	\$324,699,343
Transit (Urban & Rural)	11.2%	\$661,833,810	\$661,833,810	\$0
Bicycle & Pedestrian	1.7%	\$100,000,000	\$98,470,305	\$1,529,695
Estimated Totals for 2025 OCARTS Plan	100.0%	\$5,900,158,153	\$5,573,929,115	\$326,229,038

Note: Costs for the 2030 OCARTS Plan are anticipated to be funded with historically available transportation revenues. Any amendments to the adopted Plan will require a modification of Plan priorities or additional revenue, if the cost(s) of the anticipated change(s) is beyond the funds available described above.

**ATTACHMENT 1:
ESTIMATED TURNPIKE COSTS
2030 OCARTS PLAN**

Turnpike Segments	Miles	Unit Cost*	Maint. Cycles	Est. 30-Yr. Cost
Existing: (Maintenance)				
Turner Turnpike	16	\$447,000	3	\$21,456,000
HE Bailey Turnpike	9	\$447,000	3	\$12,069,000
Kilpatrick Turnpike	25	\$447,000	3	\$33,525,000
Total				\$67,050,000
2000-2030: (Construction and Maintenance)				
HE Bailey Norman Spur:				
Construction	9			\$60,960,959
ROW	9			\$6,163,650
Maintenance	9	\$447,000	2	\$8,046,000
SW Outer Loop:				
Construction	20	\$18,200,000		\$364,000,000
Maintenance	20	\$447,000	1	\$8,940,000
Turner TP Gate near Luther**				\$3,500,000
Total				\$451,610,609
Total Const. & Maint. Costs				\$518,660,609

*Per 4-lane mile, in Year 2000 dollars

**Estimated total cost is \$7 million. \$3.5 million will be paid by OTA. \$2 million was earmarked in FFY 2004 and is included in Non-Recurring Federal Revenues. The remainder will be paid by OKC and Okla. County.

Sources:

Oklahoma Transportation Authority (updated unit costs for maintenance)

Five-Year Capital Plan Report to OTA, Benham Group, March 17, 2004 (HE Bailey Norman Spur Const. & ROW)

SW Outer Loop MIS (2025 Plan unit cost of \$16.1 million per 4-lane mile was updated to 2000 dollars)

Oklahoma County (\$7 million estimate for Turner TP Gate)

ATTACHMENT 2: ESTIMATED COSTS FOR ALTERNATES ONE THROUGH FOUR-A

Estimated Costs for Implementing Alternate One of the 2030 OCARTS Plan (Present Plus Committed Network)

Functional Classification	Linear Miles	Lane Miles	COST (in thousands)			
			Const.	Maint.	R.O.W.	Total
Turnpikes	60.00	240.00	60,961	75,096	6,164	142,221
Interstates & Freeways	168.08	858.76	232,054	215,729	13,000	460,783
Principal Arterials	446.29	1,659.47	35,049	234,219	16,274	285,542
Minor Arterials	1,388.37	3,469.48	119,452	407,403	57,893	584,748
Collectors	204.11	515.98	10,532	59,812	4,340	74,684
TOTAL	2,266.84	6,743.69	\$458,048	\$992,259	\$97,671	\$1,547,978

Note: Only includes street and highway costs. The construction cost figures include structure costs. Maintenance costs are for a 2-inch asphalt-concrete overlay every 10 years over the planning period (2000-2030).

Estimated Costs for Implementing Alternate Two of the 2030 OCARTS Plan (2025 OCARTS Plan Network)

Functional Classification	Linear Miles	Lane Miles	COST (in thousands)					Total
			Const.	Maint.	R.O.W.	Major Interchange	Non-Trad'l Imprv'ts ^d	
Turnpikes ^a	80.00	320.00	424,961	84,036	6,164	7,000		522,161
Interstate & Freeway ^b	172.40	968.48	1,025,425	207,603	84,000	^c 245,969	18,955	1,581,952
Principal Arterials	446.78	1,785.08	247,008	221,579	95,882		17,745	582,214
Minor Arterials	1,397.58	4,109.66	904,566	395,017	382,650		3,630	1,685,863
Collectors	207.09	558.39	55,770	59,847	30,882			146,499
TOTAL	2,303.84	7,741.61	\$2,657,730	\$968,082	\$599,578	\$252,969	\$40,330	\$4,518,688

Notes: Only includes street and highway costs. The construction cost figures include bridge and other structure costs. Maintenance costs are for a 2-inch asphalt-concrete overlay every 10 years over the planning period (2000-2030).

^aSouthwest Outer Loop was considered a toll facility and the cost figures were based on the Outer Loop Corridor MIS (updated to 2000 dollars) and information provided by OTA.

^bConstruction (\$289 million) and ROW acquisition (\$71 million) for the I-40 Crosstown realignment project was based on information provided by ODOT.

^cMajor Interchanges include I-240/I-35, I-44/I-235 (project also includes widening of I/44 from 63rd St. to 36th St from 4 to 6 lanes; Widening of Santa Fe from 50th St. to 63rd St.), Broadway Extn./Memorial Road, I-40/Morgan Rd, I-35/Shields Ave.

^dThe non-traditional improvements in the aggregate are expected to cost approximately \$40 million, and they will be implemented for the most part on freeways and principal arterials. Non-traditional improvements include the deployment of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), Travel Demand Management (TDM), and Traffic System Management (TSM).

**Estimated Costs for Implementing Alternate Three of the 2030 OCARTS Plan
(Revised 2025 OCARTS Plan Network)**

Functional Classification	Linear Miles	Lane Miles	COST (in thousands)					Total
			Const.	Maint.	R.O.W.	Major Interchange	Non-Trad'l Imprv'ts ^d	
Turnpikes ^a	80.00	320.00	424,961	84,036	6,164	7,000		522,161
Interstate & Freeway ^b	173.33	979.10	1,063,274	209,589	84,000	^c 245,969	18,955	1,621,787
Principal Arterials	456.90	1,826.19	270,610	224,970	105,484		17,745	618,809
Minor Arterials	1,423.84	4,161.39	899,670	400,883	384,334		3,630	1,688,517
Collectors	216.15	589.99	63,210	63,301	34,036			160,547
TOTAL	2,350.22	7,876.67	\$2,721,725	\$982,779	\$614,018	\$252,969	\$40,330	\$4,611,820

Notes: Only includes street and highway costs. The construction cost figures include bridge and other structure costs. Maintenance costs are for a 2-inch asphalt-concrete overlay every 10 years over the planning period (2000-2030).

^aSouthwest Outer Loop was considered a toll facility and the cost figures were based on the Outer Loop Corridor MIS (updated to 2000 dollars) and information provided by OTA.

^bConstruction (\$289 million) and ROW acquisition (\$71 million) for the I-40 Crosstown realignment project was based on information provided by ODOT.

^cMajor Interchanges include I-240/I-35, I-44/I-235 (project also includes widening of I/44 from 63rd St. to 36th St from 4 to 6 lanes; Widening of Santa Fe from 50th St. to 63rd St.), Broadway Extn./Memorial Road, I-40/Morgan Rd, I-35/Shields Ave.

^dThe non-traditional improvements in the aggregate are expected to cost approximately \$40 million, and they will be implemented for the most part on freeways and principal arterials. Non-traditional improvements include the deployment of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), Travel Demand Management (TDM), and Traffic System Management (TSM).

**Estimated Cost for Implementing Alternate Four-A of the 2030 OCARTS Plan
(Revised 2025 OCARTS Plan as Modified by Local Governments)**

Functional Classification	Linear Miles	Lane Miles	COST (in thousands)					Total
			Const.	Maint.	R.O.W.	Major Interchange	Non-Trad'l Imprv'ts ^d	
Turnpikes ^a	80.00	320.00	424,961	84,036	6,164	7,000		522,161
Interstate & Freeway ^b	173.33	979.10	1,063,274	209,589	84,000	^c 245,969	18,955	1,621,787
Principal Arterials	456.90	1,863.87	331,950	225,228	130,644		17,745	705,567
Minor Arterials	1,423.84	4,144.89	894,893	402,675	382,316		3,630	1,683,514
Collectors	216.15	591.07	69,626	62,875	37,082			169,583
TOTAL	2,350.22	7,898.93	\$2,784,704	\$984,403	\$640,206	\$252,969	\$40,330	\$4,702,611

**ATTACHMENT 3:
BACKGROUND ON AVERAGE ANNUAL REVENUES
FROM HIGHWAY FUNDING SOURCES**

**OCARTS AREA FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY FUNDS
2030 OCARTS Plan**

HISTORICAL FEDERAL-AID EXPENDITURES IN OCARTS AREA FROM TEA-21 FEDERAL FUNDING CATEGORIES:								
Funding Category:	FFY 1998	FFY 1999	FFY 2000	FFY 2001	FFY 2002	FFY 2003	FFY 2004	Average
Interstate Maintenance	\$27,944,782	\$19,209,857	\$38,061,018	\$7,394,800	\$43,202,599	\$1,291,238	\$35,414,950	\$24,645,606
National Highway System	\$6,088,272	\$0	\$0	\$80,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,589,665	\$1,108,277
Bridge Program	\$812,988	\$102,692	\$861,239	\$4,026,841	\$1,417,086	\$2,101,272	\$11,516,825	\$2,976,992
STP ¹ , Statewide & Safety	\$9,835,729	\$5,997,366	\$13,633,469	\$10,825,788	\$7,721,233	\$7,655,919	\$684,846	\$8,050,621
STP, Enhancement	\$2,940,181	\$4,058,702	\$1,968,537	\$2,343,915	\$4,645,244	\$2,396,399	N/A	\$3,058,830
STP, UZA Suballocation ²	\$12,486,281	\$14,296,769	\$15,272,944	\$15,453,081	\$16,143,816	\$13,717,086	\$16,268,119	\$14,805,442
Congest. Mitig./Air Quality ³	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000
Minimum Guarantee	\$791,733	\$0	\$12,950,794	\$0	\$0	\$8,067,343	\$0	\$3,115,696
Subtotal	\$60,999,966	\$43,765,386	\$82,848,001	\$40,224,425	\$73,229,978	\$35,329,257	\$65,574,405	\$57,861,464
10% Contingency	\$6,099,997	\$4,376,539	\$8,284,800	\$4,022,443	\$7,322,998	\$3,532,926	\$6,557,441	\$5,786,146
Total	\$67,099,963	\$48,141,925	\$91,132,801	\$44,246,868	\$80,552,976	\$38,862,183	\$72,131,846	\$63,647,610

¹ Surface Transportation Program

² Includes apportionments from all Federal-aid categories suballocated to the UZA

³ Most OCARTS area CMAQ funds provided by ODOT were transferred to FTA for use on transit activities. See Transit Table

NON-RECURRING FEDERAL REVENUES:								
	FFY 1998 & 99	FFY 2000	FFY 2001	FFY 2002	FFY 2003	FFY 2004*	FFY 2005**	Total
Demonstration Funds					\$1,490,250	\$350,000		\$1,840,250
High Priority Proj./I-40 Earmarks	\$23,852,412	\$17,510,334	\$18,246,950	\$22,774,447	\$20,411,108	\$27,000,000	\$51,000,000	\$180,795,251
ITS Earmarks			\$321,592	\$1,189,265	\$706,179	\$898,164	\$925,926	\$4,041,126
ITS CVISN Projects			\$2,239,950					\$1,787,470
Nat'l Corridor Planning & Devel.			\$2,239,950					\$2,239,950
Transp Comm System Preserv.		\$178,000		\$991,307	\$437,500			\$1,606,807
Other Discretionary Funds	\$883,000				\$499,861	\$2,980,500		\$4,363,361
FFY 2004 Earmarks*						\$2,800,000		\$2,800,000
FFY 2005 Earmarks**							\$7,391,667	\$7,391,667
Totals	\$24,735,412	\$17,688,334	\$20,808,492	\$24,955,019	\$23,544,898	\$34,028,664	\$59,317,593	\$206,865,882

* Includes FFY 2004 earmarks for Luther area TP Gate, Lake Draper road improvements and NE 23rd St. improvements

** Includes FFY 2005 earmarks for I-40/Morgan intchg., Broadway Ext., Hudiburg Dr. in MWC, RR grade separations in Norman, and other OCARTS area projects

Sources: Oklahoma Transportation Commission Agendas / Awards Lists, ODOT Programs Division and ODOT Planning Division, ACOG ITS Data

OCARTS AREA FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY FUNDS - 30-YEAR ESTIMATE 2030 OCARTS PLAN

HISTORICAL FEDERAL-AID EXPENDITURES WITHIN OCARTS:						
	Basis of Suballocation to OCARTS Area	Fed. Share	FFY 1998-2004 Average	Matching Funds**	Total	30-Yr. Estimate
Funding Category:						
Interstate Maintenance	State Discretion	90%	\$24,645,606	\$1,834,728	\$26,480,334	\$794,410,033
National Highway System	State Discretion	80%	\$1,108,277	\$82,505	\$1,190,782	\$35,723,462
Bridge Program	State Discretion	80%	\$2,976,992	\$221,621	\$3,198,613	\$95,958,375
STP *, Statewide & Safety	State Discretion	80%	\$8,050,621	\$599,324	\$8,649,945	\$259,498,350
STP, Enhancement	State Discretion	80%	\$3,058,830	\$339,870	\$3,398,700	\$101,961,000
STP, UZA Suballocation	TEA-21 Formula	80%	\$14,805,442	\$1,645,049	\$16,450,491	\$493,514,733
Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality	State Discretion	80%	\$100,000	\$11,111	\$111,111	\$3,333,333
Minimum Guarantee	State Discretion	80-90%	\$3,115,696	\$346,188	\$3,461,884	\$103,856,533
Subtotal			\$57,861,464	\$5,080,397	\$62,941,861	\$1,888,255,820
10% Contingency for Cost Overruns			\$5,786,146	\$508,040	\$6,294,186	\$188,825,582
Total			\$63,647,610	\$5,588,436	\$69,236,047	\$2,077,081,401

* Surface Transportation Program **Match for IM, NHS, BR and STP-State reduced by 1/3. Assumes Soft Match will continue for 10 years.

NON-RECURRING FEDERAL REVENUES	
	FFY 1999-2005 Total
Demonstration Funds	\$1,840,250
High Priority Proj./I-40 Earmarks	\$180,795,251
Intelligent Transp. Systems	\$4,041,126
ITS CVISN Projects	\$1,787,470
Nat'l Corridor Planning & Devel.	\$2,239,950
Transp Comm System Preserv.	\$1,606,807
Other Discretionary Funds	\$4,363,361
FFY 2004 Earmarks*	\$2,800,000
FFY 2005 Earmarks**	\$7,391,667
Total	\$206,865,882

* Includes FFY 2004 earmarks for Turner TP Gate near Luther, Lake Draper road improvements and NE 23rd St. improvements

** Includes FFY 2005 earmarks for I-40/Morgan intchg., Broadway Ext., Hudiburg Dr. in MWC, RR grade sep. in Norman & other OCARTS area projects

Sources: Oklahoma Transportation Commission Agendas / Awards Lists, ODOT Programs Division and ODOT Planning Division

**STATE FUNDS SPENT WITHIN THE OCARTS AREA
2030 OCARTS PLAN**

MAINTENANCE EXPENDITURES IN OCARTS, FY 1998 - FY 2004								
County	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 1998-2004 Annual Avg.
Canadian	\$1,526,725	\$0	\$110,000	\$0	\$1,476,770	\$0	\$147,247	\$465,820
Cleveland	\$726,036	\$0	\$1,829,468	\$0	\$2,472,924	\$423,436	\$414,199	\$838,009
Grady	\$162,428	\$0	\$0	\$76,862	\$0	\$0	\$25,000	\$37,756
Logan	\$803,198	\$287,470	\$10,000	\$943,741	\$62,265	\$195,203	\$33,815	\$333,670
McClain	\$0	\$73,292	\$0	\$885,826	\$148,384	\$44,625	\$658,978	\$258,729
Oklahoma	\$1,798,105	\$161,851	\$1,284,244	\$5,727,385	\$7,502,681	\$2,273,295	\$1,763,289	\$2,930,121
Total								\$4,864,106

INDUSTRIAL ACCESS AND LAKE ACCESS EXPENDITURES IN OCARTS, FY 1998 - FY 2004								
Fund	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 1998-2004 Annual Avg.
Ind. Access	\$495,616	\$83,587	\$533,000	\$450,000	\$1,855,000	\$0	\$749,349	\$595,222
Lake Access	\$0	\$0	\$59,895	\$77,578	\$289,140	\$0	\$0	\$60,945

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM EXPENDITURES IN OCARTS, FY 1998 - FY 2004								
Fund	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 1998-2004 Total
CIP	\$22,689,624	\$30,344,083	\$26,853,753	\$29,359,662	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$109,247,122

Note: State Maintenance, Industrial Access and Lake Access funds are recurring revenues that have been averaged for a future revenue projection.
The CIP program was approved by the Legislature in 1997 under HB 1629 (Phase I) and in 2000 under HB 2259 (Phase II). No additional future revenues are projected from this source for the OCARTS area.

Source: ODOT Programs Division and Oklahoma Transportation Commission Awards Lists

TAXES AND FEES RETURNED TO COUNTIES, CITIES AND TOWNS IN THE OCARTS AREA FY 1998 - FY 2004

TAXES AND FEES DISTRIBUTED DIRECTLY TO COUNTIES FOR ROADS:										
County	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 98-04 Average	% Pop. in OCARTS	Estimated OCARTS Average
Canadian	\$3,270,124	\$3,171,754	\$3,545,213	\$4,218,763	\$3,610,355	\$3,988,916	\$4,190,801	\$3,713,704	73.56%	\$2,731,800
Cleveland	\$3,575,455	\$3,654,935	\$3,913,032	\$3,860,472	\$3,810,808	\$3,853,588	\$3,895,458	\$3,794,821	100.00%	\$3,794,821
Grady	\$4,421,212	\$4,223,829	\$5,138,928	\$6,895,609	\$4,985,920	\$5,607,492	\$6,012,961	\$5,326,564	23.23%	\$1,237,361
Logan	\$2,197,938	\$2,196,785	\$2,368,432	\$2,493,916	\$2,436,401	\$2,655,465	\$2,876,380	\$2,460,760	72.48%	\$1,783,559
McClain	\$1,662,364	\$1,589,434	\$1,834,250	\$2,092,813	\$1,795,759	\$1,899,949	\$2,016,021	\$1,841,513	80.97%	\$1,491,073
Oklahoma	\$8,986,600	\$8,930,836	\$9,449,136	\$9,628,739	\$9,521,688	\$9,604,681	\$9,768,381	\$9,412,866	100.00%	\$9,412,866
Total										\$20,451,480

Includes Gasoline, Diesel & Special Fuel Taxes; Gross Production Taxes; and Motor Vehicle Collections, including County Bridge and Road Improvement Funds

Source: "State Payments to Local Governments," FY 1998 - FY 2003, Oklahoma Tax Commission

44

TAXES AND FEES DISTRIBUTED DIRECTLY TO CITIES AND TOWNS:										
County	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 98-04 Average	% Pop. in OCARTS	Estimated OCARTS Average
Canadian	\$583,778	\$605,901	\$642,031	\$640,839	\$657,483	\$661,394	\$664,267	\$636,528	73.56%	\$468,230
Cleveland	\$1,388,159	\$1,443,042	\$1,531,609	\$1,526,240	\$1,623,884	\$1,630,840	\$1,633,864	\$1,539,663	100.00%	\$1,539,663
Grady	\$309,390	\$320,184	\$338,244	\$338,651	\$350,119	\$353,076	\$356,130	\$337,971	23.23%	\$78,511
Logan	\$198,046	\$204,814	\$216,210	\$216,628	\$207,090	\$209,200	\$211,428	\$209,059	72.48%	\$151,526
McClain	\$173,547	\$179,679	\$189,899	\$190,042	\$220,398	\$222,060	\$223,551	\$199,882	80.97%	\$161,845
Oklahoma	\$6,526,562	\$6,778,802	\$7,225,423	\$7,166,725	\$7,391,517	\$7,405,473	\$7,407,471	\$7,128,853	100.00%	\$7,128,853
Total										\$9,528,627

Includes Admission Fees, Alcoholic Beverage Tax, Gasoline Excise Tax, and Motor Vehicle Collections

Source: "State Payments to Local Governments," FY 1998 - FY 2003, Oklahoma Tax Commission

**ATTACHMENT 4:
COVER LETTER AND FORM FOR
SURVEY OF LOCAL TRANSPORTATION REVENUES**

September 1, 2004

Name
City Manager/Clerk
Street Address
City, State, Zip

Dear :

The Association of Central Oklahoma Governments is currently involved in the development of the long range transportation plan for Central Oklahoma for the year 2030. The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) requires that plans developed by metropolitan areas be **financially realistic**, since the adopted plan will serve as the basis upon which future federal, state, and local transportation funds will be spent.

In order to ensure that the 2030 transportation plan eventually adopted for Central Oklahoma will be financially realistic, ACOG staff will develop a cost estimate for each plan alternative considered. These estimates will include costs for maintenance of the current transportation network and for construction of new facilities recommended by the alternative. The cost estimate for each plan alternative, in turn, will be compared to the anticipated revenue for the region, based on historical data. These revenues will be projected over the planning period (through 2030) to determine if current revenue levels will be adequate to implement the proposed long-range plan. In order to accomplish the above task, ACOG will need to determine revenue sources and funding levels for transportation improvements at the federal, state, and local levels.

Enclosed is a survey to determine **local** revenue sources and estimated funding levels used for street improvements by Central Oklahoma communities. The information received from your response will be combined with the responses of other communities, and ultimately combined with anticipated federal and state transportation revenues applicable to Central Oklahoma. Therefore, completion of the enclosed survey is a very critical component for compiling information on total transportation revenues for Central Oklahoma. It should be noted that the primary focus of the enclosed survey is to determine revenue for **major** street improvements which serve the Central Oklahoma region (i.e. freeways and arterials), rather than local street improvements which serve primarily local residents (i.e. residential and collector streets).

September 1, 2004

Page 2

Please complete the enclosed survey at your earliest convenience and mail or fax your response to ACOG no later than **September 30, 2004**. Feel free to contact Holly Massie or me at 234-2264 if you need any further information about the survey. Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Zach D. Taylor
Executive Director

Encl.: Survey of Local Revenue Sources for 2030 OCARTS Plan

**ACOG Survey of
Local Revenue Sources for Transportation Improvements
for 2030 OCARTS Plan Financial Capacity Analysis**
September 2004

Name & title of person completing survey: _____

Telephone No. _____ Community Name: _____



CURRENT INFORMATION

1.) What sources of local revenue does your city **currently** use for transportation improvements?
(Check all that apply)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Fund | <input type="checkbox"/> General Obligation Bonds |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Earmarked Sales Tax | <input type="checkbox"/> Paving District(s) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Street Improvements Required of
Private Developers | <input type="checkbox"/> Street & Alley Fund
(Funds returned by state) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other, <i>please explain</i> _____ | |

2.) Please provide the following information for each revenue source checked above:

General Fund

- Annual revenue dedicated to **street** construction projects: _____
- Annual revenue dedicated to street maintenance: _____
- Annual revenue dedicated to **trails** construction (bicycle/pedestrian): _____
- Annual revenue dedicated to trails maintenance: _____
- Type of projects to be funded (specific examples please): _____
- _____
- _____

GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS

- Period covered: _____ Remaining years of revenue: _____
- Annual revenue dedicated to **street** construction projects: _____
- Annual revenue dedicated to street maintenance: _____
- Annual revenue dedicated to **trails** construction (bicycle/pedestrian): _____
- Annual revenue dedicated to trails maintenance: _____
- Type of projects to be funded (specific examples please): _____
- _____
- _____
- Percent of annual revenue to be used to match federal funds: _____

EARMARKED SALES TAX

Amount of sales tax earmarked (i.e. $\frac{1}{2}\text{¢}$, $\frac{1}{4}\text{¢}$, etc.): _____

Period covered: _____ Remaining years of revenue: _____

Annual revenue dedicated to **street** construction projects: _____

Annual revenue dedicated to street maintenance: _____

Annual revenue dedicated to **trails** construction (bicycle/pedestrian): _____

Annual revenue dedicated to trails maintenance: _____

Type of projects to be funded (specific examples please): _____

Percent of annual revenue to be used to match federal funds: _____

Paving District(s)

Period covered: _____ Remaining years of assessment: _____

Annual revenue dedicated to street construction projects: _____

Type of projects to be funded (specific examples please): _____

Street and Alley Fund

Annual revenue dedicated to street construction projects: _____

Annual revenue dedicated to street maintenance: _____

Type of projects to be funded (specific examples please): _____

Percent of annual revenue to be used to match federal funds: _____

Improvements by Private Developers

Please provide a brief explanation of your city's **street improvement requirements** for private developers who improve property adjacent to an arterial street: _____

On average, approximately how many linear miles of **arterial streets** are improved each year due to this requirement? _____

How many lane miles (linear miles x the number of lanes added or improved)? _____

What would be the estimated average annual cost of these improvements if the city had to construct them with local funds? _____

Please provide a brief explanation of your city's sidewalk and/or trails requirements for private developers: _____

What would be the estimated average annual cost of these improvements if the city had to construct them with local funds? _____

Other: _____

FUTURE INFORMATION

1.) What sources of local revenue does your city **anticipate using for future transportation improvements** over the next 10-20 years? (Check all that apply)

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| _____ General Fund | _____ General Obligation Bonds |
| _____ Earmarked Sales Tax | _____ Paving District(s) |
| _____ Street Improvements Required of Private Developers | _____ Street & Alley Fund |
| _____ Other, <i>please explain</i> : _____ | |

2.) Please provide the following information for each source of future revenue checked above:

General Fund

Estimated annual revenue to be dedicated to **street** construction projects: _____
Estimated annual revenue to be dedicated to street maintenance: _____
Est. annual revenue to be dedicated to **trails** construction (bicycle/pedestrian): _____
Est. annual revenue to be dedicated to trails maintenance: _____
Type of projects to be funded (specific examples please): _____

General Obligation Bond

Estimated period to be covered: _____
Estimated annual revenue to be dedicated to **street** construction projects: _____
Estimated annual revenue to be dedicated to street maintenance: _____
Est. annual revenue to be dedicated to **trails** construction (bicycle/pedestrian): _____
Est. annual revenue to be dedicated to trails maintenance: _____
Type of projects to be funded (specific examples please): _____

Percent of annual revenue to be used to match federal funds: _____
Known or estimated date of vote: _____

Earmarked Sales Tax

Proposed amount of sales tax to be earmarked (i.e. ½¢, ¼¢, etc.): _____

Estimated period to be covered: _____

Estimated annual revenue to be dedicated to **street** construction projects: _____

Estimated annual revenue to be dedicated to street maintenance: _____

Est. annual revenue to be dedicated to **trails** construction (bicycle/pedestrian): _____

Est. annual revenue to be dedicated to trails maintenance: _____

Type of projects to be funded (specific examples please): _____

Percent of annual revenue to be used to match federal funds: _____

Known or estimated date of vote: _____

Paving District(s)

Estimated annual revenue to be dedicated to street construction projects: _____

Type of projects to be funded (specific examples please): _____

Street and Alley Fund

Estimated annual revenue to be dedicated to street construction projects: _____

Estimated annual revenue to be dedicated to street maintenance: _____

Type of projects to be funded (specific examples please): _____

Percent of annual revenue to be used to match federal funds: _____

Other: _____

Thank you for your assistance!

Please return this survey by **September 30, 2004** to the attention of Holly Massie
at the following address.

Association of Central Oklahoma Governments
21 E Main St, Suite 100
Oklahoma City, OK 73104-2405
234-2264 / FAX 234-2200
hmassie@acogok.org

**ATTACHMENT 5:
BACKGROUND ON AVERAGE ANNUAL REVENUES
FROM TRANSIT FUNDING SOURCES**

FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL FUNDS HISTORICALLY AVAILABLE TO COTPA AND CART

FEDERAL FUNDING SOURCES:					
Funding Category	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Annual Average
COTPA:					
FTA Sec. 5307 Urbanized Area Formula	\$3,419,610	\$6,717,719	\$5,662,744	\$6,688,769	\$5,622,211
FTA Sec. 5309 Capital Program - Discretionary	\$2,731,250	\$0	\$7,416,532	\$0	\$2,536,946
FTA Jobs Access Reverse Commute (JARC)	\$0	\$995,050	\$1,100,000	\$1,261,887	\$839,234
FHWA Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ)	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000	\$400,000
CART:					
FTA Sec. 5307 Urbanized Area Formula					\$1,200,000
FTA Sec. 5309 Capital Program - Discretionary					\$800,000

STATE FUNDING SOURCES:					
Funding Category	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Annual Average
COTPA: Public Transit Revolving Fund	\$626,130	\$619,043	\$558,378	\$558,378	\$590,482
CART: Public Transit Revolving Fund					\$70,000
Subtotal	\$626,130	\$619,043	\$558,378	\$558,378	\$590,482

LOCAL FUNDING SOURCES:					
Funding Category	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	Annual Average
COTPA:					
OKC General Fund	\$6,873,972	\$6,950,025	\$6,380,044	\$6,781,903	\$6,746,486
Other Municipal and County Funds	\$192,079	\$161,787	\$169,557	\$281,984	\$201,352
Farebox and Ticket Revenues	\$1,945,058	\$2,015,544	\$1,746,482	\$1,448,161	\$1,788,811
Other Revenues*	\$2,586,162	\$2,996,018	\$359,507	\$5,180,477	\$2,780,541
CART:					
City of Norman					\$180,000
University of Oklahoma					\$850,000
Farebox and Private Sector Funds					\$125,000

* Includes advertising, Areawide Aging Agency grants, and other non-FTA revenues

Sources: COTPA and CART

Note: Annual average COTPA Sec. 5307 funds reflected in Table 3 of this report (\$4,422,211) is the above figure (\$5,622,211) less the CART Sec. 5307 funds (\$1,200,000)