

---

# **PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY**

**SH-11**

**From Barnsdall extend Southeast 2 miles  
Osage County  
JP 20288(04)**

**OKLAHOMA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**For  
Public Meeting Held September 21, 2017  
at  
Barnsdall High School**

Prepared by:



9225 North 133<sup>rd</sup> East Ave.  
Owasso, OK 74055

November 16, 2017

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.0 Executive Summary</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2.0 Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3.0 Agency Solicitation</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1 Agency Comments and ODOT Responses	5
<b>4.0 Public Meeting</b>	<b>7</b>
4.1 Meeting Notification	7
4.2 Meeting Information and Format	7
4.3 Summary of Public Meeting Comments	8
4.4 Written Public Comments	9

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Agency Comment Summary	2
Table 2: Public Comment Summary Both Written and Verbal Comments	3
Table 3: Public Meeting Comment Matrix	8
Table 4: Written Comments Matrix	9

---

## 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document summarizes the public meeting conducted for SH-11 from the SH-11/SH-123 intersection east of Barnsdall, extending southeast approximately 2.0 miles in eastern Osage County. The purpose of this meeting was to present the proposed design and obtain public input to aid the Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT) in moving forward with the completion of the environmental studies, design, and construction.

The public meeting was held on September 21, 2017 at 6:00 PM at the Barnsdall High School Auditorium located at 200 8th Street in Barnsdall, Oklahoma.

Thirty-eight (38) public attendees signed in for the meeting. The meeting included a presentation on the project from ODOT's consultant, Craig and Keithline. Representatives from ODOT, Craig and Keithline, and Able Consulting, were available for discussion before and after the presentation. The comment period was open until October 9, 2017 with a total of ten (10) written comments received, including six (6) from agencies and four (4) from members of the public.

Agency solicitation letters were mailed out for the project August 24, 2017. The responses received from the agencies are summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1: Agency Comment Summary**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Comment</b>
National Park Service	No comments at this time.
Bureau of Land Management	The BLM has no concerns or objection to the proposal.
Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Prior to beginning any construction activity disturbing more than one acre, you must submit an NOI and obtain authorization under OKR10, construction storm-water.</li><li>2. Since this project is located within the Tulsa Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), any burning associated with land clearing operations must be conducted using an Air Curtain Incinerator.</li></ol>

Oklahoma Conservation Commission (OCC)	The OCC stated the project area spans two stream channels and associated riparian corridors and potentially riparian wetlands. The OCC has several general concerns that should be addressed throughout this project that are siltation problems and mechanical disturbance in the waterbody itself. OCC recommends plans that reduce disturbance, and thus siltation, in the waterbodies and erosion control plans. OCC also recommends minimizing changes in the stream configuration or permanently protected riparian mitigation be implemented. OCC requests that following completion of this project, the streams remain free flowing with naturally vegetated stable banks and with stream substrate free of excess sedimentation from project activities.
Oklahoma State Parks Oklahoma Tourism and Recreation Department	The project will have no adverse impact on any federally funded park or State Park.
Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation	There are no known species of state concern to consider in Osage County.

Public comments addressed varying issues. One gentleman asked numerous questions about the alignment, curves, design speed and cost. Others asked questions about funding, oversized loads, and shoulders. During the small group session property owners were glad to know where the improvements were to be located, even if their property was impacted. ODOT right-of-way agents were in attendance and answered questions. There were lots of reports of automobile accidents along the roadway and agreement with the need for safety improvements along SH-11.

Four residents that live near to each other all commented on a hill that is a crest vertical curve (located east of SH-123) that currently meets the project 3R design criteria and is not currently scheduled for modification. This issue needs to be considered during the design stages of the project.

Table 2 summarizes both the written public comments received and the verbal comments/questions from the public meeting.

**Table 2: Public Comment Summary Both Written and Verbal Comments**

Comment	# of Comments
A Support for the Project – during open meeting period	2
B Funding	2
C Alternative D is the preferred alignment and set	2
D Design and Alignment Questions	4
E Concerns about shoulder being close to house and accidents	1

F	Question about oversized loads	2
G	Questions regarding roadway surface and shoulders	2
H	Will we be notified if the alignment changes	1
I	Utilities	2

## 2.0 INTRODUCTION

This document summarizes a public meeting conducted for SH-11 from the SH-11/SH-123 intersection east of Barnsdall, extending southeast approximately 2.0 miles in Osage County. The Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT), in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), is proposing to improve the SH-11 roadway, that includes two bridge structures. This segment of SH-11 has inadequate shoulders, sharp curves, and steep hills and valleys which result in limited sight distance contributing to substantial accident history. There are two narrow bridges over Dog Thresher and Little Dog Thresher Creeks within the project limits that do not meet current design standards. The purpose of this project is to correct a narrow roadway to improve safety.

ODOT tasked a Consultant to develop alternatives for correcting the roadway deficiencies while taking into consideration construction costs, right-of-way and utility costs, and environmental constraints. The approximately two-mile project has been broken into west mile segment and the east mile segment for discussion purposes. The west mile extents are from SH-123 extending east 1 mile to approximately 0.25 miles east of NS-385 Road. The east mile extents are from approximately 0.25 miles east of NS-385 Road extending east 1 mile to approximately 0.35 miles east of CR- 2331 Road. For Alternatives B, C, and D the offset to the south on the west mile is due to the fixed connection at SH-123 and the existing curves.

- Alternative A – Total new alignment ¼ mile to the north of existing SH-11.
- Alternative B – Improve roadway on or near existing, with west mile offset to the south, east mile offset to the north, with a 65-mph design speed; using existing lanes to maintain traffic during construction.
- Alternative C – Improve roadway on or near existing, with west mile offset to the south, east mile offset to the south with a 65-mph design speed; using existing lanes to maintain traffic during construction.
- Alternative D – Improve roadway on or near existing, west mile offset to the south, east mile offset to the south with a 55-mph design speed; using existing lanes to maintain traffic during construction.

After analysis and consideration of the alternatives, SH-11 is proposed to be reconstructed on or near the existing alignment, west mile offset to the south, east mile offset to the south with a 55-

---

mph design speed (Alternative D). The east mile offset to the south will result in a channel change to Little Dog Thresher Creek but will avoid higher excavation cost, oil/gas wells and ponds; while improving sight distance by correcting steep curves and slopes.

The project will also include replacement of the two narrow bridges within the project limits. The proposed roadway will have two (2) 12-foot-wide driving lanes and 8-foot-wide paved shoulders. One to two lanes will be open for through traffic during all phases of construction. The purpose of the public meeting was to present the proposed design for this highway segment and receive public comment.

### 3.0 AGENCY SOLICITATION

Agency solicitation letters were mailed on August 25, 2017. These letters provided a project description with an enclosed project location map and proposed alternative map. The letter requested recipients provide input by October 9, 2017 and included an invitation to the public meeting. This letter was sent to thirty-three (33) State and Federal agencies including the Kaw Nation, Osage Nation, Pawnee Nation, United Keetoowah Band of Cherokees, Wichita and affiliated Tribes, and Osage Minerals Council.

#### 3.1 AGENCY COMMENTS AND ODOT RESPONSES

The agency letters received are summarized below along with an ODOT response.

- 1) The **National Park Service** had no comments at this time.

**ODOT Response:** Your response is appreciated. This comment is noted.

- 2) The **Bureau of Land Management** conducted a search of our files showing there are no BLM surface lands or Federal minerals within or near the project area. There is no BLM administered Indian mineral interests near or within the project area. Therefore, the BLM has no concerns or objection to the proposal.

**ODOT Response:** Your response is appreciated. This comment is noted.

- 3) The **Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ)** provided recommendations prior to beginning any construction activity disturbing more than one acre, you must submit an NOI and obtain authorization under OKR10, construction storm-water. Also, since this project is located within the Tulsa Metropolitan Statistical Area, any burning associated with land clearing operations must be conducted using an Air Curtain Incinerator.

---

**ODOT Response:** Your response is appreciated. These two comments for a construction Stormwater permit and the use of an Air Curtain Incinerator will be complied with during construction.

- 4) The **Oklahoma Conservation Commission (OCC)** stated the project area spans two stream channels and associated riparian corridors and potentially riparian wetlands. The OCC has several general concerns that should be addressed throughout this project. One concern is siltation problems and mechanical disturbance in the waterbody itself. OCC recommends plans that reduce disturbance, and thus siltation, in the waterbodies and erosion control plans. OCC also recommends minimizing changes in the stream configuration or if the streams must be manipulated, natural designs be used to reshape and stabilize the stream. This natural stabilization method is considerably more economical and beneficial to the environment than historical stabilization techniques. If this method cannot be used, OCC recommends that permanently protected riparian mitigation be implemented possibly through a conservation easement. Tying to this recommendation, OCC suggests that sufficient cross-sectional drainage area through the bridge crossings be incorporated in the plan to allow for maximum periodic flood drainage. OCC requests that following completion of this project, the streams remain free flowing (stream slope unaffected by construction) with naturally vegetated stable banks and with stream substrate free of excess sedimentation from project activities.

**ODOT Response:** Your response is appreciated. ODOT will prepare and provide an erosion control plan for the contractor to follow for this project to prevent erosion and siltation during construction. The requests for free-flowing banks and natural vegetation are noted and will be considered during design.

- 5) The **Oklahoma State Parks – Oklahoma Tourism and Recreation Department** commented that this proposed project will have no adverse impact on any federally funded park or State Park. Lake Waxhoma appears to have recreation facilities, but it was not funded with LWCF. The only thing affected would be traffic circulation of a temporary nature. The City of Barnsdall appears to manage it according to the Oklahoma Water Resources Board.

**ODOT Response:** Your response is appreciated. The project, as designed, will not impact Lake Waxhoma.

- 
- 6) The **Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation** stated there are no known species of state concern to consider in Osage County. They stated we needed to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding Federally listed species.

**ODOT Response:** Your response is appreciated. ODOT will consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding Federally listed species.

## 4.0 PUBLIC MEETING

### 4.1 MEETING NOTIFICATION

In addition to the notification provided via the agency solicitation letters (see above), notice of the public meeting was sent by letter to the Governor's office, elected officials (federal and state), Federal Highway Administration, Oklahoma Transportation Commissioner, Indian Nations Council of Governments, Osage County Commissioners, the City of Barnsdall, local school districts, emergency service providers, post offices, oil & gas facilities and medical facilities in the project area. The letter provided a brief description of the purpose and need for the project, and an invitation to the public meeting. The letter was accompanied by a project location map. Twenty-four (24) letters were mailed on August 24, 2017.

Notice of the public meeting was also sent by letter to all property owners in the study area. Thirty-six (36) letters were mailed on August 25, 2017.

### 4.2 MEETING INFORMATION AND FORMAT

The public meeting was held on September 21, 2017 at 6:00 PM in at the Barnsdall High School Auditorium located at 200 8th Street in Barnsdall, Oklahoma. Thirty-eight (38) attendees signed in for the meeting, including seven (7) members from ODOT. The Barnsdall Fire Department and Barnsdall School representatives were present. One newspaper reporter was in attendance.

ODOT opened the meeting, then Keven Kriewall with Craig and Keithline presented the project design, followed by an Able Consulting presentation about environmental constraints. Following was an open question and answer period in which ODOT and Craig and Keithline answered questions. ODOT, Craig and Keithline and Able Consulting staff was then available for one-on-one and small group discussions. Strip maps of the proposed project were provided for public viewing.

The presentation covered:

- Purpose of the Meeting and Project
- Current Project Area Information
- Design Criteria



- Alternatives Considered
- Preferred Alternative
- Video
- Project Schedule

#### 4.3 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC MEETING COMMENTS

Public comments addressed varying issues. One gentleman asked numerous questions about the alignment, curves, design speed and cost. Others asked questions about funding, oversized loads, and shoulders. During the small group session property owners were glad to know where the improvements were to be located, even if their property was impacted. ODOT right-of-way agents were in attendance and answered questions for the property owners that were impacted. There were lots of reports of automobile accidents along the roadway and agreement with the need for safety improvements along SH-11. Four residents that live near to each other all commented on a hill that is a crest vertical curve (located east of SH-123) that currently meets the project 3R design criteria and is not currently scheduled for modification.

A summary matrix table of the public meeting comments is provided in Table 3.

**Table 3: Public Meeting Comment Matrix**

	Comment	# of Comments
A	Support for the Project – During open meeting period	
B	Funding	2
	<b>Assume the project is funded and will happen?</b>	
	<b>Will there be a tax offset by improving the roadway?</b>	
C	Alternative D is the preferred alignment and set	2
	<b>Alternative D is the preferred alignment and set.</b>	
	<b>I will have to contact our Representative to get another alignment selected?</b>	
D	Design and Alignment Questions	4
	<b>Why are there still curves, why can't we have a straight road?</b>	
	<b>Why is the design for only 55 mph, why not 65 mph?</b>	
	<b>We can't get a straight road because of cost?</b>	
	<b>Sight distance issues at driveways, will the hill be bulldozed down.</b>	
E	Concerns about shoulder being close to house and accidents	1

	<b>The road shoulder will be in my yard and worried about accidents to my house?</b>	
F	Question about oversized loads	1
	<b>SH-11 has large oversize loads and causes problems. Are you aware of this and have you considered in your design?</b>	
G	Questions regarding roadway surface and shoulders	2
	<b>What are you going to do to the actual road surface?</b>	
	<b>Will the shoulder fail like in Skiatook?</b>	
H	Will we be notified if the alignment changes	1
	<b>Will the shoulder fail like in Skiatook?</b>	

#### 4.4 WRITTEN PUBLIC COMMENTS

Four (4) written comments from the public were received, both at the meeting and after the meeting.

**Table 4: Written Comments Matrix**

	<b>Comment</b>	<b># of Comments</b>
A.	Utilities	2
	<b>1a. AT&amp;T Transmission Lines under the property are not present in the project area.</b>	
	<b>2a. An AEP transmission line crossing is located on the east end of the project just on the west side of Lake Waxhoma. From the initial inspection this road project does not appear to impact our Transmission line, but a final determination can't be made until full plans with cross sections are provided so that clearances can be checked.</b>	
	<b>ODOT Response:</b> These comments are noted and appreciated.	
B.	Support for project and design	2
	<b>3a. Like the idea of leveling hills and valleys.</b>	
	<b>4a. Should have been done years ago. Lives matter more than any property.</b>	
	<b>ODOT Response:</b> These comments are noted and appreciated.	
C.	Concern for roadway to handle ultra-heavy wide loads, that use SH-11	1

---

**3b. Concern with road construction to stand up under ultra-heavy wide loads that are routinely routed through SH-11. Need to beef up the bed for weight.**

**ODOT Response:** A geotechnical study will be completed, and a pavement plan recommended. Your comments will be considered during the final design.