

Virtual Open House Meeting Summary

States Highway 51

Wagoner County / Job Piece # 33806(04)

SH-51 connection with Muskogee Turnpike (SH-351)

Held June 8, 2021 to June 22, 2021

Weblink: [SH-51 Connection with Muskogee Turnpike - Wagoner County](#)

Prepared by:



9225 North 133rd East Ave.
Owasso, OK 74055

July 6, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u>	2
<u>2.0 INTRODUCTION</u>	3
<u>3.0 VIRTUAL OPEN HOUSE</u>	4
<u>3.1 MEETING NOTIFICATION</u>	4
<u>3.2 OUTREACH</u>	4
<u>3.3 MEETING INFORMATION AND FORMAT</u>	6
<u>4.0 COMMENTS</u>	6
<u>4.1 PHONE CALL COMMENTS</u>	6
<u>4.2 WEB-PAGE, WRITTEN COMMENTS , INTERACTIVE MAPS COMMENTS</u>	7
<u>5.0 AGENCY SOLICITATION LETTERS</u>	18
<u>5.1 AGENCY COMMENTS AND ODOT RESPONSES</u>	18
<u>6.0 DATA ANALYTICS AND SIGN IN</u>	19

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE 1: WEBPAGE, WRITTEN AND INTERACTIVE MAP COMMENTS</u>	6
---	---

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>MAPS 1 and 2: DIRECT MAIL ROUTE</u>	5
--	---

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT) held a virtual open house to present the proposed design alternatives for a SH-51 Connection with the Muskogee Turnpike (SH-351), beginning 0.43 miles east of Midway Road extending northeast to the Muskogee Turnpike (SH-351), in Wagoner County. The meeting presented the design for the project and allowed the public to submit input. Due to concerns over the spread of COVID-19, this was a web-based format (no in-person meeting) held June 8, 2021 through June 22, 2021 at [SH-51 Connection with Muskogee Turnpike - Wagoner County](#).

The purpose and need for this project is to provide a connection from the Muskogee Turnpike (SH-351) to SH-51 in the Broken Arrow and Coweta area. The need is consistent with the Long-Range Plans for the area and will involve an interchange and roadway improvements that best serves the traveling public and provides adequate capacity for the connecting network of local roads. ODOT has tasked a consultant to develop alternatives for connecting the two highways while taking into consideration construction costs, right-of-way and utility costs, and environmental constraints. Now that the virtual open house has concluded, the meeting material can be found at: <http://www.odot.org/publicmeetings>.

Regarding the interactive maps, comments were provided on the three alternatives. Alternative 1 included an interchange at Midway Road and improvements to Midway Road to provide a 4-lane divided roadway, Alternative 2 includes an interchange at S 273rd E Ave with improvements to Midway Road and E 101st St S to provide a 4 lane divided roadway, Alternative 3 includes an interchange at S 273rd E Ave and virgin alignment to provide a 4 lane divided roadway.

The virtual public open house had participant activity that included: sixty-five (65) participants that signed into the virtual public open house, seven (7) phone calls were received and answered, twenty-nine (29) written comments and forty-four (44) comments were received through the webpage and interactive map. The written, webpage and interactive map comments were grouped into general categories as listed below with 73 comments. Some commenters had more than one comment per category:

<u># of Comments</u>	<u>General Category</u>
25	Support for Alternative 3- Preferred
9	Property Impacts
7	Are There Planned Improvements to 273 rd East Avenue
7	Support for Alternative 1
4	Fix the Roads We Have / None of the Alternatives is Desired
4	Do Not Support Alternative 1
3	Are There Planned Improvements for Bridge over 257th East Avenue
3	Noise Concerns
2	Support For Project In general
2	Toll Questions
2	Are There Planned Improvements for 101 st Street
2	Support for Alternative 2

1	Do Not Support Alternative 2
1	Impacts to Broadcast Tower
1	Impacts to Farm
1	Time Frame for Project
1	Traffic Questions
1	Selling Property
1	Drainage Issues
1	Future Land Use

Based on the comments received, Alternative 3 remains the preferred alternative to move into design with attention to the broadcast tower, drainage, and noise. Roadway improvements to local streets, including 273rd East Avenue, 101st Street and the bridge on 257 East Avenue were mentioned several times as needed if this project moves forward.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

This document summarizes a Virtual Public Open House conducted for the SH-51 connection to the Muskogee Turnpike (SH-351) within the Broken Arrow and Coweta area in Wagoner County. The purpose of the virtual open house was to present the proposed design alternatives for this highway connection and receive public input to aid ODOT in moving forward with the completion of the environmental studies, design, and construction. ODOT has tasked a consultant to analyze the best alternatives while taking into consideration construction costs, right-of-way and utility costs, and environmental constraints.

The purpose and need for this project is to provide a connection from the Muskogee Turnpike (SH-351) to SH-51 in the Broken Arrow and Coweta area. All alternatives include the addition of an interchange with the connecting road and the Muskogee Turnpike (SH-351). The typical connector roadway section will consist of four (4)-12 ft. wide driving lanes with 4 ft. inside and 10 ft. outside paved shoulders with a grass median. The study evaluated traffic safety and operations, constructability, construction time, right-of-way impacts, utility impacts, noise impacts, environmental constraints, compatibility with community development plans and construction cost. The three options considered are listed below.

Alternative 1 – Midway Road

- Turnpike interchange located at Midway Rd.
- Ramps accomplish all four directional movements.
- Improvements on Midway Rd to provide 4 lane divided connection from SH-51 to Muskogee Turnpike (SH-351).

Alternative 2 – S 273rd E Ave Option 1

- Turnpike interchange located at S 273rd E Ave.
- New bridge located in line with section line.

- Ramps accomplish all four directional movements.
- Improvements on Midway Rd and E 101st to provide 4 lane divided connection from SH-51 to Muskogee Turnpike (SH-351).

Alternative 3 – S 273rd E Ave Option 2 (Preferred Option)

- Turnpike interchange located at S 273rd E Ave.
- New bridge located very near current location.
- Ramps accomplish all four directional movements.
- New connection on virgin alignment to provide 4 lane divided connection from SH-51 to Muskogee Turnpike (SH-351).

ODOT/OTA recommend Alternatives 1 and 2 receive no further consideration due to utility and right-of-way costs, potential relocations, noise impacts, and community disruption. Therefore, Alternative 3 becomes the preferred alternative.

3.0 VIRTUAL OPEN HOUSE

3.1 MEETING NOTIFICATION

Due to concerns over the spread of COVID-19, a virtual open house was held that was a web-based format (no in-person meeting). The information was available June 8 through June 22, 2021. Now that the virtual open house has concluded, the meeting material can be found at: <http://www.odot.org/publicmeetings>.

In addition to the notification provided via the agency solicitation letters (see Section 5.0), notice of the virtual open house was sent by pamphlet to the Governor's office, elected officials (federal and state), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Oklahoma Transportation Commissioner, Oklahoma Turnpike Authority, Wagoner County Commissioners, City of Broken Arrow, City of Coweta, Coweta and Broken Arrow Public Schools, and emergency service providers in the project area. The pamphlet provided a brief description of the purpose and need for the project, purpose of the meeting, and an invitation to the virtual open house. The pamphlet was accompanied with a map, comment form and property rights brochure. Thirty-four (34) letters were mailed to public officials and government entities on June 4, 2021. One hundred eighty-five (185) landowners and eight (8) utilities were mailed the pamphlet June 4, 2021.

3.2 OUTREACH

Outreach was provided by a direct mailing by the post office to three (3) mail delivery routes along the project area as noted in blue in maps 1 and 2. Two-thousand-one-hundred-and-four (2,104) pamphlets, location map, comment forms, right-of-way brochures and self-addressed stamped envelopes were printed and mailed by Mercury Press Plus and direct mailed to Broken Arrow & Coweta Post Offices for distribution to routes 74014-R023 (Broken Arrow), 74014-R049 (Broken Arrow), and 74429-R006 (Coweta).

3.3 MEETING INFORMATION AND FORMAT

The virtual open house was held from June 8 to June 22, 2021, to present the information on this project. Poe and Associates hosted a website that included tabs for sign in and handout, virtual project presentation, project alternatives, an interactive project map, right-of-way information, project history, noise study, frequent questions, and submit a comment.

All comments were requested to be received on or before June 22, 2021. Written comments could be submitted by mail, email, or by use of an online comment form as described on the submit a comment page. Comments could also be added to the interactive map. Phone calls were also taken.

4.0 COMMENTS

4.1 PHONE CALL COMMENTS

Seven (7) phone call messages were received from the virtual open house. These phone calls were provided from the ODOT Public Involvement Officer and forwarded to the NEPA consultant to return. Each phone call was returned by the NEPA consultant, Able Consulting. A summary of each phone call is listed below along with the date the phone call was returned.

Caller 1: 6/7/2021 Caller owns MBS Manufacturing, and the building will be impacted by the preferred alternative. Caller just purchased the building last month and was not aware of study. After reviewing the property, caller was informed that impacts of the project could result in either a relocation of building or total take. Caller has been added to the mailing list and was sent the meeting materials. Caller was provided the lead designer and ODOT project manager phone numbers to keep up with project progress. It was explained that right-of-way and utilities are not programmed, there are no construction projects programmed. OTA has committed \$7.5 million for \$31 million project and sufficient funding is not secured. Currently, this is a study to determine the alignment. Could be 5 years plus before project happens.

Caller 2: 6/8/2021 Caller lives in neighborhood at E. 101st St and S 273rd and wanted to know when this will happen, and that letter said to call with questions. Caller was provided information as to website to visit, reviewed the project summary that right-of-way and utilities are not programmed, and no construction projects are programmed. OTA has committed \$7.5 million for \$31 million project and sufficient funding is not secured. Currently, this is a study to determine the alignment. It was explained to caller how the design has been shifted to the west to avoid the neighborhood caller lives in.

Caller 3: 6/10/2021 Caller felt that having two weeks to get a representative was not enough time. It was explained to caller that there is no funding for right-of-way or construction, and there was no need for a lawyer at this time. Caller asked when the project would happen? It was explained that OTA has committed \$7.5 million for \$31 million project and sufficient funding is not secured. Currently, this is a study to determine the alignment. Caller is in the middle of projects on his property and asked if they should move forward with improvements. It was explained that a property owner is free to make improvements on their property and there are currently no projects programmed.

Caller 4: 6/11/2021 Returned call and left message.

Caller 5: 6/14/2021 Caller asked if this was already decided/done. It was explained that no, these efforts were the initial efforts in a study, but that the preferred alternative was Alternative 3 which directly impacts her property. It was noted that the study would result in a final recommendation to ODOT/OTA for consideration in moving forward with the process. It was explained that the \$300,000 number quoted was related to utility relocation costs, not right-of-way acquisition costs and that we could understand her concerns on compensation if she felt we were going to divide the \$300,000 among the right-of-way relocates. Caller was provided information on relocation process and that it had not been determined who would be the agency acquiring at this point. Caller asked what the timeline was for anything to happen. Caller was informed that the OTA has \$7.5 million set for the project and that ODOT did not have the project for construction in their 8-year program. It was explained that one of the goals of the study was to have information for the locals to be able to request grant funds to help defray the cost of the project. Caller asked who the “locals” were, and it was explained that it would be Coweta, Broken Arrow and Wagoner County. Caller expressed concern that this could impact property if it were to be sold and that as a property owner would need to disclose, but it was not disclosed to them when they purchased property in 2014/2015. It was explained that it was likely true that they should disclose, and we not familiar with the status of any discussions or formal efforts in 2015, but that the long-range plans for Coweta and others included it. Caller asked if we had spoken with other landowners. It was explained that this was the first that had been passed to us. Caller indicated that the people off Midway would like to have offers and move. Caller indicated they needed more time to think of questions. Caller was provided phone number.

Caller 6: 6/15/21 Caller asked if ODOT and OTA are two separate state agencies? It was explained that yes, they were. Caller asked who will pay for this? The project summary was reviewed with caller, and it was explained that right-of-way and utilities are not programmed, and there are no construction projects programmed. OTA has committed \$7.5 million for \$31 million project and sufficient funding is not secured. Currently, this is a study to determine the alignment. It was explained how the design has been shifted to the west to avoid the neighborhood. Caller understand that a new addition at 273rd is being planned and there is a hill to the north that has accidents, and it will only get worse. Caller asked about noise, and it was explained that a noise screening was completed. Caller asked about pond, and it was explained that the project sponsor can drain a pond if needed to build the project. Caller said they built on property next to family and pond and very upset about the project.

Caller 7: 6/17/2021 Voicemail response – Caller lives at 85th Street and 257th Street and in Broken Arrow. Caller is in favor of the preferred option as sees it has the best solution for the area.

4.2 WRITTEN, WEBPAGE AND INTERACTIVE MAP COMMENTS

Seventy-three (73) written, webpage, and interactive map comments were received from the virtual open house. These comments received from the virtual open house are from citizens who left a comment on the webpage or provided a written response. These comments have been grouped into general categories for ease of reading in the table below. An ODOT response has been added at the end of each general category.

Written, Webpage and Interactive Map Comments	
Support for Alternative 3- Preferred (25 comments)	
1a	The sooner the better.
3a	I support this project and would like to see it begin as soon as possible.
5a	My statement is “yes”. The sooner the better, because I live south of SH-51. It will only benefit me without personal impact on my property for construction.
7a	Yes please! Please hurry
8a	I would prefer Alternative 3.
9b	I understand that there probably should be another access point for future development and out of the 3 proposed routes I would support the Preferred Route Alternative # 3. Looking at the area map via goggle it seems to me that that area would have a much less impact on property owners since a lot of that area seems un-developed. So, with all that said for me as a homeowner in the area the Preferred route (Alternative #3) gets my vote.
10a	After reviewing the information provided it is my opinion, along with my wife's, that the Alternative 3 (Preferred) option is the one we both feel will be the most beneficial to the area. The straight shot from HWY 51 to the interchange of the Muskogee Turnpike would be a great addition to the community. Thank you for the great pamphlet and the information provided for it provided all the information we needed to form an opinion.
15a	I too support Alternative Route 3. This seems less invasive of residential areas as found in Alternative 1 and 2. Also, Alternative 2 comes down a hill onto 111 th Street and truckers like to use there jake brakes descending hills. The noise generated would be a nuisance to the developments along the route below the hill. #3 would also get the National Guard vehicles into the Muskogee Turnpike in an efficient manner.
16a	We are all for the purple preferred route.
18a	We prefer Alternate 3 because we have almost 100 new homes here now and about to get so more I have been told. We need an alternate to Broken Arrow and Tulsa.
19a	Thank for letting us know about this construction. My preference is Alternative 3.
22a	Alternative 3 is the best choice. The areas north and south of 3 have and are growing/expanding, giving a better tax base, thus needing better roads for ingress and egress.
24a	I approve and support ODOT's SH-51 Connection Project. I approve and support ODOT's preferred alternative because it will provide a connection from OK 51 to the Muskogee Turnpike along S. 273rd Street which will improve safety and reduce congestion.
25a	Alternative 3 has the least impact on existing properties, while providing transportation access for a rapidly growing area of the region. I am glad to see the years of planning for the project coming to fruition.
27a	Please start the alternative #3 as soon as possible. This is a great plan.
28a	We want the interchange to be on 273 due to the influx of new homes being built in the area.
43a	Alternative 3 is the most logical choice for the developing area.
45a	We are in support of Alternative #3 foremost. This seems to effect fewer homes/property than #1 and #2, provide the best option for access to the SH-351 from SH-51, and will relieve SH-51 from increasing traffic especially in during rush-hour. Unfortunately, there are families/businesses that will be impacted, however, in the name of progress and future planning these changes need to happen. Many people will be against this, please count this comment as 2 votes/comments for the change.

46a	I agree with alternative #3. Exit and entrance ramps to the turnpike in this area have been needed for a long time.
49a	Since we would be displaced if you went with option 1, I am glad you prefer the 3rd option. With the current housing market and economy, it would be difficult to relocate. Not to mention all the other variables you laid out for us that would impact this area. Thank you for the thorough information.
53a	I am excited about this, I think that option 3 is the best for this area and look forward to the closer turnpike access in this area.
55a	Option/alternative 3 looks the best with least disruption for Wagoner County residents. Excited to have the addition to the turnpike. The other options looks like the would cause more disruption- noise, moving etc...for current homeowners.
56a	As a homeowner who would likely be impacted by Alternative 1, I am very happy to endorse Alternative 3, as it is the best option from all angles.
66a	Please go with the preferred alternative #3! This is the best option that displaces the least amount of families. We do not need Midway made into a 4 lane road. I will lose my backyard if you do that!
73a	I get to travel the area a lot. With the new housing on 273 rd and on 81 st , I feel Alternative 3 is the best.
ODOT Response: Thank you for your input and support for the project. ODOT/OTA recommend Alternatives 1 & 2 receive no further consideration due to utility and right-of-way costs, potential relocations, noise impacts, and community disruption. Therefore, Alternative 3 becomes the preferred alternative.	
Are There Planned Improvements to 273rd East Avenue (7 comments)	
1b	Will this include road expansion of 273 rd east avenue?
27b	273rd is a really rough road between 81st and 101st. Will 273rd be resurfaced?
41a	I live at 94th and 273rd. My greatest concern with this project connecting to 273rd is that Wagoner County keeps that road in HORRIBLE condition already. It also has severe drainage problems and some flooded places when it rains. Due to the fact that this project will bring much more traffic to 273rd (as many will want to head north on 273rd to the arterial road, 71st St) and it's condition will inevitably worsen. If this is the chosen alternative, I'd like to see this road improved to a superior condition with good drainage, road markings and curbs, at least to 91st St. There are about sixty houses in my neighborhood and we all share this concern.
47a	We live at 10525 s 273rd e ave, Coweta, ok 105th is a private drive not a street. 273rd between 101st and 111th has a very dangerous hill. Several people have died going up and down the hill. We have to cross 273rd to get to our mailboxes, which have been wiped out several times, due to the speed of traffic up and down the hill. Entrance to our property is over 100 years old and don't want it torn down. A 4-acre pond is our view and don't want it drained or disturbed. Has been there since turnpike was built in 1964. Family land has already been taken once for turnpike. Only pond for our future cattle. Have grandkids who shouldn't be expected to catch a bus on even busier road that will be 4 lane to our driveway.
58a	If option 3 is the preferred option what will be done with 273rd north of the existing turnpike. This road is in terrible condition; with the increased volume of traffic it will only get worse. At a minimum reconstruction needs to take place to 91st street and all of us that live on this road could argue taking it to 81st. These roads in their current state will not support excess traffic from having a on/off ramp and interchange off of 273rd. This needs to be taken into account when budgeting and securing funding for the project.

59a	<p>What about the feeder county road (S 273rd East Ave) from 71st street to project meeting at approximately S 97th Street? Will funds be allocated for county road improvements, including intersection safety/vegetation maintenance? This project (Alternative 2 or 3) will increase traffic on S 273rd north to 71st Street. This street, being on the border of two county commissioners, does not presently get much maintenance consideration. Will the county get some compensation to improve the roadway north? Have the county commissioners been contacted?</p>
63a	<p>Since I live on 273rd and my driveway exits onto 273rd, I have concerns about the increased traffic coming from the proposed turnpike exit. My street (273rd) is already a problem because we are located in Broken Arrow but are considered in the county because 273rd is the city limit border. This street is already in horrible condition, we have no speed limit signs and most people use it as their personal racetrack (especially contractors and non-residents). A stop sign at 94th & 273rd might help, but the increased traffic will only cause more road damage.</p>
<p>ODOT Response: Improvements to 273rd East Avenue would be the responsibility of the County or City of Coweta. ODOT has coordinated with the city regarding the proposed interchange and improving this road has been discussed with the city and will continue as this proposal proceeds. There are currently no improvements planned for the 273rd East Avenue roadway north of the turnpike as part of this project.</p>	
<p>Fix the Roads We Have / None of the Alternatives is Desired (4 comments)</p>	
2a	<p>I am trying to see who this connection would benefit? Possibly avoiding the toll plaza. But I am sure there will another put in its place. I hear toll money, property tax money, state tax money, lottery money, car registration and tag money go to roads, maintenance, and improvements. Where? I have been here 3 years and have not seen any. Roads are horrible. Cracks, potholes, paving issues. When the base is wet, you can't see the lanes. Roads probably have not been stripped in 5-7 years. Striped paint does not last that long especially in this heat. I would go for Alternative 3; I would say fix the roads we have before spending money on new ones.</p>
17a	<p>Having read the information you have provided; I find several things lacking.</p> <p>You have used facts and statistics without detailing the method or original of these facts and statistics. They are also 10 years or older. You did not use these statistics to project when and if traffic necessitated any of the alternatives. You stated that these roadways are currently under used, which has also been my observation on a daily basis.</p> <p>The future plans of Broken Arrow and Coweta are not compatible to substantiate the need for any of these alternatives.</p> <p>Currently, hwy 51 and Muskogee Turnpike connect at 81st and again a few miles E of Coweta. Traffic flow, observed at multiples times, does not show a need for any of these alternatives. Any of these alternatives would be a convenience, but not enough to warrant this amount of undetermined money.</p> <p>The amounts you give do not include many of the expenses (and so states). Further, you allow for no costs overrides which history says will occur and about in what percentage.</p> <p>Obviously, none of these alternatives are desired. Any money could be better spent in repair or improvement of what already is in place, rather than make more problems.</p>

52a	Please no. The area is already growing faster than it can keep up with. This would only make it easier for the area to grow even faster. There are no traffic jams out here. There are no major issues other than road maintenance that isn't taken care of. We don't need to add more roads with more traffic to the problem. Not to mention it's SO close to the neighborhoods. Neighborhoods we chose to move to knowing there was no connection between the two highways. Neighborhoods that are full of young families with young children that will have added danger close by. Please spend this money on improving the already existing roads. Don't add to all the already existing problems.
67a	Current substantial facts and total figures are needed to validate the necessity of this roadwork regardless of alternative 1,2, or 3. Hwy 51 and Muskogee tpk connect at 81st and again 5 mi on E side of Coweta.
ODOT Response: The Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT) and Oklahoma Turnpike Authority (OTA) have worked jointly with Wagoner County, City of Broken Arrow, City of Coweta and Indian Nations Council of Governments (INCOG) in development of this proposal. This connection is within INCOG's 2045 Regional Transportation Plan, and both the Cities of Coweta and Broken Arrow are supportive of the project. The next phase of the study will include detailed cost estimates for right-of-way and design.	
Do Not Support Alternative 2 (1 comment)	
4a	My family recently moved to Coweta. We moved here to be secluded. We picked this area because its away from super close highway access. If this project is a must our vote is for Alternative 1. If that is not possible, then our second pick would be Alternative 3. We DO NOT want Alternative 2; it is way too close to our new home.
ODOT Response: ODOT/OTA recommend Alternatives 1 & 2 receive no further consideration due to utility and right-of-way costs, potential relocations, noise impacts, and community disruption. Therefore, Alternative 3 becomes the preferred alternative.	
Support For Project In general (2 comments)	
6a	Look forward to any option, this area has been land locked for too long. We welcome the idea. Time for progress and growth. Bring it on.
51a	I am in favor of adding an entrance ramp to the turnpike. I feel like this should have been done from the start. We have definitely grown and now need the access. Myself and several of my neighbors work in Muskogee. This would save time and hassle for us all. I am in favor of the option that is the most cost effective and least damaging. Thank you for considering my thoughts on this matter.
ODOT Response: Thank you for your input and support for the project.	
Do Not Support Alternative 1 (4 comments)	
9a	As a resident of Sliver Lake, (Oneta Road and 96 th / Rosewood Dr.) I would like to voice my opinion and opposition one of the proposed connection options. I strongly oppose the Midway Road Alternative # 1: There is already way too much Traffic Noise from the Turnpike now where it runs parallel to 96 th and Rosewood. Placing a new connection in this area will only make a bad situation worse and further diminish our neighborhood Property Values. Nobody wants to constantly hear highway Noise 24/7 with 18-wheeler Jake brakes and horns, screaming motorcycles and loud jacked up trucks.
42a	As a homeowner that would be impacted by Alternative 1; I strongly oppose Alternative 1. We purchased our home and 1 acre for children to be able to run freely and enjoy our backyard as they grow up. Alternative 1 poses a safety risk for our family as the turnpike would be closer to our home. This concerns me as a

	parent and an individual for the sake my children playing in the backyard and also to know the turnpike will be closest to our master bedroom. Heaven forbid a car come through our home due to the 80 MPH speed limit or stranded drivers approach our my children or our home. I am fearful of the noise impact and rodent issue this will pose on our community. As a previous project led to an increase of rats into the neighborhood which impacted multiple family’s cars due to them eating car wires. The highway is loud enough as is. The idea of bringing it even closer to home is very concerning. Also, the idea of toll noises is very unfavorable. Please do not pursue Alt 1.
65a	Please rule out alternative 1 on Midway. The interchange is too close to too many homes. The other alternatives would better disperse traffic and not cause as many residences to be lost.
71a	I vote for the Alternative 3 or 2. Not Alternative 1.
ODOT Response: ODOT/OTA recommend Alternatives 1 & 2 receive no further consideration due to utility and right-of -way costs, potential relocations, noise impacts, and community disruption. Therefore, Alternative 3 becomes the preferred alternative.	
Support for Alternative 2 (2 comment)	
11a	I support Alternative 2. 273 rd E. Ave. / Oak Grove Road.
70a	I live off of 11 th in the Woods at Oak Grove. I do not think using 11 th would be the best fit because of flooding and the condition of the road. I think Midway Road would be better but there is flooding in one spot on that road as well, but it is in better condition than 11 th . So, I would vote for Midway Road or the new entrance that is Alternative 2. Please consider all the Walmart, McDonald, Sonic traffic. We have grown substantially and 111 th is already hard to navigate.
ODOT Response: ODOT/OTA recommend Alternatives 1 & 2 receive no further consideration due to utility and right-of -way costs, potential relocations, noise impacts, and community disruption. Therefore, Alternative 3 becomes the preferred alternative.	
Impacts to Broadcast Tower (1 comment)	
12a & 62a	<p>I am the General Manager of KJRH-TV, Channel 2 and the NBC affiliate in Tulsa. I am writing to discuss the proposed new State Highway 51 connection known as Alternative 3. On behalf of Scripps Media, inc., owner of KJRH-TV and KOTV-TV (collectively “Scripps”), I am writing to express concerns about the engineering impact and cost of Alternative 3, which we believe has been greatly underestimated by Poe and Associates.</p> <p>Scripps owns a broadcast tower adjacent to the proposed Alternative 3 site. This tower was built in 1984 and is a registered structure with the Federal Aviation Administration, (RN 1011355). In addition to housing transmitters for KJRH and KOTV, the tower houses transmitters for the local PBS television and NPR radio station. It also is home for two doppler radars that provide critical weather information for northeastern Oklahoma. Alternative 3 would directly impact the viability of one of the tower’s guywire anchors not only during construction but also during operation. Specifically, the proposed roadway would run so close to the anchor point of the guywire as to guarantee an eventual vehicle/anchor accident. The guy wire anchor is critical to the tower structure. Below the anchor is a significant amount of concrete. Routine tensioning and/or replacement of guy wires requires a large work area around the guy anchor.</p> <p>The result of either a construction issue or auto accident into the anchor would jeopardize and could directly cause the failure and collapse of the tower supporting our broadcast infrastructure. This tower, located at 36’ 1 ‘14.78’N by 95’ 40’31.88’W, stands at 1,839’ tall. Its failure in a worst-case scenario could put at risk the homes across S. 273rd and could potentially fall across the Muskogee Turnpike (SH-351).</p>

We believe Poe and Associates has dramatically underestimated Right-of-Way acquisition for Alternative 3. This alternative would require significant reengineering, barrier and infrastructure improvements and possibly the wholesale construction of a new tower at such a location and height so as to match our current broadcast envelope, resulting in millions of dollars of expense.

We ask you to seriously consider these risks and costs and invite further direct discussion as this project moves forward.

ODOT Response: Thank you for your comment and concern regarding safety and cost in regard to potential damage of the Scripps broadcast tower anchors. During the development of the refined Alternative #3, the location of the guy wire anchors was specifically considered as a constraint in setting the geometrics of the proposed improvements. Please know that sufficient room is provided to keep both the guy wire anchor and the traveling public safe in this instance. Provisions will be incorporated in the final design efforts to ensure that neither the anchor nor the public are unduly exposed to a dangerous situation. Additional discussions and coordination will take place throughout the process, avoiding any design aspects that would necessitate the relocation of the tower or anchors.

Impacts to Farm (1 comment)

13a We own a 38-acre property in which we have both breeding and raising racing quarter horses since 1997. To do the interchange on Midway Road would cause havoc to our farm operation.

Seems that the most logical location for the interchange would be in the 273rd Street area which is more open. Further consideration is the large housing development off Midway Road in proximity to the Basin Area development, Forest Ridge and all housing in between.

We developed this raw land into a commercial horse breeding enterprise providing a lot of employment in the area. We have invested since 1997 over 8 million dollars in the farm, the buildings, the enterprise and it would be devastating if our operation were disrupted by a cloverleaf involving our property or access to it. It seems that the logical place to create access would be east of armory with access to the back past our property.

ODOT Response: ODOT understands it is difficult on property owners when land is needed for proposed improvements. If land is needed, ODOT will try to minimize the impact as much as possible.

Support for Alternative 1 (7 comments)

14a I think connection is needed. Like Alternative 1.

20a Alt 1 should be used!! 273rd cannot handle the traffic. Too many blind hills from 91st to 71st narrow, poor road has never been maintained for the 10 years I have lived here. You will create many accidents. Too many animals are on this road deer, turkey, dogs. You will create road death between 91st and 71st. Use Midway Road.

21a We want Alternative 1 because its closer to HWY 51 and we live closer. That would be so awesome.

40a Our household would love to see the Alternative 1 – Midway option. The road and bridge on Midway needs to be redone anyway and this option would be much more convenient for homeowners living near the area.

50a I believe option 1 would be the best option, the bridge over the Muskogee turnpike is in desperate need to be widened for the first. Secondly, I think it would be the most efficient option for the traffic that you expect/want for this expansion. Third it seems to be the less intrusive with the widening of Midway and adding on & off ramps.

54a	I have been wanting this for years, as have many of our neighbors. We would very much prefer the Midway option. It would also decrease traffic on many of the two-lane roads headed to Tulsa or Muskogee. Please pick Midway ODOT! 😊
72a	I feel the best route to the turnpike would be the Alternative 1. Alternative 3 route could definitely not be a good route to the Turnpike. There would be definitely more impacts on Alternative 3.
ODOT Response: ODOT/OTA recommend Alternatives 1 & 2 receive no further consideration due to utility and right-of-way costs, potential relocations, noise impacts, and community disruption. Therefore, Alternative 3 becomes the preferred alternative.	
Property Impacts (9 comments)	
23a	From what I see on the map of proposed construction, it looks like my property at 27527 E 101 st s will not be affected, other than inconvenience while the intersection of 273 rd and 101 st is being worked on. Will ODOT need my property for this proposed project?
31a	Alternatives 2 and 3 bulldozes my family’s entire ranch. You appear to have \$300k budgeted for the “4 relocation’s” created by option 3. Unfortunately, your math is awful. In order to replace my 13-acre ranch with two barns, pipe gated entry, and all the pipe and cable fencing and cross-fencing, as well as the \$50k we have put into updating the interior, by the OK State Constitution you will have to provide us with just compensation. Clearly you have not looked at comps for 10+ acre properties. I want to keep my home and will be contacting an eminent domain attorney immediately. Have you spoken to any of the residents in the Rausch Coleman homes for Alternative 1? I have and many would love to be bought out. You need to continue your information gathering and provide more details.
32a	You cannot build this you will be destroying beautiful land along with 13 acres that belongs to my friend!! They family has lived on the property for a while now YOU can’t just go and bulldoze it down. That is not right!! Stop with this project, we do not need this.
33a	We’ve lived here for 6 years. We’ve put countless hours and money into making this house our home. My girls have spent most of their lives in this house. We’ve buried animals out here that we loved and were a part of our family. We planned to spend the rest of ours here. We do not need another access ramp onto the turnpike. It’s a 20-minute drive to Tulsa. It seems insane to force families out of their homes and spend 31 million dollars to save a few minutes maybe. All this will do is have more people skipping Coweta businesses and go straight to Tulsa and or from Tulsa straight home. It will ruin our life and ruin Coweta’s already struggling economy.
34a	Alternative 2 and 3 and the impact it creates on those living there is not represented in your info. Looking over the presentation you have undervalued the horses and land. You are cutting through ranches and business. While monetarily giving an estimate for relocation to be only \$300,000. When looking over the value of the houses in the path of your evaluation. The house and ranches are of considerably more value than that of your estimate. This as well tearing through the ranches and businesses located on the path are going to take from the livelihood of the people that live on the path. You have deemed alternate 3 the preferred choice of displacement without taking into account the lives you will be affecting. I encourage you to reconsider the options as none of them are good and will be tearing homes apart.
35a	Taking someone’s land that they are living on, have children on, have animals on, and are clearly working to build a home on is a ridiculous way for the state grab for money. You are trying to build more roads that you are just going to neglect. Take care of the roads we already have. The roads that cause damage to our vehicles on a daily basis. Do not take these people’s land away from them. You are being a bunch of bullies and should be ashamed of yourselves. They have worked hard for everything they have and what they have done. How do you sleep at night? Finish some of the construction we already have before you even attempt to start something else.

36a	I am extremely irritated to think that ODOT has proposed to steal an amazing family's ranch that they have worked so hard on. It is wrong and unethical for you to do this to this family. How on earth can you destroy a family's dreams just to convenience others? We can only hope that when an attorney get involved that he will make you pay for the mistake you are about to make.
38a	I oppose this due to the fact it is not necessary. Part of this will take away beautiful homes that people have built and made their forever homes. There is more than just money or easier transportation with this, it would greatly be an inconvenience to my family who has put their heart and souls into making their ranch a home to a lot of animals that depend on them. This is their home it's not fair to have someone be able to take that away. I hope you can reconsider the devastation this would cause to many people.
57a	Bought my home over 2 years ago. Have spent money fixing interior/exterior with my plans to retire in this home. News of this addition ramps/interchange is very concerning. The thought of my home getting bought out & demolished is even more concerning. In my area there are numerous owners which, im sure, feels the same fear & concern. Please don't take this nice neighborhood away from us. We all (& speaking for myself) moved out in this area for a reason. There is less occupied land elsewhere. But I must ask though, why is it even necessary to build this in the first place? To collect more revenue (turnpike tolls?) Yes this turnpike brings in travelers to Tulsa but it is not jammed pack with over flowing vehicles. Convenient new ramps & more toll is what I really fear is the reason behind this proposal. So, I can possibly lose my home because someone thinks convenient & more toll \$\$ is the answer. Again, please rethink on this proposal. My home & others are going to be greatly affected.
<p>ODOT Response: ODOT understands it is difficult on property owners when land is needed for proposed improvements. If land is needed, ODOT will try to minimize the impact as much as possible. The \$300,000 number referenced is related to utility relocation costs, not right-of-way acquisition costs. There will be new right-of-way required for any of the alternatives. The proposed right-of-way is preliminary at this time and will be refined as the design and construction plans are developed. If your property will be affected, an ODOT- authorized agent will contact you in the future. Currently, there is no funding for right-of-way acquisition.</p>	
<p>Time Frame (1 comment)</p>	
23b	When is the estimated time frame for beginning this project? About how long will it take, beginning to end?
<p>ODOT Response: There is no date for construction, the schedule is dependent on funding and subject to change. OTA has \$7.5 million set aside for the project and ODOT does not have any projects listed in their 8-year program for the proposal. One of the goals of the study was to have information for the locals to be able to request grant funds to help defray the cost of the project. Construction itself could take 365 days or more for the entire project.</p>	
<p>Traffic (1 comment)</p>	
26a	The presentation showed the existing traffic at the affected intersections, but I didn't see how this improvement would affect the future traffic patterns. Did I miss that or is there a map showing what the anticipated traffic counts would be after the improvement?
<p>ODOT Response: The presentation included discussion of the future roadway system based upon the results of the operational analysis. Local roadway network in all alternatives is predicted to operate similarly and there are predicted needs for capacity improvements for the signalized intersections of SH-51 at Midway and at E 111th.</p>	
<p>Are There Planned Improvements for Bridge over 257th East Avenue (3 comments)</p>	
44a	Although I'm opposed to Alternative 1 as it is proposed, I am concerned about the safety of the current narrow bridge on 257 th E Ave that crosses over the turnpike. My question is; If Alternatives 2 or 3 are chosen, are there any plans to replace the narrow Midway bridge to meet the needs of the growing area?



65b	However, regardless, the bridge on Midway needs to be expanded to 2 full width lanes just to safely accommodate the existing traffic
68a	We have got to do something about the bridge on 257th and the turnpike. It is way too small for the amount of traffic that we have in that area. I love the interchange idea at 273rd but can we fix 257th bridge as well???
ODOT Response: Improvements to the bridge on 257 th East Avenue would be the responsibility of the County. ODOT has coordinated with the local governments regarding the proposed interchange. There are currently no improvements planned for the bridge over the Turnpike on 257 th East Avenue roadway.	
Noise Concerns (3 comments)	
29a	As a homeowner I'm deeply concerned about options 1 & 2 and the process and expenses of relocating. Option 3 warrants it's own concerns as well. In Turtle Creek Neighborhood at Midway the Turnpike already puts off a lot of noise impacts. Our HOA has asked for a noise study with the current route. I'm concerned adding more traffic and more access will just increase the noise level and drive down property values. I would highly recommend putting in a sound barrier wall along the neighborhoods and homes that are directly off of the turnpike.
37a	Our neighborhood is on the SE corner of Midway and 91 st street. The Muskogee Turnpike runs along the south side of our neighborhood. The noise level is already absurd, there's not a day without traffic noise. We are having to plant trees that will help to block the current noise level and that is going to prove to be a feat in itself. There is a peaceful horse farm along the south side of the neighborhood that butts up to the turnpike and I would hate to see that go as well. If the Turnpike was to use the Alternate 1 proposal it would wipe out all of the houses behind us and it would literally sit in our backyard. This is frustrating not only because of the anticipated noise level but also because we are in the midst of having a pool.
47b	We live at 10525 s 273 rd E Avenue, Coweta, ok. Noise is already an issue for us. Will a noise barrier be built?
ODOT Response: Based on the noise analysis screening of the Alternative 3 proposed design and 2045 design year traffic volumes, no receptors will experience traffic noise levels that constitute a noise impact. Although at least one (1) noise impact is anticipated for either Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 proposed designs, additional impacts would also be anticipated due to those residential dwellings being in close proximity with the improved roadways and interchange involved. A detailed Traffic Noise Study will be completed once preliminary plans are available which will include model validation fieldwork.	
Selling Property (1 Comment)	
30a	I was getting ready to put my house on the market when I received your packets of information. My question is: When will a decision be made of which alternative will be the route taken? Listing now, I'd have to disclose the possibility of the ODOT needing to acquire the property which would hinder my potential sell. If Alternative 1 was not chosen and was publicly presented that way, then there would be no issue in trying to sell my house. However, when would that be decided and publicly announced?
ODOT Response: Based upon the current schedule, the final recommendations and decision should occur by fall 2020.	
Toll Questions (2 comments)	
39a	The connector will not have tolls, but will the ramps have toll gates? (ie, will a toll be charged from when the turnpike starts at the western Coweta exit to the new on/off ramps?) Thanks!



	<p>The connection roadway proposed looks bigger than the turnpike and the Highway 51. Is this connector a toll road? Do you have to pay?</p> <p>2. The presentation is not clear if any other roadway cross sections were considered. The SH-51 is 5 lanes. Can you not build just like that?</p> <p>3. The map is not clear about what the future right of way will be.</p> <p>4. Can public provide input into any design alternatives?</p> <p>5. When you get on the turnpike from this road, will you be required to stop and pay? Or will it be all electronic?</p> <p>60a 6. How much will be the toll to go to Tulsa if you take the Toll Road at this</p>
--	---

ODOT Response: The Muskogee Turnpike will have tolls, but the connection from SH-51 to the Turnpike will not have a toll. The roadway section was selected to provide a strong connection between SH-5 and the Turnpike. OTA is transitioning to system of PlatePay in addition to PikePass as an All-Electronic Tolling System. As such, future turnpike improvements will be geared toward this cashless approach.

Are There Planned Improvements for 101st Street (2 comments)

	<p>In alternate 3 the preferred project, will 101st Street be affected? This is coming very close to my neighborhood, and I would rather 101st street be left alone. Can it connect directly from the turnpike to Highway 51, not to encourage traffic near the quiet residential areas? I moved out this way for that reason. I do not support this project and do not think it is needed. Why not make an on-ramp on highway 51 for the creek turnpike, which is a few miles away from your proposed plan and then you can reach the Muskogee turnpike from the creek turnpike. Then no one is affected and it will cost a lot less. Try that way first. I think you will have very happy drivers, business owners and homeowners. When you bring an outside consultant in they don't drive the roads every day. This would be a great plan. We moved out this way for a reason and a few miles to drive to a new on ramp is Okay by me and keep my residential area quiet. Thanks for listening!!</p> <p>48a</p>
--	---

	<p>I'm concerned about increased traffic on 101st st between Hwy 51 & Midway. Through traffic and trucks routinely disregard signage and speed on this stretch to avoid the light at Hwy51 and Midway. What can be done to mitigate potential increases?</p> <p>69a</p>
--	---

ODOT Response: Improvements to 101st would be the responsibility of the County or City of Coweta. ODOT has coordinated with the city regarding the proposed interchange and improving 101s Street has been discussed with the city and will continue as this proposal proceeds. There are currently no improvements planned for 101st Street roadway outside of the interchange area.

Drainage Issues (1 comment)

	<p>We are happy the road will NOT affect our Church property. I have major concerns about water retention and flood management if the preferred choice is selected. We currently have a lot of drainage issues, and a lot of run off unto our parking lot from the ditch that runs along HWY 51 when we have heavy rains. We are restricted from enlarging the culvert pipes under our driveways by ODOT, yet the current HWY expends too much water for these culverts to handle. I have pictures and video of the many times we've had excessive run off into our property and have had to spend a large amount of Church funds to control water that is NOT ours. Please have a complete and thorough review of the drainage on HWY 51 and how these new roads will affect runoff and will we it not drain into the current ditches that will create flooding of our Church property. We have spoken with ODOT and the City of Coweta extensively about this, and neither of them seem willing to address.</p> <p>61a</p>
--	--

ODOT Response: Any alternative that is selected will be designed with appropriate considerations and controls on drainage aspects. Impacted drainage ditches and systems will be evaluated for any changed conditions to ensure that they properly function with the improvements.

Future Land Use (1 comment)	
64a	The road should serve future land use. Please address how this preferred option number 3 (purple) will serve future residential or commercial along all the roads. It is a good idea. It should help Coweta grow even more. Can you not make it a five-lane road and save some money?
ODOT Response: Improvements constructed as part of this project will include appropriate access controls to provide access. Coordination with the local governments will include recommendations to develop access control guidelines for this area to deal with new development as it occurs. The roadway section was developed in an effort to provide a strong connection between SH-51 and the Muskogee Turnpike.	

5.0 AGENCY SOLICITATION LETTERS

Agency solicitation letters were dated June 8, 2021 and were mailed during the virtual open house. These letters provided a short project description, website link, and enclosed project location and aerial maps. The letter requested recipients provide input by June 22, 2021 and included a link to the project presentation information. This letter was sent to thirty-eight (38) State and Federal agencies including the US Army Corps of Engineers, Tribal Nations and numerous State agencies.

5.1 AGENCY COMMENTS AND ODOT RESPONSES

Two (2) agency letter responses were received and are summarized below along with an ODOT response.

- 1) The **Oklahoma Aeronautics Commission** stated that based on the limited information provided and our cursory review, the potential project does not appear to pose a hazard to the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace.

ODOT Response: This comment is noted and appreciated.

- 2) The **Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)** stated no adverse environmental impacts under DEQ jurisdiction are anticipated for the project; however, please be aware of the following regulatory requirements:

A. Prior to beginning any construction activity disturbing more than one acre, you must submit an NOI and obtain authorization under OKR10, construction stormwater. If you need assistance, please contact DEQ's Stormwater Unit at (405) 702-6100.



B. It is unclear if water and wastewater utilities will need to be relocated as part of this project. Water and wastewater infrastructure projects that will require a construction permit from DEQ's Water Quality Division include the following:

- Construction of new water and wastewater treatment facilities;
- Modifications and upgrades to existing facilities;
- Construction of new water distribution and wastewater collection lines;
- Relocation of existing water distribution and wastewater collection lines.

Projects that do not require a construction permit include:

- Replacement of existing equipment with same type and size equipment;
- Replacement of existing water and wastewater lines with the same size line in the same location.

ODOT Response:

These comments are noted and ODOT will obtain authorization under OKR10, construction stormwater prior to construction.

6.0 DATA ANALYTICS AND SIGN IN

The data was analyzed from the SH-51 connection with Muskogee Turnpike webpage virtual public input page. Total homepage views included 3,632 users with 259 average daily views. The interactive map received 30.16% of the views, while the project presentation had 20.66% of the views.

Sixty-five (65) participants signed in for the meeting on the webpage.