

MINUTES
LMPO TRANSPORTATION POLICY BOARD
THIRD FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
JUNE 28, 2022

Minutes of the LMPO Transportation Policy Board meeting held June 28, 2022, in the 3rd Floor Conference Room, 212 SW 9th Street, Lawton, Oklahoma.

The agenda for the meeting was posted on the bulletin board in City Hall in compliance with the Oklahoma Open Meeting Act.

The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m. by Mayor Stan Booker.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Stan Booker
 Richard Rogalski for Jay Burk
 David Denham
 Jay Earp
 Sean Fortenbaugh
 Alan Hampton
 Ed Petersen

MEMBERS ABSENT: Steve LaForge
 Johnny Owens
 Debra Porter

ALSO PRESENT: Janet Smith, Planning Director
 Jonathon Stone, Planner
 Kameron Good, Planner I
 Charlotte Brown, Plans Supervisor

- 2. Verify posting of meeting.**
Recommended Action: Verification of posting time and date

June 24, 2022 at 11:00 a.m. by Tammy Anderson

- 3. Establish Quorum.**
Recommended Action: Establish that a quorum is present

Seven (7) of the ten (10) members present

- 4. Introductions.**
Recommended Action: Introduction of all individuals present.

Booker stated we are glad to have Tom Zigler with us from ASCOG.

5. Approval of Minutes.

Recommended Action: Motion to approve minutes from the May 3, 2022, meeting.

Motion by Rogalski, Second by Earp, to approve the minutes of May 3, 2022 as written. **Aye:** Rogalski; Denham; Earp; Fortenbaugh; Hampton; Petersen; Booker. **Nay:** None. **Motion Passed.**

6. Cancel the Transportation Policy Board meeting of July 5th 2022.

Recommended Action: Cancel July 5th Policy Board meeting.

Motion by Denham, Second by Earp, to cancel the July 5, 2022 meeting. **Aye:** Denham; Earp; Fortenbaugh; Hampton; Petersen; Booker; Rogalski. **Nay:** None. **Motion Passed.**

BUSINESS

7. Approval of the Phase 1 Scope of Services with EST for the Traffic Flow Study and to allow the MPO Director to sign the contract after review by the City Attorney.

Recommended Action: A motion to approve the scope of services and to approve the contract.

Smith stated we received approval from the City Attorney's Office on a prior contract and this is written exactly the same. You may recall you did approve the contract with EST for the traffic flow study. When we received their documentation, and the cost was extremely high. It was over \$200,000 for one (1) mile. MPO is not able to afford this. We negotiated with them, and you see there are four (4) areas we felt were the most significant to the study. The intersections of Gore at 4th and 6th Street for converting the signal to a flashing red or yellow signal and Gore and 2nd and Railroad for intersection improvement. If we go these four (4) areas the cost is \$70,000. Richard, Jonathon, Amanda, and I were all in the meeting with input from the policy board we felt these four (4) sections were the most problematic. We are bringing back to you today those four (4) areas for your approval.

Rogalski stated that is the location of the traffic count in that area. It shows us the area in the wet box from 6th Street all the way up to Douglas School. We originally wanted to include all the way to the intersection at Laurie Tatum, but we couldn't do so. You could do a cursory study of the whole thing, or an intense study of a small piece. We think an intense study is what we want because we want real solutions. For the dollars that were available we brought it down to what is showing. We are looking at some traffic counts and real options for those signals.

Denham asked why go west instead of east. The problem is 2nd to Laurie Tatum. The thought of more flashing lights downtown on Gore at 4th and 6th, I mean the ones that are downtown are already embarrassing. I can't image doing this farther west.

Rogalski stated that is just an option. You would have flashing yellow on Gore and red on the side streets. You might not do it for all of them. I'm not sure the signals are needed. We are looking at a signal analysis to see what you want there. The first step is putting in a flashing yellow and I think 6th Street is warranted. The second step would be to take it out completely. It doesn't

cost to put in a flashing yellow and you can see if it operates well. It's one thing to figure something out on paper and another in real life.

Booker asked what was our expectation of cost on this.

Rogalski stated just under \$70,000.

Booker stated I'm with David. I would rather study the overpass. You have a problem at Laurie Tatum. I had always heard the Comanche's requested that light and the Chairman says it is not any of their minutes. He doesn't care if we take it out. I can get a letter stating that if necessary. The other complaint I get is coming from the north and exiting onto Gore and the number of lights you have to sit through to go east.

Rogalski asked are you saying there is enough traffic during peak hours that they have to sit through several signals.

Booker stated yes. I don't know what is so hard about setting those lights at 4th and 6th blinking yellow and red for the cross street. I don't see what is so hard about that. Why can't we just do it.

Rogalski stated the questions is whether we need a study to say we do or don't need the signal. We can slide down and move it the other direction.

Fortenbaugh stated I-44 and by the public safety center are probably the worse. The public safety center is becoming a bottleneck.

Rogalski stated Railroad Street is not good. Someone turned left in front of me when I was the one with the green light.

Fortenbaugh stated it looks like an automated light, but it doesn't act like one.

Rogalski stated the problem is the width of the median and that you have two (2) signals instead of one (1). Every moment has to clear the whole intersection. The left turn has to have that much more time. That is what causes the biggest problem. If you want to slide down to Laurie Tatum, we can see what the cost would be.

Booker stated I would rather do that. I'm still unclear. Can we put 4th Street blinking, or do we have to pay an engineer to study it?

Hampton stated the Traffic Commission could make that decision.

Rogalski stated I will talk with Larry. I need to see what his thoughts are. Theoretically yes you could do that.

Denham stated at 5:00 if you have a two (2) way stop nobody will ever be able to go north or south. Just take it out as opposed to blinking.

Rogalski stated if we put it to flashing it will show you if you can cross during peak hours. I believe you could. I believe that intersection the signal is six (6) feet.

Denham stated yes.

Rogalski stated that will create sufficient gaps. If I pull up to Gore at a stop sign, I will have to wait for one (1) signal for there to be a gap to drive through. My wife forces me to skip the signals on Gore. I have to go down a side street because the signal is too long.

Hampton stated the 4th street signal is there due to the old police station.

Rogalski stated yes, City Hall was there, and it was a different situation. It probably isn't a bad idea to look at it. We need to touch base with Larry. I'll have him look at that to give me his opinion.

Booker stated okay, back to the study. Will they study rush hour specifically?

Rogalski stated yes, they will do peak hours.

Booker stated I hate to leave out the area by the hospital. You sit through three (3) lights during rush hour. Can we change that during rush hour or make it longer, so it allows more traffic to go through before the light changes.

Rogalski stated it has to do with the technology in the signal. We can talk to Larry about that.

Denham stated they are all connected from 2nd Street to 38th Street as far as timing.

Booker stated traffic on Gore is such that I can't go from one end to the other like I can on Cache Road. It is because you have to many points of slowing down. The slow down at Sheridan messes up the timing.

Rogalski stated keep in mind that the contract with EST has fifty-five (55) miles of road.

Denham stated yes, it will take us thirty (30) years to do this.

Rogalski stated it has to do with the funding that has been allocated. Is this last year's money?

Stone stated no, it is FY 23's money. This is from the \$130,000 that we have. I would guess the \$130,000 would cover the five (5) signals we are talking about.

Rogalski stated so we have \$130,000 allocated for this fiscal year. We were going to use \$70,000 for the study and \$60,000 for implementation. We could expand the study to use all \$130,000 and then find funding for implementation. This is up to you. You can leave the study

boundary as it is, slide it over or expand the boundary. Which do you like, expanding or sliding it over?

Fortenbaugh stated I would say slide over. Fourth and 6th ought to be easy.

Denham stated I'm worried if we are going to do four (4) to six (6) blocks a year we will need to go back to this intersection before we get to Cache Road.

Rogalski stated we don't need to set at every place in town. We just need to look at the bad spots.

Denham stated we talk in Planning Commission that we were going to do a traffic flow survey of the town. They were talking all of Cache Road and the majority of Gore Boulevard. Not that much of Lee. We are not even getting to Sheridan and 38th, Fort Sill Boulevard and so forth. At four (4) intersections a year this is a farce.

Rogalski stated it depends on the height of the study. For our 2050 transportation plan we will do a flow module of the whole city. It is a higher-level flow model. We understand what the service is and where we are looking at trouble. When you are talking about this level it is a lower level where we are studying each intersection and the traffic patterns at small location. Doing a very intense study so we can make a physical change. There is a difference between a module that looks at how many lanes you need versus a module that says how to operate an intersection. If we are looking at that level of study, it is very expensive. If we were going to do that on every road and intersection and it will be expensive. We have a traffic SCADA project Larry is putting together. It will allow him to make some of those changes faster. He can do them from the desktop. If we spend \$100,000 on a study that says we have too many driveways on Cache Road I'm not sure what we can do about that. This we can fix.

Booker stated okay, so the \$60,000 isn't going to pay for any extended turn lanes or anything. It doesn't seem like it will cost \$60,000 to change the timing on the intersection lights. If we don't know what we need to do it doesn't matter how much money we have. Knowing what we need to do seems to take priority. There are other monies we can find to get things implemented or put a plan together of implementation over subsequent years. I would lean towards expanding this with what money we have.

Denham stated with the priority of Laurie Tatum west. If it doesn't get us to 6th Street at least get us to 2nd and possibly 4th.

Booker stated yes, I don't see any sense in studying 4th Street. Nobody wants the light. They can figure out what it is there for.

Denham stated right.

Booker stated unless we are required to have a study to remove the light, I don't see any point in spending the money. I'm not an engineer and don't know all the laws.

Hampton asked are we talking about the traffic to the eastside of Lawton.

Rogalski stated and some coming off I-44 and going east or west.

Hampton stated you have Rogers Lane, Gore and Lee Boulevard to get to that side of town and a lot of people are using Gore. There is probably not a solution to stop that as that side of town grows. It seems we will continue to have problems.

Rogalski stated the intersection configuration and timing can make it better than it is now. Removing the signal on 4th will make it better. To answer your questions there is not a law that says you have to do a study before removing a signal. It is a level of protection. If you do due diligence, you do a study and have some calculations that says the traffic signal is no longer required. Then you remove it, and you have that backing. You wouldn't change traffic arbitrarily and, in this case, it is not arbitrarily. We know that the two (2) major traffic generators are gone at that location. Let me talk with Larry to see what he thinks needs to be done.

Booker stated if we, and I assume it takes a vote, vote that we want to expand this, the question is, what can we cover. Can we get to Sheridan or Memorial Hospital?

Rogalski asked explain the area at Memorial Hospital you want studied. Are you looking at Sheridan to 38th or just 27th, 31st, and the signal at University Drive? What do you want us to look at?

Booker stated that area seems to be the most congested and one light can back up to the next. The other lights are far enough away that traffic doesn't backup. Whether that is all that needs to be studied or not I don't know.

Hampton asked that particular light changes before the offset, right? You have to have two (2) cycles to get going.

Rogalski stated we have a project that we funded the design to straighten that one out. I think it is time that we start looking at that seriously.

Hampton stated if that goes straight that will cut out a lot of time.

Rogalski stated we would remove the light at 26th and it would just be 27th crossing over and transitioning into 26th.

Booker asked what kind of motion do you need to expand this.

Rogalski asked will we have to bring back a revised contract.

Smith stated yes.

Rogalski stated we are looking for a motion of direction to revise the scope of service to include Laurie Tatum to 4th Street and whatever can be included on Gore between Sheridan and 38th up to \$130,000.

Denham stated prioritizing the light at the hospital and Cameron.

Booker stated we will accept that as a motion since you are representing Councilman Burk.

Motion by Rogalski, Second by Denham, to revise the scope of services to include Laurie Tatum Road east to 4th Street on Gore Boulevard and Sheridan to 38th on Gore Boulevard, with the priority at Memorial Hospital and Cameron, for the Phase 1 Scope of Services with EST for the Traffic Flow Study and to allow the MPO Director to sign the contract after review by the City Attorney. **Aye:** Earp, Fortenbaugh, Hampton, Petersen, Booker, Rogalski, Denham. **Nay:** None. **Motion Passed.**

8. Consider authorizing the Chairman to sign the No Cost Time Extension request for Congestion Mitigation-Air Quality Projects.

Recommended Action: A motion to authorize the signing of the No Cost Time Extension.

Smith stated this is a budgetary item moving monies that we received last year and rolling them into the upcoming year. We have not used them, and we don't want to lose them.

Booker stated okay, this is moving money into the following year.

Motion by Rogalski, Second by Hampton, to approve authorizing the Chairman to sign the No Cost Time Extension request for Congestion Mitigation-Air Quality Projects. **Aye:** Fortenbaugh, Hampton, Petersen, Booker, Rogalski, Denham, Earp. **Nay:** None. **Motion Passed.**

9. Consider authorizing the MPO to acquire a debit and/or credit card for used when other purchasing options are unavailable.

Recommended Action: A motion to authorize the acquisition of a debit and/or credit card for the MPO.

Smith stated through ODOT we have the ability to purchase office furniture and supplies as needed. Finance is not allowing me to use the planning department purchase card to make purchases for MOP even though we would be reimbursed. There are some office purchases we need to make, and we are asking for authorization to allow us a debit card to make it easier to make the purchases. Otherwise, we have to find someone that will allow us to get a check to them and that is a rarity anymore.

Motion by Petersen, Second by Fortenbaugh, to approve the MPO to acquire a debit and/or credit card for used when other purchasing options are unavailable. **Aye:** Hampton, Petersen, Booker, Rogalski, Denham, Earp, Fortenbaugh. **Nay:** None. **Motion Passed.**

10. Consider approving a resolution adopting the Fiscal Year 2023 Unified Planning Work Program for the Lawton Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process.

Recommended Action: A motion to approve the resolution adopting the FY23 UPWP.

Smith stated we have copies if you would like to see them. This is the annual plan that must be approved for our spending from what we receive from ODOT and a plan of the projects we do within that timeframe of a year. You see the projects we have done before. You see Kimley Horn towards the bottom which is called the Transit Alternative Fuel Study for the zero-emission bus study. We have our EST contract which we just discussed. We will have to conduct the transit master plan due to the LATS transfer station that we anticipate will be moving. This is the plan we have to provide ODOT and this board with a list of the projects.

Petersen asked what is the food desert analysis.

Smith stated this is in relation to what we anticipate doing with the LATS transfer system and bus routes. This is to make sure we provide those locations, so our ridership has the ability to purchase groceries. We need to know where our food deserts are. It is not a new project but one we are going to put more focus on.

Booker stated I appreciate you saying that. When I ran across that my thought was it has been here every year since I have been on the board, and I wasn't sure what we had done. You are telling me it goes into planning of routes.

Smith stated yes.

Rogalski stated the Health Department has funds available we can tie into. We take their data and see how it effects transportation. That is what we are doing.

Booker stated it wasn't a problem when I was going up. There was a grocery store every half mile. Today it is not so. Okay, can I have a motion for approval.

Motion by Fortenbaugh, Second by Earp, to approve a resolution adopting the Fiscal Year 2023 Unified Planning Work Program for the Lawton Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process. **Aye:** Petersen, Booker, Rogalski, Denham, Earp, Fortenbaugh, Hampton. **Nay:** None. **Motion Passed.**

CONSENT

(all items are in support of the FY23 UPWP)

Booker stated before I pull item fifteen (15) I want to make sure this is what we used to convert intersections to motion activation. Was that under Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality.

Stone stated yes.

Booker stated I'm going to pull item fifteen (15) for discussion. Are there any other items on the consent you wish to pull? How far does the consent agenda go? Is it all the way to adjournment?

Smith stated number twenty-four (24). Jay was talking to me earlier about it was unusual to have checks listed. I received those from finance and before we issue them, I wanted them to go through the approval process. We didn't get a finance report this month, but she did draw these checks based on money we have available.

Booker stated so, the consent agenda goes from item eleven (11) to twenty-four (24) with fifteen (15) being pulled.

Denham stated item twelve (12) talks about CMAQ as well.

Booker asked do we need to pull twelve (12).

Denham stated I don't know.

Booker stated let's go ahead and pull it and we will talk about those two (2). Do I have a motion for approval?

Motion by Fortenbaugh, **Second** by Denham, to approve the consent agenda with the exception of items twelve (12) and fifteen (15).

Earp stated I'm not familiar with the board approving individual checks. This is new to my knowledge. What has changed and why are we having to approving individual checks and not just the budget. Can we go back to approving the budget? Do other able authorities approve individual checks.

Smith stated if this governing body gives me the authority to administratively issue those checks, then we won't bring the checks back again. That was not stipulated. In other cities I have worked in it is a dual process. The budget is approved and then the issuing of checks is approved.

Booker stated since I have been here, we have operated the way you just described. It wasn't on the agenda. Has that caused any problems?

Rogalski stated not that I'm aware of. You and Janet sign them, so you have that separation/control. Susan is doing the books, so you have that separation/control. We have a very good set of things to control and hopefully we don't issue a check for something that wasn't approved. We never have before.

Booker stated okay, when will we start getting financial reports.

Smith stated Susan is working on those right now. It has been difficult for her to get all the information together.

Booker stated okay, Mr. Earp is asking that they not be on the agenda. We can't take action other than giving our opinion. Are you wanting action taken to relieve you of the responsibility of placing those on the agenda? If you are, you need to place it on the agenda for the next meeting.

Smith stated okay.

Denham asked who is HGT Lawton Management? We are paying them \$24,000.

Smith stated that is LATS and it is for the bus wraps for air quality and bike safety. Two (2) of the buses have wraps and the cost is a \$1,000 a month for each.

Rogalski stated MPO pays HGT and then it goes to the Trust. It helps operate our buses.

Denham stated I found it odd that it cost as much for that as it did entire fuel study.

Rogalski stated yes, that is the cost of advertising on the buses. It doesn't go to HGT it goes to the Transit Trust.

Smith stated this is why I wanted the checks amount on here, so you know what we are spending the money on. You can approve it at a budgetary level but when we issue the checks you can see the amount. You will be more informed.

Booker stated okay, if you will put an agenda item on for the next meeting we will discuss it further and make sure it is an action item.

Smith stated okay.

Earp asked can we pull items eighteen (18) through twenty-four (24).

Booker asked do you want to deal with each one individually.

Earp stated yes sir.

Booker stated okay, we have a motion and second on the floor. Will you accept a friendly amendment to pull items eighteen (18) through twenty-four (24)? The motion is to approve the consent agenda with the exception of items twelve (12) and fifteen (15). We need to add items eighteen (18) through twenty-four (24).

Fortenbaugh stated yes.

Booker stated and you seconded the motion.

Denham stated I amend the second as well.

Booker asked okay, does everyone understand the consent motion. Please call the roll.

Aye: Peterson, Booker, Rogalski, Denham, Earp, Fortenbaugh, Hampton. **Nay:** None. **Motion Passed.**

11. Consider approving the Annual Agreement between the Oklahoma Department of Transportation and the Lawton Metropolitan Planning Organization for transportation planning.

Recommended Action: A motion to approve the Annual Agreement between ODOT and the LMPO for transportation planning.

13. Consider approving the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Lawton and the Lawton Metropolitan Planning Organization for metropolitan transportation planning for Fiscal Year 2023.

Recommended Action: A motion to approve the FY23 MOU for Transportation Planning between the City of Lawton and the LMPO.

14. Consider approving the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Lawton and the Lawton Metropolitan Planning Organization for transit planning for Fiscal Year 2023.

Recommended Action: A motion to approve the FY23 MOU for Transit Planning between the City of Lawton and the LMPO.

16. Consider approving the annual Joint Certification Statement for the Lawton Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process.

Recommended Action: A motion to approve the annual Joint Certification Statement for the LMPO's Transportation Planning Process.

17. Consider approving the Federal Transit Administration Certifications and Assurances for Fiscal Year 2023.

Recommended Action: A motion to approve the FTA Certifications and Assurances for FY23.

12. Consider approving the annual Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Agreement between the Oklahoma Department of Transportation and the Lawton Metropolitan Planning Organization for air quality planning.

Recommended Action: A motion to approve the Annual CMAQ Agreement between ODOT and the LMPO.

Booker stated Janet will you brief us on this item.

Smith stated I'm going to turn this over to Jonathon if you don't mind.

Stone stated this is the agreement between LMPO and ODOT for the congestion mitigation air quality plans.

Rogalski stated this item doesn't specify what the money is spent on. It species that ODOT gives us the money and that we will spend it properly.

Booker asked is this the fund we used to convert intersections to motion.

Rogalski stated yes, but it is not included in this agreement. Where the money is spent is not in any of these agreements. It is included in the UPWP. The UPWP sets out where we spend the money. These agreements say we are going to get the money. We are accepting the money and are going to spend it in accordance with federal law.

Booker stated okay, since the money goes until the Unified Work Plan tell me how we are spending that money.

Rogalski stated it is the traffic flow study we just discussed.

Booker stated so, this year we are using the money on a traffic flow study.

Rogalski stated that is right.

Booker stated okay, that answers my question. Does anyone else have questions on this. If not, I would entertain a motion.

Motion by Denham, Second by Earp, to approve the annual Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Agreement between the Oklahoma Department of Transportation and the Lawton Metropolitan Planning Organization for air quality planning. **Aye:** Petersen; Booker; Rogalski; Denham; Earp; Fortenbaugh; Hampton. **Nay:** None. **Motion Passed.**

15. Consider approving the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Lawton and the Lawton Metropolitan Planning Organization for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality programs and projects during Fiscal Year 2023.

Recommended Action: A motion to approve the FY23 MOU for CMAQ programs between the City of Lawton and the LMPO.

Rogalski stated this is the financial agreement between the city and the MPO. Again, it is not specific to projects. It has to do with the amount of money we get.

Booker asked do we have a motion for approval.

Motion by Earp, Second by Fortenbaugh, to approve the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Lawton and the Lawton Metropolitan Planning Organization for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality programs and projects during Fiscal Year 2023.

Rogalski stated we talked about \$130,000. CMAQ money is actually \$150,000. Twenty Thousand (20,000) goes to the air quality awareness campaign.

Stone stated the \$150,000 is the 8% federal share. The full amount is \$180,000. The air quality campaign has \$25,000 and is spent on supplies for events. The rest is the \$130,000 for the traffic flow study.

Denham stated but the 20% is offset with staff time and labor. There are no dollars.

Stone stated correct.

Booker stated the point of that is we do campaigns.

Rogalski stated I didn't want anyone to think we were only getting \$130,000. We do multiple things with CMAQ.

Booker stated we have a motion and a second will you please call the roll.

Aye: Rogalski, Denham, Earp, Fortenbaugh, Hampton, Petersen, Booker. **Nay:** None. **Motion Passed**

18. Consider approving check number 1707 in the amount of \$5,010.00 to KSWO for advertisements for the Bicycle Safety Education Campaign, and the Air Quality Awareness Campaign.

Recommended Action: A motion to approve check number 1707.

Smith stated these amounts are for KSWO for advertisements. We have told them we will not be able to continue this amount monthly. We have a certain amount budgeted. This was the amount billed for the last advertisement.

Denham asked do they qualify as a PSA

Smith stated no.

Rogalski stated we use to get matching time. We paid for an ad, and they gave us an ad. Are they not doing that?

Smith stated they did. They are charging us for the ads and did not charge us for filming and creating them. That was the offset.

Rogalski stated in the past we paid for some, and they gave us some.

Denham stated they are required to do PSA's.

Smith stated they are, and they do some but not as much as we would like.

Petersen asked do we have the inhouse capability of producing them.

Smith stated no sir, not at this time.

Denham stated that looks like a great intern project for Cameron in the future.

Booker asked do we have a motion for approval of this check.

Motion by Fortenbaugh, Second by Petersen, to approve check number 1707 in the amount of \$5,010.00 to KSWO for advertisements for the Bicycle Safety Education Campaign, and the Air Quality Awareness Campaign. **Aye:** Denham, Fortenbaugh, Hampton, Petersen, Booker, Rogalski. **Abstain:** Earp. **Nay:** None. **Motion Passed.**

19. Consider approving check number 1708 in the amount of \$180.00 to The Breeze KBZQ-FM for advertisements for the Air Quality Awareness Campaign.

Recommended Action: A motion to approve check number 1708.

Book stated this is the same deal. Motion for approval.

Motion by Fortenbaugh, Second by Petersen, to approve check number 1708 in the amount of \$180.00 to The Breeze KBZQ-FM for advertisements for the Air Quality Awareness Campaign. **Aye:** Rogalski, Denham, Fortenbaugh, Hampton, Petersen, Booker. **Abstain:** Earp. **Nay:** None. **Motion Passed.**

20. Consider approving check number 1709 in the amount of \$125.00 to KCCU for advertisements for the Air Quality Awareness Campaign.

Recommended Action: A motion to approve check number 1709.

Motion by Denham, Second by Rogalski, to approve check number 1709 in the amount of \$125.00 to KCCU for advertisements for the Air Quality Awareness Campaign. **Aye:** Fortenbaugh, Hampton, Petersen, Booker, Rogalski, Denham. **Abstain:** Earp. **Nay:** None. **Motion Passed.**

21. Consider approving check number 1710 in the amount of \$799.00 to The Lawton Constitution for advertisements for the Air Quality Awareness Campaign.

Recommended Action: A motion to approve check number 1710.

Motion by Rogalski, Second by Petersen, to approve check number 1710 in the amount of \$799.00 to The Lawton Constitution for advertisements for the Air Quality Awareness Campaign. **Aye:** Fortenbaugh, Hampton, Petersen, Booker, Rogalski, Denham. **Abstain:** Earp. **Nay:** None. **Motion Passed.**

22. Consider approving check number 1712 in the amount of \$174.96 to JAMZ/97.9 for advertisements for the Air Quality Awareness Campaign.

Recommended Action: A motion to approve check number 1712.

Motion by Hampton, Second by Rogalski, to approve check number 1712 in the amount of \$174.96 to JAMZ/97.9 for advertisements for the Air Quality Awareness Campaign. **Aye:** Hampton, Petersen, Booker, Rogalski, Denham, Fortenbaugh. **Abstain:** Earp. **Nay:** None. **Motion Passed.**

Denham asked are we required to advertise with a certain number of entities.

Rogalski stated generally speaking we share it among everyone.

Stone stated the majority of these are radio stations and KSWO. All have the air quality index regularly on their weather reports.

Rogalski stated they do the PSA, so we advertise with them as well.

Petersen asked how about newspaper. I can't recall ever seeing anything in the paper.

Stone stated we advertise in the special section. It is cheaper for the amount of exposure we receive.

23. Consider approving check number 1713 in the amount of \$21,090.00 to Kimley Horn and Associates, INC for work done in April for the Transit Alternative Fuel Study.

Recommended Action: A motion to approve check number 1713.

Smith stated this is the zero-emission bus study we have been working on. This is the first invoice. When we get to the reports, I have a brief report I'll give.

Denham asked is this something we will eventually get on the financial report so we will know what is budgeted and how it is coming in versus what we are paying.

Smith stated yes, the total contract amount was \$130,000 for the study and this is just the first invoice.

Rogalski stated that is a contract that you have already approved.

Denham stated right, and we will get a report/update down the road.

Smith stated yes. This will come from the 2022 CMAQ funds.

Motion by Denham, Second by Petersen, to approve check number 1713 in the amount of \$21,090.00 to Kimley Horn and Associates, INC for work done in April for the Transit Alternative Fuel Study. **Aye:** Petersen, Booker, Rogalski, Denham, Fortenbaugh, Hampton. **Abstain:** Earp. **Nay:** None. **Motion Passed.**

24. Consider approving check number 1715 in the amount of \$24,000.00 to HTG-Lawton Management, LLC for advertisements for the Air Quality Awareness Campaign, and the Bicycle Safety Education Campaign.

Recommended Action: A motion to approve check number 1715.

Smith stated this is an annual amount. We get thirteen (13) months if we pay upfront for twelve (12). We have the funds so we would like to get an extra month for each bus wrap.

Rogalski stated in essence we will get thirteen (13) months total.

Booker asked David do you have a question.

Denham stated no, I was just wondering if it was annual or monthly.

Rogalski stated this is the same rate that any advertiser pays for advertising on the buses.

Denham asked if we choose to continue this next year will we see the invoice in August or July as opposed to the fiscal year. How do you keep track of the extra month?

Smith stated we are keeping track of that. I had Jonathon do some research and gather information from Ryan. We know we were given our thirteenth (13) month. The buses were out of service, and we were accommodated for that. We made sure we got the advertising we paid for. You will see this annual amount every year. Keep in mind when we are paying for the advertising it helps the city with our match. I'm looking at the budget to determine that we are spending every dollar that we can towards LATS so it helps the city.

Motion by Rogalski, **Second** by Fortenbaugh, to approve check number 1715 in the amount of \$24,000.00 to HTG-Lawton Management, LLC for advertisements for the Air Quality Awareness Campaign, and the Bicycle Safety Education Campaign.

Petersen asked since we are approving checks in sequence, where is eleven (11) and fourteen (14).

Stone stated they were voided due to typos. Currently they are using a typewriter.

Petersen stated okay.

Aye: Booker, Rogalski, Denham, Fortenbaugh, Hampton, Petersen. **Abstain:** Earp. **Nay:** None.
Motion Passed.

25. Reports or Comments.

Booker stated now we are on reports and comments.

a. Federal Highways

None.

b. ODOT Division VII

Earp stated we are in the middle of rebalancing our eight (8) year work plan. We do not have our budget number for 2030. This is the 2023 to 2030 eight (8) year plan. Some mentionable projects that are a partnership project with the City of Lawton is the Goodyear extension. We have that set for 2025. If you get your plans, right-a-way and utilities bought early we would be able to advance our part. We also have an overlay project on US 62. From the flyover bridge west of 82nd we will be overlaying US 62 to Cache in 2023. The safety project on Rogers Lane is in the design phase. Once we get a 30% set of plans, we will share that with city staff for comments.

We have our bridge on Highway 7 at east Cache Creek. It is the westbound lanes that we need to replace. We are about to switch traffic on the bridge over Highway 49 on I-44. That is about halfway done. They have made good progress. In order to get their incentive, they must be done by October 12th. I apologize for the traffic delay going to Elgin and Oklahoma City.

Booker stated thank you.

c. Fort Sill

Booker stated they are not present. The new engineer hasn't been here since she got here.

Smith stated we have reached out to her and have spoke to her once. We have not been able to make a connection since then. She is on the email list.

Rogalski asked are we sure that she is getting her email and that we have the right email.

Stone stated I got a reply when I originally tried to contact her.

Rogalski stated okay.

Booker asked so she is planning to attend.

Stone stated we confirmed her email and got a number.

Rogalski stated send me her contact information and I will reach out to her.

Booker asked is she a voting member.

Rogalski stated yes.

d. Lawton Fort Sill Regional Airport

Petersen asked does everyone like the baggage claim carousel. We have bids out for the last phase which is a boarding arm like real airports.

e. LMPO Director

Smith stated every two (2) weeks we meet with Kimley Horn through teams or zoom meetings. We have eight (8) slides as an overview of what we are looking at. This is our current fleet. We are looking into these due to lower cost. Part of the issue is we will be limited because the electric ones do not have a substantial capacity for storing energy. Hopefully by the time we implement these they will have better capacity. We are looking at the existing fleet also. We have thirteen (13) buses and ten (10) shuttles and we have been looking at the route analysis. All this information and more goes to Kimley Horn. They are in the process of analysis. We won't have options for a while. We are looking at applying for some grants which is part of the reason it is

important to get this done. I think our deadline is August to have this completed to be able to apply for grants that are out there for transitioning into zero emission buses.

Denham asked are we required to purchase these if we don't get grant money.

Smith stated there is a federal requirement.

Landers stated by 2035 or 2036 is the requirement.

Denham stated it could be changed with any new administration.

Landers stated a lot of manufactures are moving away from the current buses and going straight into electric. In the next ten (10) to fifteen (15) years this will be all you will be able to purchase.

Denham asked not even CNG.

Landers stated the problem with CNG is the upfront cost. We did a study about three (3) or four (4) years ago and at that time to recoup any of your savings it would be twenty (20) to twenty-five (25) years. It just wasn't worth it. There was too much of an upfront cost with the maintenance facility and the cost of the vehicle is \$50,000 to \$60,000 more.

Rogalski asked CNG is lower emissions right.

Landers stated yes.

Smith stated from the information gathered we do know we will have to have another hub across town that will need charging stations.

Stone stated the distance that each bus travels on an average day. The two (2) green lines are new electric battery and the degraded battery.

Denham asked what is the time from new to degraded. How many years or miles?

Landers stated you have to replace the batteries every seven (7) years. You can figure in year three (3) or four (4) the life starts to degrade. It depends on how often you charge them.

Rogalski stated we all know that electric vehicles are getting more and more prevalent, so battery technology is going to accelerate. Sooner or later, somebody is going to build a better battery.

Booker stated thank you.

f. LMPO Finances

Smith stated I'm sorry we did not get a finance report.

26. Adjournment.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Motion by Rogalski, **Second** by Denham, to adjourn. **Nay:** Booker, Rogalski, Denham, Earp, Fortenbaugh, Hampton, Petersen. **Nay:** None. **Motion Passed.**