

## CITY COUNCIL STUDY SESSION MINUTES

December 4, 2018

The City Council of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met in a study session at 5:30 p.m. in the Municipal Building Conference Room on the 4th day of December, 2018, and notice and agenda of the meeting were posted at the Municipal Building at 201 West Gray and the Norman Public Library at 225 North Webster 48 hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

PRESENT: Councilmembers Bierman, Carter, Castleberry, Clark, Hickman, Holman, Scott, Wilson, Mayor Miller

ABSENT: None

Item 1, being:

### PRESENTATION BY KIMLEY HORN AND ASSOCIATES OF THE PARKING STRATEGIC PLAN FINAL REPORT.

Mayor Miller introduced Ms. Leslie Tabor, ADG, Inc. (ADG) and Mr. Dennis Burns with Kimley Horn who will be presenting the Parking Strategic Plan (Plan) final report.

Ms. Tabor said ADG is the contract administrator for the Plan and her main role has been as liaison between the County, City, and Kimley Horn. She said the Plan is really a guide for decision makers that includes issues of governance, technology, enforcement, planning, and parking asset development and management. She said the Plan is a strategic document, not an operations manual. The main objective is to give the City and Cleveland County options on how to best manage parking, not only in downtown Norman and the County Complex area, but also in the study area addressed in the report, which is the same area as the Jacobs Study from 2016. The Plan addresses how to improve public perception of parking, contributions to economic development, encouraging turnover, integrating technology, opportunities of scalability for growth in the future, and synergies with other partners as the program grows.

Ms. Tabor said the contract with Kimley-Horn was originally with Cleveland County, but the City of Norman joined in because Council understands the best solution for parking involves having both parties at the table. She said other partners in the process included City Staff and the Economic Development Advisory Board (EDAB) with stakeholders from the Downtowners Association, Campus Corner Merchants Association, and area business owners. She said after the Jacobs Study was completed the County felt they needed something more tangible than the information provided in the study, but the Jacobs Study provided great data for Kimley-Horn to build on.

The final report consists of eight sections that include an executive summary; planning context; existing conditions review; community engagement; recommended parking program organization structure; recommended parking management program framework; recommended parking program implementation plan; and appendices and parking management tool kit. Ms. Tabor said the planning context and existing conditions review are very important to Norman because of ongoing efforts that include the Cleveland County Complex Master Plan, Center City Visioning, NORMAN FORWARD, the redesign of James Garner Avenue, etc. She said there is a lot going on in Norman's community and in order for any plan to work these have to be taken into consideration.

Item 1, continued:

Ms. Tabor highlighted the nine key elements a parking program needs:

1. A sense of purpose and direction relative to parking and transportation policy;
2. A strong and capable program leader;
3. Establish parking as a separate “enterprise fund”;
4. A strong customer service orientation;
5. A focus on mastering the fundamentals of parking management;
6. Investment in new technology;
7. Development of a strong parking maintenance program;
8. Development of an ongoing and collaborative relationship with the University of Oklahoma; and
9. Expand the parking program’s mission to adopt a broader more “mobility management” oriented perspective.

She said the Plan provides these elements and when working with multiple parties who serve diverse constituencies, it is important to know why this is being done, what the point is, what the value to the community is, how this will be sustainable, and how all parties will come together to organize, implement, and move forward with the Plan.

Kimley-Horn is recommending a hybrid combination of the professional services out-source management and parking district commission models. She said a Parking Commission consisting of two County representatives, two City representatives, and one community representative would provide oversight. The Parking Director would be the staff person overseeing day-to-day activities and a private parking management firm (being recommended for the first one to three years) would bring in all of the strength and knowledge of setting up and running a parking program. The professional services model allows for a lean-mean flexible and responsive staff and the location of that position could be housed anywhere. The program would begin small, but is scalable for growth so over time the program could encompass other facets the City or County might need. She said Kimley-Horn based their recommendation on the parking numbers they reviewed from the Jacobs Study, population, and other factors of surrounding communities to find the best fit for Norman. She said there is currently no significant parking management expertise housed within the City or County, which led to the recommendation for a private management firm the first one to three years.

Kimley Horn has identified 20 characteristics an effective parking program would have that includes Vision and Mission; Parking Philosophy/Guiding Principles; Parking Planning; Community Involvement; Appropriate Organization; Staff Development and Training; Safety, Security, and Risk Management; Effective Communications; Consolidated Parking Program; Financial Reporting and Planning; Strategic Parking Management; Operational Efficiency; Facilities Maintenance Programs; Effective Use of Technology; Parking System Marketing/Promotion; Positive Customer Service Programs; Special Events Parking Programs; Parking Enforcement; Transportation Demand Management; and Competitive Environment.

In regards to the aspects of creating the recommended parking program organizational structure there are multiple elements recommended that include agreeing to the program’s ultimate organizational framework; creating a Parking Commission; crafting a County/City specific parking manager position; hiring a parking manager; hiring a private parking management firm for at least three years; creating basic operational tools, manuals, procedures, forms, etc.; creating an Advisory Board to provide a mechanism for community input and act as a sounding board for recommended policy decisions and general feedback

Item 1, continued:

on the new services provided; establishing an enterprise fund; creating an initial program budget; and planning for the opening of the new County parking garage.

Ms. Tabor highlighted ten primary action items for implementation of the Plan as follows:

- Adopt program Vision and Mission Statements and recommended Parking Program Guiding Principles, adopt preferred parking management organizational framework, and hire parking management professional;
- Establish parking program as separate enterprise fund and combine all parking related revenue streams into this fund;
- Begin process to evaluate investment in new on-street and off-street parking technology;
- Leverage parking as a community and economic development strategy and develop a comprehensive parking planning function;
- Critically assess current parking enforcement program and invest in mobile license plate recognition (IPR) technology;
- Develop proactive facility maintenance program;
- Develop parking program brand and marketing program;
- Invest in training and staff development;
- Work collaboratively with OU and neighborhood associations to better define residential neighborhood parking issues and develop/enhance residential permit programs; and
- Expand scope of parking program over time to be more supportive of alternative modes of transportation and embrace a “mobility management philosophy.”

Surface lots, on-street meters, and enforcement can provide revenues, but it has to be well managed and consolidating these revenue streams into a single fund enhances the financial performance of the parking program.

Mr. Burns said, in general, parking garages do not pay for themselves, but they do meet a need and incentivize economic development. He said it generally takes somewhere between \$150 to \$250 per space per month to pay for operations, maintenance, maintenance reserves, and debt service depending on land and project costs. He said by combining off-street parking, surface lot parking, enforcement, and garage revenues, the goal of creating a self-supporting parking system can be met.

Ms. Tabor said based off a review of several industry sources, including hundreds of completed parking structure projects of varying size, scope, and geographic location, the national median construction cost for a new parking structure is approximately \$20,679 per space. A recent parking garage project at OU came in at less than the national average and may be the best benchmark for City/County to use assuming the basic design and general conditions are similar. Budget factors include building façade wraps; retail space/tenant; fit-out; local and national market factors; and regional construction trends. It is an estimated net revenue of approximately \$256,543 and project expenses of \$395,329 for a one year net operating result of a negative -\$137,786. As far as parking rates, Kimley Horn estimates \$30 to \$50 per month depending on whether it is a covered or uncovered parking space with a two hour minimum (first hour free parking programs in garages) and a \$10 maximum for the hourly daily rate.

Ms. Tabor said one element not specifically addressed in the report is the “ownership of physical parking assets.” While Kimley-Horn recommends that all parking related revenues be placed in an enterprise fund, it is assumed that all entities would retain ownership of their individual assets (for the City this would be on-street parking and surface lots and for the County it would be the new parking garage and any other parking assets).

Mr. Burns said the revenue projection model assumes that new credit card enabled single space meters to cover 200 additional spaces would generate approximately \$275,000 per year in new parking revenue.

Councilmember Hickman asked where the 200 new parking meters are intended to be located and Mr. Burns said in the downtown core area, such as Main Street. Councilmember Hickman asked if that was suggested in the original Jacobs Study and Mr. Burns said it was an option. Councilmember Hickman said placing meters in spaces that have previously been hourly free parking is worthy of a public conversation with interested property owners and retail merchants. Mr. Burns said if a garage structure is built why would people pay for parking when free parking is available nearby and Councilmember Hickman said if the proposal is to allow free parking for the first hour in the garage structure, then all paid parking spaces should be free for the first hour. Mr. Burns disagreed and said on-street parking is a completely different animal and the City wants turnover in those spaces because they are the most valuable, most convenient spaces for customers, which generate profit for businesses. He said garage parking is longer term use for employees or customers that want more than one hour parking. He said the first hour free in the garage attracts people and once people are in the garage, they tend to stay longer and spend more money at local businesses. Councilmember Scott said she does not like to pay for parking and will go out of her way to avoid paying for parking. Mr. Burns said nobody likes to pay for parking, but the idea is for this program to evolve from a parking program to a parking and mobility program to be much more focused on the broad range of transportation options of which parking is just one. He said the whole idea of transportation demand management or transportation alternatives and promoting that as a core concept of what a mobility program ultimately will be really starts to change the dynamics of parking. He said charging for parking is probably the single most effective thing the City can do to get people out of their single occupant vehicle, assuming they have other options to choose from. He said that is just a part of a bigger picture when talking about parking rates and how much people hate paying for parking because the City and County are trying to accomplish other transportation needs as well. Mayor Miller said “free parking” is really not free. She said the City is paying for the parking and the owners of the business may be paying for it and if that is not taken into consideration, the City will never be able to change that mind set of “I should be able to park right in front and not have to pay.” She said it also increases mobility by the fact that the parking garage is a block or two away from where people want to go so people have to walk to their destination and usually stay longer. She said Council needs to keep in mind how expensive it is to maintain parking spaces.

Councilmember Bierman said she would like to consider installing electric vehicle charging stations in the parking garage.

Councilmember Hickman said Council has discussed on-street parking permits for neighborhoods with multi-use units and asked if that could be included in this program. Mr. Burns said that could definitely

be administered through this program; however, those programs generally do not generate a lot of revenue. He said neighborhood parking permits usually just protect parking for residents.

Councilmember Holman sees the value of the parking spaces on Main Street, but there is not the same demand for parking as Campus Corner where parking is very limited. He said outside of peak hours, it is

Item 1, continued:

not hard to find parking on Main Street. He said the aesthetic of parking meters on Main Street is something to consider as well. Mr. Burns said kiosks for multi-space parking may be an option so there would not be such an eyesore. Mayor Miller said she would rather have a parking meter than have to find a kiosk, but the last three times she has been downtown for lunch she has had to drive around the block several times and could not park on either side so the City is quickly getting to the place of charging for spaces.

Councilmember Holman said the one hour limit on Main Street parking is definitively a problem because people can easily spend more than an hour having lunch or shopping. He does like the idea of revenues staying within an area to be reinvested in maintaining that area.

Councilmember Bierman said she prefers kiosks to individual meters because rates and limits can be easily changed. Councilmember Castleberry agrees with Councilmember Bierman about the kiosks, especially in areas where people shop. He said individual parking meters tend to block the sidewalk so having the sidewalk space open makes the City look cleaner.

Mr. Burns said there are three options for kiosks that include pay by space where spaces are numbered and people park in a numbered space, but the numbers are covered up so signs have to be installed it makes more clutter. Pay and display is another option where people walk to the meter, get a receipt, and walk back to car to place the receipt where it is visible. The good news about that option is portability of time because people can move around to different parking space on another block and still use the valid parking receipt. The best option is pay by license plate so there does not have to be signs or numbered spaces, which is a more efficient system. The only issue with that is people have to remember their license plate number.

Councilmember Wilson supports kiosks because it supports emerging technologies and kiosks are easier to install or remove. Mr. Burns said pay by phone is the best option, but visitors are sometimes confused by that because they are not educated on how paid parking works in a community.

Mr. Jim Adair, downtown property owner, said at one time the Gray Street parking lot was free parking, which ended up being a horrible decision because employees of businesses in downtown Norman, who had assigned parking spaces on Tonhawa Street, were filling up the parking spaces in the lot because it was closer to their work. He said the lot was not generating revenue and was not meeting parking needs. He said parking will never make the City rich and parking is not the end goal, sales tax generated from businesses that benefit from that parking is the end goal. He said structured parking makes sense and eliminates the need for a sea of parking lots throughout Norman.

Mr. Shawn O'Leary, Director of Public Works, said when the City installed the kiosk in the Gray Street parking lot, the lot went from a 90% occupancy rate to a 10% to 15% occupancy rate, because the twenty-five cents per hour ran those people out. He said everyone believes it should have been one dollar and he agrees. He said Campus Corner merchants wanted to charge two dollars per hour on their meters, but the City only wanted to charge one dollar and the one dollar rate has worked really well in Campus Corner.

Councilmember Hickman said he requested Council add the paving of the West Gray Street lot in the Capital Improvements Plan and make it usable for parking because there is growth on West Main Street that will require additional parking. He said it is important to explore partnerships with the County and would like to pursue that opportunity moving forward.

Item 1, continued:

\  
Mr. Darry Stacy, Cleveland County Commissioner, said the County Commissioners did not take action in their meeting on Monday, but plans to accept the study as presented at their next meeting and appoint a representative to begin discussions with the City.

Councilmember Holman asked when the County thinks it might get underway with the actual parking structure and how will it be used once it is constructed. Will half of it be used for County employees and visitors with the other half being used by the public? Mr. Stacy said as soon as the half block the County purchased is vacated, a bid will go out for demolition, most likely in March, and the County will be hiring an architect and construction manager for the Healthy Living Block and parking structure so things are moving at a fairly rapid pace. As far as the use of the facility, Kimley Horn has given the County some suggestions on that, but a Parking Commission could look at that and review the option that makes the most financial sense.

Councilmember Hickman asked if the County is envisioning a Commission or body similar to the Regional Transit Authority (RTA) that includes representatives from the County and City and Mr. Stacy said yes. Mr. Chuck Thompson, EDAB Chair, said EDAB concurred there should be a collective body that would include elected officials from the City and County that would look at the next steps.

Mr. O'Leary asked if Council would like to adopt this study at their next meeting or wait until January. He said Staff believes Council will want to stay on pace with the County and Staff needs clear direction from Council. Mr. Jeff Bryant, City Attorney, said this is just a strategic plan so Council can adopt the strategic plan and accept the final report and designate one or two Councilmembers to represent the City to start the collaboration process with a representative of the County. Councilmember Hickman said he is comfortable with adopting the study by resolution and volunteered to be a representative for the City. Councilmember Clark said she would also be happy to serve as a representative of the City. Mayor Miller said it makes perfect sense for Councilmember Hickman and Councilmember Clark to represent the City of Norman.

Mayor Miller said Staff will move forward with a resolution on January 11, 2019.

Items submitted for the record

1. PowerPoint presentation entitled, "Cleveland County, City of Norman, Oklahoma, Parking Strategic Plan," City Council Study Session dated December 4, 2018
2. Cleveland County and City of Norman, Oklahoma, Parking Strategic Plan Final Report prepared by Kimley Horn

\* \* \* \* \*

Item 2, being:

CONTINUED DISCUSSION REGARDING THE TRANSPORTATION BOND PROGRAM.

Mr. O'Leary said Council has been discussing the Transportation Bond Program for several weeks and those discussions also included a proposal for a Stormwater Bond Program as well as a Stormwater Utility (SWU). He said next critical steps include finalizing a project list; developing detailed project

Item 2, continued:

scoping and cost estimates (by private consulting engineering firm); possible blending of federal/local funds; obtaining public input/community dialogue; establishing an election date; and providing needed staffing and resources for plan implementation.

Mr. O’Leary highlighted the possible bond election schedule as follows:

FIRST READING	SECOND READING	NOTICE TO ELECTION BOARD	ELECTION DATE
January 8, 2019	January 22, 2019	January 31, 2019	April 2, 2019

Potential Transportation Bond Projects with a blend of federally and bond funded projects include:

- Jenkins Avenue – Imhoff Road to Lindsey Street;
- Porter Avenue/Acres Street – Porter Corridor;
- Main Street/Gray Street Two-Way Conversion;
- James Garner Avenue Special Corridor – Phase III – Acres Street to Duffy Street;
- Porter Avenue Streetscape;
- Cedar Lane Road – east of 24th Avenue S.E. to 36th Avenue S.E.;
- Lindsey Street Special Corridor – Pickard Avenue to Jenkins Avenue;
- Constitution Avenue – Jenkins Avenue to Classen Boulevard;
- 36th Avenue N.W. – north of Indian Hills Road to Moore city limits;
- 36th Avenue S.E. – Cedar Lane Road to State Highway 9;
- 24th Avenue N.E. – Rock Creek Road to Tecumseh Road;
- Tecumseh Road – 12th Avenue N.E. to 24th Avenue N.E.;
- 48th Avenue N.W. – Phase II – Rock Creek Road to Tecumseh Road;
- 48th Avenue N.W. – Phase IV – Franklin Road to Indian Hills Road;
- Indian Hills Road – 48th Avenue N.W. to Interstate 35;
- Traffic Management Center (TMC);
- Rock Creek Road – Queenston Avenue/Bruckner Drive to 24th Avenue N.E.; and
- Program Management.

Bond proposal costs are as follows:

Proposition	Description	Federal Funds	Bond Funds	Total Costs
1	Transportation Projects only with a blend of federally funded and locally funded projects	\$55 Million	\$70 Million	\$125 Million
2	Stormwater Projects only locally funded		\$60 Million	\$60 Million
	TOTAL	\$55 Million	\$130 Million	\$185 Million

Mr. O’Leary said Freese and Nichols developed the Comprehensive Transportation Plan to include more accurate cost estimates with a two percent annual inflation rate. At direction of Council, the Lindsey Street Special Corridor Project was converted into two projects with one project to include a very large stormwater element under the transportation bond projects. An economic development project in the amount of \$700,000 was also added to the 36th Avenue S.E. for the John Saxon Boulevard connection.

Item 2, continued:

Mr. O'Leary said program costs have increased from \$125 million to \$146 million with the federal share increasing from \$55 million to \$61 million and the bond share increasing from \$70 million to \$85 million; however, in order to keep from raising property tax levies, the bond amount should not exceed \$72 million.

Mr. O'Leary said in order to decrease the bond amount Staff is recommending reducing the Cedar Lane Road Project from total local funding to a federally funded project to generate \$7.5 million in additional federal funds. Staff is also recommending changing the scope of the Main Street and Gray Street Two-Way Conversion to include the Gray Street conversion only and postpone Main Street to reduce the project costs by \$5.3 million. He said the revised bond share total with these modifications will be \$72.4 million.

Councilmember Wilson said with this proposal the Cedar Lane Road Project is being pushed out to 2023 and there might be a possibility the City may not receive the federal funds and Mr. O'Leary said actually, this will be the first federally funded project the City would apply for with ACOG. Councilmember Wilson asked if there are recoupment funds for Destin Landing or Walmart and Mr. O'Leary said Walmart paid traffic impact fees and deferral fees in the 2012 bond package and Destin Landing will contribute to the current proposed bond package when developed through a recoupment district.

Councilmember Bierman said there are no projects in Ward One so she assumes once the 2012 transportation projects in Ward One are complete there will be no other needs and Ward One will be perfect, correct? Mr. O'Leary said the projects were not selected by ward, but he is not aware of any immediate needs in terms of major arterial roads in that area. Mr. O'Leary said transportation needs are a function of growth so the work is really never complete.

Councilmember Holman said the Main and Gray Street Two-Way Conversion Study was done two years ago with a total estimated cost of \$5.8 million for the conversion of both streets. He said now Gray Street alone costs \$5.3 million so what has changed? Mr. Scott Sturtz, City Engineer, said costs did go up, but he does not know if all the additional costs were included in the first study. He said 12% has been added to all projects for construction engineering and when looking at the project as one street versus two streets there were necessary changes, i.e. right-of-way acquisition, construction costs, material costs, utility relocation, labor costs, etc., that increased costs. He said although the same firm estimated the costs, there was a different group of people looking at the project with different levels of detail. Councilmember Holman said the study costs the City \$100,000 and for the cost to be double for one street two years later is kind of shocking. Mr. Angelo Lombardo, Transportation Traffic Engineer, said this project is not scheduled to begin until 2027 so two percent inflation per year is being factored in as well. Councilmember Holman said he would like to see a detailed report of the costs because the largest cost in the two-way study was the reconstruction of the railroad crossing gates, which were approximately \$1 million each. What exactly is the \$5.3 million being spent on? He suggested this project be moved to 2022 to coincide with the James Garner Avenue Special Corridor Project because the two projects have to work together to be successful and Councilmember Hickman agreed.



Mr. O'Leary highlighted the final projects list as

- Porter Avenue and Acres Street;
- Jenkins Avenue– Imhoff Road to Lindsey Street;
- Porter Avenue Streetscape;
- James Garner Avenue– Acres Street to Duffy Street;
- Cedar Lane Road – east of 24th Avenue S.E. to 36th Avenue S.E.;
- Constitution Street – Jenkins Avenue to Classen Boulevard;
- Traffic Management Center (TMC);
- 36th Avenue N.W. – north of Indian Hills Road to Moore city limits;
- 36th Avenue S.E. – Cedar Lane Road to State Highway 9;
- 24th Avenue N.E. – Rock Creek Road to Tecumseh Road;
- 48th Avenue N.W., Phase IV –Franklin Road to Indian Hills Road;
- Lindsey Street Special Corridor – Elm Avenue to Jenkins Avenue;
- Gray Street Two-Way Conversion;
- Indian Hills Road – 48th Avenue N.W. to Interstate 35 (I-35);
- Indian Hills Road and I-35 Interchange Matching Funds;
- 48th Avenue – Phase II, Rock Creek Road to Tecumseh Road;
- Lindsey Street Special Corridor – Pickard Avenue to Elm Avenue;
- Tecumseh Road – 12th Avenue N.E. to 24th Avenue N.E.;
- Rock Creek Road – Queenston Avenue to 24th Avenue N.E.; and
- Project Management (2%).

He said total costs are \$141,088,301 with \$68,713,805 in federal funds and \$72,374,497 in bond funds.

Councilmember Hickman said he is comfortable with the final project list, but has concerns about the timing on Gray Street because it seems logical to move that project to coordinate with the James Garner Avenue Project. He asked if Staff talked with the Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT) regarding contributing \$2 million, as a placeholder for the Indian Hills Road Project, in order to accelerate that project. Mr. O'Leary said yes, ODOT had a very favorable reaction to the idea, but not to the extent of making a commitment to accelerate the project to meet Council's desire. He said in the I-35 Corridor Study, ODOT views the Indian Hills Road bridge as a priority and is the only project funded in their eight year plan so he thinks the \$2 million offered by the City will stimulate their interest in expanding that project to a full interchange. Councilmember Hickman said unless the City knows the \$2 million will make a meaningful change in the project timeline, he would like to see that money put toward the TMC and get that implemented before 2024. Mr. O'Leary said federal funds will be available for the TMC so Staff would rather use that money for another project.

Councilmember Wilson understands Cedar Lane Road and 36th Avenue S.E. are two separate projects with a two year timeline gap, but is concerned about connecting the two roads because 36th Avenue S.E. will become very congested once development takes place. She would like the \$2 million to go towards the Cedar Lane Road Project. She said Cedar Lane Road intersection where

the Walmart is located, is the most dangerous intersection in the City and asked if there is anything that can be done in the interim. She said there is a lot of development taking place in that area and traffic congestion is going to increase and become even more dangerous. Councilmember Wilson said the grade on 36th Avenue S.E. and Cedar Lane Road will need to be raised significantly and asked if there is a different way to improve that intersection. Mr. Sturtz said in order to achieve a safe site distance on the

Item 2, continued:

road and at the intersection, the roadway will be raised and the hill directly to the west will be shaved off by six to seven feet. Mr. O'Leary said private property will be significantly impacted as well and more right-of-way may need to be acquired. He said there is a fine balance between making topographic changes and finding that safe road design. Councilmember Wilson said it seems there would be significant stormwater issues with that project and Mr. Sturtz said stormwater impact will definitely be taken into consideration during the design process. Mr. O'Leary said Staff will review an interim solution.

Councilmember Holman said if the Gray Street two-way conversion is moved up to 2022 with James Garner Avenue, he would like to move the Lindsey Street: Pickard Avenue to Elm Avenue from 2019 to 2027 so it would be done in the same year as Lindsey Street: Elm Street to Jenkins Avenue. Mr. Lombardo said projects are based on federal funding, which has a cap of \$7.5 million per year so both projects cannot be done in the same year in order to maximize federal funds.

Councilmember Scott asked about the status of the 36th Avenue N.W. widening and Mr. O'Leary said that project is in the 2012 Bond Program and Phase I is scheduled to begin in December 2019.

Councilmember Bierman said while she likes the idea of doing James Garner Avenue and Gray Street at the same time, her one concern is the impact to surrounding businesses. If the City is going to be looking at an extended timeline for doing both projects at the same time, she wants to be really mindful of what that will do to area businesses. Mr. O'Leary said Staff will do the best they can, but things get delayed and if Council is uncomfortable with that in 2022, they can give Staff new direction at that time.

Councilmember Castleberry said it is important for voters to understand the timeline of the projects are projected timelines and subject to change. He receives a lot of heat from constituents about projects that are projected to be completed at a date certain, but due to issues outside of the City's control may be delayed. Also, he respectfully disagrees with Councilmember Hickman's suggestion to use the \$2 million earmarked for Indian Hills Road for the TMC because the City is leveraging \$3.2 million in federal funding in order to do that. He said traffic management is important, but is already high on the project list; however, the 2% inflation for construction costs is not conservative and should be closer to 3% or 4%. Mr. O'Leary said there are conservative elements across the board in each project and Staff feels very comfortable with 2% inflation rate.

Councilmember Hickman agreed with Councilmember Holman regarding the need for more details on the Gray Street Project as well as on all projects in Wards Four and Two to be presented at ward meetings scheduled to be held for public input.

Councilmember Castleberry said he would like to change the 48th Avenue N.W.: Rock Creek Road to Tecumseh Road to Robinson Street to Tecumseh Road. Mr. O'Leary said the reason Staff is recommending improvements from Rock Creek Road to Tecumseh Road is because the two sections of 48th Avenue on the project list are the most development rich sections. He said Rock Creek Road to Tecumseh Road will have the largest, densest residential development anywhere in Norman, including a new school; however, if Council directs Staff to change the project scope, Staff will be happy to make that change. Councilmember Castleberry said the City will get more bang for the buck by changing this project to include Robinson Street to Tecumseh Road and Councilmembers concurred.

Item 2, continued:

Mayor Miller said Council seems to have come to a consensus on the project list with the changes Councilmember Castleberry recommended, finding an interim traffic solution for Cedar Lane Road, and moving Gray Street conversion to an earlier project date.

Items submitted for the record

1. PowerPoint presentation entitled, "Future Transportation Bond Issue Program Update," City Council Study Session dated December 4, 2018

\* \* \* \* \*

The meeting was adjourned at 7:26 p.m.

ATTEST:

---

City Clerk

---

Mayor