

**PLANiTULSA COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
GENERAL COMMENTS, QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS OF SUPPORT OR OPPOSITION
THAT DO NOT REQUIRE A TEXT CHANGE**

The following comments were made on the Final Draft of the PLANiTULSA Comprehensive Plan (posted on www.PLANiTULSA.com). The second column shows the comment as made (these are not edited); and the third column notes the consultants response to these issues and questions. When the comments are general opinions that do not need a response, the third column is left blank. In the opinion of the PLANiTULSA team, these items do not require a text change. If the TMAPC wishes to discuss any of these items individually, they may, at their discretion, remove an item and place it on the discussion list for further consideration.

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
1	<p>Excellent plan. Couple of things need to start right away...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complete the Gilcrease Expressway as soon as possible. 2. Start converting all municipal and county-owned vehicles to CNG. Do 20% a year. Finish by 2015. 3. Start the detailed transportation planning this spring. Start building a light rail system by 2015. Finish it in 2020. <p>Obviously, these are no more than "details" in a very big picture that has to come together consistently but they are "markers" we should start putting down now. This is a very ambitious plan. It is both creative and thoughtful. If Tulsa actually looked and worked like this, people would fight for the chance to live here. Do NOT let this die because finances look gloomy this year. There are enough of us here to pay for this and make it happen. We're not afraid to do this or spend money for it. We don't want our leaders to be afraid, either. We want to see them out front, making a difference. "Make no little plans..." Thanks.</p>	
2	<p>One thing I haven't seen mentioned in the plan is the need to address signage in Tulsa. Our overabundance of pole signs, billboards and Vegas-like digital signs are a big impediment to creating an attractive, livable city. Indeed, changing the sign ordinances to restrict the height, size and number of signs allowed per lot (as well as the brightness of digital signs), would have a profound impact upon the desirability of</p>	<p><i>Signage – this issue can be addresses during ordinance amendments, if desired.</i></p> <p><i>PLANiTULSA provides guidelines for</i></p>

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>our public right of way. We can't create inviting, walkable streets without addressing the issue of ugly, ubiquitous visual clutter. I also wonder if there should be some statement offering guidance about PUDs. Obviously, the new plan (and suggested changes to the zoning code) should lessen the need for PUDs. At least theoretically. In practice, we seem to have an addiction to PUDs, which are not necessarily used to create unique, higher quality developments. Instead, they are generally used to mass together lots for inappropriate, large-scale, suburban-style developments. How do we break this habit? Can we offer guidelines that would enable the TMAPC to "just say no?"</p>	<p><i>desired future development. Policies in the plan as well as the strategic plan recommend that zoning ordinances be amended to accommodate the development desired by citizens and stakeholders. These policies also recommend the use of PUDs to accommodate proposals where innovative development is not allowed by the development codes.</i></p>
3	<p>Not at all happy that revisions are being posted without anything showing what changes have been made. Am I expected to re-read everything all over again hoping I catch all changes? Very disappointed.</p>	<p><i>Tracking logs were posted on the website indicating changes that were made to the initial posted draft.</i></p>
4	<p>I have always enjoyed walking to town. When I lived in Brookside, I daily walked downtown using Cincinnati and the Midland Valley Trail and alleyways and side streets. I walked a total of 8 miles per day. Now I live closer to downtown and still do this. I enjoy seeing more pedestrians uptown these days. In the past years I shared the sidewalk with only the homeless. I no longer have a grocery store within walking distance (except the Quik Trip) so would welcome that option. What is the old Homeland at Denver and 12th being used for? Is it for sale?</p>	
5	<p>The plan should include planning on how Tulsa deals with municipal waste stream management. With the construction, demolition, renovation and infill development proposed in the plan, we should seek greener solutions to how to address the waste generated in these processes.</p> <p>8,000 lbs of waste are typically thrown into the landfill during the construction of a 2,000 square foot home. Annually, builders in the United States generate approximately 31.5 million tons of construction waste, almost 24 percent of the total municipal solid waste in this country. When over 50% of that waste can be recycled there is no reason for it to go into the landfill. A construction recycling program for commercial, industrial, residential and transportation construction should</p>	<p><i>This is an important component of encouraging more sustainable development. The PLANiTULSA prototype demonstration projects detailed in the Strategic Plan could include a waste-stream management</i></p>

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>be discussed, considered and included in the plan as a possible greener solution to this issue.</p> <p>Deconstruction, as opposed to traditional demolition, is also a greener solution that would provide new green collar jobs, promote construction and demolition waste recycling while creating green jobs in a new recycling market in Tulsa, thereby reducing the impact of construction and demolition debris waste streams on municipal landfills.</p>	<p><i>and best practices component. Furthermore, information about such measures should be included in the one-stop-shop for permitting and zoning.</i></p> <p><i>The city may elect to adopt incentives (e.g. discounted permit fees) that encourage waste reduction, waste-stream diversion, and other measures.</i></p>
6	<p>I searched the transportation section for the word age, aging, elderly, old, older, etc and found one statement that the old and young may be killed on page 32. I emailed long ago about the horrible sidewalks, telephone poles in the middle of the walk, along S. Lewis across from Southern Hills and south you see people walking on hillocks or below street grade being spewed with drainage from rain or snow. AARP recently emailed "Planning Complete Streets for an Aging America" a research report developed by a consortium traffic experts. Hope Planitulsa will somehow consider the content. Thanks.</p>	<p><i>PLANiTULSA promotes safer streets and broadens transportation options primarily through the recommendation to use context sensitive solutions processes. These processes include a detailed review of existing conditions, the needs of the community, and draw upon citywide implementation tools to make improvements. In addition, PLANiTULSA emphasizes providing transportation options such as walking and biking in future transportation projects.</i></p>
7	<p>I would like to see the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan in it's entirety, as adopted by the Tulsa City Council to fulfill requirements a Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) grant from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the Oklahoma Department of Civil Emergency Management (ODCEM), be implemented and incorporated into the plan. It might not be a bad idea to even add an entire section to the plan covering hazard mitigation planning to address the goals of the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan by making Tulsa a more disaster resistant community in our planning, with special emphasis on, including but not limited to, building codes for commercial and residential properties, municipal facilities, infrastructure, and</p>	<p><i>Plans that have been adopted prior to the PLANiTULSA plan remain in effect. PLANiTULSA recommends</i></p>

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>transportation systems. Proactive planning to mitigate natural or manmade disasters, as opposed to a reactive plans, are a much more cost effective approach to manage times of emergency and to reduce the potential costs associated with the damage, destruction, or disruptions caused by disaster events including loss of life and losses to the local economy. Making Tulsa more disaster resistant will make it a more desirable place to live, work and play. I hope this will be considered and included, or at least discussed for inclusion in the final draft of the plan.</p>	<p><i>that some plans (e.g. neighborhood plans, etc.) be reviewed and amended so they are aligned with Our Vision for Tulsa and the general goals of PLANiTULSA.</i></p>
8	<p>I am very concerned about ratifying this Plan for the entire city. I have heard that our present system is 30 years old. I say if it aint broke don't fix it.</p> <p>I think it will put undue stress on many levels of development. Please pass this around to the TMAPC board members as my veto.</p>	
9	<p>P.21: "Implications for the land use planning program include the need for an expanded and improved one-stop-shop permitting process so developers can easily build new space for small businesses and housing for their workers." (This statement is echoed on P.61). AMEN!</p>	<p>[Reference is to Working Draft; Location of comment in Final Draft: Land Use Chapter, Page 23, paragraph 3]</p>
10	<p>P. 49: "The challenge in these places is to preserve character without preventing residents from reinvesting in their homes to meet contemporary standards."</p> <p>Agreed that this is a challenge. There are means available to "preserve" the character of a neighborhood. To build something specific into the plan is fraught with peril. An effort was made to introduce Neighborhood Conservation Districts a couple of years ago. It met very strong resistance and resulted in at least one city councilor losing her seat. Be very careful here.</p>	<p><i>No change needed.</i></p> <p>[Reference is to Working Draft; Location of comment in Final Draft: Land Use Chapter, Page 54, 2nd column, paragraph 2, last sentence]</p>
11	<p>P. 58: "If each neighborhood plan includes its own zoning designations, its own design standards, or its own street types, over time Tulsa's planning and zoning would become hopelessly complex and fragmented."</p> <p>Agreed! However, other parts of this plan seem to promote just that.</p>	<p><i>Small area plans are not intended to have their own zoning districts, but to draw upon a city-wide set of zoning districts and investment tools. Note appendix items regarding tools for small area plans.</i></p>

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
		[Reference is to Working Draft; Location of comment in Final Draft: Land Use Chapter, Page 63, paragraph 2, third sentence]
12	Goal 15: A couple of items in here talk about “development incentives”. This is a great approach. If you mandate something, people are always looking for a “work-around”. If you provide incentives, people are always looking for ways to comply to get those incentives.	[Reference is to Working Draft; Location of comment in Final Draft: Land Use Chapter, Page 83, Goal 15]
13	Part III, Goal 5.2: "Maintain and expand incentives of rehabilitation of existing housing in targeted areas." We like this. The use of incentives instead of mandates is a positive approach.	[Reference is to Working Draft; Location of comment in Final Draft: Housing Chapter, Page 12, Policy 5.2]
14	Part III, Goal 5.3 references a "streamlined permitting process". Very important goal. This cannot be overemphasized.	[Reference is to Working Draft; Location of comment in Final Draft: Housing Chapter, Page 12, Policy 5.3]
15	I think the parks section is good, but there is no mention of "dog parks". I am relatively new to Tulsa and I am amazed at the low number of dog parks and the locations of the existing ones. They are not very accessible. As I compare the existing dog parks to other parks in Tulsa, the ratio of dog park users seem to outnumber usage of other parks by at least 3 to 1. The dog parks are used every day as opposed to the other parks being used mainly on weekends. You speak of a sense of community, dog owners have something in common, and that makes way for meeting new friends. I urge you to take a look at new dog park locations, accessible by paths to down town and mid town residents. Charging a quarter for each use could be instituted to maintain the purchase of waste bags, water,	<i>The parks chapter does not focus on specific types of facilities, such as dog parks. Implementation of the recently prepared Parks Plan will address specific programming needs. In</i>

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	maintenance etc. The dog parks in Houston have swimming ponds for the dogs with fenced sections for large and small dogs. If the park was near the river, it seems a water circulation system could be powered by a solar source and the water could be shut off in the colder months.	<i>addition, the small area planning process should be used to identify where and how to incorporate specific programming needs in the park system.</i>
16	Many in our neighborhood have spoken and requested that 76th Street between Sheridan and Memorial be opened on the east end of the street with a left turn opening from 76th Street to go north on Memorial. A man was killed around Christmas trying to make a left turn (north) onto Memorial off of 76th Street. He turned into the oncoming traffic. There are numerous other turn lanes into the are - this is a much more logical location and one needed.	
17	Please make the proposed rail connection to the Tulsa Airport more explicit. There needs to be an intermodal connection there.	
18	I strongly support the Planit Tulsa recommendations, but am extremely disappointed that the Tulsa Metropolitan Transit Authority budget has been cut by 31%, resulting in driver layoffs, route cancellation (Cherokee Industrial Park), and reduced runs on other routes. Instead, our city leaders have spend the federal stimulus transportation funds on building more highways and bridges, which will cause more traffic congestion and force Tulsa onto the EPA dirty air list.	
19	I agree that the Vision for Tulsa plan is wonderful. Most folks don't know enough regarding Tulsa history. I am 66 and working for a #1 Wireless company. I plan to share this information to my coworkers so they can share their input.	
20	I would like to see the South Tulsa Bridge extend to riverside and not Yale. The ability for Riverside to be expanded and handle the increased traffic is more feasible than Yale. The widening of Yale would have a greater impact on existing neighborhoods. Infrastructure is well established in the Yale corridor and I believe it would consume more resources than using the area of Riverside. Thank for your time.	

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
21	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review the "Our Vision for Tulsa" document. I am a retired City Planner with 38 years of experience in the public and private sectors in Colorado and California including almost 25 years as a planning director and community development director.</p> <p>My opinion of the document is that the graphics are nice, but the vision is mostly fluff - mom and apple pie. I am reminded of an old Richard Hedman cartoon that shows two planners talking. One planner says to the other, "Ideally, all your policies cancel each other out. That's the only way you can do whatever you want and still get federal funds."</p> <p>Many of the vision concepts conflict with one another. Further, it appears to me there is nothing in the vision that indicates we are going to do anything to curb urban sprawl, revitalize or redevelop existing dead or near dead shopping centers (or improve the appearance - landscaping - of new ones), or really revitalize the downtown.</p> <p>I realized long ago that no city council member and no city manager can ever say no to proposed new retail or office development and that developers, as a group, are incapable of preventing themselves from overbuilding. The result in Tulsa and almost every other city has been a huge over-supply of retail shopping centers and office development.</p> <p>The unfortunate result in many cities, and Tulsa, is deteriorating downtowns and deteriorating older shopping centers and office buildings. Cities, beginning primarily in the 1950's, started approving shopping centers, office buildings, and residential development all over the place; and urban sprawl became rampant. Those factors, along with the oil and automobile companies buying the streetcar operations and shutting them down, caused downtowns to decline.</p> <p>Unless there is strong political commitment and leadership to revitalize downtown Tulsa, and I suspect there isn't, it isn't going to happen.</p> <p>(continued below)</p> <p>If downtown is going to be revitalized, then the Comprehensive Plan is going to have to say something like no more new office buildings of more than 40,000 square feet in area will be allowed outside the downtown. It is my impression from a recent tour that most of the beautiful and historic buildings in the downtown are vacant or underutilized. They are going to stay that way unless there is a major political commitment to filling them up.</p>	

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>There needs to be similar policies for multi-family residential, movie theatres, restaurants, etc. The survey results showed that half of survey respondents would choose to live in an existing neighborhood rather than downtown. That's not surprising considering the current state of downtown Tulsa. There are, however, downtowns in other cities, in which I, and many others, would like to live: San Francisco, Portland, Boston, even Fort Worth. Unfortunately, it's a viscous circle. If people don't want to live downtown, there isn't going to be a strong downtown. To have a strong downtown, people have to live there. Downtown retail is probably a lost cause until there is a significant downtown residential population.</p> <p>I think the transportation issue is very difficult. The population densities in Tulsa are not sufficient to support any form of mass transit other than bus (and probably not even bus); and the "quick reliable bus" noted in the document is an oxymoron. I have become convinced over the years that no one is going to ride a bus if there is any other way to get where they need to go. They will ride streetcars however, the older and quainter the better.</p> <p>A streetcar line from the north into downtown, then out along Fourth Street, and up Peoria by Cherry Street and through Brookside would be very nice and, I think, utilized.</p> <p>I think that the challenge to the consultants for Portland is: What policies, strategies, codes, and ordinances are necessary to get the "Pearl District," in downtown Tulsa and limit urban sprawl. The vision as drafted isn't going to cut it.</p>	
22	<p>I spoke briefly at the meeting on Tuesday night, and I gather the next meeting will be much busier. Since I can't come then, I'd like to add a few more comments. I'm the pediatrician who grew up in Texas (6th generation!) and chose to live and raise my kids in Tulsa 30 years ago. I have been impressed at the number of multi-generation families that live here, and disappointed, as are many of my friends, that my kids didn't stay. They have moved away, partly because of transportation issues, to larger cities on the east coast in dense inner-city locations. The oldest went to the Kennedy School of Public Policy, and has a company that studies public school systems</p> <p>- mostly on Gates Foundation grants. Too bad he wasn't involved in the application process for the TPS!</p>	

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>At any rate, in addition to my comments in support of the PlaniTulsa vision and execution, I want to answer what I see are some of the nay-sayers (real estate agents and developers maybe?) who would like Tulsa to develop as it is. The plan does not disallow the continued growth into suburbia that is the apparent direction some seek. However, the character of Tulsa is in its midtown and near-downtown areas, and that is what needs to be coalesced and given some better form and function in order to help Tulsa retain its unique character as well as keep up with the changes necessary for a viable society.</p> <p>Having a more walkable layout, and access to public transportation, would contribute to better health, a reality some cities have come to embrace.</p> <p>Tulsa could be the shining star in this, the obesest state in the Union. It already has the best health care in the state, and we should capitalize on that fact.</p> <p>If some are concerned that there was a preponderance of folks from midtown taking interest in this process, I can only say, everyone had an opportunity to contribute, and the rest of the city may develop just fine "on its own", but there is huge need for oversight and collaboration, which involves sometimes cooperation over individual property owners' "rights" in order to have a quality, functional "product", a city of which we can all be proud.</p> <p>Thanks for shepherding this process along, successfully, I pray!</p>	
23	<p>I hope after all the input from the citizens of Tulsa and the expense of this project it will be adopted by TMAPC and subsequently by the City Council. We need a plan for Tulsa and the planners have gone to great lengths to get us what we want. Don't leave us blowing in the wind!</p>	
24	<p>I attended the summer Parks hearing and the recent overall hearing in my district. Seems like an interesting plan of what Tulsans - citizens - want for our city: the proof, however, will be in the actual implementation which is when all the business interests attempt to pay their way through the political process - and I am not a</p>	

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>"teabagger." It will be up to citizens to remind the folks in office that "we" wrote this plan and they need to follow it!</p> <p>In regards to that, it seems the Mayor and Council have already tried to shoot the PLANiTULSA planners in the foot with the repeal of the 100-year-old ordinance on drilling in the city and our parks. Parks and trees are mentioned throughout this plan and in all the sections of comments given. We obviously love them - so why abandon this 100 year old tradition???</p> <p>These are the sections of the Parks section I would call to their attention. PA4 "Tourism Value" hey, doesn't this mean \$\$\$\$\$\$. Why not save the parks rather than attack them. PA8 "Unobtrusive parkland" great term. Hard to use that when it has drilling going on. And right after that: PA9 "Tulsans also recognize we need to protect and capitalize on the city's local natural assets, including Mohawk Park..Turkey Mt...Tulsans want to preserve these assets for children in the community, future generations.." Well said. why couldn't the City leaders wait for this report and listen to what citizens were saying to them. On the previous page, citizens were asked about "unobtrusive il drilling in large tracts of undeveloped park land" as possible revenue sources to raise funds for the city and many favored this. However - this is then contradicted by what you have later in the chapter about ecological balance and saving tree canopies. I wonder if people would have responded to your question differently. I remember a fight back in the 80's over the North Woods of Oxley when Inhofe proposed a casino for the north side. He was plucked by the birders and had bird tracks up one side and down the other. Result: no casino and the woods still stands. It is one thing to propose it but when it comes to actually saying we are going to cut the trees, the mayor is likely to be the one that gets the ax. (Inhofe lost the next election.) PA10 "Restoring Ecological Function" Well, we are already preserving it in Mohawk with the nature center so why do we want to drill in Mohawk? Also, Turkey Mountain is another areas that supports migratory birds PA17. PA25 Building and saving the Tree Canopy - Yes, so save the parkland, duh. PA26 Avoid Development in the Flood Plain. Again the City Council and the Mayor</p>	

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>just ignored this. Bird Creek floods Mohawk. Why do you think the interpretive building at Oxley Nature Center sits up on a pad? Why is there a pond in front. Because the dirt was removed to make the building pad so the building was up out of the plain.</p> <p>As I told a city planner at my district meeting, the nature center is always being flooded. (it's part of the natural process) IT is, he replied! I said yes. It's had waist deep water in the parking lot. It has?? he replied. Well if you folks would talk to the staff and the Friends group once in a blue moon you might learn a few things!</p> <p>PA 26 7.3 "Avoid development in floodplain and wetlands areas." To me that says No Drilling, but maybe that's not development?!</p> <p>PA27 Goal 9 "Natural and sensitive areas are protected and preserved." I would add - since we are in Oklahoma, No drilling allowed.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments.</p>	
25	<p>As proud midtown residents (district 4), we support the PlaniTulsa policy plan. We would love to see downtown Tulsa redeveloped and reenergized to offset the flight to the suburbs that has occurred over the last several decades. We finally have a vision and a plan and we need to implement it.</p>	
26	<p>The reliance on neighborhood associations as an informed and engaged planning participant is misplaced. Although WIN has offered a number of classes addressing a variety of topical issues, the subject of planning has not be properly addressed. Unless a neighborhood has been engaged in a small-area neighborhood plan, the planning process and its outcomes are alien to the majority of citizens in Tulsa. Without a structured training resource on the subject of planning that results in a minimum standard of accountability, the majority of the city's neighborhood associations, leaders, and members will continue to be primarily reactive in their response to change in their neighborhoods, and historically, this reaction has been negative and personal.</p>	

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>Why has PLANiTULSA failed to address citizen education as a fundamental issue?</p>	
<p>27</p>	<p>February 22, 2010</p> <p>Janet Harrod Carr, <i>M.A., CCC-SLP</i> 2920 S. 73rd Street South Tulsa, OK 74136</p> <p>Michelle Canfield, Chair Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission Williams Tower II Two West 2nd Street, Suite 800 Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103</p> <p>RE: Comprehensive Plan for Tulsa (PLANiTULSA)</p> <p>Dear Ms. Canfield:</p> <p>As a resident of Tulsa for over 30 years and professional business owner, I wish to express my full support for the proposed adoption of the updated Comprehensive Plan for Tulsa (PLANiTULSA).</p> <p>Having closely followed the process of consultant selection, project development and extensive citizen participation, I am very pleased at the efforts and resulting Plan recommendations. I love the City of Tulsa and wish to retire here. It is very important that Tulsa continue to grow in a new and better way so that we can continue to grow and prosper so that we can keep our children and grand children here and to attract new families, young professionals and to gather diverse workers, business and residents to Tulsa.</p> <p>PLANiTULSA will be a tremendous tool in doing just that, as it will help sustain America's most beautiful city retain and build upon that title.</p>	

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>I urge you to adopt in as timely fashion as possible the PLANiTULSA vision and plan as developed by Tulsans. Please forward this letter of support to the other Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commissioners, to Mayor Dewey Bartlett and the Tulsa City Council.</p> <p>Thanks again for your involvement in enhancing Tulsa's future.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Electonically Signed JHC in 02/24/2010 Janet Harrod Carr, M.A., CCC-SLP Speech-Language Pathologist</p>	
28	<p>Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2010 11:13 AM To: TMAPC Subject: City Planning</p> <p>PlaniTulsa is the most important project undertaken by the City in 35 years. I strongly urge you and your fellow members to vote unanimously in support of it. I hope you will encourage the Mayor and Council to implement its policies and strategies as rapidly as possible.</p> <p>Larry Krutka</p> <p>Larry Krutka Krutka Fitness Programs 6655 South Lewis Ave Suite 130 Tulsa, OK 74136 W: 918 492-1272 F: Same M: 918 629-9094</p>	
29	<p>Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 2010 11:18 AM To: TMAPC Subject: iPlan Tulsa</p> <p>The opportunity to make improvements to Tulsa presents itself tomorrow by supporting the iPlan Tulsa proposal. Tulsa needs to act to propell itself forward as</p>	

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>OKC has done. The investment in a core area is very sustaining. The character of Tulsa is great and something must be done to recognize it. Please support the iPlan Tulsa proposal. It's in the city's best intrests.</p> <p>Kind Regards, Matt Sbaschnig</p>	
30	<p>Madams & Sirs,</p> <p>Tens of thousands of hours over 2 years were spent by over 6000 citizen volunteers to develop the PlaniTulsa plan. It would be a travesty of the democratic process to allow naysayers who either didn't participate, or who were in the minority (remember, majority rules), to hijack and change this excellent plan. If the TMAPC is truly representative of the people, you will adopt this plan as developed by energized citizens of Tulsa. How many more hearings do we need? People who care about Tulsa's future have worked hard to develop this long term plan. Let's approve it tonight and start working to take Tulsa into the 21st century. SAY NO TO STATUS QUO.</p> <p>When I was working in the Chicago corporate headquarters of a Fortune 500 company and one of the top brands in the world, I remember our CEO explaining why we needed to stop doing the old same things over and over and start moving to the future. He used this question...when a light bulb is out in a room, why do you keep flicking the light switch? The bulb is out. It is not going to light up...yet you still flick that switch. The solution is to CHANGE the bulb!</p> <p>PlaniTulsa is Tulsa's new light bulb. We've been flicking that switch for years. Yes, we've added a few more small lights, but we have not had a strategic, visionary, long term plan for the future in decades. And Tulsa is paying for it...with a loss in revenues and the cut back in city services, little or no population growth, and many low rankings among cities. I personally know too many young adults to baby boomers who have left</p> <p>Before I go on, I should explain, I am an Okie who left home for 24 years to pursue</p>	

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>my career. I've lived in a small town of 5,000 and world cities of up to 12 million, including three of the six largest cities in the U.S. Having lived and worked in four countries and four states, I think I have a unique perspective on truly livable cities for all people. You see, I could have lived anywhere, but CHOSE TULSA.</p> <p>Tulsa in frustration. I know many others planning to leave if things don't change. Can we afford this "brain drain"? Yes, we are a low cost city, but we are not a dynamic city that is truly growing or attracting new, innovative businesses and creative industries on a large scale. Major commitment to smart growth, new urbanism, mixed use neighborhoods, public transportation and sustainability are all currently missing here. PlaniTulsa is a good first step for all of this because these elements are in the plan.</p> <p>But sadly, I returned to find that Tulsa is behind as it is compared to other cities. We used to be the leader over Oklahoma City, but OKC has been running circles around us...and what OKC is doing is not really THAT remarkable as cities go. In Tulsa, we just perpetuate what we've always been doing, and we are falling farther and farther behind. Tulsa not only needs to catch up with other cities by adopting and immediately implementing the PlaniTulsa plan, but we need to "leapfrog" our vision and strategic planning for Tulsa to make it truly a city for the 21st century. If we don't, we will continue to lose people, lose city revenues, and then lose property values.</p> <p>Please, please, please, don't let the naysayer and anti-change minorities who selfishly protect their personal interests hijack this democratic, visionary process. It is time to do what is right for Tulsa's future. SAY NO TO STATUS QUO. Approve this exceptional PlaniTulsa plan and let's move into the 21st century!</p> <p>Thank you so much for your volunteering to serve on this board, and for approving the PlaniTulsa plan...as the caring, energized citizens developed it.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kathy Henry Citizen of Tulsa</p>	

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
31	<p>Ms. Michelle Cantrell Chair, Tulsa Metropolitan Planning Commission, c/o INCOG, Two West Second Street, Suite 800, Tulsa, OK 74103</p> <p>Dear Ms. Cantrell:</p> <p>I write to express my strong support for speedy approval of PlaniTulsa. I am a small business owner, former president and current board member of the Pearl District neighborhood association, and chair of grassroots advocacy organization the Alliance for an Accessible City.</p> <p>Many hopes for the sustainable, economically viable future of our city are pinned on passage of PlaniTulsa. It has been inspiring to be a part of this lengthy, thoughtful process with some 6,000 other Tulsans – a process unprecedented in public participation for our city. The product is an enlightened roadmap toward a world-class city informed by 21st Century realities and the desires of our citizens.</p> <p>As we reach these important final stages of hearings, it would be tragic indeed if powerful special interests were allowed to eviscerate the plan or unnecessarily delay approval to suit the few.</p> <p>Again, I urge speedy approval of PlaniTulsa by TMAPC. Let's do the right thing. Sincerely, Christine Booth</p>	

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
<p>32 Land Use Chapter, Page 28</p>	<p>Downtown neighborhood. How will that reconcile with areas that are established single family homes, including those on the national register (esp. Riverview)? TMAPC Chair</p>	<p>These areas are designated as Downtown Neighborhoods, but are considered Areas of Stability. The Downtown Neighborhood plan category does not preclude the TMAPC from applying a zoning designation that would retain the character of these neighborhoods</p>
<p>33</p>	<p>Wayne, As I understand it the TMAPC is going to be discussing the upcoming public meetings on the PlaniTulsa process at their meeting today. As I also understand it, the “ground rules” for the meetings on Feb. 23 and March 10 will be discussed. I intended to attend today’s meeting, but will be unable due to an unexpected illness. Nevertheless, I wanted to ensure that the HBA’s concerns about the process is heard today.</p> <p>First, I would like to say that this email will not address the substantive concerns we have with PlaniTulsa at all. This is simply to communicate the problems we have observed with the procedures and a request for additional time to evaluate the substance.</p> <p>Approximately one month ago, the “Final Draft” of the plan was released. In fact, members of the HBA were meeting to evaluate the plan at the very moment the final version of the Land Use Chapter went on line. Within 2 days after that meeting, I met with Susan Neal, Theron Warlick and Martha Schulz to discuss the concerns of the HBA. A couple of weeks after that, we met with John Fregonese to continue our discussions. Following that, we met again with Ms. Neal, Mr. Warlick and Ms. Schulz. I mention the number of meetings we have had to highlight the fact that we have been <u>very</u> actively involved in the process ever since the Final Draft came out. It is against this backdrop that some are saying “What has taken you so long to bring us your concerns?”</p> <p>This is at the heart of the problems with this process. For many months, we have asked the citizens of Tulsa to share their vision and dream of a better Tulsa with Fregonese and Associates. Many of HBA’s members, including myself, participated in that process. However now that the 200+ document is available, there seems to</p>	

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>be a mad dash across the finish line. I am told that despite our various concerns (and that we needed to express those concerns to the planning commission) we may have only 3 minutes to do so. This is shocking.</p> <p>The size of this document is huge. The ramifications this document will have on Tulsa's future are vast. And we are limited to 3 minutes? We have taken every opportunity we could to express our concerns since the Final Draft became available. We have not been lying behind the log. However, the reality is that more time is needed: not only during the TMAPC meeting, but for additional meetings. Currently it feels as if we don't express our concerns (within 3 minutes) by March 10, then our concerns are not valid. How can we possibly hope to have a meaningful evaluation of a 200+ page document which we control Tulsa's future in such a short time frame? This feels frighteningly similar to the full court press which was happening in D.C. to pass a health care bill.</p> <p>We respectfully request that: 1) public comments not be limited to 3 minutes per speaker; and 2) that an additional 30 to 60 days be allowed for evaluation of the Final Draft. In my discussions with other business groups in town, <u>not a single one</u> had actually read through the plan. Many read the Vision Statement and believed that was the plan itself. This was no fault of the readers, but due to a confusing website. Again, while months of input have been sought only a few short weeks seem to be allowed to evaluate this enormous document with lots of complex issues. Why the rush? We submit that all Tulsans will benefit from additional time to read and evaluate this document which is of utmost importance. Because, like they say, "The devil's in the details."</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
<p>34 Land Use Chapter, Page 12</p>	<p>You indicate vacant land in flood plains, but not "redevelopable land", some of which is in the floodplain.</p>	<p>For our analysis we assumed that floodplains have already been developed in these areas. This is not to say that redevelopment can't include storm water management techniques, such as near the Village at Central Park.</p>
<p>35 Land Use</p>	<p>Explain sentence toward the bottom <i>It is possible, after conducting a review of a proposed project or neighborhood plan,</i></p>	<p>The intent is to allow for changes to the plan over time by assuming that</p>

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
Chapter, Page 27	<i>the conclusion may be reached that the PLANiTULSA process did not exactly predict the growth and evolution of a neighborhood or the city. Should this occur, the plan map should be amended, using the building blocks and plan categories identified in this plan.</i>	unforeseen opportunities may arise, or that conditions in certain areas may change as development takes place. For example, if an area designated a neighborhood center is functioning as a town or regional center due to greater than anticipated growth nearby, it may be desirable to change its designation to town or regional center, so that transportation and other policies may be aligned to better support the area.
36 Land Use Chapter, Page 49	To clarify, if you assume the build out scenario, you get 3X the amount in the 2030 goal? So, if we build according to the plan, and only 1/3 of it actually happens, we will still get the population/sales base projected?	The build-out analysis is a measurement of the capacity of the entire plan, which is much larger than the Tulsa 2030 Goal forecast, due to the amount of available land in the city. The population, transportation, economic development, and other indicators were based on the Tulsa 2030 Goal scenario.
37 Land Use Chapter, Page 50	P. 50, Figure 19, have flood plains indicated as new neighborhoods, but in Plan map (p. 28), you have that left as either open space or agriculture. Does the build out scenario incorporate surface limestone area? INCOG says the flood map isn't correct. Is that true? Would it affect the build out scenario?	We assumed a 50% development rate for floodplains, in order to allow for the potential use of stormwater mitigation solutions such as cluster development, low-impact development techniques, and the use of floodplains as open space elements in a project. The floodplains shown are based on a floodplain survey CAD file provided by the City of Tulsa Public Works Department, via the Planning

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
		<p>Department.</p> <p>By request of the city, the consultant digitized the Public Works' map. It was used in the plan maps, because it more accurately reflects floodplains than the data on the City's shapefile. The digitized version will be provided to the City and INCOG for their use.</p>
<p>38 Land Use Chapter, Page 53</p>	<p>Areas of stability & change—not intended to be fixed, are they? Can they be revised via small area workshops? Sensitive area around Riverview—did you reconcile it with those areas on the National Register?</p>	<p>The boundaries on this map are not intended to be fixed and immutable and can be amended. The small area planning process would be a good venue for refining the boundaries, but proposals to change the map may be initiated by landowners, the Planning Commission, or the City.</p> <p>The Areas of Stability and Change map was based initially on single-family neighborhoods and HP districts. It was edited and refined by INCOG and City of Tulsa staff, who forwarded those edits to the consultant. The Riverview neighborhood was included as an Area of Stability.</p>
<p>39 Land Use Chapter, Page 73, Policy 1.1</p>	<p>Zoning, though, will happen through small area workshops? Or will we be rezoning the entire city based upon the map? Some at INCOG have suggested that blanket rezoning will occur once the plan is adopted—is that so?</p>	<p>Adoption of this plan does not alter the authority of or procedures used by the TMAPC to rezone land. Nor will adoption of this plan affect the existing zoning code.</p> <p>The plan and strategic plan recommend adding districts (e.g. mixed-use, parking management</p>

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
		<p>districts) that are not currently in the code.</p> <p>When small area plans are completed, they more often than not will include recommended zone changes so that development regulations are in alignment with the goals and objectives for the area. It is recommended that there be a set of standard citywide zoning districts that can be applied to these areas.</p>
<p>40 Land Use Chapter, Page 74, Policy 2.4</p>	<p>Explain. <i>2.4 Use the Land Use Plan categories to set the parameters for zoning districts with more than one zoning district allowed in each category.</i> <i>Plan categories:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Describe in detail desired environments</i> • <i>Are not immutable, additional plan categories can be created and geographies changed, as long as new categories are consistent with the vision</i> • <i>Are designed to provide a broad framework to guide the development of small area plans. New categories should only be created or amended through the small area planning process</i> 	<p>This policy explains that the land use plan categories (Downtown, Downtown Neighborhood, Neighborhood Center, etc.) are to be used to guide the TMAPC in deciding what zoning districts should be applied in an area.</p> <p>The plan categories do not regulate land use or development. Land may be rezoned by the TMAPC and the Plan Map then amended to match the new zoning designation.</p>
<p>41 Land Use Chapter, Page 74, Policy 2.5</p>	<p>Explain the process of amending the land use plan vs. zoning changes <i>2.5 The Land Use Plan:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Is adopted by City Council upon recommendation by the Planning Commission</i> • <i>Is amended by City Council upon recommendation by the Planning Commission</i> <p><i>Amendments can be initiated by landowners, the Planning Commission, or the City Council</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Should be amended to conform to zoning changes</i> • <i>Should be amended no more than twice in a calendar year.</i> <p>Note: Policy 2.5 is to be amended to clarify that the TMAPC adopts plans, with approval by the City Council, as per previous comments.</p>	<p>The technical process of amending the land use plan will not change as a result of PLANiTULSA's adoption. The same procedures and processes that currently apply will still apply. As this policy is written, the TMAPC will have the authority to rezone property using existing procedures and processes. It is intended that rezoning cases be reviewed for</p>

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
		<p>compatibility with the Vision and plan category in which they are proposed. But, if the TMAPC finds that a different zoning designation not typically used in the plan category would be more beneficial, it may do so and then update the plan to match.</p>
<p>42 Land Use Chapter, Page 76, Policy 3.8</p>	<p>Please explain reasoning behind requiring small area workshops. <i>3.8 In order to ensure that new development is compatible with Our Vision for Tulsa, zoning change decisions for developments over 5 acres on land currently zoned agriculture and shown as “New Neighborhood” should be based on small area plans to determine appropriate zoning and densities. Other building blocks may be appropriate, as well, given service levels and development patterns.</i></p>	<p>The Small Area Planning process depends on a public involvement process to ensure that the vision and plan resonate with the community. For some areas, especially large tracts of vacant land to which infrastructure is not yet available, workshops may take the form of working sessions with land owners, developers, the city and other stakeholders. In general, though, small area plan workshops are intended to help arrive at a consensus about growth and development, thus reducing the need for project-by-project hearings later on. In response to several other comments regarding how and when small area plans should be used, the City recommends removing Land Use Policy 3.8. Additional language has been proposed in the plan text and Small Area Planning Process appendix that better explains the conditions under which a small area plan should be conducted (i.e. large areas that are</p>

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
		<p>expected to change, rather than individual lots, small developments, etc. that are better served with rezonings, subdivisions, or PUDs). See Major Items for Discussion.</p>
<p>43 Land Use Chapter, Page 77, Policy 4.2</p>	<p>Allowing temporary property tax relief—can the city actually do this?</p>	<p>The City has the authority to offer tax abatements and create Tax Increment Finance (TIF) districts under the 1992 Oklahoma Local Development Act. The City should coordinate use of these incentive programs with the County, State and other entities as part of its redevelopment strategy.</p>

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
<p>44 Transportation Chapter, Page 13</p>	<p>Explain the different cross-sections more specifically. How will it overlay our current system? Do you envision taking different ROW in the future? Or simply make do with current row? Right now, have 21st & Peoria both designated as multimodal, but currently much is urban arterial. Will you be able to fit a multi modal street on 70' of ROW? Also address on Pg 40, Policy 10.3 10.3 Pursue main street, residential and multi-modal enhancements using a context sensitive solutions process on the following catalyst corridors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main Street- Cherry Street and Harvard Avenue • Residential- 6th Street • Multi-modal- Pine Street Peoria Street and 21st Street 	<p>The cross sections, as they appear in the plan, are intended to serve as alternatives to Tulsa's existing street design typologies. They are not rigid or immutable, but will serve as additional design options for Tulsa's street network. These cross sections serve as models for different types of streets, depending on the transportation service envisioned for the facility (i.e. if it is to include frequent bus service, a cross section that includes some form of prioritized transit lane may be used). Under the CSS process, a more detailed analysis of individual roadways will need to be conducted, and the final design of the roadway will be based on balancing the needs of the roadway's users.</p>
<p>45 Transportation Chapter, Page 27</p>	<p>Curious why 71st wasn't considered for public transportation. Was it not high performing?</p>	<p>71st was considered in the first round of transit line alternatives. A number of factors went into the selection of 91st as the primary southern transit corridor, namely the ability for transit to be a motivating force in the land development patterns along 91st and Garnett, the regional connections afforded with the bridge to Jenks and the capacity to design transit accommodations into the design of</p>

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
		91st during a municipal roadway project. 71st's auto orientation, built-out roadway capacity and less attractive regional attractions.
46 Transportation Chapter, Page 29	The "T": envision the transfer point at 21st & Utica? Then does the bus on Peoria go east some?	The Peoria line is recommended to turn east at 15th to Utica and return to Peoria on 21st. This information is presented in greater detail in the urban corridor planning appendix.
47 Transportation Chapter, Page 36, Policy 2.1	<p>"Require connectivity index"—explain what that means & how it would work. Do you mean via the index that no new subdivision will be allowed a connectivity index below a certain amount?</p> <p>2.1 Adopt a network approach to transportation projects that focuses on connecting people to places—ultimately allowing places to become more intense centers of economic development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require a roadway connectivity index to be applied to all future subdivisions and developments. 	<p>Implementing this policy would result in the adoption of objective standards for measuring the connectivity of new streets and roads in Tulsa. Connectivity is usually measured in terms of intersection density; the Sustainable Network Initiative appendix proposes a standard of 8 to 10 intersections per mile of roadway, which would provide adequate permeability. The appendix also includes definitions of what may constitute an intersection.</p> <p>These standards would not require the exclusive use of a gridded street pattern, but would allow curvilinear or organic street patterns, provided they are sufficiently connected.</p>
48 Economic Development Chapter, Page 19,	Freeze property taxes—don't know that the city has that authority.	The City has the authority to offer tax abatements and create Tax Increment Finance (TIF) districts under the 1992 Oklahoma Local Development Act. The City should coordinate use of

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
Policy 6.1		these incentive programs with the County, State and other entities as part of its redevelopment strategy.
49 Land Use Chapter, Page 48, Table 16	What is Tulsa’s current net density per acre?	<p>This is an estimate, but we pulled the residential land use (parcel based) from all three counties within City of Tulsa. That gives us 88,922.126 residential acres. The census has 385,635 people for 2008 and 185,505 units for 2006-2008.</p> <p>This equates to about 2 units per acre and 4.3 residents per acre.</p>
50 Land Use Chapter, Page 49	Build out capacity: have flood plains develop at 50% capacity, but parks section 7.3—“avoid development in flood plains”. Please reconcile.	We assumed a 50% development rate for floodplains to account for the use of design solutions such as mitigation, low-impact development techniques, or use of floodplains as open space elements in a project.
51	<p>Dear Tulsa Resident,</p> <p>I am writing to you to express my concern regarding the way The Housing and Land Use Sections of the Plan It Tulsa proposed Comprehensive Plan for the City of Tulsa is being drafted and the direct effect it will have on all of us in our existing neighborhoods.</p> <p>In short, the two sections of concern are written as an overlay for the entire city to current rules, regulations and property rights.</p> <p>The common thread that concerns me throughout these sections is that in addition to the current laws and rules that are already in place regarding your property, the revised plan adds yet another layer of bureaucracy that is both unnecessary and invasive. Among the most troubling proposals is the creation of an undefined Citizens Committee to be appointed that will have the power to direct both “style and size” in regard to renovations and infill of our property and neighborhoods.</p>	

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>How many people will sit on this commission? Who would be eligible for consideration? What are their qualifications to make these judgments or to over-ride our judgments as to how we spend our money for property improvement?</p> <p>Very simply, this Citizens Committee will hold subjective power to which you and I have no recourse. Just imagine hiring an architect and spending your time and money developing what is right for you only to have the Citizens Committee rule “that is too big for our taste” or “please change your design, we don’t approve of your style”? Are you kidding me? The plan also strongly suggests that we “pursue historic designations” which will give neighborhood associations a legitimate leg to stand on in the case of a decision or dispute. On the surface this might sound good except for the fact that it moves us ever closer to losing current property rights you now have as homeowners to spend your money on home improvement/building projects as our budgets and taste dictate. And, what if you are in a neighborhood where you disagree with the the association or the people who run it? All neighborhoods, midtown or otherwise with few exceptions were formed without these associations. The forming of them for anything more than a social board takes away our property rights, not to mention can become a source of conflict. And, it’s usually the vocal minority who rule. We all want peace in our home life. With associations and historic designations come more meetings with strife and division to our already complicated schedules. These should not be forced upon anyone in Tulsa.</p> <p>The Land Use Section of the Plan basically reads the same way for all development. A Citizens Committee which dictates both “size and style” for development of any size, plus now, they suggest where a development be located (area of change or stability). Tulsa has a wonderful history of entrepreneurship. Location is key to commercial and residential real estate. Real estate is market driven, not Plan driven. Should The Land Use section of this plan pass, it will produce a result that is contrary to the Vision Section of Plan It Tulsa, which is development friendly for a stronger growth, work force and tax base. It will be perceived as “unfriendly” to those we are hoping to attract from within our city and those we hope to attract nationally and internationally.</p> <p>I understand wanting to develop and infill struggling parts of town, and I even love mixed use developments which are proposed. I am not opposed to all change, just change which encroaches on so many individual property rights. I urge anyone</p>	

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>in an area of change to read carefully....do you want your area of town to be an area of change? Research how this will affect you if the plan is passed. Do the areas of stability promote growth in the same way that has continued to keep them stable?</p> <p>I am trying to keep this as short as possible. To read for yourselves, you can go to www.PlanitTulsa.org then click on both the housing and land use sections. If you agree with me please send an email as soon as possible to www.walberty@incog.org to register your disagreement. It can be short and simple. Just say I disagree with the proposed citizens committee and the pursuance of historic designations. This is the email address of a man named Wayne Alberty at Incog. He will broadcast your letter to each member of the planning commission and to the PlanitTulsa office. Please also let your City Council representative know. There is the final meeting on March 10th so if you plan on registering your complaint please do it by March 9. You are welcome to come and voice your concerns at the meeting March 9, 1:00 to 4:00 on the bottom floor of City Hall.</p> <p>On a personal level, I know a lot of people have spent a great deal of time on this plan and many ideas they came up with are wonderful (Walking paths, bike paths, train system from outer areas to downtown, mixed use). However, it is in the "fine points" of the plan that have the opportunity to ruin an otherwise good idea and change something that is currently working. As the saying goes, "the devil is in the details". At a time when the city is laying off police and firemen, and closing community centers, we really need to take a step back and consider not only what I have laid out before you but the cost to the taxpayers to implement such a plan. The cost section of the Plan had not been reduced to writing at the last planning commission meeting (but the tone was move forward without regard to cost). Even with partnerships of public and private funding on these developments proposed, there will be substantial costs incurred for Tulsa's share (extra engineering, water studies, streets etc.) The economy is drastically different than it was when the city hired this firm to come up with a plan. Plan it Tulsa however, seems to be going full speed ahead whether we have the money to implement it or not.</p> <p>So please have your say before it is too late!</p> <p>Most Sincerely Yours, Martha Thomas Cobb 918 625.3177</p>	

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
52	<p>From: Terry Still [mailto:t.still@centerpointmarketing.com] Sent: Friday, March 05, 2010 9:55 AM To: Alberty, Wayne Subject: Plan Tulsa</p> <p>As a matter of principle. I am opposed to citizen approval committees to oversee land use as it relates to architecture, paint colors, etc. Committees rarely represent their so-called constituents. They tend to become "holier than thou" and their appointments smack of a socialistic attitude. At the risk of my partisanship showing, this democratic approach implies that, "Since I (committee members) don't like what you are planning to do, I want everyone not to like what you are planning to do." Active neighborhoods have always been more effective in expressing their displeasure of a neighbor's actions. Thank you for considering my opinion.</p>	
53	<p>From: MIKE STILL [mailto:SRS1000@cox.net] Sent: Friday, March 05, 2010 10:02 AM To: Alberty, Wayne Subject: CITIZENS COMMITTEE</p> <p>Dear Sir: this sounds like a bad idea--I think it would hasten a decline in property values in midtown. The values are largely dependent upon location but if that location has restrictions such as this committee would have the authority to impose then it is no longer attractive.</p> <p>A committee such as this is bound to attract those who are against change and are blind to every other consideration. It would destroy capital.</p> <p>Thank you, Mike Still</p>	
54	<p>From: Kenny Trotter [mailto:isellknobs@gmail.com] Sent: Friday, March 05, 2010 10:01 AM To: Alberty, Wayne Subject: I disagree with the plan of Plan it Tulsa</p>	

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>We have enough on our plate. Come back some other day. We have enough problems today. Lets invite growth to our community not the opposite.</p> <p>Thanks, Kenny Trotter</p>	
55	<p>From: Mark Meador [mailto:Mark@marjoop.com] Sent: Friday, March 05, 2010 9:45 AM To: Alberty, Wayne Subject:</p> <p>Dear Wayne, INCOG, Planning Commission, City of Tulsa Council Members and Mayor Bartlett,</p> <p>Please register my disagreement with the proposed addition of a Citizens Committee and the pursuance of historic designations to The Housing and Land Use Sections of the Plan It Tulsa proposed Comprehensive Plan for the City of Tulsa.</p> <p>Mark Meador 5601 S. Evanston Ave. Tulsa, OK 74105 918-625-2256</p>	
56	<p>From: John McMahon [mailto:JGMcmahon@petroleumintl.com] Sent: Friday, March 05, 2010 9:32 AM To: Alberty, Wayne Subject: Plan it Tulsa</p> <p>This plan sticks. I do not need more government or committees telling me what I can and cannot do with my home. Many of the ideas are already in place put their by the developer. JOHN</p>	
57	See following letter - unable to copy text as it was submitted as image	

GEORGE KAISER FAMILY FOUNDATION

A supporting organization of Tulsa Community Foundation

February 26, 2010

PLANiTULSA
C/O Susan Neal
City of Tulsa
175 E. 2nd St, Suite 570
Tulsa, OK 74114
planning@cityoftulsa.org

Dear Ms. Neal:

On behalf of the George Kaiser Family Foundation (GKFF), I am writing to express support for the pending decision to adopt a new Comprehensive Plan for Tulsa (PLANiTULSA).

GKFF has been a funder and participant in this project over the past two years, and we are pleased with the efforts of both the consultant and city staff to include all of Tulsa. The PLANiTULSA effort addresses, in a new and unique way, many of the same community issues consistent with our mission. Increased transportation options designed to provide better access to services for as many Tulsans as possible is just one example of how this plan works in conjunction with our foundation's goals.

We believe that this plan represents an important milestone for the City of Tulsa. Through this process, Tulsans have shown they care deeply about their city by coming together and evaluating what is both valuable about Tulsa, and also what needs to be improved. Citizens, businesses and visitors will all benefit greatly from this new plan that provides for increased economic development, more housing choices and fiscal responsibility.

I urge you to move forward on the decision to adopted PLANiTULSA, as developed by the citizens of Tulsa, and pass this letter of support to the Mayor, Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission and the Tulsa City Council.

Thank you for initiating the process of improving Tulsa's future.

Sincerely,



Ken Levit
Executive Director
George Kaiser Family Foundation

Item number#	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
<p>57 continued</p>	<p>Dear Susan,</p> <p>With regard to my letter of 2/26/2010 about PlaniTulsa, I wanted to clarify one point , in particular, that we also discussed on the phone. We have been pleased to support this process from the outset through a grant from the foundation and believe that the effort will yield significant benefit for the community. I know there is a discussion about the timeline for consideration of the plan and about specific aspects of it. My view, which I am sure is yours as well, would be that the City should provide a full opportunity for all those affected by the proposed plan to have a full opportunity to be heard so that the final plan is as strong as possible. GKFF supports this process but does not hold itself out to have the expertise to judge whether the plan is ready for approval or whether it needs improvement in certain areas. I congratulate you for your hard work and look forward to getting to an ultimate result that will be of real value for the community. If you could make this clarification available to those who received the earlier letter, I would appreciate it. Thank you again for your stewardship of this project. –Ken</p> <p>Ken Levit</p> <p>George Kaiser Family Foundation</p>	

Page 5 Land Use "New developments will focus on creating pedestrian friendly mixed-use." To the exclusion of all else? Mixed use is not appropriate for all new development.

Strategies I agree with innovative parking solutions, but the push for mixed-use is too broad.

2. Define "private/public" partnerships. T.I.F.'s or corporate welfare?

3. Define "Information Technologies"

5. Define "innovative building types" - Green?

Page 6 - "community & housing" - again, "creating new mixed-use centers" sounds like the only "new" option. I agree with appropriate pockets, but not everywhere.

Equity & Opportunity - great to see a goal of health care available in all sectors of the city. Environment - great

Under "Planning Process", if followed, would be great. System must be inclusive of all stakeholders, especially those vested in living there. In view of current and possible future budget issues, any mass transit must be self-sustaining - OR not be the entire focus for development. What happens when the development is dependant on it, but it's no longer there due to cut backs?

Page 9 - Don't forget the public support for "New Centers" was conditional on single family homes. Mixed-use should be reserved for Downtown, corridors, main street and appropriate infill. The fact that 1/2 of those surveyed prefer an existing neighborhood, suggests they should predominate all else.

Page 10 - where is the data to support commuter work travel? Statistics indicate the majority of Tulsans have no intention of giving up their vehicles.

Transportation - Again, most Tulsans will not give up their cars. Show me data that proves otherwise. And they DO NOT do so at the expense of those who bike, walk, or take mass transit! We could increase our bike lanes, we are already addressing the need for sidewalks in all new development and we have a wonderful trail system! It does not need to be one or the other, they can fully co-exist. In the past they all co-existed and can do so again.

Pg. 11 - Agree that downtown and main-streets are the perfect locale to expand the diversity of housing types, but to say that mixed-use is appropriate for everyone is simply not true. The elderly and disabled often cannot walk far or ride a bicycle, is a significant segment of our aging population. Our State is not known for having the healthiest population, and while everyone hopes things will improve, the reality is that we lead the Nation in diabetes, heart disease and other ailments that often lead to limited mobility, especially as they age. As a significant part of our population, they deserve the same consideration, especially as they age as healthy youth. Even the young

is ~~the~~ ^{ages}, their needs for affordable single story condos, patio homes and nearby shopping must also be considered. While it's true, a city must accommodate the youth, don't do it to the exclusion of the "baby boomers," or the inevitable toll of time.

pg. 11 Environment again - We are not the ^{North} West Coast, or Eastern Mega Cities. Tulsa's growth is limited to our land locked mass area, which means we will never have the need to eliminate our autos. While some will choose to do so and will enjoy a dense urban environment, many will not, hence, the desire to live in existing neighborhoods. Many Tulsans have chosen to live here for that very reason. Be careful not to design our entire future to please what is likely a slight minority.

We must absolutely preserve our green spaces & parks

pg. 14 Southwest Tulsa hopes you mean it when you say "care must be taken to ensure that reinvestment is well integrated with existing neighborhoods". More than 50 of us felt betrayed when it was decided to allow well over 300 apartments at 81st and Union when the surrounding area is large acreages zoned agricultural and all the new single family homes are east of HW 75. To jump to this level of density before there are any ^{new} single family homes or commercial development west of the hiway is not appropriate. Lack of public infrastructure to carry the density is contrary to your bullet points on this page. The request of TMAPC member Michelle Cantrell and Elizabeth Wright to develop an area plan for the Tulsa Hills area last year, has continued to be ignored.

page 16 - Finally, a statement that supports Tulsa's tradition of single family homes - "New neighborhoods will consist of individual homes." We on the West Side, plan to hold you to that.

Page 17 - Please take care for those who cannot walk very far to be able to visit downtown. Right now, many of us have never been to the BOK and have difficulty with city hall due to lack of parking. Would love to see the pre-malls downtown

Page 18 - Love the corridor plans. But again, without ^{I Remember.} infrastructure improvements along corridors like Union Ave, development cannot come. What do we do to fund the improvements?

pg. 19 - Main streets. Offstreet parking must be adequate for those who cannot walk distances.

Page 20 - New Centers - I do not want all New Centers

to be "pedestrian oriented", but rather "pedestrian friendly." to orient everything to those who are able to walk unaided is not fair and ignores a significant portion of our population. I like that you have qualified the "mixed use" in "New Centers" by stating "where appropriate". Along with your "warehousing, transportation businesses, ect. Please add "largely Agricultural" areas as an exception for Pedestrian friendly, mixed-use dense areas. I can assure you, most of the people south of W. 61st on the west side of HW 75 who live on acreage, moved there for that unique lifestyle and will not tolerate anymore huge apartment complexes or commercial density West of Union. Keep it on the Hiway and they'll be fine.

Page 22 KEY WORD = SMALL-SCALE apartments or Condo's. Also where's the zero lot line patio home? Tulsa has a great need for this type of housing. Right now anything under 250,000.00 doesn't exist. Our aging working class needs 1,000 to 1,800 square ft homes in the 125,000 to 185,000 price range. If they can build them in Prattville, we can build them here. I know a half dozen people who would sell their homes and move into an affordable patio home right now. These, like single story Condo's not only serve the elderly who can no longer do maintenance, but also the young professional who don't enjoy lawn care or don't have the time. And what about all our single moms? We could eliminate code violations by filling this lacking niche in Tulsa! But again, the key is small scale. We must stop these mega sized complexes. Even HUD says they eventually promote crime and violence. There should never be another type of non single family traditional homes that exceeds 40 units and there should be substantial spacing requirements. You doubt me? Look at what happened to the Southern end of Brookside. A once desirable, stable, working class neighborhood that now accounts for our city's highest crime area. Read HUD's Reports on the issue.

Also on pg. 23 regarding historically significant, but under-served, Bingo for North and West Tulsa. Both have wonderful historic homes with no real supportive restaurants, groceries, or retail sales. Special Enterprise zones to assist small business people in locating and getting financing to locate in these areas and reestablish once thriving areas. Incentivize and give a hand up - not a hand out. For an example, look to South Haven, a once poverty stricken, drug ridden forgotten part of our city, that has been reborn and is stabilizing because of the nearly 200 Habitat homes!

pg. 23 Please be careful with the "employment" areas, we will hold you to the assertion that there be few residences in proximity. Many in West Tulsa wish to contain this type of employment to the existing areas around the Refineries, W. 21st Street, and the trucking areas off the Turner Turnpike. There has been some attempts to spread it deeper into South Haven and deeper along Skelly bypass. We want it contained so that it doesn't contaminate the surrounding residential. Your requirement of major arterials or interstates certainly does not hold for the existing area around W. 61st W. of 33rd W. Ave or the industrial area around the now closed Affiliated Foods to the N.W. of the Turnpike. That area is ripe for housing, though it's in the county.

And please, please enforce the design issues. There are a couple of places on old Sapulpa Road that are exemplary examples of how nice an industrial building can look.

pg. 24 - Please do not let sustainability translate to only contemporary designs. And don't make it a requirement or we will lose some of our "affordable" housing.

"Wee Built Compact" what? Does that mean everyone?

Page 25 we need to actively pursue annexation of Berryhill. Eventually Sand Springs or Tulsa will get them.

We have the lesser taxes. Perryhill is very proud of their School. There's no reason they can't remain independant like Union Schools. Our city sat here while Sapulpa Annexed Town West and West Tulsa to the TSP Railway, taking in Sales Tax we desperately needed. And this happened in 2004?

Pages 29 - 31 while it's great to have a transportation Master Plan, I'm not sure how we will ever get there unless we can find funding beyond Sales Tax for our city.

Pg. 32 Economic Development. "Tulsa's for Tulsa" Dump the Metro Chamber and have put own-like every single city surrounding us. They all look out for themselves! Who looks out for JUST Tulsa? Eliminate TMAPC. People who do not live in this city

should not decide issues concerning this city. Replace it with a truly representative governing body. Their decisions affect the lives of every citizen. And there are many sectors of our city who don't have a resident sitting on this powerful board. There should be 9 seats, one from every council district appointed by the sitting Councilor. No one knows the heartbeat of a given part of the city like their councilor. And the citizens can hold them accountable. Take the 1.5 million or whatever it is that we donate to TMAPC and fund our own City of Tulsa Planners. Who must Reside within the city.

Pg. 35 Amen to the need for "a special team to streamline the design and permitting process and identity matching funds, ect"!! What we also need is a plan to deal with substandard housing and slum lords. Mayor Taylor asked me to head a committee, but when I spoke to some people at WIN, they seemed to be on track, even looking to Kansas City for a model

as I suggested. I saw no point, in replicating their work, however, assurances that ordinances were forthcoming to the Council, have not happened. I will approach the current administration for a follow up, when things quiet down.

Regarding Urban Living Downtown - again, look to Kansas City or St. Louis. TRVE - we have an abundance of potential loft space.

"You cannot get the cart before the horse. We cannot prioritize "transit-oriented" development when we are presently cutting what little transit we have.

Seriously missing from the Housing Chapter is Code Enforcement. What was once a thriving department under the Savage Administration headed by the Unduplicatable Jeanie McDaniel, has been repeatedly raided by every administration since. We now have only 7 inspectors for 9 Council districts!! Study the "Broken Windows" theory. It was my philosophy even before it was put in writing. Without a strong Code Enforcement department, Tulsa will never regain its status as "America's most beautiful city". Despite that it's always on the top of the list for the Council's Compendium of needs - it continues to be defunded. As a person who used to work several hundred complaints a year, on my own time, (until it became futile when it took 6-9 months to work a case) I believe that much like the sign enforcement volunteers, we could use neighborhood leaders as a first line. Several of us on a citizens committee under Savage had some great ideas. Establish some neighborhood liaisons to work with inspectors. People tell me they see a dramatic difference in West Tulsa since I've reduced my efforts as the unofficial Code Enforcement Nazi. I'm surprised this issue wasn't addressed as part of our plan.

Page 36 & 37 Parks, Trails, & Open Spaces, will become even more important as we increase our density. We MUST develop the West Bank!! We can not do small piece-meal T.I.F. districts. No one I know in West Tulsa wants that, Unless there is a comprehensive master plan that includes re-development of Public Works at 19th & Jackson, the concrete plant and elimination of all the low income housing, connecting the development to the SWBLVD. Red Fox main Street, NO ONE will go there. People I talk to would rather wait on a comprehensive plan, than to piece-meal things out over time. This is a perfect area for a River West version of Jenks' Riverwalk along with their new mixed use under current construction to the south. Get the input from the Community. What about Bell's as an anchor? When INCOG was doing the master plan for the entire river, I heard a great idea from a very young man. When asked what tourists expect from Oklahoma, we all responded with "Indians". He suggested we cater to the stereotype and develop a working Indian Village like they have in Talequah and maybe a Buffalo Bill type "Wild West Show". And to incorporate activities citizens could revisit such as an extensive horse riding trail. Maybe even finding a way to connect to the equestrian trails on Turkey Mountain. While we're dreaming big, why not dream about the River? Who wouldn't love to live in that great Brick Bldg. Public Works owns on Jackson? After all, we were promised that property if we moved to One Technology! The light touch you've given to the river on pg 37 is not what Tulsa was promised.

Page 38. Thank you for stating the obvious that variances should be rare. Agree strongly!

Page 39 How sad that you don't include existing residents in your list of Strategic Partnerships. We are our City's greatest stakeholders!! Many of the people who live in the Tulsa Hills area have spent their entire lives here, and in many cases properties are multi generational. It's part of what makes West Tulsa unique.

Pg. 40 Step I. I, and others will hold you to your statement that Revising the zoning Code "helps a developer understand community priorities for a particular location and how to successfully build there." That wasn't done at 81st & Union. As the only area of the city currently seeing substantial commercial and residential development, Tulsa Hills should immediately undergo a community plan with all our stakeholders at the table. Similar to what was done for Red Fork,

Page 40 I strongly disagree with minimizing the use of PUD's. I'd heard a long time ago that the "powers that be" wanted it to disappear. I don't recall you asking the citizens for their take on it. I also disagree about what you consider "overregulation". What a designer considers to "meet the needs" of the users and the community may not be in keeping with the area. You grant the builder too much power. They're not here for the long haul - we are. For instance, the ultra modern, monolithic Condo's that were to be built in Brookside alongside traditional single family homes, should not happen. Or the apartments that were built on the Southside of the B.A. Expressway near downtown of a similar design was not cohesive with the surrounding homes dating to the 20's & 30's. Just because the "workshops" showed significant support for more

diverse range of buildings" does NOT mean we think it's okay to destroy the "flavor" of a given area. The right thing is to do a building like one that went in North of Swan Lake that was required to use full brick (on all sides) of a multi-story that was cohesive with the existing structures in the area. People of Tulsa should not have to require "historic overlay" to have an expectation of similarity. Who would think it okay to plopp a multi-story ultra modern house in the middle of Ranch Acres? And I can tell you of certainty that Red Fork doesn't want someone to throw up a metal building any where near our prairie style buildings, by oellies. We should also have a reasonable expectation of aesthetic standards for New areas and corridors. Otherwise, you tilt the Scales way too far towards the developer.

I have no problem with shared parking, where appropriate, but not everywhere. Currently, I have a neighborhood bar that has been there a very long time. In the past, parking has been adequate. A few years ago it got new owners who are doing something right. It's become a "hot spot". Now patrons park down the street in the neighborhood, they park on the dirt on the vacant lots across the street and drive the neighbors crazy.

Page 41 - If you arbitrarily allow "bonuses" to developers what protection do you offer adjacent property owners and their expectations of what might be built next to them? Who decides what constitutes an excellent design or practices? In general, I am concerned that the scales are about to be tipped, not in favor of developers - but to the exclusion of the public. When you

Say that zoning approvals process should be short, does that mean you intend to eliminate our current system of notification? I need clarity on this issue, Pg. 42 I do not agree that our current approach to traffic congestion consists of expanding car capacity "at the expense of all other factors!" that's ridiculous. But even if true, I believe your input from Tulsans repeatedly showed that the majority of us have no intention of giving up our autos. Would you have us do the opposite and design our city to the exclusion of vehicles? We are not, nor will we ever be a huge metropolitan city. Limited available land will prevent that. And while most of us welcome accommodating those who wish to walk or bicycle (as evidenced by our outstanding trails system) and we realize we need to increase our density in some areas, for the sake of our tax base and acquire some amenities of a larger city, most of us live here because we don't want to live in Dallas. We are Okies, not New Yorkers. I once heard a politician say, Tulsa should be Tulsa. We are part of the Bible belt and lots of people move here for that very reason. It's a great place to raise a family. Now I realize we need to improve parts of our city to accommodate young professionals and the minority that chooses to live a more urban lifestyle. But I see no reason we can co-exist. If we transform our entire city to the point it's no longer recognizable, the traditionalists will

only increase their urban flight to the "bedroom communities" around us.

Pg. 44 - although I am encouraged and delighted that Planitula desires to still include neighborhood planning, your subtle requirement that it be "consistent with Planitula, did not escape my notice. What does that mean if a community doesn't want mixed use, mixed housing, and limited parking? Will they be told to sit down and shut up?

Page 44 Step 5 - Okay, now I'm really scared. We're going to do a model (which lacks any input from the neighbors), standardize it, and then permit developers to replicate it everywhere without any input or "involvement" from the city, (or apparently anyone else!?) Absolutely not!! I believe the citizens do either. This was not part of ANY scenario.

Page 45 Finally - you agree with me that planning should be done by the city! YES!

Page LU-5 - why is there new housing only in the Jew's School district (west side)?

Corridor zoning on the west side of Union Avenue at W. 61st is not appropriate. The surrounding area is a wilderness church, deliberately sensitive to the wooded area. Directly west is a private Country School. Directly South is single family residential.

Page LU-15 If the projected 20-30 year old population is projected to drop to 20% by 2030, why on

earth are we attempting to design our entire future growth to serve them? As with all things, there needs to be balance.

Page LU-16 ¶ I still think there's too much focus on mass transportation solutions, no matter what the cost of oil in the future. Americans will not give up their Autos. Whether it be battery power, CNS, or some unknown power source, whenever possible, people will drive. Because of our limited land surface, we will never grow to the point that multiple forms of mass transit is a requirement. The only thing that would motivate most people to relinquish that power, might be to improve the air quality of our growing city. Commuter rail in a city this size is not cost effective.

Pg LU-18 ¶ 2 - by your own admission, Tulsans prefer single family homes. That you believe future development "could" provide a mix of other types of housing is not fully supported by the majority. So - while there will be a need, and therefore a market, it should be limited in scope and maintained at an appropriate level. Tulsa can still be Tulsa, but diversify in proper ratios. ¶ 4 - Many cities envy our great grid system and I see absolutely no reason to change it. Other modes of movement can be accommodated within the grid. But a major improvement would be to require all adjacent commercial development to be accessible to each other, without having to re-enter the street.

Pg. LU-19 Absolutely agree with comprehensive small area planning. It works well for us now and should continue to do so. Involve the people who live there and they will stay involved. ¶ 2 if we are only adding 40,000 jobs, where does the 38,000 homes come in? Seems a little off.

Of concern to me is that we NOT move in the direction of allowing work, live scenarios in single family neighborhoods. Although people continue to work at home more, we should continue to deny signage and public access to work at home businesses within neighborhoods. Existing exceptions seem to work.

Pg. LU-20 No to "Metro" Chamber. We need our own!

Pg. LU-21 Disagree that a focus of removing Automobiles significantly reduces attractive places for people to enjoy.

The purpose of streets is to move people. For those who desire a slower pace "to enjoy", we have ample trails and lots of green space. We also have great examples all over the city, 15th St, Harvard to Yale, Yale, 51st to 61st, ~~was~~ 71st Street where we have created attractive medians with trees and greenery. We also already have in place a requirement for landscaping on new developments. It could, however, see as a great improvement to increase these green areas within all new developments to a greater percentile.

Especially within mixed-use neighborhoods to integrate it better with surrounding homes. (last paragraph) I completely disagree with the assertion that transportation should dictate the development pattern. The transportation mode is too volatile.

pg. LV-22 I agree however with the CSS concept in general. 1) 2 - I vehemently disagree with the blanket assertion that, "the zoning code should lower required parking ratios and promote urban design principles that enable people to park once and walk to their destinations." Exactly how do you plan to "enable" the UNable?? To deliberately ignore this segment of our population flies in the face of the ADA and is contrary to Tulsa's intent to keep their cars!!

LV-23 Ditto to "ensuring that infill developments complement and enhance existing neighborhoods"! A 1) 3 - Here we go again with the intent to "MIX" housing types. IF not by land use ie. corridors, IDL, Main Streets, ect. Then how is the "target" established?

LV-24 How do you expect to "minimize" conflicts between Autos and Students on and around campus? Are you expecting grandma to walk 1/2 mile from an isolated parking lot to make sure her 3 year old makes it to the building? Otherwise, I agree with this page.

LV-25 - Regarding sustainability = As an avid viewer of the program about Greensburg Kansas, the town that was utterly destroyed by an F-5 tornado

and had the admirable goal to rebuild as America's first Platinum Green City, I am all about building green. But as this community discovered, it is still very expensive. And for this reason we must not make it a requirement to our zoning code. We've already established that for the most part Tulsans want single family homes, we must not insist that new buildings be attached to each other and share HVAC Systems because they're more sustainable. My neighborhood is a prime example that single family homes can still be built "affordable" (under 135,000). While those who believe in global warming might be willing to give up privacy for the sake of the environment, it should not be a requirement.

LU-27 - eliminating the existing requirement that a project be subject to the comprehensive plan causes me great pause. What if there are no regulations in place such as the Tulsa Hills area? I need more info on this and how it might potentially play out.

LU-30 If the "building blocks" are not "fixed" — then what is? TP & I do NOT like that "minimum" basic designs are prescribed. Elaborate on this paragraph. While on this subject, are we dumping the "Use" listings in our code? What controls the type of uses allowed next to neighborhoods and schools?

Pages LU 31, 32 & 33 I am very concerned that the only building blocks that do not focus on pedestrians is the Regional Center Corridors and Employment. Tulsans will NOT give up their vehicles! Existing neighborhood infill seems to be the only "block" that requires a consistent cohesive look. Why? Are we eliminating covenants? Are we eliminating other protected zoning such as estate, historical, ect.?