TulStat Destination Districts June 22, 2018

Notes/Agenda

- 1. Creating DD and measuring success
 - a. Placemaking is a people centered approach
 - b. Space is a resource
 - c. Placemaking will succeed with the 4 cores listed on the slide
 - i. Multiple activities in one spot
 - d. Growth can happen as expansions and in empty places
 - e. How to select?
 - i. Reactive: people come to us with ideas and resources
 - 1. Quantitative and human interaction on their ideas
 - ii. Proactive: the City will identify possible districts and work with people to develop an area
 - f. Where should we do placemaking?
 - i. Catalytic might need some investments
 - ii. Suburbs can be included in the catalytic Destination Districts
 - iii. Data and qualitative slide
 - 1. Data:
 - 2. Qualitative measurements, commitment, name, is there an ecosystem of resources.
 - g. People Dot Exercise
 - i. Use people or rely on robot?
 - ii. Very consistent!!
 - h. Robot Destination Districts
 - i. Arc Map-Data Overlay and Analysis slide
 - i. Site conditions
 - ii. Demographics
 - iii. Access and transportation
 - j. Downtown and surrounding slide
 - i. Shows established and catalytic
 - k. Brookside
 - i. BRT lines
 - ii. Qualitative assessment works well here.
 - iii. Constrained and skinny. No room to grow outward
 - iv. Employment and neighborhoods did not get scored.
 - v. Not going to tear out neighborhoods in Brookside (
 - I. Yale at 51/61
 - i. Not high walkability
 - ii. Not BRT lines
 - iii. Dd wanted to be created
 - m. Tulsa Hills
 - i. Primarily shopping
 - ii. Lots more residential growth
 - iii. Low walk score, low transit score
 - iv. Not going towards the 4 criteria.
 - v. Huge sales tax generator
 - vi. Doing it now would have been different.

- vii. "Tulsa Hills is no more of a model" The new model is becoming like a Utica square
- n. Woodland Hills
 - i. Low walk score
 - ii. Lots of neighborhood
 - iii. Low development opportunity
- o. 21st and Garnett
 - i. Emerging
 - ii. Future BRT
 - iii. International district
- p. Pine and Peoria
 - i. Emerging
 - ii. Future BRT stop
 - iii. Some reinvestment
- q. River West
 - i. Catalytic
 - ii. Land uses
 - iii. Population growth
 - iv. Possible grant to the location
- r. 36th & Peoria
 - i. GKFF purchased land
 - ii. Future BRT
 - iii. Catalytic
- s. RT 66 corridors
 - i. Catalytic
 - ii. Admiral and a11th st
 - iii. Smaller commercial buildings
 - iv. 11th st with BRT
 - v. TU and their land. Might be a connector
- t. Suburban Retrofits
 - i. A framework for placemaking investment slide
 - 1. Are aligned with the AIM Plan
- u. OKC Commercial Revitalization
 - i. Streetscaping: \$4m/mile paid by GO or ST (initial installations)
 - ii. How to pay for it once it is installed?
- v. Suburban Retrofit
 - i. Boca Raton Regional Mall retrofit
 - 1. Made it walkable
- w. Tools available for Destination Districts
 - i. Once Destination Districts located how to match the needs?
 - ii. Look at the CP, PC, CDP
 - iii. Policy Changes is the least effective
- x. Placemaking tools
 - i. How to support Destination Districts
 - ii. Maintenance is part of management
 - iii. This is a starting point in a district and understanding their needs and using these tools to address the needs
 - iv. OKC only able cannot exceed a one year assessment.
 - v. OKC has an easy time getting \$4m per mile in their GO and ST
- y. Next Steps Slide
 - i. Formal program approval

- ii. Outreach to pilot districts (21st and Garnett, 11th and Peoria, 11th and Lewis, 36th st n, 61st and riverside) to see if there is enough support
 - 1. Probably need to look at more than one, possibly two
 - 2. They are catalytic areas
 - 3. 4 criteria need to look at on choosing one of these areas

4.

- iii. Determine needs and connect resources
- iv. Develop concept and cost estimates for implementation
- v. Align with CIP project list with engineering and any other available funding sources (CDBG, TIF, Special, BID, etc.)
- vi. Council only see PCI to see scores and how they are prioritized. FOS was to improve the PCI. Council would like to see more than PCI reports and something like this with the 4 criteria and a map of the scoring with possible costs. Then they can valuate on if to concentrate only on PCI or into Destination Districts criteria on building a district. They have not had any other information before. This will give the decision makers to determine to follow the track or expand.
- vii. PCI, plus, plus...is going to be a new standard
- viii. Including the extra cost in the models
- ix. Way to prioritize not needed maintenance or not to improve for improvements' sake
- x. Models will show we will get the most bang for our buck
- xi. Need to develop a model for streetscaping?
- xii. Need champions for street projects.

2. Reaction, Thoughts, next steps (action)

- a. Will go out and start engaging in those districts mentioned above
- b. Building champions to build these districts
- c. Sub task force meet with Theorn (Matt Liecthi)

d.

3. Ewina:

- a. North Tulsa will be the most complicated
 - i. Priority but not multiple areas
 - ii. BMX might be more towards Downtown
- b. International could be a better one
 - i. Driven by culture (Little Italy, Little China, etc.)
 - ii. Area defined by the City
- c. Sheridan 21-41 is furniture/hardware driven; home improvement area
- d. Is there a south Tulsa place to be made? Not so far south at 91st and Yale
- e. Yale is a highway that runs through the city; not walkable. Branded maybe for a medical area
- f. People need something to attach to the city
- g. Memorial is most interesting Eaton square
- h. Cherry street has recently started an association
- i. Show those that are popular to the catalytic/emerging areas.
 - i. Why not one of each???
- j. Important to focus on all three.
- k. Robust transit is a quality of life. It is expanded by how many people use it.

Action Items

Talking to the commissions and people in the districts How to frame the tension and how to strategize about placemaking.