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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
devise 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 eco-
system 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
l. 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 Liechti)
   d.

3. Ewing:
   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.