

New items begin on page 113

ADDENDUM TO DISCUSSION LOG for consideration June 15, 2010

Subsequent to the April 28th meeting of the TMAPC, the following 2 issues required further discussion.

The Team presents the issues with corresponding framing, for consideration by the TMAPC.

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue	TMAPC ACTION
Staff	Transportation Page TR [39] Page 39	TRANSPORTATION CHAPTER <i>Grammar/typing error</i>	<i>Specific reference to the Gilcrease Expressway was recommended by the TMAPC on April 28. A phrase appearing in the June 2010 final draft appears to be incorrectly worded. Goal 10.2., currently reads:</i> 10.2 Ensure that this area <u>which will be made</u> more accessible by the Gilcrease Expressway <i>Staff recommends the following revision to 10.2 to correct grammar and punctuation as follows:</i> 10.2 Ensure that this area which will be made more accessible by the Gilcrease Expressway.	
69. INCOG	Transportation Page [9] Page 9 Figure 3	This map does not show any roadway widenings on 81st or 101st Streets. These roads are currently over capacity and are projected to be extremely over-burdened by 2030. Currently segments of 81st Street (From Yale to Mingo) and 101st Street (Sheridan to Memorial) are already operating at LOS E, meaning that the facility is "in the vicinity of capacity," or LOS F operation. (INCOG 2009 Congestion Management	<i>Team recommends:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>The reevaluation of roadway widening based on demographic changes and recommendations to use a multi-modal approach to meet the travel demands of Tulsans.</i> ▪ <i>Emphasizing the need for Transit improvements to the 91st and Mingo-Garnett</i> 	<i>This item has yet to be reviewed by the TMAPC.</i> A revised Figure 3 is shown in the Final Draft shows six miles of additional lane widening on 101 st Street. 81 st Street has not been altered because lane widening at the noted locations

New items begin on page 113

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue	TMAPC ACTION
		<p>Process, p. 17, Map 4) Recommended Action: Include roadway widenings on 81st and 101st Streets from Riverside Drive to Garnett Road.</p>	<p><i>Corridor prior to investments in roadway capacity.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Conducting an analysis of the subject area using the urban corridor planning process to uncover intersection and ITS improvements that could be made in conjunction with transit alternatives.</i> <p><i>Notes: One important document will be INCOG's of INCOG's pending Transportation Alternatives Analysis, which will evaluate the potential for mass transit in several in the vicinity. The Planning Commission may wish to see defer action on this item today and take it up upon completion of this pertinent analysis.</i></p> <p><i>The Team has prepared a document that proposes a corridor planning process on several key facilities in the city.</i></p> <p><i>Recommend that the Urban Corridor document be added to the Plan document as a transportation appendix.</i></p>	<p><i>is already funded and/or under construction.</i></p> <p><i>Also for review, the Team has inserted into the Appendix "Transportation II: Urban Corridors" [page AP 29] that provides guidance for review and planning of urban arterial corridors.</i></p>

New items begin on page 113

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue	TMAPC ACTION
<p>***** The following entries are comments submitted after the April 28th TMAPC meeting.*****</p>				
70. Phil Marshall, TMAPC	Land Use, pg [76] Policy 3.6	<p>Would you check to see if this paragraph 3.6 was addressed at the meeting. I believe it can be deleted per 4-14-10 minutes where Ms. Cantrell clarified that anywhere in the plan where it refers to rhythm, proportions, character, it will be replaced with the underlined language proposed under Consolidated Table of Discussion Items, Major Issue #5.</p> <p>3.6 Encourage complementary building height, scale, design and character.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a sense of place by encouraging development of buildings, structures and landscapes that complement the character and scale of their setting. • Encourage new development to be appropriate to the context of its location in density, massing, intensity and size, particularly when adjacent to existing residential areas and historic districts. • Design buildings to be compatible in height, scale, bulk and massing to the urban context and 	For TMAPC discussion.	

New items begin on page 113

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue	TMAPC ACTION
		<p>established character of the surrounding area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design parking lot location, configuration, access points and screening to minimize spillover and mitigate any negative effects. 		
<p>71. Tulsa Metro Chamber</p> <p>Per letter dated May 28, 2010</p>	<p>Transportation</p> <p>Page TR [39]</p> <p>Page 39</p>	<p><u>Transportation or Land Use Chapter, Discussion Item #36</u></p> <p>We appreciate the addition of the Gilcrease Expressway in the chapter. Consultant and City Planning staff suggested that language be added that prepare the area for development through the Small Area Planning process. It is our understanding that Small Area Plans are usually used in developed areas with neighborhood stakeholders assisting in the plan that will affect their area. It is unclear how a small area plan would apply to a corridor such as the Gilcrease Expressway which is largely undeveloped. We encourage privately-initiated pre-development planning (such as a Master Development Plan, Planned Unit Development, or a Corridor Development Plan) rather than Small Area Plans as has been described by the consultants.</p>		
<p>72. Tulsa Metro Chamber</p>	<p><u>Economic Development Chapter,</u></p>	<p><i>From the letter:</i> It is our understanding that the Planning Commission has directed the consultants to craft wording encouraging coordination with the business community and economic development</p>		

New items begin on page 113

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue	TMAPC ACTION
Per letter dated May 28, 2010	<u>Discussion Item #40-59</u>	<p>organizations with regard to implementing the goals and policies in the Economic Development chapter. We endorse this recommendation. Saying that, we still think it is important to specifically mention involvement of private economic development organizations in any policies dealing with establishing a One-Stop Shop for economic development (Policy 1.1) and in streamlining the permitting process to improve efficiency in doing business with the city (Policy 1.3) so that the city officials understand the practical concerns of the business community.</p> <p>In response to our initial input, consultant and City Planning staff suggested the following language: Ensure that the City of Tulsa Department of Economic Development work with industry leaders, chambers of commerce, and other organizations engaged in economic development of Tulsa and the region in target clusters to identify public and private actions and investments to strengthen competitive advantages of the City as well as the region". (Policy 3.1 and 4.1) We agree with this language, and would ask that the target clusters [as included in our original statement] themselves be spelled out in either this point or earlier in the same chapter.</p>		
73. Paul Uttinger, Email 06/02/10	Maps	<p>I can't find separate links to the revised Land Use and Areas of Growth/Stability maps, if there are any.</p> <p>Will the revised maps be the huge parcel specific files</p>		

New items begin on page 113

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue	TMAPC ACTION
		<p>similar to those uploaded in mid-January? Or will the final versions be published in the Land Use chapter as small maps with a limited zoom level?</p> <p>Both maps ought to be non-parcel specific. That was the goal stated at the beginning of the PLANiTULSA process, and it makes more sense to show broad planning concepts at this stage, then let the finer details be worked out through the small area plans.</p> <p>There isn't enough time to accurately characterize each individual parcel within Tulsa, and that level of precision isn't needed for a comprehensive plan, anyway.</p> <p>- Paul Uttinger, AIA</p>		
74. Theresa Landers, Email 06/02/10	General	<p>I scanned the final pdf version rather rapidly, but did not notice any addressing some of the dead zones surrounding the older, lower income areas, such as 6th street from downtown to the university, and 11th from downtown to Memorial. Sixth Street almost looks like a war zone and 11th has way too many empty buildings and nasty looking used car dealerships.</p> <p>These areas don't seem to be as much of a priority as Brookside - an already developed area with a life of it's own.</p> <p>Again, perhaps I overlooked where these areas are mentioned, so I would appreciate your response addressing these questions. Thank you</p>		

New items begin on page 113

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue	TMAPC ACTION
75. Lou Reynolds E-mail 6/10/10	Maps	On behalf of Shadow Mountain Behavioral Health System (SMBHS), I am writing to request that the PlaniTulsa maps be amended to include the 20 acres that SMBHS owns at 6262 South Sheridan within the Tulsa Plan Map as “Regional Center”. Shadow Mountain is a 108-bed psychiatric hospital, with over 300 employees, that offers a comprehensive continuum of behavioral healthcare services		
76. Monty Prater	General	Maybe I've missed it, but this doesn't seem to acknowledge two recent developments that alarm me--shrinking of trained police force and reduction of services for children and teenagers.		
77. Tim Boeckman Email 06/11/10	Maps	How is Expo Square and the Tulsa County Fairgrounds incorporated into the plan? It was not highlighted on the map as a center of activity. Events at the fairground generate more tourism in the city than all other events in Tulsa.		
78. Meredith Jackson Email 06/13/10	General	In the new article about "Plan It Tulsa" featured in Builder Magazine there is a paragraph that refers to the city not having many, or any builders who specialize in New Urban Design as it is reflected in the overall plan, common areas, type of homes, architecture, building etc. Is the city looking to hire someone who does have a background in the area of Traditional Neighborhood Planning, Design, and Building? If so, who may be contacted in this regard. Thank you in advance for your		

New items begin on page 113

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue	TMAPC ACTION
		help on this.		
79. Jennifer Brown Email 06/14/10	General or Housing	How does allowing the concentration of low income housing for the homeless in one area of Tulsa (White City and surrounding neighborhoods) fit into the Planitulsa strategy?		
80. Lou Reynolds Email dated 06/13/10 to Glen Bolen in response to J. Fregonese Letter dated 04/09/10		Dear Glen: Attached are St. John Medical Center's and Hillcrest Healthcare System's proposed revisions to the Economic Development Chapter. Let me know if you have any questions. Best regards, Lou Reynolds <i>See attached letter with suggested changes.</i>		
81. Homebuilders' Association	Various	Home Builders' Association will submit a letter of issues for TMAPC consideration, either before or during the June 15th Public Hearing		