

Comment Response Matrix  
 PLANITULSA Comprehensive Plan  
 February 2010  
 Vision Document

Chapter	Ref #	Page	Column	Paragraph/Table	Comment	Reviewer	Category
Vision	1	13	n/a	Vision Map	This map does not show the Tulsa Community College Southeast campus (81st and US 169). This has been noted on numerous previous reviews of the draft plan. <b>Recommended Action: place TCC Southeast on map or delete all higher education sites</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Vision	2	43	n/a	Photo	This is a European picture showing vehicles driving on the left side of the road. <b>Recommended Action: Find picture that shows drivers on the right side of the road</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Vision	3	45	n/a	First paragraph, line 3	The text says; "The city will adopt the comprehensive plan." <b>Recommended Action: The text should be changed to reflect the state statutory language that requires that TMAPC adopt the Comprehensive Plan and the City Council approves the Plan thereafter.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Vision	4	45	n/a	Paragraph 3	The paragraph has been changed from the Fall 2009 Draft and is overly prescriptive regarding staffing and consolidation of functions. The Comprehensive Plan is intended to provide for the orderly physical development in accordance with the present and future needs of the city. Organizational structure and staffing are administrative and budgetary issues that should not be addressed in the Compressive Plan. <b>The Fall draft language should be restored.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Policy

Please refer questions about this chapter to Dane Matthews at 918-579-9471

Comment Response Matrix  
 PLANiTULSA Comprehensive Plan  
 February 2010  
 Land Use Chapter

Chapter	Ref #	Page	Column	Paragraph/Table	Comment	Reviewer	Category
Land Use	1	3	2 (under photo)	First paragraph, 4th and 5th lines from bottom	This still references "the City's planning department", when in fact the developer worked with a number of departments and agencies to get approval of the project. If the consultant is referencing the City Planning Department, the proper words should be capitalized. <b>Recommend wording "The developer worked closely with the city staff in realizing the project."</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	2	4	Map	Figure 1	This map does not show TCC Southeast campus (81st and US 169) <b>Recommended Action: place TCC Southeast on map or delete all higher education sites</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	3	8	n/a	Chart 4	<b>Subtext should read "The City's share of the <u>metropolitan area's</u>..."</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	4	8	n/a	Chart 4	The title lists it as population to 2008, but the bar chart only shows it to 2006. <b>Correct either title or label for consistency</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	5	8	n/a	Chart 5	The Tulsa County data on the pie chart reflects all of Tulsa County population outside of the City of Tulsa (unincorporated and City of Tulsa) <b>Recommended change: Label should read "Tulsa County (except City of Tulsa)"</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	6	11	Map	Figure 5	The floodplain layer does not reflect the current or previous City of Tulsa regulatory floodplain map nor the FEMA floodplain map. <b>Map should reflect the City of Tulsa regulatory floodplain map, which has been previously provided to the consultant.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	7	11	Map	Figure 5	Source on surface limestone is INCOG, not City of Tulsa. <b>Change source to INCOG</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	8	11	First paragraph	Second line	The City of Tulsa's corporate limits includes 200 square miles. This includes the Wagoner County Annexation. <b>Recommended Action: Change "182 square miles" to "200 square miles"</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	9	13	n/a	Figure 7	The figure shows substantial floodplains (Bird Creek) and rock quarries as redevelopable lands. <b>These areas are not easily redevelopable and should be excluded from Tulsa's "redevelopment opportunity areas"</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	10	13	n/a	Figure 7	<b>Add title to legend to indicate what the valuation is based on. For example is this cost per acre?</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	11	13	Right column	Line 1	Figure notation refers to "XX" and should be corrected. <b>Reference Figure 7</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	12	14	chart	Chart 6	Natural increase seems to be missing from the bar chart, but is indicated in the legend. Or colors are not consistent The legend has no x-axis. <b>Revise chart to make data more readable.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical

Comment Response Matrix  
 PLANiTULSA Comprehensive Plan  
 February 2010  
 Land Use Chapter

Chapter	Ref #	Page	Column	Paragraph/Table	Comment	Reviewer	Category
Land Use	13	14	chart	Chart 7	Youth and Young Adults appear to be combined on the graph, but separate in the legend. <b>Revise chart to reflect all items in the legend</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	14	16	Table	Table 3	<b>The category "148 - 165,000" should be corrected to "148,000-165,000". Source should also be Fregonese and Associates, in addition to the Census</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	15	23	First column	First paragraph, second line, first word	<b>Should be "or" not "of".</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	16	31	Second paragraph		Staff questions the statement that "surface parking lots are not needed or desirable". <b>Suggested rewording: "Surface parking lots should be limited"</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Policy
Land Use	17	32	Second column	Title of column	Inconsistent use of terminology. <b>Recommended Action: "Multimodal Corridors" should be "Mixed Use Corridors"</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	18	33	First column	2nd Paragraph, 3rd sentence	The final draft (Jan. 18, 2010) reads as "Development activities in these areas should be limited to the rehabilitation of existing homes, or small scale infill that that complements the character of the neighborhood and is consistent in form, scale, rhythm, and proportion as seen from the street." <b>Recommended Action: Change the sentence to read "Development activities in these areas should be limited to the rehabilitation, improvement, or replacement of existing homes, and small scale infill as permitted through clear and objective setback, height, and other development standards of the zoning code." Agree as recommended by the consultant.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Policy
Land Use	19	37	First column	Second paragraph, third sentence	Refers to "Livable streets", and probably should be "Residential streets". <b>Recommended Action: Replace "Livable Streets" with "Residential Collectors" to be consistent with the Transportation Chapter</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	20	38	Second column	Comments on figures	Spelling error: <b>Recommended Action: The word "Transporation" in the figure should be corrected to "Transportation".</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	21	39	Figures	Figure 17	The Transportation Chapter now has a range of 4-8' sidewalks on the sample Residential Collector street cross section. <b>Recommended Action: Update this cross section to match the Transportation Chapter, Figure 7, p. 17.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	22	39	Second column	First paragraph, last line, third word	The word "to" is unnecessary. <b>Suggested Action: Remove the word "to"</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	23	40	First column	First paragraph, second line	<b>Recommended Action: Strike "a" from the sentence</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical

Comment Response Matrix  
 PLANiTULSA Comprehensive Plan  
 February 2010  
 Land Use Chapter

Chapter	Ref #	Page	Column	Paragraph/Table	Comment	Reviewer	Category
Land Use	24	41	First column	Third paragraph, third line	This is the first time the term HOV is used. <b>Recommended Action: HOV should be spelled out</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	25	45	First column	Second paragraph, fourth line	Trends Continue was not based on INCOG's projections, but rather the consultant's view of historical trends continuing. INCOG's projections for growth in the City of Tulsa are considerably higher than the Scenario A forecast. INCOG's forecasts for downtown, east Tulsa, midtown, south Tulsa, north Tulsa, and west Tulsa are more than 200% of the Scenario A: Trends Continue forecast. <b>Recommended Action: Sentence should read "Scenario A, Trends Continue was based on historical trends continuing over the next 20 years."</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	26	48	First column	Table 15	<b>Recommended Action: A breakdown by subarea of where infill housing units and mixed use housing units are located would be helpful.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	27	48	First column	Table 17	The table indicates that 100% of new housing units downtown and 50% of new housing units in North Tulsa are mixed use and that 100% of new jobs downtown are mixed use. These numbers seem excessive. This would mean that there are no new buildings for office use only or no new (or converted) buildings for residential use only in the downtown core. <b>Recommended Action: Review conclusion/forecast.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	28	51	First column	1st paragraph, last sentence	The text reads "To prevent job growth from outstripping housing production here, the city should be prepared to engage in necessary small area planning so new communities can be built quickly." There is no evidence that small area planning results in development being built quickly. This ignores market driven realities <b>Recommended Action: Delete sentence</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Policy
Land Use	29	52	Second column	Third paragraph, second sentence	The text reads: "The ideal for the Areas of Stability is to identify and maintain the valued character of an area while accommodating redevelopment and reinvestment that that complements the character of the neighborhood and is consistent in form, scale, rhythm and proportion." Consistency in form, scale, rhythm and proportion may be a laudable goal, but will lead to subjective interpretation. <b>Recommended Action: Delete the clause ...and is consistent in form, scale, rhythm and proportion.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Policy

Comment Response Matrix  
 PLANiTULSA Comprehensive Plan  
 February 2010  
 Land Use Chapter

Chapter	Ref #	Page	Column	Paragraph/Table	Comment	Reviewer	Category
Land Use	30	56	First column	Third paragraph, first sentence	The text reads: "These plan categories are to be implemented by zoning regulations that ensure the appropriate shape, scale and make-up of development with the district. The term "appropriate" is subject to interpretation. <b>We agree with the consultants recommended change to read: "These plan categories are implemented by zoning regulations which apply setback, height and other development standards."</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Policy
Land Use	31	57	First column	First paragraph	The text reads: An easily searchable and understandable zoning code, that is accessible on the Internet should be a long-term goal of the City's planning department." <b>The zoning code is currently searchable on the TMAPC website and this goal should be on-going rather than long-term.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	32	59	Second column	Paragraph title	<b>"Livable Streets" should be "Residential Streets" for consistency in reference.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	33	64	First column	Third paragraph	<b>We concur with the consultants' additional suggested reference to the Downtown Master Plan</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	34	64	Second column	First paragraph	<b>References to all "depts." should be spelled out.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	35	64	Second column	First paragraph, next to last line	<b>The correct terminology for Skiatook is the "Town of Skiatook", as has previously been suggested.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	36	64	Second column	Second paragraph	The language regarding bike routes is incorrect. There is no existing or planned bike route along the Highway 75 corridor. <b>The text should be revised to reflect the language in the Parks, Trails and Open Space chapter (p. 17 paragraph 2) reflecting INCOG's previous comments.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	37	67	Second column	Third paragraph line 1	The text reads "... for to achieve..." <b>Strike the word "for".</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	38	69	First column	First paragraph, second line	<b>The word "luckily" should be changed to "fortunately".</b> The agencies have worked for many years to maintain these records. Luck was not involved.	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	39	69	First column	Third paragraph, seventh line	<b>Spell out "TAZ" as Transportation Analysis Zone".</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical

Comment Response Matrix  
 PLANiTULSA Comprehensive Plan  
 February 2010  
 Land Use Chapter

Chapter	Ref #	Page	Column	Paragraph/Table	Comment	Reviewer	Category
Land Use	40	74	First column	Item 2.5	<b>First bullet should read, "Is approved by the City Council for areas within the City and the Board of County Commissioners of Tulsa County for areas within the unincorporated areas of Tulsa County upon adoption by the Planning Commission."</b> The TMAPC adopts the Plan and by Statute, the Council and County Commission approve it for their respective jurisdictions (OSS Title 19, Section 863.7) as has been previously noted.	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	41	74	First column	Item 2.5, last bullet	The text reads the Land Use Plan "should be amended no more than twice in a calendar year." This proposed policy already has been subject to radically different interpretations. Explanation and clarity of purpose is needed. <b>The consultant has advised that "Twice annual plan amendments mean that the plan should be amended to conform to zoning changes made in the last six months. This allows TMAPC to change a zone and amend the plan to match."</b> We concur with this intent and the language should be modified to reflect the intent.	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Policy
Land Use	42	74	Second column	Item 2.6, last bullet	The draft states: "The plan is only implemented by changes to the City's laws or by the actions and investments it takes." This statement is misleading. The plan is implemented largely through private investment adhering to the comprehensive plan, small area and functional plans, zoning code, subdivision regulations, development standards and through public sector capital improvement programs. <b>Reword to more accurately reflect how the plan is implemented.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	43	76	Second column	Item 3.8	The text states that "... zoning change decisions for development over 5 acres of land currently zoned agriculture and shown as 'New Neighborhood' should be based on small area plans to determine appropriate zoning and densities." <b>We recommend that the text be changed to reflect that re-zoning of agriculture zoned property should be based on the Comprehensive Plan and any existing small area plan, and not be subject to an additional requirement of a small area plan if none exists.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Policy
Land Use	44	77	First column	Item 4.4	The text reads: " Coordinate public support by consolidating development-related functions to streamline the development process." Public support, consolidating and streamlining are divergent issues. <b>Reword to "Maximize coordination and streamlining of development related activities."</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Policy

Comment Response Matrix  
 PLANiTULSA Comprehensive Plan  
 February 2010  
 Land Use Chapter

Chapter	Ref #	Page	Column	Paragraph/Table	Comment	Reviewer	Category
Land Use	45	80	Second column	Item 8.3, second bullet	The text reads: "Review land use decisions to ensure that residents have safe and multi-modal access to schools, including developing a Safe Routes to Schools Program." We support the Safe Routes to School Program and have secured funding through the SRS Program for the City of Tulsa, Tulsa Public Schools and INCOG to implement the program. Nonetheless, does the consultant really mean that <b>all</b> land use decisions including lot splits and BOA variances and re-zoning should be reviewed with regard to SRS? <b>Staff concurs that the Safe Routes to Schools should be a consideration in the overall development process. Rewording of this goal would be helpful.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Land Use	46	82	First column	Item 13.1, fifth bullet	<b>The word "of" should be inserted between "use" and "an" in first sentence.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical

Please refer questions about this chapter to Dane Matthews at 918-579-9471

Comment Response Matrix  
 PLANiTULSA Comprehensive Plan  
 February 2010  
 Transportation Chapter

Chapter	Ref #	Page	Column	Paragraph/Table	Comment	Reviewer	Category
Transportation	1	2	2	Chart 1	<p>This chart is not reflective of the INCOG Long Range Transportation Plan which shows the following for mode share capital funding:</p> <p>Transit: \$114,046,750 (5%)            Bike: \$70,036,510 (3%)            Roads: \$2,152,175,000 (92%)</p> <p>Reference: Chapter 6 of the Destination 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan, page 127, Table 22</p> <p><b>Recommended Action: revise pie chart to reflect INCOG Long Range Transportation Plan figures</b></p>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Transportation	2	2	2	Chart 1	<p>The chart does not take into account operating costs.</p> <p><b>Recommended Action: Include operations costs as shown in the INCOG LRTP or explicitly note on the chart that operations costs are not considered in this graphic.</b></p>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Transportation	3	4	1	2nd Paragraph Under Scenario Planning and Tulsa 2030 Goal	<p>Word missing. <b>Recommended Action: Add the word input in the sentence that reads "Based on this public <u>input</u> and work with city staff..."</b></p>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Transportation	4	7	n/a	Table 6	<p>CO2 is not currently a pollutant as defined by the NAAQS.</p> <p><b>Suggested Action: Remove CO2 from the pollutants listed here and in the text that corresponds to Table 6.</b></p>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Transportation	5	7	n/a	Table 3	<p>Saying lane miles per 1,000 new residents does not give us a good idea of how many lane miles there are for the entire city.</p> <p><b>Recommended Action: Lane miles should be shown as <u>per capita</u> instead of per 1,000 new residents</b></p>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Transportation	6	9	n/a	Figure 3	<p>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 Process, p. 17, Map 4)</p> <p><b>Recommended Action: Include roadway widenings on 81st and 101st Streets from Riverside Drive to Garnett Road.</b></p>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Policy

Comment Response Matrix  
 PLANiTULSA Comprehensive Plan  
 February 2010  
 Transportation Chapter

Chapter	Ref #	Page	Column	Paragraph/Table	Comment	Reviewer	Category
Transportation	7	9	n/a	Figure 3	The Capital Improvement Program relies on a variety of factors to determine where funding should be directed, only one of which is the Comprehensive Plan. As a result this map should not be used to limit funding for needed capital improvements that are not identified on this map. This Figure implies that capital improvements should be determined based on this map. The City of Tulsa should not use this map in making capital improvement decisions. <b>Recommended Action: Add disclaimer to map noting that other factors such as traffic congestion, intersection delay, and safety should be included in capital improvement decisions. This map should not be the sole decision-making document with regard to future capital improvements.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Policy
Transportation	8	9	n/a	Table 8	Part of 81st Street from Riverside Dr. to U.S. 169 is already 4-lanes, i.e. west of Harvard. <b>Recommended Action: Indicate that part of 81st Street is already 4-lane (i.e. Riverside to Harvard and East of Mingo to U.S. 169)</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Transportation	9	11	n/a	Figure 4: Vision Map	The map is difficult to read with transit and roadway classification on the same map. It is impossible to determine the roadway classification and appropriate cross sections for Garnett, 91st, Yale, 21st, and Peoria  <b>Recommended Action: This map should be separated into two maps for better legibility:</b>  1) Transit 2) Roadway Classification	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Transportation	10	11	n/a	Vision Map	BRT is still shown as being on Garnett Rd even though the text on page 28 now reads that the U.S. 169 corridor is best suited for BRT. <b>Recommended Action: Show transit in the U.S. 169 corridor as a swath extending 1/2 mile from U.S. 169 including Mingo Rd and Garnett Rd to indicate that the precise alignment has not yet been determined for this corridor.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Transportation	11	13	1	2nd Paragraph	Labeling. <b>Recommended Action: Appendix XX needs to say Appendix Transportation I</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Transportation	12	15	n/a	Figure 6	Clarify what the ◇ symbol indicates. Some may be confused and think these are HOV lanes as they have seen in other cities. <b>Recommended Action: Use "Wide Outside Lane" under the figure to illustrate that these lanes should not be marked with an ◇ symbol, but are intended for bus/bike use.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical

Comment Response Matrix  
 PLANiTULSA Comprehensive Plan  
 February 2010  
 Transportation Chapter

Chapter	Ref #	Page	Column	Paragraph/Table	Comment	Reviewer	Category
Transportation	13	20	n/a	Chart 5	Labels on x-axis are truncated. <b>Recommended Action: show all city names on chart</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Transportation	14	21	n/a	Figure 8	It is understood that this figure is for illustration purposes. However, it appears that the outside lane is for buses only. If this is the intent, then ok, but if not, please indicate what the $\diamond$ is meant to depict. <b>Recommended Action: clarify what the HOV symbol is meant to show</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Transportation	15	24	1	1st Paragraph	Labeling. <b>Recommended Action: Appendix XX needs to say Appendix Transportation I</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Transportation	16	24	2	1st Paragraph	Labeling. <b>Recommended Action: Appendix XX needs to say Appendix Transportation II</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Transportation	17	26	1	3rd Paragraph	Labeling. <b>Recommended Action: Figure XX should say Figure 10</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Transportation	18	32	1	Last Paragraph	The term "livable streets" should not be used to be consistent with the rest of the chapter. <b>Recommended Action: Replace "livable" with "residential collector" for consistency</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Transportation	19	36	n/a	2.1, 5th bullet	A roadway connectivity index should not be required. <b>Recommended Action: Change to "Encourage"</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Policy

Please refer questions about this chapter to James Wagner at 918-579-9447

Comment Response Matrix  
 PLANiTULSA Comprehensive Plan  
 February 2010  
 Parks and Open Space Chapter

Chapter	Ref #	Page	Column	Paragraph/Table	Comment	Reviewer	Category
Parks & Open Space	1	7	n/a	Chart 3	Under City Trails on the chart, the number does not match the text listed above. <b>Recommended Change: Change chart or text to be consistent</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Parks & Open Space	2	15	n/a	Figure 3	Label in legend does not say trails <u>and</u> existing on-street bikeways. <b>Recommended Change: Change label to "Existing Trails and On-Street Bikeways"</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Parks & Open Space	3	15	n/a	Figure 3	The floodplain layer does not reflect the current or previous City of Tulsa regulatory floodplain map nor the FEMA floodplain map. <b>Recommended Action: Map should reflect current CoT regulatory floodplain map, which has been previously provided to the consultant.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Parks & Open Space	4	17	1	Paragraph 2	Revise language to better reflect the Trails Master Plan. <b>Recommended Action: Revise 4th sentence to read "The Tulsa Trails <u>are part of</u> a 283-mile <u>planned</u> trail system <u>envisioned</u> in the Regional Trails Master Plan.</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Parks & Open Space	5	17	n/a	Picture Caption	The region refers to multi-use paths as trails. <b>Recommended Action: Revise caption to read "...bike and pedestrian trails provide recreational..."</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Parks & Open Space	6	18	1	Paragraph 1	Sentence beginning "The plan examined...and the selection of development opportunity areas to explore XX" <b>Recommended Action: End sentence with "development opportunity areas."</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical

Please refer questions about this chapter to Dane Matthews at 918-579-9471

Comment Response Matrix  
PLANiTULSA Comprehensive Plan  
February 2010  
Economic Development Chapter

<b>Chapter</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Column</b>	<b>Paragraph/Table</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>
Economic Development				NO COMMENTS	

Comment Response Matrix  
PLANiTULSA Comprehensive Plan  
February 2010  
Housing Chapter

<b>Chapter</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Column</b>	<b>Paragraph/Table</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>
Housing				NO COMMENTS	

Comment Response Matrix  
 PLANiTULSA Comprehensive Plan  
 February 2010  
 Appendices Chapter

Chapter	Ref #	Page	Column	Paragraph/Table	Comment	Reviewer	Category
Appendix: Land Use	1	3	1	4: Environmental Features	The City Planning Department is too narrow. These resources are available through numerous sources including INCOG and Public Works. <b>Recommended Action: Change to read "The planning staff..."</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Appendix: Land Use	2	8	2	Bullet 5	The Planning Commission <u>adopts</u> the small area plans and the City Council approves the plan to be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. <b>Recommended Action: Change language to: "The City Council acts to approve the small area plans as adopted by the Planning Commission as a part of the Comprehensive Plan."</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Policy
Appendix: Transportation I	3	14	n/a	Current Urban Arterial	This is not an Urban Arterial. <b>Recommended Action: The label should read "Current Primary Arterial"</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical
Appendix: Transportation I	4	15	n/a	n/a	In previous draft an Angled Parking option was included. INCOG commented on the Angled Parking option previously, but intended the option to be included in a cross-section with more ROW, such as a secondary arterial. <b>Recommended Action: Include angled parking cross-section in 100' of ROW to include enough lane width and parking stall space</b>	INCOG/TMAPC Staff	Technical

Please refer questions about the Land Use Appendix to Dane Matthews at 918-579-9471

Please refer questions about the Transportation Appendix to James Wagner at 918-579-9447