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Project Goals

1. Identify the **alignment** for the Route 66 Bus Rapid Transit route
2. Identify **stop locations** along the selected alignment
3. Develop a strategy for **marketing and branding** of the Route 66 BRT
4. Develop a **land use framework** to encourage transit-oriented development along the route

Guiding Principles

1. Ensure social equity by focusing resources to marginalized populations
2. Promote existing assets and economic development of the BRT corridor
The process would include **five main phases:**

1. **Assemble Teams** (Phase 1)
2. **Define Route** (Phase 2)
3. **Stop Location** (Phase 3)
4. **Branding Marketing Outreach** (Phase 4)
5. **Land Use Framework** (Phase 5)

Two sets of meetings for each **phase**.
## Guiding Principles

1. Ensure social equity by focusing resources to marginalized populations

2. Promote existing assets and economic development of the BRT corridor

## Guiding Principle Indicators

- **Demographics & Equity**
- **Education & Youth**
- **Employment**
- **Tourism**
Phase I
Team Assembly
# Steering Committee Expert Groups

## DEMOGRAPHICS & EQUITY
- **Francisco Trevino**, Casa de la Cultura
- **Angenette DeBose**, Resilience Office, City of Tulsa
- **Marquetta Finley**, TSHA
- **Melanie Poulter**, Community Service Council
- **Ray Pearcy**, Journalist and Writer

## EDUCATION & YOUTH
- **Emily Hutton**, YMCA, MTTA Board of Directors
- **Jorge Robles**, Tulsa Public Schools
- **Delia Kimbrel**, Impact Tulsa, TMAPC
- **Larry Wofford**, University of Tulsa
- **Susan Neal**, Gilcrease Museum, University of Tulsa

## EMPLOYMENT
- **Gerry Chauvin**, Eastgate Metroplex Leasing
- **Rachel Hutchings**, Workforce Tulsa
- **Elizabeth Osburn**, Tulsa Regional Chamber
- **Andrea Pemberton**, TYPROS

## TOURISM
- **Rhys Martin**, RT 66 Commission
- **Matt Stockman**, Visit Tulsa
- **Meredith Peebles**, LTFF
- **Aaron Meek**, Route 66 Businessowner
- **Jesse Boudette**, Route 66 Businessowner
Karen Keith, Tulsa County Commissioner

Crista Patrick, District 3 Councilor City of Tulsa

Kara Joy Mcke, District 4 Councilor City of Tulsa

Mykey Arthrell-Knezek, District 5 Councilor City of Tulsa

Connie Dodson, District 6 Councilor City of Tulsa
Phase II
Define the Route
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Principle Indicators</th>
<th>Guiding Principle Indicator Datapoints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics and Equity</strong></td>
<td>Zero vehicle households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Households with annual incomes under $30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority Populations - Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority Populations - Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of population with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One vehicle households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population 65 years old and over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited English Proficiency (LEP) households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renter Occupied Household Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Household Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population under 25 years of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and Youth</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding Principle Indicators</td>
<td>Guiding Principle Indicator Datapoints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics and Equity</td>
<td>High Schools within ½ mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Youth</td>
<td>Percent of economically disadvantaged students by school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent chronically absent by school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community College within ½ mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University within ½ mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Destinations - Sports Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Destinations - Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Destinations - Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Destinations - Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Schools within ½ mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary Schools within ½ mile (age restriction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding Principle Indicators</td>
<td>Guiding Principle Indicator Datapoints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics and Equity</td>
<td>Major Employment Centers (High concentration of jobs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs paying between $1,250 and $3,333 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs for workers with less than high school diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Youth</td>
<td>Jobs paying less than $1,250 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs for High School equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs in Manufacturing (shift work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs in Accommodation, Food Service (shift work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs in Transportation &amp; Warehousing (shift work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs in Healthcare/Social Assistance (shift work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs within the retail trade (shift work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs in Construction (shift work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs in Information (Media) (shift work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Jobs paying more than $3,333 per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs in Arts, Entertainment, Recreation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategic Planning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Principle Indicators</th>
<th>Guiding Principle Indicator Datapoints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographics and Equity</td>
<td>• Hotels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Youth</td>
<td>• Dining and Retail Establishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>• Event Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Landmark Concentration (e.g. Buck Atom statue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Foot traffic at landmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Route 66 Projects (e.g. Meadow Gold Sign)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Steering Committee Comments

- Feedback during meetings (Staff Workgroup and Steering Committee)
- Indicator and Datapoint Survey (Datapoints, weights and comments)
- E-mail

Highlights

- Datapoint recommendations: Prioritize places where people need to go
- Specific groups and locations to serve
- How will the service affect the existing routes? No gaps
- Albuquerque RT 66 BRT and Kansas City Case Study
- Improve connectivity
- Survey transit riders and drivers
- Accessibility (ADA, LEP, shelters)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Principle Indicators</th>
<th>Feasibility Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographics and Equity</td>
<td>Cost Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Youth</td>
<td>Existing Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Built Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Connectivity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Data to Analyze
- Guiding Principle Indicators: Demographics and Equity, Education and Youth, Employment, Tourism
- Feasibility Indicators: Cost Analysis, Existing Transit, Built Environment, Connectivity
- Steering Committee
- Staff Workgroup and Consultant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feasibility Indicators</th>
<th>Feasibility Indicator Datapoints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost Analysis</td>
<td>• Bus Rapid Transit Operation Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fiber Installation Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Indicators</td>
<td>Feasibility Indicator Datapoints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Analysis</td>
<td>• Tulsa Transit Ridership Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Transit</td>
<td>• Ridership Survey - Transfers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Environment</td>
<td>• Ridership Survey - Popular Stops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Indicators</td>
<td>Feasibility Indicator Datapoints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Analysis</td>
<td>• Grocery Stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Transit</td>
<td>• Healthcare (Hospitals, Primary Care Facilities, Urgent Care)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Environment</td>
<td>• Government Facilities (Social Security, HUD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>• Social Services/Nonprofits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Banks/Financial Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Vacant Parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Indicators</td>
<td>Feasibility Indicator Datapoints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Analysis</strong></td>
<td>• Sidewalks along the arterials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Transit</strong></td>
<td>• Bike/Ped Crashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Built Environment</strong></td>
<td>• Signalized intersections (fewer is better)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connectivity</strong></td>
<td>• Sidewalks within ¼ mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traffic Counts (AADT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sidewalks within ½ mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Intersecting GO Plan bike facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lane width (wider is better)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Auto crashes (fewer is better)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sidewalks within 1 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Roadway speed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• GO Plan bike infrastructure (on route – potential conflicts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Survey Resulting Weights

- **Feasibility Indicators**
  - Staff team worked on datapoints, did research and assigned weights in a similar manner (cost analysis, existing transit, built environment & connectivity).
  - Completed a survey internally; averaged weights.
  - Compared to the weights of the Strategic Planning Model.
  - Collected Ridership Data
  - Conducted Survey of riders of Route 140 & 150 with our interns
  - Consultant team developed operational and cost analysis
Strategic Planning Process

Guiding Principle Indicators
- Demographics & Equity: 30%
- Employment: 30%
- Education & Youth: 25%
- Tourism: 15%

Feasibility Indicators
- Cost Analysis: 40%
- Existing Transit: 30%
- Built Environment: 15%
- Connectivity: 15%

Steps:
1. Guiding Principle Analysis
2. Feasibility Analysis
3. Sheridan Garnett Yale
4. Garnett Memorial Sheridan
The analysis led to identifying top alignments in 2 levels:

- Guiding Principle Analysis
- Feasibility Analysis

The analysis of these levels lead to a BRT Score, and the identification of 3 Top Alignments.

The BRT Score Results which would be analyzed for the Operational Analysis.
Why is Garnett our recommended choice?

**Highlights**

- Most Cost-Effective
- High Hispanic/Latinx Population
- High Rate of Disabilities
- Balance of Incomes (Low, Moderate, High)
- Large Amount of Shift-Work Jobs

- Most Hotels
- Most Route 66 Landmarks and Projects
- Redevelopment Potential
- High Access to Social Services
- Existing Transit Ridership
Route Destinations

Legend
- Garnett Alignment
- Tulsa Transit Route

McClure Park

Mingo Trail
Street School

Lindbergh Elementary
Phase III
Stop Location
P1 – Terminal, and stations offering transfers to perpendicular transit routes, as well as those at the intersection of major arterial streets.

P2/P3 – Mid-mile stops and supportive surrounding land uses and key destinations.
Downtown Alignment & Stops
Option A

Key Highlights

- **Housing** - Rank: #3
- **Employment** - Rank: #1
- **Education and Youth Activities** (sports facilities, parks, libraries) - Rank: #2
- **Tourism** (hotels, dining, retail, event centers, landmarks) - Rank: #3
- **Built Environment** - Rank: #2
- **Connectivity** - Rank: #2

Option B

Key Highlights

- **Housing** - Rank: #2
- **Employment** - Rank: #3
- **Education and Youth Activities** (sports facilities, parks, libraries) - Rank: #2
- **Tourism** (hotels, dining, retail, event centers, landmarks) - Rank: #3
- **Built Environment** - Rank: #3
- **Connectivity** - Rank: #1

Option C

Key Highlights

- **Housing** - Rank: #1
- **Employment** - Rank: #2
- **Education and Youth Activities** (sports facilities, parks, libraries) - Rank: #3
- **Tourism** (hotels, dining, retail, event centers, landmarks) - Rank: #1
- **Built Environment** - Rank: #1
- **Connectivity** - Rank: #3
Thank you for taking this survey to help the Tulsa Planning Office, Tulsa Transit, and the Downtown Coordinating Council determine the most suitable option for the alignment of the Route 66 BRT (BRT) in the downtown area.

The Route 66 BRT will use the transit center on Denver Avenue, known as the "Denver Avenue Station (DAS)" as the western terminus of the alignment. The route continues east from downtown along 11th St. until turning south onto Garnett Rd., then turning east on 21st St. and terminating at the East Gate Metroplex.

* 1. Please rank the 3 options by your preference. Drag the options to place them in your preferred order, with your #1 selection at the top. Or simply choose the rank from the drop-down menu in each row.

- [ ] Alignment Option A - Boulder & Cinclinnati
- [ ] Alignment Option B - Denver
- [ ] Alignment Option C - Elgin

* 2. How frequently do you ride public transit?
- [ ] Daily
- [ ] Weekly
- [ ] Monthly
- [ ] A few times per year
- [ ] Never

* 3. What is your connection to downtown Tulsa? (check all that apply)
- [ ] Downtown Property Owner
- [ ] Downtown Business Owner
- [ ] Downtown Resident
- [ ] Downtown Employee
- [ ] Downtown Visitor
# Route 66 BRT Downtown Alignment Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment</th>
<th>Rank 1</th>
<th>Rank 2</th>
<th>Rank 3</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Final Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alignment A</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment B</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment C</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## How frequently do you ride public transit?

- Green: Daily
- Yellow: Weekly
- Blue: Monthly
- Orange: A few times per year
- Red: Never

## What is your connection to downtown Tulsa? (check all that apply)

- Downtown Property Owner
- Downtown Business Owner
- Downtown Resident
- Downtown Employee
- Downtown Visitor

![Survey Results](image_url)
Final Alignment & Station Location
Ranked Stop Locations

Route 66 BRT Proposed Stops - Ranked

1. Denver Avenue Station
2. E 11th St S and S Peoria Ave
3. Eastgate Metroplex
4. E 11th St S and S Lewis Ave
5. E 11th St S and S Utica Ave
6. E 21st St S and S 116th East Ave
7. E 11th St S and S Garnett Rd
8. E 11th St S and S Sheridan Rd
9. E 11th St S and S Memorial Dr
10. E 11th St S and S Yale Ave
11. E 21st St S and S 129th East Ave
12. E 3rd St S and S Elgin Ave
13. E 7th St S and S Boston Ave
14. E 9th St S and S Elgin Ave
15. E 11th St S and S Delaware Ave
16. S Garnett Rd and E 19th St S
17. E 11th St S and S Hudson Ave
18. E 117th St S and S 101st East Ave
19. E 11th St S and S 89th East Ave
20. E 11th St S and S 73rd East Ave
21. E 21st St S and S 121st East Ave
22. S Garnett Rd and E 14th St S
23. E 11th St S and S Pittsburg Ave
Phase IV
Branding, Marketing & Outreach
Branding & Marketing Strategy
Four subcommittees are proposed to continue working on the project’s Technical Design Phase, to launch in 2022

- **Public Outreach and Advocacy Subcommittee.** Communications, advocacy, event logistics and implementation, and engagement with stakeholders directly impacted.

- **Marketing and Branding Subcommittee.** Branding of the stations, design elements, prioritize marketing funds and coordinate the logistics of marketing efforts.

- **Design and Operations Subcommittee.** Focus will be on how the BRT infrastructure integrates with the existing streetscape and funding allocation/prioritization.

- **Leadership and Implementation Subcommittee.** Oversee the work of the three subcommittees above and make decisions regarding implementation of the system.
Phase V
Land Use Framework
Mixed-Use Rezoning Program

What is it?
Council-initiated mixed-use rezoning application program for the Peoria BRT Route at no cost.

What is the goal?
To stimulate transit-oriented development to best utilize the BRT system.

Where did this come from?
2017 Peoria Avenue BRT Land Use Framework.

30+ completed applications
What is Mixed-Use development?

Mixed-use development is characterized as pedestrian-friendly development that blends two or more residential, commercial, cultural, institutional, and/or industrial uses.

- Municipal Research and Service Center

Vertical Mixed Use

- Combines different uses within the same building
- Public uses on the lower floor such as retail shops, restaurants, or commercial businesses
- Private uses on the upper floors such as residential units, hotel rooms, or office space.
What is Mixed-Use development?
Mixed-use development is characterized as pedestrian-friendly development that blends two or more residential, commercial, cultural, institutional, and/or industrial uses.

- Municipal Research and Service Center

Horizontal Mixed Use

- Single-use buildings within a mixed-use zoning district parcel, which allows for a range of land uses in a single development project

- Complementary and integrated uses that are walkable and within a given neighborhood, tract or land, or development project
Mixed-Use Districts
There are four mixed-use zoning districts in the Tulsa Zoning Code. *Zoning Districts regulate the uses permitted in a specific area.*

Zoning Districts include:
- **MX-1**: Neighborhood Mixed-Use
- **MX-2**: Community Mixed-Use
- **MX-3**: Regional Mixed-Use
- **IMX**: Institutional Mixed-Use

Character Designations
There are four character designations for Mixed-Use development. *Character designations regulate allowed building types and required building and development patterns (setbacks, transparency, etc.)*

Character Designations include:
- **P**: Pedestrian
- **U**: Urban
- **V**: Variable
- **F**: Flexible
Mixed-Use Rezoning Program

Tulsa Mixed-Use Zoning Classifications

HX-1: Neighborhood Mixed-Use
- Small-scale retail, dining, and service uses that serve surrounding neighborhood
- Vehicle sales and service uses are not permitted within a MX-1 zoned area

MX-2: Community Mixed-Use
- Retail, service, and employment uses that serve many surrounding neighborhoods
- Fueling stations and vehicle part and supply sales uses are permitted by right in a MX-2 zoned property
Tulsa Mixed-Use Zoning Classifications

MX-3: Regional Mixed-Use

• Highest intensity of mixed-use

• Large-scale retail, entertainment, civic, and employment centers that attract employees and visitors at a regional level.

• Low Impact Industrial Manufacturing uses by special exception

IMX: Institutional Mixed-Use

• Properties that are zoned IMX must include one or more university or hospital and have specific land area requirements.
Tulsa Mixed-Use Zoning Character Designations

Pedestrian (P)

- High level of pedestrian focus whether that is currently present or desired
- Parking is prohibited between the building and primary street

Urban (U)

- Same characteristics as Pedestrian
- Accommodates more building types
Tulsa Mixed-Use Zoning Character Designations

Variable (V)
- Areas that are more auto-oriented, or transitional areas between auto-centric and high walkability areas
- Allows for more flexibility for the positioning of building on a lot

Flexible (F)
- Same characteristics as Variable
- Accommodates more building types
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allowed Building Types</th>
<th>Pedestrian (P)</th>
<th>Urban (U)</th>
<th>Variable (V)</th>
<th>Flexible (F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vertical Mixed-Use</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal Mixed-Use</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Buildings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment/Condo</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic/Institutional Buildings</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplexes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached Houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Sites</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mixed-Use Zoning Recommendation

- MX-1: Neighborhood Mixed-Use
- MX-2: Community Mixed-Use
- MX-3: Regional Mixed-Use
- IMX: Institutional Mixed-Use
Mixed-Use Rezoning Program

How does it work?
• Property owners are invited to rezone to Mixed Use zoning.
• Discussions with staff to determine best zoning classification and character designation.

How do we make it worthwhile?
Partnership with Tulsa Agency on Economic Opportunity (TAEO) to make Commercial Revitalization Revolving Loan Fund dollars available.
• More favorable loan terms for those who pursue Mixed-Use rezoning recommendations

Included in a suite of development incentives created by the Route 66 Commission
• Brownfield assessment and remediation
• Neon sign grant program
• Façade grant program
Next Steps
• Public outreach in November being carried with the broader public and share report.

• Led by HNTB & Tulsa Transit

• Communicate results and engage with stakeholders directly impacted by implementation.

• BRT Subcommittee kick-off work January 2022
Thank you!

tulsaplanning.org/brt66