



association of central oklahoma governments

Chair Mark Sharpton
Logan County Commissioner

Vice-Chair Willa Johnson
Oklahoma County Commissioner

Secretary/Treasurer Kathy Walker
Nichols Hills Councilmember

Interim Executive Director
John G. Johnson

AGENDA

JOINT LAND USE STUDY POLICY COMMITTEE

Friday, May 9, 2008
10:00 a.m.

ACOG Conference Room
21 E. Main Street, Suite 100, Oklahoma City, OK 73104

- A. Call to Order and Introductions (Attachment A)
- B. Approval of Minutes (Attachment B)
Action Requested: Motion to approve the February 15, 2008 minutes
- C. Summary of Stakeholder Meetings and February 28, 2008 Public Meeting (Attachment C)
Action Requested: For information only.
- D. Extension of Joint Land Use Study Timeframe (Attachment D)
Action Requested: For information only.
- E. Presentation of the Revised JLUS Draft Report by Consultant Team
(*Revised Draft Report was sent to committees on April 15, 2008*)
Action Requested: Review and comment on the Revised JLUS Draft Report. JLUS Policy Committee will be asked to accept the JLUS Report on May 23, following the third public meeting.
- F. New Business
- G. Adjourn

JLUS Policy Committee Members and Alternates

Name	Title	Entity	
Dave Howe			Chairman
Roger Malone	Councilmember	City of Choctaw	Member
Randy Moss	Mayor	City of Choctaw	Alternative
George Skinner	Commissioner	Cleveland County	Member
Denise Heavner	County Assessor	Cleveland County	Alternate
Brian Linley	Mayor	City of Del City	Member
Dick Carter	Councilmember	City of Del City	Alternate
Russell Smith	Mayor	City of Midwest City	Member
James L. Ray	Councilmember	City of Midwest City	Alternate
Kevin Loudermilk	Councilmember	City of Nicoma Park	Member
Theron Franks	Councilmember	City of Nicoma Park	Alternate
Pete White	Councilmember	City of Oklahoma City	Member
Sam Bowman	Councilmember	City of Oklahoma City	Alternate
Brent Rinehart	Commissioner	Oklahoma County	Member
Willa Johnson	Commissioner	Oklahoma County	Alternate
Earnest Ware	Mayor	City of Spencer	Member
James C. Talley	Councilmember	City of Spencer	Alternate
Col. Mona Lisa Tucker	72 ABW/Vice Commander	Tinker AFB	Ex-Officio
Gene Gallogy	Director, Base Civil Eng	Tinker AFB	Ex-Officio
Richard Burpee	Lt. Gen. USAF Ret.	OSMPC	Member

MINUTES

JOINT LAND USE STUDY (JLUS) POLICY COMMITTEE
Friday, February 15, 2008
10:00 a.m.

The Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) Policy Committee and Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) Technical Work Group met on Friday, February 15, 2008 at 10:06 a.m. in the ACOG Conference Room at 21 E. Main Street, Suite 100, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

PRESIDING

Mr. Dave Howe, Chairman

POLICY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Hon. Dick Carter	City of Del City
Hon. Roger Malone	City of Choctaw
Hon. Russell Smith	City of Midwest City
Hon. James L. Ray (alternate)	City of Midwest City
Hon. Brent Rinehart	Oklahoma County
Hon. Earnest Ware	City of Spencer
Mr. Richard Burpee	Oklahoma Strategic Military Planning Commission
Mr. Gene Gallogly	Tinker Air Force Base – Ex Officio

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Tom Leatherbee	City of Del City
Billy Harless	City of Midwest City
Bill Dalke	Tinker Air Force Base, Ex Officio
LouAnna Munkres	Tinker Air Force Base, Ex Officio

GUESTS PRESENT

Mark Edwards	City of Del City
Michael Coker	Michael R. Coker Company
Linda Pavlik	Pavlik and Associates
J. Guy Henson	City of Midwest City
Geranium Carrington	City of Del City
Warren Thomas	Tinker Business Industrial Park

STAFF PRESENT

John G. Johnson	ACOG
Holly Massie	ACOG
Susan Yingling	ACOG
Jerry Church	ACOG
Jane Sutter	ACOG

A. CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

Chairman Howe called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m. and asked all of the attendees to introduce themselves to the rest of the group.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JANUARY 4, 2008 MEETING

Mr. Burpee made a motion to approve the minutes from the meeting held January 4, 2008. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carter and carried unanimously. Mr. Malone was absent during the vote.

C. PRESENTATION OF THE JLUS DRAFT REPORT BY CONSULTANT TEAM

Mr. Coker: Before I start getting into the presentation, a little preamble to where we are, I think, in the context of getting the final report into everybody's hands. We had a meeting with the technical committee at the first part of the month and we've received comments up until the 12th from the technical committee and we've made revisions to the draft report up through the 12th that are now on the Web site that you can go to whether you've gotten there or not. This presentation is based upon those revisions. We are still getting modifications in from the technical committee and we expect some comments from you all today as well so there will be another go around of upgrades to the draft report before we get to our public meeting at the end of the month. I encourage you, if you don't give us your comments today, to give us your comments as timely as you can. We have tried to incorporate as many of the comments that we got from the technical committee into the current draft as possible. And we want to do the same thing with the policy committee draft before we get to the next big public meeting which is scheduled at the end of the month.

Ms. Massie: We have not put the draft report on the ACOG Web site as of yet because it hasn't been to this committee yet. The updated version that Mike just mentioned, we received those links a couple of days ago and those will be emailed out to everyone this afternoon. So the version you've seen has been updated somewhat as Mike indicated.

Mr. Coker: But as far as this presentation is concerned, there is not a whole lot of difference between this one and the one we did on February 1st. Jim Falvo couldn't be here today because he came down with the flu.

One of the things we've done is we've tried to break the recommendations into more bite-sized pieces so you'll see this one is recommendations for all the local governments, both the municipalities and the counties that are participants in this program, and then we'll break it down a little later on to specific municipalities or groups of municipalities that have recommendations that are the same.

We think that consideration of flight path corridors, not Tinker's flight path corridor design, but what we do underneath those flight path corridors is important. Our recommendation is for everybody who has Tinker affiliations where Tinker flies over their municipality or their county, to let Tinker know that there is something that is going to be going on underneath one of those flight paths. And I'll give you an example. Spencer has not a whole lot of stuff going on as far as direct impact, but they do have a noise corridor that goes right over the community – 65 LDN. If the community is thinking about doing something that will be impacted by a 65 decibel noise level, we think that should be communicated to Tinker so they understand what's going on in Tinker.

We think that everybody should consider the transfer of development rights. And that is the ability to take density allowances and entitlements and move them some place else in your municipality and allow them to be used on another piece of property, leaving the place that may be impacted by overflight adjacency or noise in a vacant state. It's a good program to allow a null impact on a property. For building code provisions, we think that everyone needs to bring their current building codes, especially on the residential side, up to current IBC building code standards. And each one of the IBC building codes that has been adopted since 2000 has a standard in there that recommends the reduction of the interior noise level to 45 decibels. If you adopt that, and you comply with the International Energy Code, you pretty much get to 45 decibels inside the houses.

We think that everybody should consider including the height and obstruction regulations that are currently included in the FAA Part 77 requirements, as well as some recommended guidelines from the Air Force that has to do with natural things like trees that might grow in a flight path that could be impacted or in one of the flight plains that comes off of the runway surfaces. If you look in the AICUZ, there's a pretty good graphic in the last AICUZ that shows those flight paths and elevation paths off of the runway surfaces. Try to adopt regulations that minimize those kinds of encroachments into those flight paths.

Instruction guideline preparation that prepare a document in your municipality or your county that allows me as a developer to come in and say I'm interested in developing in Midwest City in this location and here are some guidelines because we have an Air Force Base right next door. Those guidelines are very helpful to people like me when we come in because it makes it easier to make a business decision on whether or not we can afford to develop there.

One of the things that is available in most counties and municipalities is the ability to move a building around on the site. Now, you're familiar with zoning and there's usually a front yard set back and a side yard set back and a rear yard set back and there's a building height envelope. But if you have a developer that is reasonable to work with, you can ask that developer to move the building around on the site to maximize the natural benefits of the topography to minimize noise impacts. And that's one of these recommendations is acoustic site design is to maximize the surfaces that you have that you don't have to build to minimize the noise impacts on any kind of a structure.

These next recommendations are applied to Midwest City, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma County and Cleveland County. Once again, architectural design for the noise level reduction. We think that the sound attenuation programs are pretty good for new construction if you comply with the 2006 IBC or 2003 IBC or 2000 IBC and the Energy Code, you pretty much get to this kind of thing. But we think that if you're not there, you should require for new construction. And then for remodels, to the extent that it's a voluntary program, encourage people to comply with sound attenuating renovations to their home, windows, doors, baffles, insulation, those kinds of things, and concurrently with that, create a program that allows a participant who meets all of those criteria to have a certificate that shows a prospective home buyer that the seller is as close to being compliant with noise reduction as they can possibly be and that there is an Air Force Base close by.

The next recommendation applies to Midwest City, Del City, and Oklahoma City. In all of these jurisdictions, we think they have done a really good job so far. When we reviewed all their ordinances, there are just a few areas where we think there are some modifications that can improve Tinker's viability. The first one is to revise their current zoning requirements, and I know that Del City has recently adopted revised zoning ordinance regulations as has Midwest City and we have reviewed all of those and we think they are really good. Oklahoma City has had a pretty good program in place all along. But we think you want to minimize the incompatible land uses in and around the Base to the extent that it's possible. Not to take away nonconforming uses that don't currently meet the standards, but to really look at how you allow new construction or infill, for instance, in Del City and Midwest City, I think you're going to see that there are opportunities for infill over the next 20 years as Oklahoma City and this current environment around Tinker grows like you are continuing to grow.

One of the things we found in the comprehensive plan, especially in the future land use maps, is that the geography that outlines the noise contours was not shown very clearly, if at all. We are recommending that those maps be included in their future land use elements to promote compatible development inside those noise contours. The encroachment that threatens Tinker is all around Tinker, but this community has done a better job at protecting Tinker than almost any of your contemporaries across the country. So when we make a recommendation about something that we think you could do, it's really something that we think you can do in addition to all the work you've done already that would help improve Tinker's opportunity for continuing the mission and

expanding the mission over the long haul. If you read a recommendation that says something you're opposed to, that's okay. We're not you. We're trying to come at this as essentially unbiased. At the end of the day, it's the policy committee's recommendations that will go on to the municipalities and the counties. We might be the messengers, but you'll be the people who are really responsible for what gets out into the adoption area.

We think that in areas within APZ-I and areas that are impacted by high noise levels, you should consider programs that require or encourage noise mitigation and provide for voluntary acquisition, we're not talking about condemnation or eminent domain, we're talking about when you have the opportunity to acquire property that may be developed in a place that is not advantageous to Tinker. For instance, the area just north of the north/south runway at Tinker was acquired by bond program from the county. That is the kind of thing we are talking about. If there are more of those, we want to encourage them.

Land banking is different than acquisition. What we're recommending here is, if you have a government or nongovernment entity that has a piece of property that's in an area that could be developed, especially if it has development rights that would allow for the construction of a less-compatible or non-compatible use, that the owner or the municipality acquire that land temporarily as a holding action until such time as a compatible use come available. There are compatible uses in APZ-I for new uses. So you're not taking the land and putting it into open space. You're setting it aside until an appropriate development can occur.

Recommendations for Midwest City, Oklahoma City, and Spencer. Modification for the rezoning process. We're recommending that you give a hard look at allowing rezoning that provides for residential uses in areas that are impacted by noise levels at 65 decibels or greater unless they are proposing to sound attenuate as part of the development.

Mr. Henson: You've got existing or future? I didn't see anything in your document that showed future areas. If we're going to regulate, if it says existing and future, is there a future 65 area out there that's been mapped?

Mr. Coker: One of the things we were thinking about was that as the mission at Tinker has the potential to expand, there may be different aircraft noise signatures that may, in fact, impact the noise contours around Tinker. Oklahoma City uses the noise contours that are out of the 1983 AICUZ that are bigger than the 2006 noise contours.

Mr. Henson: So what you're saying is that if they provide us other material that shows a different contour then be prepared to go with that.

Mr. Coker: Yes, exactly right. Show the noise contours on future land use maps and zoning maps, I think we talked about this a little bit earlier. Voluntary avigation easement program allows the purchase, and I think maybe if you can get an avigation easement without buying it that's a good thing so I think we'll modify that language to say avigation

easement acquisition by purchase or voluntarily. It ensures the ability of the Air Force to fly over property and to have those continuing noise levels. It makes the individual property owner aware that that's happening, and it gives the right to the Air Force to do what they were supposed to do with that mission.

Oklahoma County and Cleveland County. One of the things we think is important is a disclosure format, especially for the sale of residential property. Single family and duplexes are the most directly effected. We think that a noise disclosure program is a good thing across the board. The reason it falls under the county guidelines in our case is because we think the county can do that and cause that regulation to be affected across all the municipalities without the municipalities necessarily having to take individual action. Now that said, we have experience with another JLUS where we made this recommendation where the realtors got very uptight about that because they felt like that was adding another level of disclosure that they didn't need to do. But in that other jurisdiction the state law, as the state law in Oklahoma requires, if you know there is an issue that may affect the sale or use of the property, if you are the seller or the seller's agent, you're supposed to disclose it. We don't think this recommendation is counter to what you have currently in the state law.

Oklahoma City and Oklahoma County. Bird management. They have a southeast Oklahoma City landfill. It's a considerable distance from the airport but we have heard of bird migration and flocks that have interfered with flight operations. We just really think there shouldn't be anymore landfills to the extent that it's possible for the county and the city to deal with that within close proximity to the runways. And secondly, try and improve the way to manage the bird population so they don't interfere with flight operations.

Oklahoma City and Tinker. Closure of the Douglas Boulevard. One of the things that the Oklahoma City Southeast Sector Plan suggests is the closing of Douglas Boulevard and the relocation of the thoroughfare to the east on Post. So the potential for the expansion of Tinker operations, and they already have a number of operations included in MROTC on the east side of Douglas, it would provide for the opportunity to close that street off as a thoroughfare and provide that as a part of the infrastructure for the airbase and for the operations of moving aircraft across Douglas, for instance, at the MROTC. We say determine the feasibility of closing it. We don't know that it's altogether feasible. We haven't done that analysis yet. We do know that ODOT has a program in their long range plan for the redesign of the interchanges at I-240 and I-40 at Douglas so at some point in time, ODOT is already thinking about the potential for that interchange to be moved to someplace other than Douglas.

Ms. Massie: You mean Post Road?

Mr. Coker: Yes, Post Road.

Mr. Burpee: They also associated with the MROTC, if you close down Douglas, they want to expand 44th Street and Post so that when you connect Post to I-40 and I-240 you can handle the traffic that comes in from the south and the north. So 44th Street needs to be included in part of your plan as an expansion.

Mr. Coker: I think there is just really one specific recommendation on Tinker. We all know that the JLUS is the community's project and the AICUZ was Tinker's. So we didn't spend a whole lot of time talking about the AICUZ. It's a big document; it's available. We used some of it in our work because it was applicable, but they are two different documents. We think it's important for Tinker to continue to let you all know what's happening on the base through their public information offices and meetings and, I think individually you're communities have got good relationships with the Base. I think there needs to be both a vertical and a horizontal communication from the Base coming out and from us going into the Base.

So implementation is not on our chart, but these are some of the tools that are available to you when it comes time to implement. You've already done a whole lot of these things. Many of you changed your zoning ordinances to be much more focused on how you preserve the Base's mission and how you minimize the adverse impact of inappropriate land uses, but these are a number of ways to get there from here.

Mr. Burpee: In your draft, you have that all of the various municipalities within eastern Oklahoma County all have different connections with Tinker AFB. One of your recommendations was to have a single organization, create an organization, or have ACOG or something like that that is a prime source dealing with Tinker. Will you elaborate on that?

Mr. Coker: One of the things we think would be helpful is if there was an umbrella organization that was like a two-ended funnel. Tinker at the big end of the funnel, and all of us at the other end of the funnel, and information coming into some central clearinghouse that would allow then for all of us to know what was going on at Tinker as far as development, construction, increased mission, and those kinds of programs. Because I think there is a high likelihood that Tinker is going to get more missions. On the other side of the equation, a place for us to collect data about anticipated construction in Midwest City or Oklahoma City or Del City that may be affected by operations at the Base or may affect operations at the Base because the Base doesn't have the ability to regulate what goes on in your cities. So whether it's ACOG as your clearinghouse or some other entity, we think that's a program that needs to be put into place to gather all that data. It's kind of that vertical and horizontal communication I'm talking about when it comes to development, uses, base operation, and mission.

Mr. Henson: I think there was, associated with that, was the recommendation that there be almost a super zoning agency that would control land use decisions, zoning decisions, and so forth.

Mr. Coker: Yes, like the zoning board that is designed specific. That is something we've recommended that you consider.

Mr. Henson: I think practically speaking that is a difficult thing legally to do because you're asking the municipalities to delegate their police power for zoning and I don't know whether that's possible.

Mr. Coker: That's why you didn't hear me push that along too hard because I've been a city planner in a big city and we never wanted to share any of our stuff with anybody else. And I suspect whether you're a big city like Oklahoma City or a smaller city like Spencer, you would be reluctant to give over your jurisdictional authority to some third party. That notwithstanding, that is a tool that's available.

Ms. Pavlik: You'd need to go to the legislature to work through that.

Mr. Burpee: How do we enforce this now? Is that up to ACOG?

Mr. Coker: Those are the next steps. Through the course of the remainder of the winter and spring we're going to have two more public meetings where we invite everybody, but we're going to meeting with all the municipalities and counties making presentations trying to get feedback especially from the elected officials that are interested and incorporate their comments into this. But as I said, the way this gets affected is that the municipalities and the counties have to adopt the recommendations of the policy committee. And the recommendations that you see in the document today are likely to change some between now and the time the policy committee finally adopts it. But the implementation, whether it's that or something else, becomes the responsibility of the municipalities and the counties and how it works after that is their job. They have to implement it and they have to follow it up. I don't think anything in here, with the exception of the things people do voluntarily, doesn't cost something. I think everything costs some money and you all are the people responsible for budgets, not us. And at the end of the day, there will have to be that review at the council level or commissioners' court to underwrite and fund the implementation.

Mr. Malone: We've had some discussion about the possibility of the Tinker facility being able to gain the old GM facility. If that does happen, there's going to be a big shift of where the industrial activity would be sent. It would be going west, not east. That seems like it would lessen the possibility of closing Douglas to gain the more eastern real estate. Has that been considered in your plan?

Mr. Coker: The GM plant is not in our plan. We evaluated it and talked about the potential for that to occur and since it was on nobody's radar scope at the time we were putting this draft together, it didn't make it into this draft. If it were to become a reality, it may change operations, but I don't know. It might be time at that point to reconsider the

recommendation on Douglas. I still don't know what the effect of the MROTC expansion because what's out there today is only the first phase. There's at least as twice as much as that as what's currently on the ground as what's planned for it. And secondly, there are already a number of base operations that are on the east side of Douglas. So I think it would merit consideration if that comes to pass. I just don't think it's part of this project.

Mr. Henson: I've never seen the evaluation of Tinker. How has Tinker rated in the past when it comes to the AICUZ standards? Where are our strengths and where are our weaknesses when it comes to AICUZ.

Mr. Dalke: I think what you're asking is where do you compare when it comes to the BRAC evaluation. In terms of the AICUZ, we put the AICUZ out. We have complied with the Air Force recommendations on how often we have to get the information out to the communities. BRAC comes in and has evaluated the Base. I don't believe that information is available for release. I haven't seen anything that I could ever talk about in terms of what the BRAC says in terms of this is good or this is bad.

Ms. Munkres: Basically, they do want to know if the communities have adopted some sort of AICUZ document or if they are compatible in the developments. One of the things we have been able to do is we have been able to take out some of the things that were identified, if you will, as red, like the acquisition of the automobile dealership in the Clear Zone. So those things have been taken out by acquisition. But they are interested in whether or not the cities are complying with the recommendations of the AICUZ compatible land use criteria.

Mr. Burpee: We don't know when the next BRAC is going to be. They always look for discriminators. What discriminates you and causes you to be in violation of AICUZ zones and noise zones versus the other two depots. I think that we need to make sure that we don't have any "red dots". We had a red dot in 1995 and as she said, that was cleared up when the county bought the land up there on Douglas by the Tinker gate. That was the only red dot we had at that time, but who knows? They've expanded some of the noise contours here. They've expanded the safety zones. How those things fall, I think we need to make sure we take care of them in some form or another because the next BRAC will certainly look at that.

Mr. Henson: So along those lines, when this document or the AICUZ document speaks to incompatible or nonconformed uses, what should we be doing with regards to those? Are they allowed to stay?

Mr. Coker: I think that if you look in the 2006 AICUZ, it talks about nonconforming uses that are nonconforming as a result of this document. It specifically talks about in APZ-II that there are nonconforming and there's not any expectation that they will be brought into conformity as a result of this document. It doesn't really address APZ-I and there are land uses that are considered to be incompatible, and I think what Mr. Burpee is suggesting, is that if you get into incompatible land uses in your APZ-I's then the

government is going to be looking at what you have done or what you plan to do to improve the compatibility of land uses within that geography. That said, there's no recommendations in here that you go out and buy stuff to take incompatible land uses off the map.

Mr. Gallogy: And we wouldn't make that kind of recommendation. All the AICUZ does is show what we have out there and where there may be some incompatibilities. I think the BRAC commissions, when they look at this, there's a whole series of factors that they evaluate. I think when we look at AICUZ against JLUS, the community is trying to adopt a lot of these standards and that is a very positive sign. We have gotten tremendous community support and that is a very positive sign. There's a lot of things that go into that report that show the support Tinker receives is probably better than any other installation in the country, and therefore, we'd like to continue to work with that installation and that relationship will continue to expand or keep the missions there. This study is one more step in the right direction. We're looking at this and the development around the base, and if we can continue to keep those flags down to yellow or green level, I don't think too many AICUZ flags that get raised.

Mr. Malone: I guess getting back to Guy's original question, we had one red flag on the previous BRAC. Have the other ones that you've run into had more than one red dot or yellow flag? What's the benchmark?

Mr. Gallogy: Lots more incompatibilities with more municipalities than you all have.

Mr. Henson: And the 2006 AICUZ report from Tinker doesn't recommend purchasing any property, but then you come back with the JLUS and it does have recommendations of purchasing property and buying up property. Why is that?

Mr. Coker: Remember that the AICUZ is the Air Force's work and that's their recommendations to protect Tinker. The JLUS is your recommendations to improve the viability of Tinker while, to the extent possible, not adversely affecting your viability as municipalities and counties. It's a completely different environment. And remember that the recommendations in here are the consultant recommendations and if the policy committee members don't like them, the recommendations will come out and the report will go on to the municipalities and the counties without that offending recommendation. But we're going to make recommendations that make sense that would help protect communities in the next go around of BRAC reviews and also protect the Base as well to help reduce over time potential incompatibilities.

Mr. Henson: With regards to the Glenwood area, have you ever seen a region do something like that?

Mr. Coker: No.

Mr. Henson: Would it be inconceivable to try to use the resource of the cleared Glenwood area in some form of a transfer of a development rights scheme that would acknowledge and recognize that as applied to the larger area? It's like we have Glenwood, it's a great asset, but we don't get to count it because it's all clear. And yet, you're suggesting to try to do some transfer of development rights that would address the AICUZ, but the fact that it's already been cleared out, we don't get to count that. I would like to figure out a way to count that.

Mr. Burpee: It's part of Tinker. They use a lot of training activity out there and that's a positive that it's cleared out.

Mr. Henson: But in a different set of circumstances, you wouldn't have the APZ-I totally cleared out like that maybe at another base location. You might have a density standard of one or two units per acre. Over there you have no dwelling units. I'm just seeing an expansion of the application of the noise contours pretty significantly in Midwest City. I'm just trying to see if there's some opportunity to utilize all that vacant property in some formulas to be able to create some transfer of development.

Mr. Coker: My recollection is the county floated the bond program and bought all of those houses which meant they bought the land, and they bought all the development rights that went with it so there's nothing to transfer in that regard. I'm not discounting your concept because I think there's some value there. If the county wanted to allow someone to have those development rights, they could do that, except for the fact that the city regulates zoning, not the county. If there's an opportunity for you to capitalize on areas that are not potentially in compatible locations, you have a tool. You can rezone those areas to increase the density. It doesn't require any transfer of development rights, it's just an application of development rights through your entitlement program. If you think there's an area that's not in the APZ-I that's appropriate for single family, for instance, that you want to increase the density from four units per acres, change the zoning to give them six units per acre. There's lot of tools there, I just don't think that Glenwood is the right tool.

Mr. Henson: I guess I'm looking for a more holistic approach than just a transfer of development rights. I think you can kind of look at whether you could look at APZ-I and APZ-II and look at the amount of land that won't be developed, and try and figure out whether that vacant land can be calculated in some formula.

Mr. Coker: I really think you're on to something. I think that that's something each of the municipalities and the counties can really undertake and that doesn't have to be part of this effort. That could be something that you do that could add value to the community in the long run.

Mr. Gallogy: I think the BRAC commissions do look at that. We've filled out questionnaires, and we identify the things that are incompatible. We give them examples of zoning ordinances that are there to protect the interests of the airfield in the nearby

community. I think they look at is it getting worse or is it getting better. There are some communities that it's getting much worse. Maybe they only have four or five incompatibilities today, but there's nothing there to protect you tomorrow and it's just getting worse. And they know that in five years, you're not going to be able to fly on that airfield. So when we take a look at Tinker and the surrounding communities, I think there have been a lot of things that we've done with the communities and at Tinker to protect ourselves from those kinds of encroachments, and it continues to get better and better. There's always steps that are being undertaken like this that would identify ways to further protect the airfield and the encroachment zones. There are still developments that are going on. Del City has one that you guys are looking at in APZ-II that are incompatible with APZ-II, but that doesn't mean it's going to close Tinker. It just means that they're going to take a look at that. Del City doesn't have a lot of choices. You don't have a lot of vacant land; you've got to build something out there if you want to continue to grow and prosper.

Mr. Burpee: I remember the Glenwood thing. The Department of Defense told the city that if they didn't do something about Glenwood, they were going to shut that runway down, which was essentially the only runway we had going at the time in 1971. So the county passed a bond issue and bought the land up and that's why we did it. The other thing that the county and the city did that was very smart was at Stanley Draper Lake. That whole area out there was designed to protect the south runway just like Glenwood was designed to protect the north side. I'd hate to see that be disturbed and raise a red flag on any future base closures.

Mr. Thomas: I'd like to speak for a couple of minutes from the private sector. I don't know that there's anybody else here that's representing the private sector, and as I said earlier I'm with the Tinker Business Industrial Park. And I know that this is a work in progress so this is not meant to be any kind of an indictment or anything, but I read the document, Mr. Coker, and what I would take exception to even at this point, first of all, is that we haven't been contacted. Neither my partner Flintco nor me have been contacted with respect to this study and yet we're cited as being one of the incompatible uses, which I take exception to, both in terms of land use and also density. And I've read every page of this and I want to say at the outset, Mr. Chairman, Tinker is our mother lode. If it were not for Tinker, none of us would be here. And so we have been out there since 1985. We came to the area because we were asked to come to the area in the aftermath of the First Southern Baptist Church fiasco where they were going to put thousands of people in a single complex. We were asked to come out there by the state chamber, the city chamber, and the leaders of the community to develop a place where private contractors could do business with Tinker. And so I want you to know that we are fully committed to the mission and the preservation of Tinker AFB come what may in the ALC. So I don't want you to feel like my comments are self-serving because they're not.

Our understanding of the criteria are to protect public safety, protect the mission of the military installation and to create an environment for the private sector who supports the war fighter and the military installation to do its work. That's our part. We're the third

leg of the stool. We have 35 companies in our cluster that do about a billion and a half a year to do that. There's some history there. Not only were we asked to come out, Flintco and we were asked to come out and develop a project with the quality that you see there today. But we bought the land in 1985, millions of dollars, and our zoning was approved in 1986. It was an I-2 zoning and we submitted a PUD in conjunction with that zoning in 1986. I have a letter right here from Commander Phil Hubbard who said that our project was in compliance with the AICUZ ordinance in 1986. Then we began to do our serious land planning and our construction and there began to be some sensitivities about how it would affect BRAC and the future of the Base. We were obviously sensitized to that too. So we entered into almost a year of an intensive work effort with Tinker, the City of Midwest City, and with Argon Laboratories out of Chicago who was under contract from the Air Force to develop a model for how you can protect public safety, protect the mission of the military installation and let the private sector to do what it's supposed to do in terms of supporting the war fighter. So that was in 1986. We amended our PUD in 1988 and I have copies of all these documents. I'd love to meet with you, Mr. Coker, and your staff so that I can show you all of this material. And then in 1990, after a real intense effort by this working group that I just described, this ordinance was adopted. This was 18 years ago. It has an avigation ordinance that they did not pay for, but we voluntarily wanted to offer so that every lease at Tinker Business Industrial Park does and has, since 1990, has the AICUZ ordinance and the entire AICUZ document. And not only do they sign the lease, they sign and initial every page that they have read what the decibel levels are, what the density requirements are, more importantly, what they are not. What kind of uses we do not allow. We have no retail. It's considered to be, Argon told us at the time, that this template was the most restrictive in the country. It's single-story, we cannot have more than 50 human beings per acre at any one given point in time, we have sound attenuation construction when we build a building, there is no retail on the project, and I don't know what classifications you're using in terms of commercial, but it was said in the same sentence that we and Sam's are commercial. It's by order of magnitude different from Sam's which is in the same APZ, but a few hundred feet to the east of us. Fifty people per acre, the avigation easement, the sound attenuation, and then in terms of density, whereas the average for business services across the country is about 150 square feet per person. We cannot have less than 265 square feet per person, or 76% more space per person to make sure we have adequate space within the envelope to do what is called for and that is to have a low density environment. We think we have a low density environment there. Somebody made the statement that we're busting our numbers. Every year we do our own survey at TBIP to we can present to the municipality what the occupancy load is of the buildings. And then on occasion, the City of Midwest City, as they should in terms of enforcement entity, showed up and said we want to look at your buildings. They can go into any building they want to except for Boeing. Even General John Allen, who opposed this at the time, said that the ordinance that was adopted met both spirit and letter of AICUZ. I think the proof of the pudding is that we've been through three BRAC runs. As was pointed out here, there was one red dot. It was not on the crosswind runway, it was on the north runway and it was eliminated. All we've had is green after going through three rounds of BRAC. I do not know of one complaint about TBIP. So I want to tell you from the private sector standpoint, in terms of

this work in progress, I would encourage there to be an open dialogue with the private sector, particularly if you're going to cite them in the study. Midwest City, from day one, has been the protector of the ALC and Tinker AFB. From day one, they have been diligent about protecting that installation and making sure, I don't care who you were or who you know or how much money you've got, that the installation was protected. And I for one am proud, not only of the effort that we've made in terms of supporting the mission of the war fighters and so on, but I'm real proud of Midwest City in terms of their performing their duties and responsibilities and I think they're a good model for others.

There's a point of clarification in terms of the study. Is it factual that of the accidents that have happened of about 800 accidents, that 27% of the accidents happen in the clear zone, 10% have happened in APZ-I, 5% have happened in APZ-II? Am I reading that accurately to say then that 42% of the 800 accidents have happened in clear zone, APZ-I and APZ-II, meaning that 58% have happened beyond those areas? What it says in the study is ten miles.

Mr. Coker: Or on the runway. I think that number is pretty accurate as of 2006 because that was the data we got from the Air Force that was included in here so there aren't a whole lot of accidents that happen at Tinker.

Mr. Thomas: I guess my point is that I think it's a balance. There's no perfect solution. We're human beings, we're trying to do the best we can here with common goals, but if 58% of the accidents happen beyond APZ-II or some place else out there, it cites as the benchmark it's ten miles. Do you know what ten miles is? It's Turner Turnpike. Off the cross runway it's Lake Hefner. I mean, somehow in here, we've got to make sure that we're balanced in how restrictive we get.

Mr. Burpee: If we accept the APZ-I and APZ-II and an airplane augers into APZ-I or APZ-II, who's liable?

Mr. Coker: I think the Air Force is probably the first person you're going to look at, but after that, it's anybody who allowed something that was not compatible.

Mr. Burpee: It would be the ordinance that was presented then, right?

Mr. Coker: You're asking a legal question that I don't know that I'm prepared to answer.

Mr. Burpee: I think that's the issue. Who's going to be responsible? And, Warren, you know that if we had a conference like this in one of your buildings out there, we'd be violating your intent of your building code because you can't have more than 50 people per acre. So I just wonder, if there is an accident, who pays?

Mr. Thomas: The average acreage per building is about six. That's 300.

Mr. Burpee: The cluster of your buildings covers how many acres?

Mr. Thomas: APZ-I is 53 and some change. We've got about 31% FAR.

Mr. Burpee: I would just think Midwest City and the Air Force should be concerned about that if something happens. And if you've been in one of those buildings and an airplane takes off on the crosswind runway, it stops all the conversation until the airplane is gone.

Mr. Gallogy: I think you were talking about the noise contours changing. It's not so much that would just be the results of the expansion of Tinker. If the tanker guys goes to the KCX instead of the KC-135, that could change the noise contours. If the AWACS get a new airplane one of these days, that could change our noise contours. It may be more flights, it may be less flights, it may be more airplanes, it may be fewer airplanes, maybe just a different airplane. There are all kinds of different mission changes that cause this contour to change. And over time the Air Force has changed the way we look at things too. It used to be with a crosswind runway, we didn't worry too much about the APZ-II. We didn't worry too much about the APZ-I because it was a secondary runway. You're not flying off that runway near as much as you're flying off your primary runway so do you still look at the statistics the same way. Now we look at it and as far as the density per acre, we look at that and say, okay, you've got so many acres out there and you've got it spread out as far as the number of people per acre, but if they're all in one acre and you're counting the whole thing and we crash an airplane right in that one acre where everybody's located, that's a whole lot of people that are going to go in one crash. So that may be incompatible even though the density of 50 people per acre is still met. It may not be quite what we're looking at there, but when we published that standard, you guys were trying to meet it.

Mr. Thomas: Even Argon would say do we get down to the point where we're saying how many people who can occupy a room, a bathroom, a conference room? They said that the best criteria were the two we utilized, which is the amount of square footage per person and the number of people per acre. That's the balance.

Mr. Coker: We appreciate your position on this. We're not targeting you. We don't know you. We know that you've got three big buildings, but you've got 64 acres. And we know that even if you distribute 50 human beings per acre across 64, that's a big number. And if you take that number and plug it into three buildings, then you've got a concentration that is roughly equivalent of an assembly kind of density and that's the position that we've taken. We've changed the recommendation since you saw it last, but it still says that we think that you need to have a gross density reduction that's more evenly spread across the 64 acres or the acquisition. Now, that said, I think your point, Mr. Thomas, about the fact that most of the accidents occur someplace else, most of the accidents that occur, there aren't that many, occur someplace else. That is a recommendation that I think this committee as a whole gets to evaluate and they get to make the decision as to whether or not it goes forward from here. It's my recommendation to the committee, but what goes on to the municipalities and the counties is their recommendation, not mine. So it's not personal at all. Our job here is to say what things are out there that could

be considered to be less compatible land uses as a result of human density and yours just happens to be one of them.

Mr. Henson: I think what we're missing is the component that we tried to address and that is the density issue. What I see has occurred is we're still using the term low intensity/low density and the way we're going to accomplish that is by having a 20% coverage requirement. And the 20% coverage requirement is going to be on the entire piece of property to be developed. So under those circumstances, let's start counting floodways and street right of way, and it's not too hard to get down to that 20% coverage, but if you don't have a density standard behind that 20% coverage, you can get a large number of people sitting in a small area and you've got to be able to address the density issue, otherwise you can play games with that coverage requirement.

Mr. Coker: I think that your ordinance does a real good job at taking a crack at that.

Mr. Henson: There's no pride of authorship. I just think that we're dealing with having to get drilled down and more specific on how you're going to deal with the number of people who are going to occur in the 20% envelope. I go to the 1999 AICUZ handbook and the 20% deals with residential. It doesn't look like it deals with the commercial side.

Ms. Munkres: I think that's one of the things we wanted to see this committee do is set aside and to make a determination as to what is low density because the Air Force does not have a definition for low density. The Navy has come out with a regulation so that might be something we could look at.

Mr. Thomas: Actually, they've removed the standard because they didn't want to have a benchmark. They simply say low density.

Mr. Edwards: We have an apartment complex that is inside the APZ-I zone. It was built around 1965 and it's at the end of its functional life. We're moving to condemn that apartment complex. We're going to be moving to low the density requirements on that piece of property. Our ultimate goal is that, when redevelopment occurs, is going to be stuff that is compatible with APZ-I.

Mr. Johnson: I'd be interested to hear what Tinker has to say.

Mr. Dalke: We believe this is a community effort and a lot of our documentation is in the AICUZ. We would like to see this become a stronger community document. We have a number of comments, some of them are dealing with points of history or points of clarification. For instance, the construction of the crosswind runway happened in 1942. It was expanded in 1995 and we want to make sure all of the facts that we are aware of are factually correct.

Ms. Munkres: I think one of our comments was in the executive summary, we'd like to see it more oriented away from Tinker as compared to being more oriented towards the

communities. There's like six or seven pages about Tinker's history and I really think that should be more community-oriented in the executive summary. Maybe the executive summary could be more like about four to six pages. Boil that down and have that more oriented toward the community.

Ms. Massie: So give more of a history of what the communities have done in support of Tinker?

Ms. Munkres: Well, the executive summary should be a boiled down synopsis of what's in the document. I think it's several pages more than it should be. I guess some of the maps, for instance, in one area, the maps seem to be old maps. It doesn't show the Navy complex. It shows the residential streets back 20 years ago. Maybe we could use some of the maps out of the AICUZ documents. I know the area around APZ-I and APZ-II on the crosswind in Del City, the maps seem to be skewed. Maybe it's the retrofitting of the maps. And I think we have to be careful about where those lines are shown because people need to make investments based on that. It looks like it's about 200 yards off in the retrofitting on the aerial.

Mr. Dalke: So we have 86 comments in general. Most of those comments are specific things of the document we felt should be clarified.

Mr. Gallogy: Overall, this really was intended to be a community document, but we kind of felt reading through it that it was too Tinker-central. Tinker is the basis for a lot of this document, but we felt that the emphasis for this should be on the communities.

Ms. Munkres: Also, I didn't see any provisions for any kind of an overlay for the zoning agency.

Ms. Pavlik: Your packets do include comments that we have received from the technical committee and several cities also gave us some comments. Overall, many of those from an accuracy standpoint and a rework standpoint have already been made and the revised draft will be posted for you later today. It would be helpful if Bill and LouAnna if you would look at the revisions too. We appreciate getting your comments and will continue to look at those. As you know, we've got our scheduled events and we can see us getting more comments.

Mr. Howe: I would recommend that Tinker submit their comments to the contractor via email so they can review them and make changes.

Ms. Massie: We would like to receive written comments that anybody has. If you can list the page number, that would be helpful. You can email those to me and I will pass them on to the consultants.

D. OVERVIEW OF UPCOMING FEBRUARY/MARCH JLUS PUBLIC OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

Ms. Pavlik handed out a schedule of the upcoming JLUS public outreach meetings to the Policy Committee members for their information. She said that there were still openings if anyone needed to meet with the consultants. Ms. Pavlik said she had been unable to reach anyone with the Oklahoma Home Builders Association and the Oklahoma Realtors Association. Mr. Howe asked Mr. Smith to help Ms. Pavlik make that contact.

Mr. Malone gave Ms. Pavlik the updated time of 7 p.m. for the Choctaw City Council Meeting on the JLUS meeting schedule.

E. NEW BUSINESS

No new business.

F. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:38 a.m.

ADOPTED THIS _____ DAY OF _____, 2008.

INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

CHAIRMAN

ACOG

Association of Central Oklahoma Governments

21 E. Main St, Suite 100, Oklahoma City, OK 73104-2405
(405) 234-2264 Fax: (405) 234-2200 TDD: (405) 234-2217
www.acogok.org e-mail: acog@acogok.org

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 30, 2008
TO: JLUS Policy Committee
FROM: Holly Massie, Special Programs Officer
SUBJECT: Summary of Stakeholder Meetings and February 28, 2008 Public Meeting

INFORMATION:

The second public meeting for the Joint Land Use Study for Tinker AFB and the surrounding communities was held on February 28, 2008, at 7:00 p.m. at the Midwest City Library. The purpose of the meeting was to present the preliminary recommendations of the Joint Land Use Study to the general public, as provided to the JLUS Technical and Policy Committees earlier in February by the consultant team.

A postcard announcing the meeting was mailed to nearly 200 individuals, which included study area elected officials, chambers of commerce, school superintendents, city board and commission members, neighborhood and civic groups, and interested citizens who attended the first JLUS public meeting last October. Additionally, ACOG staff issued a press release to 33 media outlets, including print, radio and television. Attached is a summary of the public meeting and list of those who attended.

In addition to the public meeting, DFW Advisors, Michael Coker Company and Pavlik and Associates made presentations to numerous study partners and stakeholders, as called for in the JLUS Public Involvement Plan and reflected below:

February 19 (Tuesday)

8:30 a.m. – Oklahoma City Council, 200 N. Walker, 3rd Floor, City Hall

9:00 a.m. – Cleveland County Board of Commissioners, 201 S. Jones, Norman, County Courthouse

1:30 p.m. – Mid-Del Independent School District, 7217 SE 15th, MWC, Administration Building

February 21 (Thursday)

7:00 p.m. – Spencer City Council, 8300 NE 36th Street, City Hall

February 26 (Tuesday)

6:15 p.m. – Choctaw City Council (pre meeting), 2500 N. Choctaw Road, City Hall

7:15 p.m. – Midwest City Council, 100 N. Midwest Boulevard, City Hall

February 27 (Wednesday)

9:00 a.m. – Oklahoma County Board of Commissioners, 320 Robert S. Kerr, OKC, Courthouse

February 28 (Thursday)

11:30 a.m. – Midwest City Chamber of Commerce, East Is In Luncheon, Rose State College Student Center, Midwest City

March 3 (Monday)

6:00 p.m. – Del City Council (including Chamber representatives), 4517 SE 29th Street, City Hall

March 6 (Thursday)

9:30 a.m. – Mid-Del Board of Realtors, Midwest City

10:30 a.m. - OKC Chamber of Commerce-Greater OKC Partnership Group, 123 Park Ave., Oklahoma City

March 19 (Wednesday)

2:00 p.m. – Central Oklahoma Homebuilders Association, Oklahoma City

April 1 (Tuesday)

7:00 p.m. – Nicoma Park City Council, 2301 Nichols Drive, City Hall

ACTION REQUESTED:

For information only.

MEETING SUMMARY

Joint Land Use Study Public Meeting
Midwest City Library, Room A, 8143 E. Reno Ave., Midwest City, OK 73110
Thursday, February 28, 2008
7:00 p.m.

The second public meeting of the Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) was called to order by David Howe, JLUS Policy Committee Chairman. He introduced John Johnson, interim director of the Association of Central Oklahoma Counties (ACOG). Among the elected officials and their representatives present were Del City Mayor Brian Linley, Del City City Manager Mark Edwards, Spencer City Manager Louis Smitherman, State Representative Gary Banz, and Col. Mona Lisa Tucker of Tinker Air Force Base.

Mr. Howe explained that the JLUS is a cooperative land use planning effort among Tinker Air Force Base and the surrounding central Oklahoma communities, sponsored by ACOG. Partners are Midwest City, Del City, Oklahoma City, Spencer, Choctaw, Nicoma Park, Oklahoma County, Cleveland County, the Oklahoma Strategic Military Planning Commission and Tinker AFB. The U.S. Department of Defense (DoD), Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) is the funding agency.

James Falvo, principal, DFW Advisors, Ltd. Co., as the lead JLUS consultant, gave a brief overview of the process and contrasted the JLUS with the Air Force's Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study (AICUZ), the latter being the military's formal process for recommending land use policies around the base to reduce their impact on the base's mission. The JLUS, in turn, belongs to the communities. The JLUS includes land development recommendations supportive of the base's mission, and is designed to complement the AICUZ and incorporates AICUZ information.

Health, safety and welfare concerns related to the local communities include: (1) excessive installation noise identified by the AICUZ noise contours, and (2) potential incompatible development in the Clear Zone (CZ) and Accident Potential Zones (APZ). Encroachment occurs when communities continue to grow near and around military installations, exposing more people to safety and noise concerns. Encroachment limits the ability to train and maintain operational readiness.

Michael Coker, AICP, president of the Michael R. Coker Company and a planning expert, discussed several recommendations for the surrounding communities included in the JLUS draft report, including the following:

- Developing a transfer of development rights program to maintain public safety and mission sustainability where development rights currently exist.
- Continuing to meet or exceed DoD recommendations for noise level reduction.
- Upgrading building codes to the most recent version of the International Building Code.
- Preparing a construction guide for builders, developers, architects, inspectors to clarify development and building guidelines in areas impacted by accident potential and noise.

- Encouraging positioning of structures on a development site for the purpose of reducing noise levels in the most noise-sensitive buildings.

Recommendations specific to cities and counties were outlined as follows.

Midwest City, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma County and Cleveland County

- Establishing guidelines for existing structures and new construction in the 65 plus dB DNL to participate in a sound attenuation program. Once a structure complies with the program, certification should be awarded to the property owner and recorded along with all other property ownership records.

Del City, Midwest City and Oklahoma City

- Modifying land use and comprehensive plans to minimize incompatible land uses in and around the base, particularly within *both* of the AICUZ accident potential zones.
- Incorporating a new land use category into Future Land Use Elements of comprehensive plans to promote compatible land use development surrounding Tinker AFB
- Allowing land to be placed in a temporary holding status to be turned over for compatible development at a future date

Midwest City and Oklahoma City

- Establishing land use policies against re-zoning land to any category permitting residential development within the existing or future 65 dB DNL contour unless sound attenuation will be achieved.
- Showing noise contour areas on all adopted Future Land Use Plan and zoning maps. All new development within these areas should be required to provide noise attenuation features

Spencer, Midwest City and Oklahoma City

- Allowing the purchase of avigation easements to ensure land use compatibility of properties within the 65 dB DNL or greater noise contour

Oklahoma County and Cleveland County

- Implementing disclosure process for structures located within AICUZ noise contours and accident potential zones at the initial advertisement of property (e.g., Multiple Listing Service database).

Oklahoma County and Tinker AFB

- Working with the state's agriculture department to help reduce the number of birds circling the landfill in the southeast sector.
- Determining the feasibility of closing Douglas Boulevard to address future needs for Tinker expansion

Tinker AFB

- Providing (or continuing to provide) detailed information regarding proposed development plans and future mission changes to surrounding communities.

Linda Pavlik of Pavlik and Associates, communications consultant, explained the importance of public input and reported meetings with all study partners, their staffs, and chambers of commerce. The next public meeting is scheduled in May, and she emphasized that the full draft report is available on line at www.acogok.org/jlus. Attendees were encouraged to fill out comment forms made available prior to the meeting.

Following the presentations, general comments were made and questions answered. One person questioned a proposed purchase of the GM plant by Oklahoma County and subsequent gift of the property to Tinker AFB. He said that the GM property is on the tax rolls, and if given to the military, it would become tax exempt. Mid-Del ISD depends on property taxes for its budget, he said, asking if the JLUS report could recommend a mechanism whereby the school district could receive dollars from this type of transaction. There was discussion about several area schools being located in the APZ II and how this use could be addressed. Linda Pavlik stated that some property owners present had expressed a concern to her that their neighborhoods would be cleared. Mr. Falvo told the group that condemnation of properties was not being recommended in the report.

JOINT LAND USE STUDY (JLUS) PUBLIC MEETING

Thursday, February 28, 2008

7:00 – 8:00 p.m.

Midwest City Library, Room A

8243 E. Reno Avenue, Midwest City, Oklahoma

Attendance List

Name	Affiliation
Glenn Goldschlager	Midwest City resident
Lloyd Lumry	Midwest City resident
DeAnna Lumry	Midwest City resident
Billy J. Williams	Del City resident
Dorothy Rogers	Midwest City resident
Gary Haynes	Del City resident
Dwight W. Peoples	Spencer resident
Janelle Stafford	Tinker Business Industrial Park
Warren Thomas	Tinker Business Industrial Park
John Estes	The Oklahoman
Gary W. Banz	State Representative
Hon. Brian Linley	Del City Mayor
Mark Edwards	Del City – City Manager
Louis Smitherman	Spencer City Manager
Ruth Walters	Oklahoma County Planner
Col. Mona Lisa Tucker, ABW/Vice Commander	Tinker Air Force Base
Gene Gallogly, Base Civil Engineer	Tinker Air Force Base

JOINT LAND USE STUDY (JLUS) PUBLIC MEETING

Thursday, February 28, 2008

7:00 – 8:00 p.m.

Midwest City Library, Room A
8243 E. Reno Avenue, Midwest City, Oklahoma

Attendance List (Cont.)

Name	Affiliation
Bill Dalke, Base Planner	Tinker Air Force Base
LouAnna Munkres, Community Planner	Tinker Air Force Base
Brion Ockenfels, Public Affairs	Tinker Air Force Base
Dave Howe	JLUS Policy Committee Chairman
James Falvo	DFW Advisors Ltd.
Michael R. Coker	Michael R. Coker Company
Linda Pavlik	Pavlik and Associates
John G. Johnson	ACOG
Jerry Church	ACOG
Holly Massie	ACOG

ACOG

Association of Central Oklahoma Governments

21 E. Main St, Suite 100, Oklahoma City, OK 73104-2405
(405) 234-2264 Fax: (405) 234-2200 TDD: (405) 234-2217
www.acogok.org e-mail: acog@acogok.org

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 30, 2008
TO: JLUS Policy Committee
FROM: Holly Massie, Special Programs Officer
SUBJECT: Extension of Joint Land Use Study Timeframe

INFORMATION:

The JLUS grant agreement with the U.S. Department of Defense, Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA), was signed by the OEA director on July 26, 2007, and the consultant contract between ACOG and DFW Advisors Ltd. Co. was executed on July 27, 2007, following approval by the ACOG Board of Directors in June 2007. These actions allowed the consultant team to officially begin work in August 2007.

Both the federal grant agreement and consultant contract are due to expire April 30, 2008. In order to complete the JLUS, it will be necessary to extend the grant period and ACOG's contract with DFW Advisors for approximately 60 days – until **June 30**. The ACOG Board of Directors approved the contract extension at its April 24, 2008 meeting and ACOG staff is working with the OEA project manager to extend the federal grant period.

ACTION REQUESTED:

For information only.