

## Ken Sellers

---

**From:** Ken Sellers [kens@gjcorp.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 10, 2008 4:01 PM  
**To:** kensoksafe@windstream.net  
**Subject:** FW: John Fregonese - Contra Costa Ca. & Portland OR. Background  
**Attachments:** Contra\_Costa\_CA\_Fregonese\_Calthorpe\_Associates.pdf

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Ken Sellers [mailto:kens@gjcorp.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 03, 2008 10:07 AM  
**To:** 'dist1@tulsacouncil.org'; 'dist2@tulsacouncil.org'; 'dist3@tulsacouncil.org'; 'dist4@tulsacouncil.org'; 'dist5@tulsacouncil.org'; 'dist6@tulsacouncil.org'; 'dist7@tulsacouncil.org'; 'dist8@tulsacouncil.org'; 'dist9@tulsacouncil.org'  
**Subject:** John Fregonese - Contra Costa Ca. & Portland OR. Background

Dear Tulsa City Councilors:

On behalf of concerned area citizens, I ask you to monitor closely the Visioning process used by Fregonese & Associates as they facilitate development of the Plan/Tulsa Comprehensive Plan. The attachment contains an account of Mr. Fregonese's past involvement in a couple of similar undertakings.

An excerpt:

"Contra Costa, CA - Fregonese Calthorpe & Associates (FCA), a land-use planning firm that works for many local governments, has threatened legal action against local residents who are upset with what FCA calls "conceptual illustrative plans" for their neighborhood. The company was hired by Contra Costa County (in the east San Francisco Bay area) to help write a land-use plan for the county."

Furthermore if the views expressed below by Michael Bates are incorporated in the Comprehensive Plan as he seems to suggest, I anticipate such a plan will meet with stiff resistance.

Excerpt form Michael Bates UTW Column:

<http://www.urbantulsa.com/gyrobase/Content?oid=oid%3A22366>

**JUNE 4, 2008**

## **Art of the Possible**

**Progress and the city's common good must be at the heart of successful streets vote**

*BY MICHAEL D. BATES*

"Politics of Pragmatism

The final obstacle is south Tulsa Councilor Bill Christiansen, who doesn't object to the structure of the package, but to making widening a stand-alone ballot item, separate from maintenance. Christiansen has called for a 50/50 split of funds between widening and maintenance.

There is a political problem to be solved here. District 8 has grown faster than any other part of the city, and the voters are the most reliable of any district. It would be tough, but not impossible, to pass a package without strong south Tulsa support.

But taking care of what we have is a more pressing need than building more to take care of. **Street widening ought to be considered in connection with matters of urban design and public transit** which could reduce the need for wider streets.

South Tulsa traffic isn't snarled just because the roads are narrow. Zoning segregates retail from residential, so that every shopping trip requires several miles of driving.

**The development patterns so beloved of suburbanites -- cul-de-sacs, residential collector streets, gated communities -- funnels traffic into bottlenecks. The lack of through-residential streets forces local traffic onto arterials. Midtown's grid disperses traffic efficiently across multiple paths.**

In Midtown, you can use neighborhood streets to avoid making a left-hand turn onto or off of an arterial. That's not possible in most of south Tulsa, and nasty old left-turners are a prime cause of traffic delays down south.

Homeowners in south Tulsa have chosen the area's amenities over convenience and ease of travel. Before all of us spend hundreds of millions on street widening in their part of town, south Tulsans should be willing to accept some adjustments to their lifestyle, **which may include putting public streets through their gated communities**, building mid-mile minor arterials (think 15th or Utica in midtown), and allowing neighborhood-scale retail development to connect directly to residential areas.

**Fixing what's wrong with south Tulsa is a complex issue, and what to fund ought to be addressed as part of the new Comprehensive Plan.**

Delaying the streets vote makes sense, and minor adjustments may be needed. But the Council shouldn't abandon the sensible, straightforward approach represented by the Martinson plan: Reprioritize existing revenues to fix what we already own."

Thank you for your consideration.  
Regards;

Ken Sellers  
V.P. OK-SAFE, Inc.  
[kensoksafe@windstream.net](mailto:kensoksafe@windstream.net)