

Johnson, Thad A

From: lonaustin1@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2024 11:44 AM
To: PL, Subdivision and Zoning
Subject: Many Unanswered Questions Regarding 1901 Grand Blvd for Jail

You don't often get email from lonaustin1@aol.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Point of View: Unanswered concerns about jail location on Del City border.

I live in Del City and have appeared three times before the county commissioners to oppose the 1901 Grand Boulevard location for a new jail.

The commissioners have been made aware by multiple presenters of the reasons why this location is not a good idea. This location is literally “across the street” from the western border of Del City and the proximity to multiple schools, businesses and a residential neighborhood of thousands of homes. Interestingly, the commissioners have repeatedly voted to remove this location from consideration, yet it is once again being considered.

The public is being kept in the dark about why this keeps happening. The commissioners have failed to disclose their discussions in closed executive sessions and have failed to address the questions and concern brought to their attention with real and meaningful solutions. This failure has cast doubt upon the integrity of their “search” for a jail site.

There are unanswered questions about how the coming and goings at a detention center like this would affect the safety of a neighborhood only one block away. This is a neighborhood where children normally walk to school and play outside. Detainees at the present jail are currently released at all hours into the community. Del City would have no control of the new jail. This is not acceptable.

There are unanswered questions about how Oklahoma City will provide increased police presence on their side of this border. No plan, no costs have been projected and Oklahoma City has not committed anything. Del City Police would have to staff up to protect our community, placing a severe financial burden upon our city.

There are unanswered questions about “incarcerating” convicted sex offenders in a facility close to a school or day care center. Both exist within less than half a mile of the proposed site. This issue has never been addressed by the commissioners.

There are unanswered questions about how this location will affect potential economic development in Del City. We just initiated a 20 year plan to grow our city but those plans depend upon providing a safe and secure place for potential new homes and businesses. We are unaware of any studies that address this concern.

There are unanswered questions regarding the effect this facility would have on home values in Del City. The commissioners wouldn't think of considering a location off I235 in Edmond, Why Del City? This would be obviously be detrimental to all 21800 home owners in Del City.

There are unanswered questions concerning the effect upon Del City's sales tax base. This is the main source of revenue for Del City. Our police, fire and city services depend upon this tax base. Again, no explanation to this question. Has it even been considered at all?

There are unanswered questions about why there is even serious consideration given to a location away for the central city location where it will obviously require extensive relocation of county, city and sheriff department facilities and transportation hubs.

And lastly there are unanswered questions about why this location with a roughly \$5 million dollar price tag is being considered above locations less expensive.

It would seem locating the New Jail at a more central Oklahoma City location close to the Oklahoma City Police Station and Oklahoma County Court House which would greatly facilitate transportation of detainees and prisoners to and from those facilities as is required for hearings, trials and settlements. There is land available and buyers willing to cooperate to make that happen....is somebody is in the way?

A. A. Austin

923 Hisel Road

Del City, OK 73115

Johnson, Thad A

From: Cindy C <c2clyde@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 9, 2024 10:04 PM
To: PL, Subdivision and Zoning
Subject: Please Vote NO to Rezone 1901 E Grand Blvd for new Jail

You don't often get email from c2clyde@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Planning Commissioners,

Re: Case # SP-588

I live in Del City off S Bryant directly on the border of Oklahoma City. Please vote against the recommendation to rezone 1901 E Grand Blvd for the new jail site. The impact it will have on Del City is beyond measure.

I feel the Oklahoma County Commissioners have not been transparent with us, the taxpayers. Now, we're told they don't have enough money for the project and will have to ask us, the taxpayers, for more. How can you start a project with less than half the amount necessary to complete it? Is an extra \$300 million even going to be enough? Our tax dollars have been misrepresented.

Has any investor refused to invest in one of the fastest growing economies in the US because it has a jail in it? Looking at the boom in Oklahoma City, I'll say NO!!

But, if you put it at Grand Blvd, what investor will want to toss a bunch of money into Del City just hundreds of feet away from a jail? The risk is far too great! The economic impact to Del City will be devastating. Look at the Plaza District or Bricktown ... investors did that! Del City has investors too.

Oklahoma City will not be economically impacted if you keep it downtown. Even with the jail in its current location, we have new stadiums being built, high rises being considered, investors investing. Anyone who has brought a business or residence in that area, made the decision knowing there was a jail in its proximity.

What about the additional necessary infrastructure to accommodate the E Grand Blvd location, such as, a police substation, the transporting to and from downtown, transportation for visitors and inmates after release? This isn't a one and done deal like the jail. The cost to maintain the smooth running of these additional structures and amenities will come from the taxpayer. How will the taxpayers feel when they find out the truth, that they will have to foot the bill?

Are you aware of the proximity of 1901 E Grand Blvd to daycares, schools, parks, homes, businesses, a health facility, just hundreds of feet away? We, in Del City, already live in a marginalized community, add a jail into the mix, and we now have kids walking to and from school constantly afraid of all that "stranger danger" they were taught. This will cause an increased number of our children suffering with PTSD, constantly waiting, looking and listening for something bad to happen. A brain in constant survival mode does not have the capacity to act rationally, and the ability to learn is greatly diminished. An article in Psychology Today states, "nearly all youth detained in the juvenile justice system have experienced traumatic events often leading to PTSD". Our kids will live this every day! We want our children to feel safe, our community to be safe. A jail so close to home will do the exact opposite.

As homeowners, we are worried about criminals walking the streets at all hours of the day and night, whether they are visitors or the recently released who have nowhere to go other than towards "the action", ie Del City. The community directly opposite this location on S Bryant is a Del City neighborhood mixed with young and old alike, schools, parks, businesses and churches. Putting a jail at 1901 E Grand Blvd will attack our two most vulnerable populations, our children and our elderly, and paralyze an up-and-coming city with fear. All we want to do is live our lives in safety, peace and harmony.

I ask you to vote NO to recommend the rezoning of 1901 E Grand Blvd. The current location of the jail serves the court system and law enforcement in an efficient way.

Thank you for your time.

Cynthia Ciancarelli
3016 Neighbors Ln
Del City, OK 73115

Johnson, Thad A

From: Nadine Gallagher <nadine.e.gallagher@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 11, 2024 12:44 PM
To: PL, Subdivision and Zoning
Subject: Proposed jail site - 1901 Grand

You don't often get email from nadine.e.gallagher@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

My name is Nadine Gallagher, and I am a teacher at Crooked Oak Middle School, I am also the president of the Crooked Oak Association of Classroom Teachers. I am writing to express the Crooked Oak teacher's opposition this proposed jail location. Also my own opposition as live but a few miles from this site.

One of the chief characteristics of our school district is the small town feel. For many families Crooked Oak is a tradition. It's the kind of school where your kindergarten teacher comes to your high school graduation, not only because you were her student, but so was your father. A jail being placed less than a half mile from our school will inherently change the district.

Aside from the cultural change at our school, after reading the planOKC, I can't see how zoning for a jail smack in the middle of schools, residential neighborhoods, and 1200 feet from the Crooked Oak athletic facility is anything but a disaster waiting to happen. The people who live in this area don't deserve to have their neighborhoods, schools, and lives set aside behind the plans for a jail that could be located in another place without this level of devastating impact. There are little to no city services in this area of Oklahoma City, not even basic, reliable public transportation.

I urge you to please send this back to the County Commissioner to find a more suitable location.

Nadine Gallagher

"But we know too well that our freedom is incomplete without the freedom of the Palestinians."

Nelson Mandela

Sent from BlueMail

Johnson, Thad A

From: S H <stefniehawley@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 5, 2024 8:44 AM
To: PL, Subdivision and Zoning
Subject: Please vote no to rezone 1901 E. Grand Blvd for new county jail

You don't often get email from stefniehawley@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

The site is across the from intellectually disabled group home, called Reliant, which houses, full-time cerebral palsy, autism, and other people with intellectual disabilities. They are like children.

This site is also across the street from a daycare.

It is 0 feet from Trosper Park, where kids from the area schools practice their golf the Park is the biggest Metropark.

There are playgrounds and a golf course. There is a bike trail that was paid for by Maps money. It will affect Mid-del School schools.

Trosper, Park and the surrounding site, was an oil field , which was cleaned up for its current use in 1957 standards.

The crooked Creek floods into tropser Park, and 1901 there is toxic waste water from the wells soil and contamination to the sites.

You can stand on the playground Epperrly Heights, grade school and see the 1901 location from their playground.

Kids in the area are not dropped off at school

they get on the bus or walk. 1901 E agrand Blvd is 300 ft from the bus stop feeding around 9 schools. If you zoom out one has to wonder how 1901 and Trosper Park could better the community that is growing up around the FaM museum and the river projects instead of hurting the area.

There is no transportation for people coming and going there on grand. They will end up in the Del City neighborhood that is just across the street where kids play, walk, they ride their bikes, people leave their doors unlocked and answer the door to strangers because it has been a very safe community for a very long time.

there is a community garden, neighborhood parks, a grade school, elderly, retired, working teachers and off-base housing.

Del City share services and supports the Tinker Air Force Base.

The Middel schools and Del City along with Midwest City support the Tinker Air Force Base. Anything that could de-stabilize the area could put tinker Air Force base at risk of losing it.

Tinker Air Force Base is a single largest employer in the state and brings in more money than oil and gas combined.

Grand Boulevard is a a snow route.

Grand Boulevard also have the issue that a large population of deer and other animals such as fox raccoon and skunk have followed the creek to find water -

since the Oklahoma river was dammed up and made dry- east of Eastern Avenue. Transporting inmates safely could be a real issue.

29th St. grand Boulevard is very unsafe to drive at night because of the amount of deer that cross the street these deer have followed the only path to water they can find, which is the creek in these areas.

Trosper Park is part of the Grand ring of the Oklahoma county parks, just like will rogers and nichols hills park is.. It is the largest park, and it has been neglected, but over the years many efforts have been made to clean up the area and to keep it safe. Bringing transients and drugs to this area is a terrible idea. Putting the county jail so close to Del City, which is am active workign class and normal stabilized community with schools, Parks, community involvement, sports, music, and the highest density of single-family homes is a terrible idea.

Other sites were took off of this list because of a single school or a single elder care facility. This site has 9 public schools and affect two private schools, many churches and parks. The county commissioners put it on and took it off many times. The county commissioners know this is a bad site.

In regards to the Mental Health funds, that they want to use those funds for jail- are supposed to be used in the community and we kindly ask you to open a mental health facility for the community near other services. Such a St Anthony or ou med area downtown- or by the crisis center out by fairgrounds where they need more help and is more centralized location, outside of a suburban city that supports Tinker Air Force Base, and supporting industries. Such as teaching and families of deployed military families., retired working class people and Veterans in Del city.

It just is not an ideal location space for this.

The transient population is absolutely terrible on the west side of the city. That is where it should be - where they need the services.

We cannot trust the trust to properly handle what is already a mess in the county jail. Please do not destabilize Del City, Midwest City and the emerging economy around the River project and other MAP projects.

Thank you

Johnson, Thad A

From: Margo Hirschman <mhirschman1956@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 2:22 PM
To: DS, Subdivision and Zoning
Subject: The building of the jail.

You don't often get email from mhirschman1956@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

I have lived in Del City all my life and I have lived here all my life. We do not want the jail built in Del City, It needs to be built downtown adjacent to the court house. Moving it to Del City and having to transport prisoners back and forth is not a safe way to do business. You are wanting to build it close to homes and daycares. This is not something Del City needs or wants.

Greg and Margo Hirschman
208 Vickie Dr
Del City, OK 73115

Johnson, Thad A

From: Johnson, Thad A
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2024 12:23 PM
To: Johnson, Thad A
Subject: FW: Jail Site proposed in SP-588
Attachments: Analysis of Jail SP Program Description--4-8-24.docx

From: Larry Hopper <lhopper572@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2024 7:26 AM
To: privdog@gmail.com
Subject: Jail Site proposed in SP-588

Planning Commissioner Privett,

Thank you for the opportunity to offer comment and analysis on SP-588 a Special Permit for a 70-acre site given the address of 1901 E. Grand Blvd. in Ward 4. It would be appreciated if you would at least read this email and hopefully my professional analysis, offered pro bono. I've been very familiar with this site over 55 years. I reside in Ward 4 near SE 59th and Sooner. I am a certified land planner and was employed by the City of OKC for over 35 years before I retired from there.

This analysis primarily addresses the four page Program Description provided by the applicant. This analysis may also be offered to the City of Del City staff and elected officials, as an open letter to the Daily Oklahoman newspaper, and to others.

It is my assessment that this location is not appropriate for the County jail, and that the Program Description does not meet the City's standard of what a Program Description should contain. See April 11 PC Staff Report page 11 to read those standards.

As a Ward 4 resident and as a certified urban planner, I am asking that you be the one to recommend that denial to the rest of the Commissioners, or to recommend the continuance and for you to vote likewise.

The basic suggested reasons for doing so is that the Program Description provided by the applicant is simply inadequate, and that it is premature for the Planning Commission (PC) to take any action aside from a very long continuance.

Action is also premature because the Planning Commission April 11 Staff Report (hereafter referred to as the Staff Report) raises many unanswered concerns that really need to be addressed and not with technical evaluation (TE) staff statements but addressed with upfront information and studies submitted by the applicant.

Sure, this entire matter relates to social equity and potentially to other political and social factors, but one doesn't have to get into those very far because so many other questions exist about some technical aspects, like those included in my attached assessment/analysis.

The attached analysis' sections eight pages follow (in order) these basic deficiencies of the Program Description:

- A the inmate release and transportation plan
- B who is qualified to prepare a Program Description
- C the various elements that the PC Staff Report says have to be addressed that are simply not addressed or very inadequately addressed
- D addressing the prospect of sex offenders who might be housed at the jail
- E the seeming confusion about whether the jail will have a transitional living facility
- F the apparent insufficient number of parking spaces
- G and how to mitigate the impacts of such a proposed jail on the City of Del City, which is a block away.

While the April 11th Staff Report seemingly contains or mentions a dozen or more unanswered questions within itself that it appears the planning staff want answers to, my assessment of that will be contained in a separate communication.

I would be pleased to try to answer any questions you have or to visit with you about this jail matter. Please call or text me.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry Hopper, FAICP
Ward 4 Resident, OKC

405-613-0479

INITIAL PRO BONO ANALYSIS OF THE APPLICANT'S PROGRAM DESCRIPTION OF THEIR PROPOSED JAIL SP

Thank you for the opportunity to offer comment and analysis on SP-588 a Special Permit for a 70-acre site given the address of 1901 E. Grand Blvd. in Ward 4. It would be appreciated if you would at least read and digest this analysis, offered pro bono. I've been very familiar with this site over a 50 years when it was still an old growth woodland and had the best outcrop of rose rocks that I've ever seen. I started hiking back the site back in 1967 and have monitored the site and nearby area's evolution and impacts ever since.

This analysis primarily addresses the four page Program Description provided by the applicant. This analysis could have been more complete, but it is submitted as-is for the sake of timeliness. I will address the specific concerns that the April 11 Planning Commission Staff Report raises in a different communication. This is certainly a complicated land use matter of regional impact, not just on Del City and on Oklahoma City. This analysis may also be offered to the City of Del City staff and elected officials, as an open letter to the Daily Oklahoman newspaper, and to others.

It is my assessment that this location is not appropriate for the County jail, and that the Program Description does not meet the City's standard of what a Program Description should contain. I have suggested alternate locations in my comments at public meetings and to the Ward 4 Councilman, and two of these sites continue to be considered by Oklahoma County. I live in Ward 4 near SE 59th and S. Sooner, about 3 miles from the proposed jail site, and I do have sympathy and much support for cause of the Del City residents.

I am asking you what many other people are probably asking but specifically for Planning Commission to recommend denial of this Special Permit (SP) to the City Council; and if it appears not get a denial recommendation, that the item be continued for not just two weeks but at least a month so that many of the deficiencies in the applicants proposal can be further addressed.

As a Ward 4 resident and as a certified urban planner, I am asking that you Commissioner Privett, as the Ward 4 Planning Commissioner, to be the one to recommend that denial to the rest of the Commissioners, or to recommend the continuance and for you to vote likewise.

The basic suggested reasons for doing so is that the Program Description provided by the applicant is simply inadequate, and that it is premature for the Planning Commission to take any action aside from a very long continuance.

Action is also premature because the Planning Commission April 11 Staff Report (hereafter referred to as the Staff Report) raises many unanswered concerns that really need to be addressed and not with technical evaluation (TE) staff statements but addressed with upfront information and studies submitted by the applicant.

The City Council shouldn't have to hear this matter until all or most those unanswered concerns have been addressed so that at least the Planning Department and Public Works staff can properly address each item.

Sure, this entire matter relates to social equity and potentially to other political and social factors, but one doesn't have to get into those very far because so many other questions exist about some technical aspects, like those included in my comments here.

The rest of this analysis follows in order these basic items about the Program Description:

- A the inmate release and transportation plan
- B who is qualified to prepare a Program Description
- C the various elements that the Staff Report says have to be addressed that are simply not addressed or very inadequately addressed
- D addressing the prospect of sex offenders who might be housed at the jail
- E the seeming confusion about whether the jail will have a transitional living facility
- F the apparent insufficient number of parking spaces
- G and how to mitigate the impacts of such a proposed jail on the City of Del City, which is a block away.

While the April 11th Staff Report seemingly contains or mentions a dozen or more unanswered questions within itself that it appears the planning staff want answers to, noted here is that the Program Description Exhibit E is very inadequate, incomplete, and short-sighted in terms of the surrounding area and does not contain some of the elements that Staff Report page 11 requires.

A.

Alarming is that the applicant's Program Description does contain a section titled the inmate release plan, but it is inadequate and not really a plan. The section is worded in such a way that it makes it sound as though no "released person" or "former inmate" has to follow the plan, and so it appears they can simply walk away between midnight 12:00 AM at 7:00 AM, and at any other time of the day when they are released if that's what they please to do. **See G below for a brief review of the various nearby land uses which are the residence or the daytime location of numerous vulnerable people.** It seems logical that former inmates will be informed of the location of the nearest public transit bus stop. That stock is at the border of Del City

This entire section needs to be much more clearly and specifically worded. If it is now such an optional program, then the County needs to adopt new standard operating procedure (SOP) and laws if needed that in essence eliminate the possibility of someone simply walking away. An SOP/law that basically makes it to where the freewill of that person starts once they are transported back downtown by the County. In that way the release situation continues to be the same as it has apparently been for over the past 100 years. The way the Staff Report is written it appears that they can walk away whenever, and so that section needs much more scrutiny it needs to be much tighter before the Planning Commission makes a recommendation, regardless of where in the County the jail eventually gets located. In essence this section is inadequate and not an effective inmate release plan. **The SP should not be approved until the County has changed this and the SOP/laws to be more compatible with nearby neighborhoods whether those be in Del City or any other municipality.**

One might suggest that no one to be released from the County custody will be considered released until they are transported by the County's detention officers to the block where the existing Oklahoma City Police Department is located. This would maintain the same basic release location which has been in place for approximately 100 years. Then they can move about on their own free will, or be picked up by family or friends. While this would result in very high transportation costs each year, it seems only fair.

Perhaps the city of last residence in Oklahoma County of the former inmate should be charged the cost of that transportation trip back downtown, with some definition of what the city of residence means. This gets into the larger question of whether or not the various municipalities have more responsibility for the operating budget of the jail, aside from having an operating budget or mutual aid arrangement to transport the arrested to jail.

B.

The Program Description needs to be prepared by a certified urban land use planner (an AICP) aside from myself, perhaps with the assistance of an attorney and an engineer. All those individuals need to state who they are, their credentials, and they should be listed by name and occupation on the Program Description a matter of transparency for the general public to see. The City of Oklahoma City has wisely employed members of AICP in the Planning Department, but of course they should not be preparing a Program Description for an applicant. **Once a proper Program Description has been prepared, then the SP case should be brought back before the Planning Commission and no recommendation vote should be made until that time.**

C.

Page 11 of the Planning Commission April 11 Staff Report (hereafter referred to as the staff report) states the six or so elements that must be addressed in a Program Description.

-The first element of the Program Description to address the “type of program proposed.”

-The third is “type of supervision that will be provided for the participants in the program”

-The fifth one is the “means to mitigate any impact upon the surrounding land uses from the operation of the program” and the

-Sixth one is to address “the behavior of the participants in the program.”

One of the worst deficiencies of the Program Description is that it never includes the word Del City even though Del City is one of several municipalities within the county. It does not describe or mention any of the land uses a block away in Del City where thousands of people live within a long block of the proposed jail site.

The Program Description never describes this facility” as some sort of restorative justice center, and simply calls it the Oklahoma County jail facility.

Jumping to the fifth element:

The Program Description does not have any sort of section that mentions means to mitigate impacts upon surrounding land uses. It does not mention Del City. It does not describe fencing and landscaping, but only saying the fencing will be consistent with the I-3 zoning. It simply does not identify potential impacts or ways to mitigate those impacts. One would think that it would describe more about the deterrent features of the fencing (barbwire?) and the height, and perhaps specify that the outer fence would just be a brick

or concrete wall of a certain height, one that helps screen the view of the facility from nearby neighborhoods. The Description does not even address ways to mitigate the impact on the Reliant Living Center where some very vulnerable adults reside. There are two child care centers within 1/4 mile of the facility, one at 3106 SE 15th and another at 2101 S Bryant. These likely open up shortly before the Program Description's proposed (but confusing) 7:00 AM "inmate release" process.

The proposed jail facility is just over 3/4 of a mile from the Epperly Heights Elementary School on Del Road in Del City, and the walk distance to that school is closer than or approximately the same as the walk distance to the three Crooked Oak schools at Eastern and 15th. Almost as close is the new location of the Cristo Rey High School in Del City .

The nearest Embark public bus route has a stop at SE 44th and Bryant, and would involve someone released from jail walking about 1.5 miles past the Reliant Living Center and along the edge of Del City neighborhoods where there are ten public streets that enter into Del City neighborhoods. That area along S Bryant passes these three Oklahoma City land uses: yet another child care center (3901 S. Bryant), a beer tavern, and yet another dwelling place which is known to house several vulnerable adults (or mobility impaired residents over 18 years old") with disabilities called Berrywood Terrace just north of 44th and Bryant. Another Embark bus stop is located along I-40 in Del City.

There is simply not enough of a description of the means to mitigate the impacts on the nearby land uses in Del City, Nor those along S. Bryant.

The Program Description mentioned beds (not the word jail cells) and beds is more commonly understood to relate to hospitals or potentially a hotel, resort, maybe or a summer camp for children. But the description is supposed to address the "behavior of the participants," and it really does not. It does not mention that the word behavior, detainees' behavior, nor the past alleged illegal behaviors of the "participants" which resulted in their being arrested for murder, assault, car thefts, drug dealing, weapons charges, and any number of other behaviors. The Description never states who are "participants," or that they are detainees, persons arrested for offenses, or any description of their behaviors. The Description does at least indirectly mention about beds for the "not incarcerated" in a behavioral health center or indirectly talks about beds for "adulthood incarcerated" in a behavioral health center. But incarceration is more of an initial outcome, and not a behavior.

It would seem reasonable for the description of behaviors to include the percentage of all those who have been detained anytime in the past year after being arrested due to the types of behaviors mentioned above. That way the behaviors would better fit the Program

Description requirement about behaviors, and add much-needed context and ensure that there's no mistaking that while this is a jail or a restorative justice center. That would help make clear that this is not some sort of hospital, hotel, or camp for voluntary participants of general public but is a place where the “participants” have been detained because of their past behaviors.

The applicant’s Program Description does not state ever specifically use the term “type of program” proposed nor does it use the phrase restorative justice. The Program Description really doesn't ever define the type of program our programs in a meaningful way. While part of the title does indicate that it's a jail facility, there really is no substantial or significant description of the “type of program.” It lists the square footage breakdown for things like inmate services and tactical and how there's some kind of behavioral health area, but it doesn't really describe the type of program to occur there. That is more of an architectural listing than a description of the type of program. Much more detail is needed about that. It's unclear what is meant by the term dormitory. Page 2 lists how there would be over 300 beds for short and long term housing, and yet it doesn't state what type of program applies to that. Let's assume that's a program to house sex offenders for the short and/or longer term.

D.

And, among the most glaring problems with that Program Description is that it lacks the description of what to do about the sex offenders as raised in Staff Report Page 4. This is a potential conflict with state law. Understandably the Staff Report does not go into the details of what the applicable statute is (apparently Section 1, Chapter 136). The Program Description by the applicant should give a very accurate, clear, and adequate overview of that statute and what “written verification of compliance” (in laypersons’ terms) means and requires.

E.

The Planning Department in the Staff Report makes the point that this proposed facility is not categorized as a “transitional living facility” as defined by state law. The County should simply state that there will be no form of transitional living facility on the 70 acres (facility as defined by state law). And then the Program Description should accurately define in laypersons’ terms what the statute says is meant by that phrase transitional living facility.

Finally, one is left to reasonably conclude that some people released from being incarcerated might be allowed to stay on the premises in one of the 300 plus beds of short term housing related to behavioral health or perhaps and the 144 bed dormitory. The county's description of the "type of program" should address these sorts of details and far more.

F.

Parking: the apparent insufficient number of parking spaces. The site is to employ an average of 234 people per shift and yet only 370 parking spaces is not enough for the period of time when shifts are changing when it would appear that at least 468 spaces would be needed just for staff not to mention the public and other visitors to the site. So parking has not been adequately addressed. Interestingly it says that 288 spaces will be located behind secure fencing, making it almost seem as though the protection of employees cars is really one of the main aims of the facility. One could raise the concern that perhaps employee cars should not be behind the same fence as the jail facility, but in a separate fenced or unfenced lot that has a secure connection that only employees can use. And, once again, 288 spaces does not seem enough at shift change time When as many as 468 employees might need to have a parking space.

The need to double the number of parking spaces will definitely impact the size of a stormwater detention at any facility. **Thus, approval of the jail should probably wait until that sort of drainage engineering study can be completed by the applicant and until the applicant can redesign their parking areas and submit that to the City for review.**

G.

Again, the Program Description does not have any sort of section that mentions "means to mitigate impacts upon surrounding land uses." It does not mention Del City. It does not describe fencing and landscaping, but only saying the fencing will be consistent with the I-3 zoning. It simply does not identify potential impacts or ways to mitigate those impacts.

One would reasonably anticipate that it would describe more about the deterrent features of the fencing and the height, and perhaps specify that the outer fence would just be a brick or concrete wall of a certain height, one that helps screen the view of the facility from nearby neighborhoods. The Description does not even address ways to mitigate the impact on the Reliant Living Center where some very vulnerable adults reside.

There is simply not enough of a description of the means to mitigate the impacts on the nearby surrounding land uses in Del City, nor the uses along the walk path to the nearest public bus transit bus stop.

It is interesting how the Program Description says the site “boasts” accessible connections from 4 directions. The other way to look at it is that the site boasts accessible connections into the neighborhoods to the east, essentially those hundreds of homes just a block away in Del City. There are ten public streets that lead into Del City between the proposed jail site and the nearest public transit bus stop.

Conclusion: the best way to mitigate the impact of a jail on Del City neighborhoods is to not have it located along Grand Boulevard at this location or in this vicinity.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry Hopper, FAICP
Ward 4 Resident, OKC

April 8, 2024

Johnson, Thad A

From: Wendell Kluge <wendellkluge@aol.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 24, 2024 8:25 PM
To: DS, Subdivision and Zoning
Subject: Jail Site 1901 E Grand Blvd

[You don't often get email from wendellkluge@aol.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

Hello Planning Commissioners,

I am very against the proposed site of the new Jail at 1901 E Grand Blvd and would request that you “not” approve a Zoning change that would allow it to be built there. These are my reasons:

1. It is too close to public and private schools.
2. It is too close to established Day Care facilities.
3. It is too close to Church.
4. It is right next door to a very large residential neighborhood with thousands of citizens.
5. There is no support structure for individuals incarcerated and released to gain access to transportation, food, shelter, etc.
6. There has to be a more suitable site without all these concerns.
7. The current Jail site is ideal without all these restrictions and the support structure is established for Bail, Court, transportation, etc.
8. The Del City Community will be very negatively impacted by this action.
9. Del City’s Police & Fire Departments will be over extended since there are no close OKC support services near by.
10. I feel this decision is being rushed to obtain the \$50 million committed for the Mental Health Facility.
11. It is a big mistake and will result in a waste of tax payer money just like the current high rise Jail.
12. I seriously doubt it can be built for the mount of money approved in the last bond election. So you will have to come back and ask for more money! What will you do if the voters don’t approve it?

I will be watching to see if you will do the right thing and “Not Approve” the rezoning request.

Wendell Kluge

4744 Crest Place
Oklahoma City, OK 73117