



Collaboration Corvallis  
Steering Committee Meeting Agenda  
June 4, 2013  
3:00pm  
Corvallis Senior Center  
2601 NW Tyler Avenue

- I. Call To Order
- II. Opening Remarks – President Ray and Mayor Manning
- III. Review of March 18, 2013, Meeting Summary Notes
- IV. Public Comment Opportunity \*\*  
(*Oral testimony may be limited to no more than three minutes*)
- V. Project Management Update
  - a. City/OSU Staff Involvement
  - b. Work Group Summaries
  - c. Overview of Recommendation Matrices
- VI. Selections for Recommendation Consent Agenda
- VII. Workgroup Strategy Recommendations
  - a. Neighborhood Livability
  - b. Neighborhood Planning
- VIII. Proposed Scope of Work for Housing Work Group
- IX. Summer Work Group Meeting Schedule and September Steering Committee Meeting
- X. Other Business
- XI. Adjournment

\*\*Written testimony can be submitted via email addressed to [pm.corvallis.osu@gmail.com](mailto:pm.corvallis.osu@gmail.com), or mailed to Community Development Dept., City of Corvallis, PO Box 1039, 500 SW Madison Avenue, Corvallis, OR 97339



---

MEMORANDUM

---

**TO:** Collaboration Corvallis Steering Committee

**FROM:** Eric Adams, Project Manager

**DATE:** May 31, 2013

**SUBJECT:** Fourth Round of Work Group Recommendations

---

Since the March 18, 2013, Steering Committee meeting, the three project work groups have continued to address the remaining Scope of Work objectives to develop a fourth round of recommendations. A brief summary of these recommendations is provided below. Please note that the Parking and Traffic Work Group is currently assessing potential recommendations regarding transportation planning and traffic management. These recommendations will be available for the Steering Committee's consideration following its June 4, 2013, meeting.

Also attached to this memorandum are updated versions of the two recommendation matrices that were presented to the Steering Committee at their last meeting. These revisions include updates on the status of recommendations accepted prior to the March 18 meeting, as well as the addition of recommendations accepted at that meeting.

**I. Neighborhood Livability**

**Scope of Work Objective 5 – Consider the merits of creating an ongoing City and OSU supported group that would monitor achievement of livability goals and make recommendations to the City and OSU**

**Recommendation**

- 1. The Neighborhood Livability Work Group recommends to the Collaboration Corvallis Steering Committee that the City of Corvallis and Oregon State University form a Community Relations Advisory Body by January 1, 2014, that is tasked with the following objectives:**
  - Monitor the success of policies and programs implemented to promote and improve neighborhood livability.**
  - Identify the need for adjustments to existing neighborhood livability programs in response to changing conditions.**

- **Assist with the development of new policies and programs that promote neighborhood livability as the dynamic between the university and surrounding neighborhoods changes.**
- **Facilitate communication throughout the community in support of neighborhood livability.**

**The work group recommends that the advisory body be composed of stakeholders representing the University’s administration, local government, student organizations, community groups and neighborhood associations, rental housing owners and managers, healthcare advocates, and local businesses. The City of Corvallis and Oregon State University should identify and commit staff necessary for managing and administering the advisory body in order to achieve the stated objectives. Costs associated with forming and sustaining the advisory body should be shared equally by the City of Corvallis and Oregon State University. As appropriate, the City of Corvallis and Oregon State University should consider guidance from the International Town Gown Association concerning the formation and operation of such advisory bodies.**

Basis for Recommendation

In response to Objective 5, the Neighborhood Livability Work Group reviewed the purpose and composition of similarly tasked advisory bodies from the following communities.

- Eugene, Oregon (<http://gcr.uoregon.edu/community-relations>);
- East Lansing, Michigan (<http://wealllivehere.org/>);
- Tucson, Arizona (<http://externalrelations.arizona.edu/community.cfm>); and
- Berkeley, California (<http://office.chancellor.berkeley.edu/gcr/StdtdNeighborRelations.shtml>).

Discussions with staff who support these groups confirmed that their sustained existence has positively influenced relations between each respective university and local community. Many of the topics and issues addressed by these groups closely mirror those that caused the initiation of the Collaboration Corvallis project. Given the level of effort that has been expended to identify and implement strategies for resolving these issues, the work group believes it is prudent to create a standing advisory body charged with monitoring the success of those strategies over time, and exploring the need for new or alternate strategies as needed.

The recommended composition of the advisory body is generally consistent with the spectrum of stakeholders identified through the Collaboration Corvallis project. The work group concludes that their participation is essential in order for continued efforts to improve and sustain neighborhood livability to be effective.

## **II. Neighborhood Planning**

**Scope of Work Objective 2 – Review current development standards, and identify potential measures that would minimize potential impact from the creation of high density housing in or near lower density residential areas.**

- a. Develop and enact Land Development Code (LDC) language that would implement selected mitigation measures (measures to mitigate impacts to neighborhood character, privacy, parking, and other issues, as identified).**

The recommendations presented below fall into two general categories: specific development standards intended to foster neighborhood-compatible infill development; and regulatory mechanisms for managing the design of residential infill development in order to achieve compatibility. Although not specifically defined by the Neighborhood Planning Work Group, the term “infill development” generally applies to the development or redevelopment of a property that is located within an established neighborhood characterized by distinct architectural styles and patterns of development (i.e., buildings of similar height, mass, and scale). For many existing neighborhoods within the Project Area, infill development may also result in redevelopment of properties at a higher density than was originally present because of changes in a property’s zoning and the corresponding allowed density. While the Corvallis Comprehensive Plan places emphasis on encouraging a compact urban form through the efficient use of urbanized land, those aspirations are balanced against a desire to ensure that new development is compatible with its surroundings. The following recommendations were crafted with those considerations in mind.

### **A. Development Standard Recommendations**

- 1. The Neighborhood Planning Work Group recommends that the City of Corvallis explore implementation of a maximum Floor Area Ratio standard as the preferred method of addressing the mass, bulk, and scale of infill development in residential zones.**
- 2. The Neighborhood Planning Work Group recommends that the City of Corvallis explore implementation of an average front yard setback standard for residential infill development, which would be determined based on existing development, but not include new dwellings constructed within the last five years.**
- 3. The Neighborhood Planning Work Group recommends that the City of Corvallis review the Pedestrian Oriented Design Standards contained in the Land Development Code and revise them to reduce repetition of design and monotonous building faces. Key issues that should be addressed are: (1) making roof height articulation a mandatory design standard; (2) increasing the minimum length and depth of horizontal building offsets, and require horizontal offsets as a mandatory design element; and (3) ensure that such standards apply to multifamily dwelling types, as currently defined. Amendments to the current standards should also be made to require provision of roof articulation and building offsets more frequently as the length of a structure increases. Lastly, for developments with more than one building, options for implementing a quantitative measurement of minimum differentiation (e.g., percent differentiation) of dimensional aspects of building design should be explored. In conducting this review and making corresponding revisions, the City of Corvallis should consider the**

**approaches taken by the City of Sumner, Washington and Town of Wake Forest, North Carolina.**

- 4. The Neighborhood Planning Work Group recommends that the City of Corvallis review Corvallis Land Development Code Section 4.10.60.04 (menus for Pedestrian Features and Design Variety) to explore whether additional dwellings types should be regulated by the subject standards. Particular attention should be paid towards assessing whether the current standards adequately address concerns raised about infill residential development through the Collaboration Corvallis project.**
- 5. The Neighborhood Planning Work Group recommends that the City of Corvallis explore amending the Corvallis Land Development Code to require placement of off-street parking facilities (e.g., garages and driveways) towards the rear of infill residential lots with frontage along an improved alley. Further, amendments to the Land Development Code should be explored that would enable placement of off-street parking facilities at the rear of lots without alley frontage in situations where such configuration is common within the given neighborhood area. Issues to be considered include adjustments to minimum required driveway widths, minimum driveway and garage setbacks, maximum lot coverage, storm water drainage requirements, requiring shared driveways, and alley standards that would reflect development patterns in established residential neighborhoods.**
- 6. The Neighborhood Planning Work Group recommends that the City of Corvallis consider amending the Corvallis Land Development Code to require varied roof plane orientation at least once every two to three units for multifamily dwelling types.**
- 7. The Neighborhood Planning Work Group recommends that the City of Corvallis consider applying amendments regarding exterior building wall and roof articulation, and roof plane orientation to all areas of the city, and not just within the Collaboration Corvallis Project Area.**
- 8. The Neighborhood Planning Work Group recommends that the City of Corvallis consider amending the existing Corvallis Land Development Code provisions regarding calculation of minimum window coverage percentage on dwelling facades to include the wall area within gabled building ends. In addition to windows, other architectural design elements should be allowed or required within gabled ends in order to satisfy the coverage requirement.**

#### Basis for Recommendations

The set of recommendations presented above responds to issues identified by the work group concerning the architectural compatibility of recent residential infill development. In general, these issues fall into one or more of the following categories, which were determined by comparing examples of recent infill development with the dwelling types and styles that are original to most of the neighborhoods within the Collaboration Corvallis Project Area.

- Building mass, bulk, and scale
- Building setbacks
- Architectural elements and site design

Based on this comparison, it was determined that the existing Land Development Code standards, which are tailored more toward development of “greenfields”, have often resulted in new dwellings

that are of larger mass and scale than original dwellings; allow new, infill dwellings to be set back from the street at distances that do not complement the existing pattern of building placement along a block face; and do not always result in sufficient architectural design variation, especially for multifamily dwellings composed of several attached units. Each of these issues may cause infill development to be architecturally incompatible with original forms of residential development, and gradually erode the “character” of traditional neighborhoods within the Project Area as redevelopment takes place.

Concerns over compatibility were balanced against the recognition that the potential for an appropriate increase in density within these neighborhoods should not be precluded. Based on assessments of similar infill development regulations implemented in other jurisdictions researched for this topic, including Portland, Oregon; Sumner, Washington; Boulder, Colorado; Lake Oswego, Oregon; Geneva, Illinois; Alexandria, Virginia; Edmonton, Alberta; and Blacksburg, Virginia; the recommendations presented above should facilitate redevelopment to at least the minimum density permitted in each residential zone within the Project Area.

## ***B. Regulatory Mechanism Recommendations***

- 1. The Neighborhood Planning Work Group recommends that the Infill Task Force or another representative work group be asked to work on concepts and recommendations for possible design guidelines similar to those devised for Ashland, Oregon and Portland, Oregon with illustrative, graphic examples. In working on the task, it is suggested that outreach to neighborhood groups be included. When design guidelines are adopted by the City of Corvallis they should be posted on the City’s website and incorporated into a document that will be given to all developers when they first inquire.**

### Basis for Recommendation

The work group has reviewed several examples of infill design guidelines from various jurisdictions across the country and within Oregon. In general, these documents provide illustrated descriptions of the preferred forms of infill residential development each community hopes to encourage. They are typically based on the goal of encouraging key characteristics of architectural styles and development patterns found in existing neighborhoods. Aspects of development commonly addressed by design guidelines include: the height and location of new construction in relation to existing dwellings; roof forms; window and door styles and their placement; exterior siding materials, roofing materials, building orientation; the location of off-street parking (i.e., driveways and garages); and the overall massing and scale of new construction in relation to existing development.

In some jurisdictions, these documents merely serve as informational pieces that are made available to help guide architects and contractors when designing new dwellings, while other jurisdictions utilize design guidelines as subjective decision criteria applied through a quasi-judicial design review process. In Oregon, because of “needed housing” law, the latter approach is only possible when an owner of residential property consents to such regulation (e.g., through some type of historic preservation program). In all other cases, only clear and objective standards that do not require the exercise of discretion can apply to residential development. This limitation, which is enforced through state law (ORS 197.307), significantly constrains the

ability to regulate architectural design, especially aspects that are easier to describe in qualitative terms or may warrant flexibility. Crafting a set of design guidelines as described above would help bridge a “regulatory gap” and allow the community to articulate, in layman’s terms, the preferred character defining elements of neighborhood-compatible development.

Such guidelines would only serve an advisory purpose, and compliance with them would not be required through the land use or development permitting process – unless they were also relied on as decision criteria through a discretionary design review. This concept is discussed below as part of the “Historic Preservation Lite” recommendation.

- 2. The Neighborhood Planning Work Group recommends that following development of design guidelines and implementation of recommended amendments to existing Land Development Code standards, including those previously forwarded to the Steering Committee, the City of Corvallis should solicit neighborhood input on the adoption of neighborhood-specific design standards.**

#### Basis for Recommendation

Through its review of various strategies implemented in other jurisdictions to regulate the design of residential infill development, the Neighborhood Planning Work Group considered the merits of implementing design standards that would only apply to certain neighborhoods areas. This approach is used by the City of Portland, among others, to require inclusion of particular design elements so that new development is compatible with the style and character of a given neighborhood. However, prior to taking this approach, the work group concluded that it would be prudent to formulate residential design guidelines based on the architectural styles and development patterns found in each neighborhood, particularly those within the Project Area. It is anticipated that a better understanding of whether and to what extent neighborhood-specific design standards are necessary.

If the community concludes that neighborhood-specific design standards are a necessary and desirable means of regulating infill development, a design standards overlay would be a useful means of implementing those clear and objective standards so they apply to only certain areas rather than throughout the city. For example, the City of Portland uses this mechanism to implement specific portions of its Community Design Standards. As applied in Corvallis, a design standard overlay might be structured to require a certain minimum roof pitch or allow a different maximum building height in a given neighborhood than could otherwise occur elsewhere in the city. This approach could be implemented in conjunction with a set of advisory design guidelines that would address aspects of design that are difficult to regulate through clear and objective standards (e.g., window placement patterns).

- 3. The Neighborhood Planning Work Group recommends that City of Corvallis staff develop and present to the City Council a proposal for implementing a “Historic Preservation Lite” district. The proposal should consider and address the following elements:**
  - a. Incentives for property owner participation – such as flexibility from minimum off-street parking standards, building setbacks, and building heights that would apply upon**

- redevelopment of a property, as well as potential reductions to land use and building permit fees associated with the redevelopment of a property.**
- b. Considerations for the inclusion of a property in a “Historic Preservation Lite” district, including:**
- i. Whether a property owner’s decision to participate upon formation of a district should be permanent and binding on all future owners.**
  - ii. Whether opportunities should be provided for additional properties to be added to a district after its original formation.**
  - iii. Whether the age of a structure (i.e., the date or general period of its original construction) should be used as a criterion for participation in a district.**
  - iv. Whether and to what extent the physical condition of a structure should be used as a criterion for participation in a district.**
  - v. Reliance on information about the appearance, architectural style, and age of existing dwellings gathered through the Neighborhood Photo Survey.**

#### Basis for Recommendation

Based on testimony received by the Neighborhood Planning Work Group, residents of neighborhoods within and outside of the Collaboration Corvallis Project Area are concerned about the demolition of existing dwellings, particularly those which could qualify as historic resources. In addition, subsequent redevelopment may not always be compatible with original patterns of development, which, as discussed above, can cause adverse impacts to a neighborhood’s character and sense of place.

The “Historic Preservation Lite” concept may be an effective means of regulating the demolition of existing residential structures and subsequent redevelopment. In comparison to the existing historic preservation program managed by the City of Corvallis through provisions in Chapter 2.9 of the Land Development Code, this approach would allow for the formation of locally adopted districts regardless of the number of participating properties. Consistency with preservation standards for a National Historic District would also not be necessary, meaning that the scope of regulated development activities would not have to be as comprehensive as the range of activities currently addressed by Chapter 2.9. In addition to demolition and redevelopment, these comparatively rigorous standards are intended to protect and preserve the historic integrity of listed resources through application of discretionary review criteria addressing a broad spectrum of architectural design elements. Some property owners have expressed concern over this degree of regulation if the primary concern is only related to demolition and redevelopment.

Despite constituting a lesser degree of protection for potentially historic resources, it would be possible to create this locally imposed and locally regulated district as a type of historic preservation measure and qualify for the exemption in state “needed housing” law that allows a local jurisdiction to apply subjective review criteria to housing development. Other Oregon jurisdictions, such as the City of Salem and Washington County, have successfully taken this approach by devising a set of review criteria to determine when it may be in the community’s

best interest to allow demolition of historic homes, as well as inform the design of subsequently redeveloped dwellings so they are compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

Because participation in the district would be voluntary, the result could be a broad range of participation, such that some blocks might have no or only a few participating properties, while other blocks might have full participation. The implementing ordinance could be crafted so that once a property owner consents to participation, the property remains “in the district” in perpetuity. Alternatively, the ordinance could be written to allow for removal of a property under certain circumstances.

For those participating properties, the model discussed by the work group would regulate demolition of existing dwellings and subsequent redevelopment through a mandatory design review process using discretionary criteria as a basis for determining whether demolition was appropriate and redevelopment was compatible. Those criteria could be the same design guidelines discussed above, a set of review criteria supplemented design standards, or some combination thereof. As with the design standards overlay, it is not anticipated that property owners would incur any costs as a result of participating, unless one of the regulated activities was proposed through the design review process.

#### **IV. Summary**

The Steering Committee should expect to receive additional recommendations in response to the following Objectives at the next quarterly meeting, which is anticipated to occur near the beginning of September 2013.

##### Neighborhood Planning

*Objective 2 – Review current development standards, and identify potential measures that would minimize potential impact from the creation of high density housing in or near lower density residential areas.*

- a. Develop and enact Land Development Code (LDC) language that would implement selected mitigation measures (measures to mitigate impacts to neighborhood character, privacy, parking, and other issues, as identified).*

Forthcoming recommendations from the Neighborhood Planning Workgroup will focus on the possible creation of additional mechanisms that would regulate the demolition of dwellings that are not addressed by existing or recommended historic preservation measures.

*Objective 1 – Consider pros and cons of making adjustments to zoning/density in areas near the University.*

- a. Review current zoning, City Comprehensive Plan, other local policy direction, as well as direction from the statewide planning program (DLCD).*
- b. Determine if there are appropriate locations within the City for lower and higher density housing.*

*(1) Include in the review, impact on traffic and livability in other areas; CTS impact; and other pedestrian, bicycle, and traffic impacts that would occur from having higher density zoning in areas further away from campus.*

*c. Determine if the benefits of making such adjustments outweigh the disadvantages.*

Several underlying considerations related to Objective 1 have been previously discussed by the Neighborhood Planning Work Group. Potential recommendations in response to this objective may be limited to identification of the trade-offs associated with adjustments to existing zoning patterns and what additional research would be necessary in order to inform decisions to rezone certain areas.

### Parking and Traffic

*Objective 3 – Find opportunities to better manage traffic volumes and parking impacts within study area.*

*Objective 5 – Implement combined solutions to address both traffic and parking as much as practicable.*

Since the March 18, 2013, Steering Committee meeting, the Parking and Traffic Work Group has received presentations from various City of Corvallis and OSU staff concerning the existing framework for transportation planning. Issues discussed so far include integration of transportation planning efforts conducted by the City and OSU; programs and incentives for reducing use of single occupancy vehicles as a primary transportation mode; programmatic and infrastructure improvements that could improve the safety of bicycle and pedestrian travel. Additional presentations on regional transportation planning efforts and connections between the local regulatory process for land use and provision of transportation facilities are scheduled for upcoming meetings. Once the work group has had an opportunity to fully assess this new set of information, the anticipated outcome will be recommendations on transportation planning policies that should be accounted for through future updates to the City of Corvallis Transportation Master Plan, the OSU Campus Master Plan, and related efforts at the regional level.

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Summary

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objectives	Recommendations	Expected Outcomes
Neighborhood Livability	1. Create a sustainable program to mitigate issues associated with having a large student population within neighborhoods.	1. Production and distribution of an “Off-campus Living Guide” modeled after similar documents in use at Michigan State University, Colorado State University, the University of Florida, the University Colorado Boulder, and the University of California at Davis.	Increased awareness of information essential for OSU students to successfully transition to living off-campus.
	a. Develop livability standards that can be used as a guide for municipal code enactment and OSU Student Conduct standards.	2. The Corvallis Police Department, Oregon State Police, and the Oregon State University Office of Public Safety should find new and improved ways to collaborate in order to decrease incident response times, and increase law enforcement presence in the neighborhoods near Oregon State University.	Increased efficiencies in providing consistent community policing and proactive education on local and state laws that address alcohol use, nuisances and disorderly conduct, and other factors affecting neighborhood livability.
		3. The Corvallis Police Department no longer issue warnings for Special Response Notices (SRN), but issue the citation upon the first response instance instead.	In comparison to 2011 totals, a substantial increase in number of SRNs issued between September and June, resulting in fewer calls for service related to disruptive social gatherings, excessive noise, etc.
		4. Oregon State University should amend the Student Code of Conduct to clearly state that the Student Code of Conduct applies to behavior occurring off campus in the Corvallis community. The University should proactively notify students of the aforementioned change.	Increased awareness by OSU students that the Code of Conduct applies to behavior that occurs off-campus, and that the possible sanctions can be imposed in response to incidents that occur off-campus. This knowledge is anticipated to act as a deterrent of behaviors that impact neighborhood livability.
		5. Oregon State University should increase staffing in the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards to allow for effective enforcement of the Student Code of Conduct against behavior occurring off-campus. It is estimated that it would require an additional two FTE’s to accomplish effective off-campus enforcement.	More effective management of off-campus student conduct; including expanded education programs and more efficient implementation of corrective response.
		6. Oregon State University and the City of Corvallis should establish and maintain membership in the International Town Gown Association; and  Oregon State University and the City of Corvallis should send delegates to the next annual International Town Gown Association conference.	Improved access to national research on policies and programs designed to improve the social relationships between a university and its host community.

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Summary

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objectives	Recommendations	Expected Outcomes
Neighborhood Livability (cont.)	<p>1. Create a sustainable program to mitigate issues associated with having a large student population within neighborhoods.</p> <p>a. Develop livability standards that can be used as a guide for municipal code enactment and OSU Student Conduct standards.(cont.)</p>	<p>7. Oregon State University and the City of Corvallis should commit resources necessary to fund Dr. Robert Saltz to provide Oregon State University and the City of Corvallis consultation on best practices for enforcement of underage drinking laws and nuisance statutes.</p> <p>Following the Safer California Universities Project guidelines developed by Dr. Saltz, the Neighborhood Livability Workgroup recommends that the Corvallis Police Department and the Oregon State Police perform targeted, publicized, enhanced enforcement weekends.</p>	<p>Through partnering with the Benton County Strategic Prevention Framework, development of strategies that would be applied community-wide to decrease existing rates of underage and high-risk drinking. This would include the creation of strategy effectiveness metrics that would be periodically measured.</p>
		<p>8. In order to allow the Corvallis Police Department to return to a Community Policing model that emphasizes cost-effective education and outreach strategies designed to proactively address community livability; to facilitate more consistent and effective enforcement of existing and proposed Corvallis Municipal Code regulations regarding nuisances, disorderly conduct, vandalism, and alcohol violations; to improve the safety of both the community and police officers who respond to the community's calls for service; and to promote and sustain livable neighborhoods throughout Corvallis; the Neighborhood Livability Work Group recommends to the Collaboration Corvallis Steering Committee that the City of Corvallis establish a goal of increasing the ratio of sworn police officers from the current rate of 0.96 per 1,000 residents to 1.2 sworn officers per 1,000 residents.</p>	<p>The expected outcomes are noted in the recommendation.</p>
	<p>2. Prepare associated municipal code amendments and student conduct standards and move them through the enactment process.</p>	<p>1. The Neighborhood Livability Workgroup recommends that the City of Corvallis amend Municipal Code Section 5.03.040.010.02 as follows, which would impose minimum fines that are consistent with Oregon Revised Statute section 471.410.</p>	<p>Increasing the existing minimum monetary penalties for providing alcohol to a minor to be consistent with State law is expected to serve as a better deterrent of this behavior than existing minimum fines.</p>

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Summary

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objectives	Recommendations	Expected Outcomes
Neighborhood Livability (cont.)	2. Prepare associated municipal code amendments and student conduct standards and move them through the enactment process. (cont.)	2. The City of Corvallis should amend Corvallis Municipal Code section 5.03.040.010.10 to be consistent with the attached model Social Host ordinance (see Nov. 26, 2012, memo to Steering Committee). The provisions that impose an escalating fine schedule for repeat offenses, and that clearly state each person who contributes to a violation of the ordinance is subject to the associated penalties are critical for addressing neighborhood livability concerns. It is concurrently recommended that the Corvallis Police Department respond to calls for Social Host violations as a top priority call.	<p>Revising the existing Corvallis Municipal Code Section 5.03.040.010.10, as described, is expected to serve as a better deterrent of this behavior than existing penalties.</p> <p>It should be noted, however, that consistent police response to suspected Social Host violations as a top priority call will likely require an increase in the number of sworn officers employed by the Corvallis Police Department.</p>
		3. The City of Corvallis Police Department should continue to monitor the effectiveness of the Special Response Notice (SRN) ordinance and recent decisions to impose SRN cost recovery fees more frequently rather than informal “warnings”, and continue to share citation reports with the Oregon State University Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards. It is further recommended that, before November 2013, the Corvallis Police Department assess whether the perception of improved neighborhood livability conditions exists in those areas of the city currently experiencing frequent disturbances from social gatherings, and consider the potential effectiveness of increasing the existing SRN 30-day probation period and increasing the fees and/or fines currently imposed through the ordinance.	By November 2013, a determination of whether modifications to the SRN ordinance are necessary to improve neighborhood livability. If modifications are required, it is anticipated that implementation would require up to six months.
		4. The Corvallis City Council should direct Community Development Department staff to devise a plan that facilitates effective and consistent enforcement of Corvallis Municipal Code Section 6.10.040.040(6).	Creation of an accurate physical survey of existing gravel parking areas that would be used to enforce against the creation of additional gravel parking areas, as prohibited by Corvallis Municipal Code Section 6.10.040.040(6).

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Summary

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objectives	Recommendations	Expected Outcomes
Neighborhood Livability (cont.)	2. Prepare associated municipal code amendments and student conduct standards and move them through the enactment process. (cont.)	5. The City of Corvallis should amend Corvallis Municipal Code Section 4.01.070 by removing the words “promptly” and “before it becomes offensive”, and revise the associated language so it is clear and objective.	Increased ease of enforcing Corvallis Municipal Code 4.01.070, making the regulation more effective at controlling the improper management of refuse on private property.
	3. Develop a funding mechanism to support an enhanced code enforcement and student conduct program.  a. Create outreach and informational programs as key components of the new program.	1. The Neighborhood Livability Work Group recommends to the Collaboration Corvallis Steering Committee that the City of Corvallis:  a. Implement a Property Maintenance Code that applies to all properties; b. Create, through subsequent political process, an equitable funding structure that gives consideration to demands on the complaint-response system; c. Provide staffing commensurate with the requirements of the code; and d. Utilize culturally and linguistically appropriate education and outreach strategies to engage community stakeholders to better understand and reduce barriers to complaints.	A Property Maintenance Code (PMC), with adequate staffing and resources, would provide an important and immediate first step in addressing neighborhood concerns regarding property maintenance, and landlord and tenant accountability. Furthermore, culturally and linguistically appropriate, targeted education, outreach to and engagement with community stakeholders are essential in order to better understand and address barriers to the current complaint-driven code enforcement system. A Neighborhood Liaison position has the potential to assist with these efforts. An equitable funding structure for the program that gives consideration to demands on the complaint-response system would ensure costs are paid commensurate with demand for those resources.
		2. The Neighborhood Livability Work Group recommends to the Collaboration Corvallis Steering Committee that the City of Corvallis utilize a progressive enforcement strategy as part of the process for resolving complaints related to habitability and livability codes.	The current code enforcement process does not include a progressive enforcement strategy with increasing fines for repeat violations, which, if adopted, could act to diminish the prevalence of livability and habitability issues currently impacting Corvallis neighborhoods; particularly those within the Collaboration Corvallis Project Area.

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Summary

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objectives	Recommendations	Expected Outcomes
Neighborhood Livability (cont.)	3. Develop a funding mechanism to support an enhanced code enforcement and student conduct program.  b. Create outreach and informational programs as key components of the new program. (cont.)	3. The Neighborhood Livability Work Group recommends to the Collaboration Corvallis Steering Committee that the City of Corvallis: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Support collaborative efforts to seek additional information and input from diverse stakeholders to develop additional programs and policies to address concerns raised, and</li> <li>b. Review options for additional policies or programs needed to address housing conditions (e.g, a rental licensing program with mandatory inspections, a performance-based inspection model, an enhanced inspection model that focuses on problem areas and/or landlords, self-monitoring by property managers) within two years of implementing a Property Maintenance Code.</li> </ul>	<p>During the first two years of implementation of a Property Maintenance Code accompanied by increased staffing and community outreach, additional information should be collected on: benefits and gaps of the new Property Maintenance Code, conditions of local housing stock, dynamics related to a complaint-driven system, and potential programmatic solutions. Furthermore, during this period of assessment, opportunities exist for continuing to engage diverse community stakeholders (e.g., property owners, managers, and brokers; student groups; housing experts; City and County staff; cultural groups; and the faith community) through participatory public processes (e.g., public meetings, work groups, and/or a health impact assessment) to better understand current conditions and seek solutions.</p> <p>A commitment to review the issue within two years of implementation provides time to observe the impact of the Property Maintenance Code, seek additional information, work collaboratively with community stakeholders, and ensures that the City is committed to addressing these concerns.</p>

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Summary

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objectives	Recommendations	Expected Outcomes
Neighborhood Livability (cont.)	4. Evaluate and implement opportunities to utilize students, peers, and neighborhood volunteers in outreach and informational programs.	1. The Work Group recommends to the Collaboration Corvallis Steering Committee that OSU, with assistance from the City of Corvallis, develop and provide orientation programs that prepare students for living off campus. Based on models from other universities that were research to develop this recommendation, the following elements should be included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Education on rental housing, including lease contracts and Oregon’s landlord/tenant laws.</li> <li>b. Considerations for selecting roommates and managing household responsibilities.</li> <li>c. Process for initiating utilities and refuse collection services</li> <li>d. Education on city ordinances concerning on-street parking regulations, nuisance behaviors, noise, alcohol possession and consumption, and others.</li> <li>e. Awareness of neighborhood livability issues and effective ways to establish and maintain mutually respectful relationships with neighbors.</li> </ul> Assuming commensurate staff are available, it is further recommended that OSU and the City of Corvallis strive to implement a pilot program before the end of the Spring 2013 term.	Currently there is no organized orientation provided for students preparing or desiring to live off campus. Beginning Fall of 2013, all traditional freshman students are required to live on the OSU campus, which will provide focus opportunities for educating students on these matters before transitioning to off-campus housing.  OSU and the City of Corvallis have knowledgeable and experienced personnel who could provide orientation and programming on how to live off campus in a manner that promotes and supports community livability.

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Summary

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objectives	Recommendations	Expected Outcomes
Neighborhood Livability (cont.)	4. Evaluate and implement opportunities to utilize students, peers, and neighborhood volunteers in outreach and informational programs. (cont.)	2. The Work Group recommends to the Collaboration Corvallis Steering Committee that the City of Corvallis identify and assign to a city department the responsibility of providing support to neighborhood associations and student living groups in coordination with OSU. The purpose of this recommendation is to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Improve and foster communication between neighborhood associations, the City of Corvallis, and OSU regarding neighborhood livability issues.</li> <li>b. Assist neighborhood associations with identifying and securing resources that will improve and sustain their ability to manage neighborhood livability at the neighborhood level.</li> <li>c. Provide neighborhood associations and student living groups with a central point of contact for future community initiatives related to improving and sustaining neighborhood livability.</li> </ul> It is recommended that this strategy be implemented prior to Fall 2013.	Effective education and outreach strategies implemented by city government in support of neighborhood associations and student living groups, to facilitate constructive communication regarding livability issues between neighbors; develop neighborhood-specific livability goals and communication plans; and, when available, secure third party funding for initiatives that promote livable neighborhoods.

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Summary

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objectives	Recommendations	Expected Outcomes
Neighborhood Livability (cont.)	4. Evaluate and implement opportunities to utilize students, peers, and neighborhood volunteers in outreach and informational programs. (cont.)	3. The Work Group recommends to the Collaboration Corvallis Steering Committee that the City of Corvallis and OSU develop and implement a “Community/Neighborhood Welcome” program with assistance from neighborhood associations and other community stakeholders. The expected outcomes of this strategy include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Setting a positive tone at the beginning of each school year to encourage mutually respectful relationships between neighbors.</li> <li>b. Supporting related efforts to engage students with neighborhood livability education and outreach programs.</li> <li>c. Working to diminish hostility toward students that has grown in the community.</li> <li>d. Providing additional opportunities for community leaders to visibly engage in efforts to support livable neighborhoods.</li> </ul> It is recommended that this strategy be implemented prior to Fall 2013.	Due to the concentration of rental housing units in neighborhoods surrounding the Oregon State University campus, many permanent residents and students who live in these areas are new neighbors to one another each year. This dynamic can become a disincentive for permanent residents and students to invest time to become acquainted and communicate openly about their respective neighborhood livability expectations. Several university communities researched for the purpose of devising effective education and outreach programs currently hold a “Welcome Week”, which have been effective at improving neighborhood communication.
		4. The Work Group recommends to the Collaboration Corvallis Steering Committee that Oregon State University and the City of Corvallis identify, coordinate, and make available to community members a mediation/conflict resolution service.  It is recommended that this strategy be implemented prior to Fall 2013.	Many times there are significant conflicts between neighbors that are difficult to resolve, and typical interventions might not always be successful.  Professional mediation has proven to be a viable solution in many college town communities. Coordinating with a mediation organization and qualified personnel who are located in the local community is expected to support neighborhood livability for all residents.

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Summary

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objectives	Recommendations	Expected Outcomes
Neighborhood Planning	2. Review current development standards, and identify potential measures that would minimize potential impact from the creation of high density housing in or near lower density residential areas.	1. In order to encourage affordable housing built specifically for low-income residents, who typically have lesser needs for parking, the City Council should direct City Planning staff to develop Land Development Code language that would exempt multifamily affordable housing development, defined as units made available for rent or purchase by households at or below 60 percent of the Area Median Income, from the parking requirements for four- and five-bedroom units.	Removal of a potential disincentive for developing additional housing in Corvallis consistent with Federal regulations pertaining to affordable housing for low-income individuals and families.
		2. The definition of “Family” contained in Chapter 1.6 of the Corvallis Land Development Code should be amended to include the term “domestic partnership”, and be inserted after the word “marriage” as it appears in the current definition.	Clarification that the term “Family” includes domestic partnerships.
		3. A definition for the term “Residential Home” should be added to Land Development Code Chapter 1.6, and that the term be added to the existing list of residential use classifications contained in Chapter 3.0. The language for each should be consistent with the definition provided in Oregon Revised Statute Section 197.600(2).	Clarification that a “Residential Home”, as defined in Oregon Revised Statute Section 197.600(2), is a permitted use.
		4. The off-street parking standards in Land Development Code Section 4.1.30 should be amended to address duplex, attached, and multi-family dwellings with more than three bedrooms. Units with four bedrooms should require the provision of 3.5 parking spaces, and units with five bedrooms should require 4.5 parking spaces. Similar adjustments to standards for on-site bicycle parking should also be made.	Revising the Land Development Code to include parking standards for multi-family units with four or five bedrooms is expected to reduce the potential for additional neighborhood parking impacts, as well as promote infill development that is more compatible with existing neighborhoods.
		5. The Work Group recommends that the City of Corvallis explore amending the Corvallis Land Development Code so that lots reconfigured through the Lot Line Adjustment process do not contain “unusable area”, as yet to be defined.	The subject recommendation is intended to balance the transition of existing neighborhoods to potentially higher density with the desire to preserve historic development patterns and the resultant neighborhood character.

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Summary

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objectives	Recommendations	Expected Outcomes
Neighborhood Planning (cont.)	<p>2. Review current development standards, and identify potential measures that would minimize potential impact from the creation of high density housing in or near lower density residential areas. (cont.)</p>	<p>6. The Work Group recommends that the City of Corvallis amend the Corvallis Land Development Code so that the minimum required side yard setback distance specified for zero lot line, single attached units is the same as that for a duplex, and that the setback distance be consistent for these two dwellings types in each zone in which they are permitted. However, the Work Group also recommends that a minimum side yard setback distance of 10 feet only be required in instances of infill development, as yet to be defined.</p>	<p>The subject recommendation is intended to balance the transition of existing neighborhoods to potentially higher density with the desire to preserve historic development patterns and the resultant neighborhood character.</p>
		<p>7. The Work Group recommends that the City of Corvallis amend Chapter 2.14 (Partitions, Minor Replats, and Property Line Adjustments) of the Corvallis Land Development Code, specifically Section 2.14.30.05.b.2(b), by removing the option to calculate density potential by including up to 50 percent of the area of public street right-of-way that fronts a site.</p>	<p>The subject recommendation is intended to balance the transition of existing neighborhoods to potentially higher density with the desire to preserve historic development patterns and the resultant neighborhood character.</p>
		<p>8. The Work Group recommends that the City of Corvallis amend Chapter 2.12 (Lot Development Option) and Chapter 2.0 (Public Hearings) of the Corvallis Land Development Code, specifically Sections 2.0.50.04(b) and 2.12.30.04(b), to increase the public notice area for Major Lot Development Options to include all owners and occupants of properties within 500 feet of a site.</p>	<p>The Work Group determined that it is in the public's best interest for a larger area to be informed of Major Lot Development Option requests, especially due to their potential to significantly alter standards that were implemented to facilitate compatible development in residential zones.</p>
		<p>9. The Work Group recommends that the City of Corvallis amend the Corvallis Land Development Code to allow the redevelopment of residential infill properties at densities that are otherwise below minimum required density.</p>	<p>The subject recommendation is intended to balance the transition of existing neighborhoods to potentially higher density with the desire to preserve historic development patterns and the resultant neighborhood character.</p>

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Summary

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objectives	Recommendations	Expected Outcomes
Neighborhood Planning (cont.)	3. Review opportunities to provide housing for OSU students that are compatible within the community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Evaluate ways to increase on-campus housing, such as on-campus living requirements, public-private partnerships, etc.</li> <li>b. Consider the merits and means to incentivize off-campus housing in preferred target areas such as downtown Corvallis, greenfield sites, etc.</li> </ul>	1. OSU should strive to increase the percentage of undergraduate students living on campus through means such as entering into public-private partnerships to develop housing that is closer to market rates, and developing housing that is attractive to upper division students and allows more independence and autonomy for students. New housing should be designed so students don't have to bring cars to campus and reserves land for future housing demand. Based on a review of on-campus housing supply at comparator institutions identified by OSU in its Strategic Plan, as well as consideration of other factors, it is recommended that 28-30 percent of OSU undergraduate students are able to live on campus by 2019.  2. OSU should include in their Campus Master Plan a chapter on student housing that sets goals, objectives, and targets for the percentage of students living on campus, and incorporates the land use planning necessary to achieve those goals, objectives, and targets. Goals should include providing housing on campus for a minimum percentage of students physically enrolled at the Corvallis campus. A determination of the minimum percentage should consider the potential impacts of OSU's enrollment growth on neighborhoods surrounding the campus that could be mitigated through on-campus housing. To the extent practicable, the Campus Master Plan should designate preferred sites to accommodate housing for the minimum percentage of students, which will provide greater assurances to University Housing & Dining Services and prospective development partners that land is available for this purpose.	Provision of on-campus housing for up to an additional nine percent of the undergraduate student population. Based on data available in the 2011 Housing Study commissioned by University Housing & Dining Services and the number of new multi-family units permitted by the City of Corvallis as of June 2012, the rental housing vacancy rate is expected to increase to roughly 4-5 percent if 28 percent of the undergraduate student population lives on campus. This additional amount of housing on campus would minimize pressure on existing neighborhoods surrounding the OSU campus to accommodate increased student housing.  Greater focus through the Campus Master Plan on how and where additional on-campus student housing can be accommodated. The recommended range of 28-30 percent of undergraduate students being able to live on campus should be used as a benchmark for updates to the Campus Master Plan. Identification of specific sites for new housing is expected to facilitate University Housing & Dining Services' efforts to plan new housing facilities.

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Summary

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objectives	Recommendations	Expected Outcomes
Neighborhood Planning (cont.)	<p>3. Review opportunities to provide housing for OSU students that are compatible within the community.</p> <p>a. Evaluate ways to increase on-campus housing, such as on-campus living requirements, public-private partnerships, etc.</p> <p>b. Consider the merits and means to incentivize off-campus housing in preferred target areas such as downtown Corvallis, greenfield sites, etc.</p>	<p>3. OSU place a priority on exploring the use of Public/Private Partnerships and other options that would facilitate development of an innovative on-campus village-style housing project for students, faculty, and staff. Elements for OSU to consider as part of such a project include: (see Nov. 26, 2012, memo to Steering Committee).</p>	<p>Strategic consideration of the use of Public/Private Partnerships to deliver new housing on campus for students, faculty, and staff in combination with retail space and recreational facilities; similar to the West Village project in Davis, California.</p>
Parking and Traffic	<p>3. Find opportunities to better manage traffic volumes and parking impacts within study area.</p>	<p>1. Increased marketing and educational outreach for existing transportation demand management resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increasing awareness of Corvallis Transit System (CTS) routes that directly serve the OSU campus and target areas of Corvallis with high OSU student, faculty, and staff residency.</li> <li>• OSU should develop and distribute educational literature to new and returning students about the trade-offs of bringing a car to Corvallis.</li> </ul> <p>OSU increase publicity of its existing rideshare program, which is implemented through the Office of Sustainability in partnership with Cascades West Rideshare and the “Drive Less. <i>Connect.</i>” program.</p> <p>2. Fully fund the on-campus bike-share program currently under development by the OSU Student Sustainability Initiative (SSI) and the Department of Recreational Sports (DRS) that would be available to OSU students, faculty, and staff. (See Aug. 8, 2012, memo to the Steering Committee for more details.)</p>	<p>Within the OSU campus population, increased awareness of the availability and effectiveness of alternate transportation modes that could replace trips made via single occupancy vehicles. See the Aug. 8, 2012, memorandum to the Steering Committee for more information.</p> <p>Expansion of the existing bike rental fleet that is available to OSU students, faculty, and staff, which would increase options for traveling by bike to and from campus on a regular basis, or as needed.</p>

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Summary

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objectives	Recommendations	Expected Outcomes
Parking and Traffic (cont.)	3. Find opportunities to better manage traffic volumes and parking impacts within study area (cont.)	3. Install wayfinding signage at State Highway 34 bypass intersection to encourage parking at Reser Stadium and the 26 <sup>th</sup> Street parking garage on campus.	Increased awareness by individuals who commute to the OSU campus on State HWY 34 of on-campus parking options. Redirection of trips to the south side of the OSU campus and away from residential neighborhoods along the north boundary that are currently experiencing parking impacts.
		4. In order to promote full utilization of available parking on the Oregon State University campus, including under-utilized parking facilities on the east side of campus, at Reser Stadium and in the Gill Coliseum Garage, OSU should undertake full consideration and the implementation in Fall 2013 of a variable pricing on-campus parking program that would create higher parking permit fees for parking in the campus core and in parking lots near the north campus border and lesser parking permit fees in lots at Reser Stadium, other identified lesser-used parking lots and the Gill Coliseum garage.	Increased utilization of on-campus parking facilities such as the parking lots near Reser Stadium and the parking garage near Gill Coliseum, which regularly have utilization rates of less than 25 percent. Decreasing the price for parking in areas further away from the core of campus is also intended to function in tandem with expanded neighborhood parking management off campus to further encourage increased utilization of on-campus parking facilities.

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Summary

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objectives	Recommendations	Expected Outcomes
Parking and Traffic (cont.)	3. Find opportunities to better manage traffic volumes and parking impacts within study area (cont.)	5. Implementation of a neighborhood parking management program that is consistent with the corresponding findings and program elements described in the March 13, 2013, memorandum to the Steering Committee.	<p>The following outcomes are expected as a result of this recommendation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce negative neighborhood parking impacts.</li> <li>• Promote effectiveness of on-campus parking utilization management.</li> <li>• Promote use of the Corvallis Transit System and other alternate modes.</li> <li>• Minimize unintended parking impacts outside of the Collaboration Corvallis project area.</li> <li>• Implementation of financially self-sustaining parking management strategies.</li> <li>• Creation of parking management strategies that, across neighborhoods, are effectively implemented, enforced, and financially managed; including the promotion of parking citation payment and collection.</li> </ul>
	4. Leverage transit system and OSU shuttle as much possible	1. Annual OSU contribution of an additional \$30,000 to fund CTS service expansions for Routes 5, 6, and C1. (See Aug. 8, 2012, memo to the Steering Committee for more details).	Increased transit ridership on key routes that are heavily used by OSU students, faculty, and staff. Projected ridership increases for the identified service expansions totaled approximately 11,000 trips annually.

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Summary

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objectives	Recommendations	Expected Outcomes
Parking and Traffic (cont.)	4. Leverage transit system and OSU shuttle as much possible (cont.)	2. Improved schedule and route coordination between CTS and OSU Shuttle.	Reduce the number of single occupant commuter trips to the OSU campus occurring at peak travel times, but also improve service levels for students, faculty, and staff who must travel to and from campus multiple times each day. It will be necessary for staff from the City of Corvallis and OSU's Transit and Parking Services to review the existing routes and schedules to identify opportunities for improving service coordination. Such discussions might also include the logistics of implementing a seamless GPS-based transit vehicle tracking system, which is a new management tool both entities are currently considering independently.
		3. The mission of the OSU Shuttle should be immediately redefined to emphasize transit services between on-campus parking facilities on the fringe of campus, future transit hubs serving CTS and the OSU Shuttle, and service to a handful of core campus destinations.	The OSU shuttle provides a critical service for transporting students, faculty, and staff between the campus core and outlying areas. Its ability to operate efficiently is anticipated to become even more important to facilitate changes in on-campus parking management. Reinforcing the mission of the shuttle to focus on these duties is expected to help minimize traffic and parking impacts in neighborhoods surrounding campus.
		4. The OSU-Shuttle should fully implement a GPS positioning system (VIS) for its buses and actively promote public use of mobile applications that provide shuttle users "real-time" information on the location and time at which the shuttle will arrive. It is strongly encouraged that the GPS tracking system compliment and be compatible with GPS tracking information generated by similar systems implemented in the future for the Corvallis Transit System.	Implementation of VIS is expected to improve shuttle ridership due to the ability for riders to more accurately plan trips by having access to real-time data on the shuttle's location and projected time of arrival at each stop. These benefits are expected to be even more significant if the system is coordinated with a VIS implemented for the Corvallis Transit System.

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Summary

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objectives	Recommendations	Expected Outcomes
Parking and Traffic (cont.)	4. Leverage transit system and OSU shuttle as much possible (cont.)	5. The City of Corvallis should implement a fully operational GPS system for its buses by September 2013, and actively promote the use of mobile applications that provide CTS users “real-time” information on the location and time in which CTS service will arrive.	Implementation of VIS is expected to improve CTS ridership due to the ability for riders to more accurately plan trips by having access to real-time data on the shuttle’s location and projected time of arrival at each stop. These benefits are expected to be even more significant if the system is coordinated with a VIS implemented for the OSU Shuttle.
		6. The city of Corvallis should adopt; fully fund; and implement a transit marketing and communications plan for CTS that targets at least a 20 percent increase in transit ridership and frequency among residents and employees working within two miles of the OSU campus. This program will be conducted to complement efforts to reduce the impacts of traffic and parking associated with the growth of OSU campus, LBCC Benton Center and employment in the downtown.	As articulated in the recommendation, the marketing and communications plan is expected to generate at least a 20 percent increase in transit ridership. The actual period of time over which this increase occurs was not specified, but should be set by City staff in order to compel adjustments to marketing strategies if ridership gains are not occurring at a significant rate.
		7. A funding agreement should be reached by April 30, 2013 between the cities of Corvallis and Albany, the counties of Linn and Benton, Oregon State University, LBCC and other partners to at least sustain, if not grow, current transit service levels provided by the Linn-Benton Loop.	Sustained service of the Linn-Benton Loop bus routes, which serve commuters who regularly travel between Albany, Corvallis, OSU, and LBCC is expected to help maintain, if not decrease, the number of single occupancy vehicle trips made daily between these destinations.
		9. A historical evaluation and full understanding should be provided related to the 2004 OSU Campus Master Plan commitment that calls upon Oregon State University to fully fund expansion of CTS service as necessitated by OSU growth. The city of Corvallis and OSU should undertake discussions to mutually agree on a defined process and outcomes by which any future transit funding commitments are made by -- or requested of -- the University.	A review of the commitment made in the OSU Campus Master Plan to fund OSU-related CTS service expansions is expected to give both organizations the opportunity to establish a specific and detailed agreement for how, to what extent, and when such funding contributions shall be made.

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Summary

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objectives	Recommendations	Expected Outcomes
Parking and Traffic (cont.)	4. Leverage transit system and OSU shuttle as much possible (cont.)	10. The city of Corvallis, along with Oregon State University and other regional transit providers should undertake a study to consider the development of a transit hub/transit center located on or adjacent to the OSU Campus. The objectives of this study would be to determine: the cost of creating such a transit hub; whether such a hub would promote – and to what degree -- increased use of transit services provided by CTS and other regional providers; whether such a hub would more effectively connect and serve the OSU campus and LBCC’s Benton Center by transit; whether such a hub would link well to OSU Shuttle service serving campus destinations; variable funding sources for such a hub; and what measurements for expanding transit service to the proposed hub would be utilized. This study would be completed by Aug. 1, 2013.	The expected recommendation outcomes are articulated in its language.
		10. The city of Corvallis and Oregon State University should undertake a communications, marketing and public engagement campaign to promote alternative modes of safe travel within targeted residential areas that are within two miles of the core of the University campus. The purpose of this campaign would be to promote the recommendations presented by the workgroup to the Steering Committee for consideration at the November 29, 2012, meeting, as well as any subsequent recommendations regarding alternate transportation modes.	The expected recommendation outcomes are articulated in its language.

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Disposition

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objective No. – Recommendation No. <sup>1</sup>	Organization(s) Responsible for Implementation	Anticipated Implementation Timeframe / Estimated Cost	Magnitude of Difficulty <sup>2</sup>	Implementation Status / Comments
Neighborhood Livability	No. 1-1 Off-campus Living Guide	Oregon State University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards</li> <li>• Division of University Relations and Marketing</li> </ul> City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City Manager’s Office</li> </ul>	6 to 12 months.  OSU used existing staff to update guide. OSU’s cost to print is \$2,200. Distributed beginning spring term 2013.	2	Final guide is complete and ready for printing. OSU Division of University Relations and Marketing is coordinating with Benton County Strategic Prevention Framework staff to obtaining funding for production. (12-21-12)
	No. 1-2 Corvallis Police Dept./Oregon State Police coordination	Oregon State University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oregon State Police</li> <li>• University Office of Public Safety</li> </ul> City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Police Department</li> </ul>	Ongoing; however, initiation of discussions to explore opportunities for enhanced patrols on weekends should occur as soon as possible.  Enhanced communication with City and Sheriff’s office using existing OSP staff.  Additional staffing necessary (each Sworn Officer @ \$100,000)	Enhanced Communication: 1  Funding additional Sworn Staffing: 5  OSU: 2	CPD has worked with OSP/OSU and OSU Office of Student Conduct enhancing sharing of information beyond existing Mutual Aid agreements. Existing legal limits regarding jurisdiction and enforcement authorization remain. Enhanced patrols require additional officers. CPD and OSP coordinate patrols as appropriate based on known activity.
	No. 1-3 Eliminate Special Response Notice (SRN) “warnings”	City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Police Department</li> </ul>	Immediate. We’ve implemented strict enforcement of SRN’s and CNP’s. (in-kind staffing/ moderate effort)  Additional Sworn Staff: (each Sworn Officer @ \$100,000)	Strict Enforcement: 3  Funding additional Sworn Staff: 5	Police Department has begun issuing SRNs consistent with this recommendation. However, it is anticipated that additional staffing will be necessary to sustain this practice long term. (12-21-12)
	No. 1-4 Amend Student Code of Conduct	Oregon State University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards</li> </ul>	6 to 12 months. Requires OAR amendment that should be in effect by fall of 2013.	1	

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Refer to accompanying recommendation summary for full text of each Scope of Work Objective and corresponding recommendations.

<sup>2</sup> Scale of 1-5, with 1 being “easiest” and 5 being “hardest.”

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Disposition

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objective No. – Recommendation No. <sup>1</sup>	Organization(s) Responsible for Implementation	Anticipated Implementation Timeframe / Estimated Cost	Magnitude of Difficulty <sup>2</sup>	Implementation Status / Comments
Neighborhood Livability (cont.)	No. 1-5 Increase Student Conduct Staffing	Oregon State University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards</li> </ul>	6 months.  Anticipate 2.5 FTE at a cost of \$220K.	3	Additional staffing has been authorized. Anticipate filling these new positions by summer 2013.
	No. 1-6 City/OSU ITGA Membership and Annual Conf.	Oregon State University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Office of the President</li> </ul> City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City Manager’s Office</li> </ul>	3 to 6 months. Membership: \$800 Annual Conf.: \$2,000 per person; 1 staff member each from City and OSU	1	<b>City and OSU have become ITGA members. City staff have registered for the 2013 Conference.</b>

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Refer to accompanying recommendation summary for full text of each Scope of Work Objective and corresponding recommendations.

<sup>2</sup> Scale of 1-5, with 1 being “easiest” and 5 being “hardest.”

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Disposition

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objective No. – Recommendation No. <sup>1</sup>	Organization(s) Responsible for Implementation	Anticipated Implementation Timeframe / Estimated Cost	Magnitude of Difficulty <sup>2</sup>	Implementation Status / Comments
	No. 1-7 Consult with Dr. Robert Saltz on California Safer Universities project	Oregon State University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Office of the President</li> <li>• Oregon State Police</li> <li>• University Office of Public Safety</li> </ul> City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City Manager’s Office</li> <li>• Police Department</li> </ul>	3 to 6 months.  Currently coordinating with Benton County Strategic Prevention Framework to pay costs for Dr. Saltz consultation.  Dependent upon strategy development Recruitment to hire and realize effective tasks no less than 1 year. (In-kind staff/ Moderate effort)  Additional Sworn Staff: (each Sworn Officer @ \$100,000)	Consultation Planning and Coordination: 2  Recruitment & Hiring: 3  Funding additional Sworn Staff: 5	Staff from the Benton County Strategic Prevention Framework and Collaboration Corvallis have contacted Dr. Saltz to identify dates when he could attend meetings in Corvallis with relevant stakeholders, and begin an assessment of opportunities for implementing strategies utilized in the Safer California Universities project. It is currently anticipated that Dr. Saltz will visit Corvallis in April (3-1-13).  Enhancing staffing to address underage drinking laws and nuisance statutes through a targeted and publicized campaign require additional staffing and/or officers on overtime.  <b>Dr. Saltz came in April and presented Safer California Universities Project material. Corvallis Police Staff attended with other community stakeholders. Dr. Saltz was impressed with current systems in Corvallis. Additional sworn staff would lend to greater consistency for enforcement, education and prevention efforts.</b>

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Refer to accompanying recommendation summary for full text of each Scope of Work Objective and corresponding recommendations.

<sup>2</sup> Scale of 1-5, with 1 being “easiest” and 5 being “hardest.”

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Disposition

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objective No. – Recommendation No. <sup>1</sup>	Organization(s) Responsible for Implementation	Anticipated Implementation Timeframe / Estimated Cost	Magnitude of Difficulty <sup>2</sup>	Implementation Status / Comments
Neighborhood Livability (cont.)	No. 1-8 Goal to increase Corvallis Police Dept. Staffing	City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City Manager’s Office</li> <li>• Police Department</li> </ul>			
	No. 2-1 Increase minimum fines for providing alcohol to minors	City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City Manager’s Office</li> <li>• Police Department</li> <li>• City Attorney’s Office</li> </ul>	Spring 2013 (Target - end of March) (In-kind staff/ Moderate effort) <b>Update: Council action scheduled in May/June</b>	2	Staff is developing ordinance modification and reports for council consideration modifying fine amounts to be consistent with State Statute. (3-1-13)
	No. 2-2 Adopt specific elements of a Social Host Ord.	City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City Manager’s Office</li> <li>• Police Department</li> <li>• City Attorney’s Office</li> </ul>	Assessment, decisions and ordinance modifications completed by Sept. 2013. (In-kind staff/ Moderate effort)  Additional staffing necessary (each Sworn Officer @ \$100,000)	Evaluate/Modify Ordinances: 3  Funding additional Sworn Staff: 5	Social Host ordinance overlaps existing ordinances. A comparative analysis is being conducted to determine if existing ordinances should be modified or updated. Existing ordinances address Alcohol offenses, SRN, CNP, Disturbance and noise issues. Increased investigatory requirements are counter-productive to enforcement efficiencies. Additional staff are needed to enforce at levels desired by the Livability work group. CPD will continue to triage and prioritize calls for service based on nature of call and staffing levels.

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Refer to accompanying recommendation summary for full text of each Scope of Work Objective and corresponding recommendations.

<sup>2</sup> Scale of 1-5, with 1 being “easiest” and 5 being “hardest.”

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Disposition

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objective No. – Recommendation No. <sup>1</sup>	Organization(s) Responsible for Implementation	Anticipated Implementation Timeframe / Estimated Cost	Magnitude of Difficulty <sup>2</sup>	Implementation Status / Comments
Neighborhood Livability (cont.)	No. 2-3 Monitor effectiveness of SRN ordinance; report by Nov. 2013	Oregon State University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards</li> </ul> City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City Manager’s Office</li> <li>Police Department</li> </ul>	SRN Ordinance modifications for initial response cost recovery is anticipated to be completed by Sept. 2013. (In-Kind staffing/ Moderate effort)  Livability Conditions Survey – November 2013. Complete by February 2014 Cost - \$5,000 (In-kind staffing/Moderate effort)	Evaluate/Modify Ordinance: 3  Livability Report: 4	Staff will begin to explore enhancing the SRN ordinance to recover initial response costs. Sharing of information with OSP/OSU and Office of Student Conduct has been improved and occurring now. We recommend the Work Group conduct a survey to assess livability conditions in November 2013. Extending the SRN Ordinance probation period beyond 30 days must consider fairness for residents who didn’t live at the location yet are subject to a second response penalty. Preliminarily this may have legal challenges.
	No. 2-4 Gravel parking area enforcement	City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Development Department</li> </ul>	Completed by December 2013 \$5,000 (In-kind staffing/Moderate effort)	3	Physical survey of existing gravel parking areas to create baseline.
	No. 2-5 Refuse disposal enforcement	City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Development Department</li> </ul>	Completed by August 2013 (In-kind staffing/Moderate effort)	2	Change Municipal Code language to provide for easier enforcement.
	No. 3-1 Property Maintenance Code	City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Development Department</li> </ul>	<b>City review/adoption process schedule for July – October 2013 (Inkind Staffing – Major Effort)</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Initial City Council direction scheduled for May 20 Council meeting</b>  <b>Staff directed to proceed with program development.</b>
	No. 3-2 Progressive Enforcement Model	City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Development Department</li> </ul>	<b>City review/adoption process schedule for July – October 2013 (Inkind Staffing – Major Effort)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Part of Property Maintenance Code (PMC) package</b>

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Refer to accompanying recommendation summary for full text of each Scope of Work Objective and corresponding recommendations.

<sup>2</sup> Scale of 1-5, with 1 being “easiest” and 5 being “hardest.”

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Disposition

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objective No. – Recommendation No. <sup>1</sup>	Organization(s) Responsible for Implementation	Anticipated Implementation Timeframe / Estimated Cost	Magnitude of Difficulty <sup>2</sup>	Implementation Status / Comments
Neighborhood Livability (cont.)	No. 3-3 Explore additional prop. maint. education and enforcement	City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Development Department</li> </ul>	To be initiated after PMC has been in place. Time horizon – 2015 (In-kind staffing - moderate effort)	3	This will be initiated following the implementation of the PMC
	No. 4-1 Off-campus living orientation program	Oregon State University City of Corvallis	Timetable TBD	2	Action pending resolution of staffing changes in the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards
	No. 4-2 Neighborhood Liaison program	City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Development Department</li> </ul>	By January 2014 if approved by City Council - part of the budget proposed for Housing & Neighborhood Services Division.	3	This action will be considered as part of PMC program
	No. 4-3 “Welcome Week” program	Oregon State University City of Corvallis	Timetable TBD	2	Action pending resolution of staffing changes in the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards
	No. 4-4 Neighbor-to-neighbor Mediation program	Oregon State University City of Corvallis	Initial evaluation completed by Fall 2013		Action pending resolution of staffing changes in the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards
Neighborhood Planning	No. 2-1 Affordable housing parking exemption	City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Development Department</li> </ul>	December 2013 (In-kind staffing/Minimal effort)	2	Part of LDC Collaboration Package
	No. 2-2 Amend LDC def. of “family”	City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Development Department</li> </ul>	December 2013 (In-kind staffing/Minimal effort)	2	Part of LDC Collaboration Package
	No. 2-3 Add LDC def. of “Residential Home”	City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Development Department</li> </ul>	December 2013 (In-kind staffing/Minimal effort)	2	Part of LDC Collaboration Package

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Refer to accompanying recommendation summary for full text of each Scope of Work Objective and corresponding recommendations.

<sup>2</sup> Scale of 1-5, with 1 being “easiest” and 5 being “hardest.”

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Disposition

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objective No. – Recommendation No. <sup>1</sup>	Organization(s) Responsible for Implementation	Anticipated Implementation Timeframe / Estimated Cost	Magnitude of Difficulty <sup>2</sup>	Implementation Status / Comments
<b>Neighborhood Planning (cont.)</b>	No. 2-4 LDC parking standards for 4- and 5-bedroom units	City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Development Department</li> </ul>	December 2012 (In-kind staffing/Major effort)	4	The City of Corvallis has completed the necessary public hearing process for the recommended Land Development Code amendments, and they were implemented as of December 2012. (12-21-12)
	No. 2-5 LDC standards for Lot Line Adjustments	City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Development Department</li> </ul>	<b>December 2013</b> (In-kind staffing/Minimal effort)	2	<b>Part of LDC Collaboration Package</b>
	No. 2-6 Setbacks for single-attached units	City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Development Department</li> </ul>	<b>December 2013</b> (In-kind staffing/Minimal effort)	2	<b>Part of LDC Collaboration Package</b>
	No. 2-7 Density Calc. for Minor Replats and Minor Land Partitions	City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Development Department</li> </ul>	<b>December 2013</b> (In-kind staffing/Minimal effort)	2	<b>Part of LDC Collaboration Package</b>
	No. 2-8 Major Lot Development Option notice area	City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Development Department</li> </ul>	<b>December 2013</b> (In-kind staffing/Minimal effort)	2	<b>Part of LDC Collaboration Package</b>
	No. 2-9 Minimum density calculations for infill development	City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Development Department</li> </ul>	<b>December 2013</b> (In-kind staffing/Minimal effort)	2	<b>Part of LDC Collaboration Package</b>

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Refer to accompanying recommendation summary for full text of each Scope of Work Objective and corresponding recommendations.

<sup>2</sup> Scale of 1-5, with 1 being “easiest” and 5 being “hardest.”

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Disposition

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objective No. – Recommendation No. <sup>1</sup>	Organization(s) Responsible for Implementation	Anticipated Implementation Timeframe / Estimated Cost	Magnitude of Difficulty <sup>2</sup>	Implementation Status / Comments
Neighborhood Planning (cont.)	No. 3-1 On-campus housing for 28-30% of undergrad students by 2019	Oregon State University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• University Housing &amp; Dining Services</li> </ul>	<p>6 years</p> <p>Growing from current 18% to 30% would be an increase of 3,187 students based on 2019 projected enrollment. Our planned new residence hall costs approximately \$90K/bed. This will leave 2,858 left to grow by 2019. Using this cost/bed, OSU would need to spend approximately \$257M to house to a total of 30% of undergraduates in 2019, using traditional bond financing methods. In addition to additional residence halls, growing to 30% would require an additional dining facility, which would cost approximately \$12M.</p> <p>OSU will be constructing a new 324 bed residence hall in April, opening fall of 2014 at a cost of \$30 million. Hard cost \$21 million, soft cost plus fees \$9 million.</p>	<p>Currently planned residence hall: 3</p> <p>Plan for future publicly funded residence halls: 5</p>	<p>On-going investments are being made in existing inventory to improve quality of life while minimizing costs to residents. The New Student Residence Hall will begin construction in April 2013. See No. 3-3 for update on PPP that may be able to help address the objective of housing 30% of undergrads.</p>
	No. 3-2 Housing chapter in Campus Master Plan	Oregon State University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Campus Planning</li> </ul>	<p>18-24 months.</p> <p>Housing will be addressed more thoroughly in the CMP update. No cost, as staffing and funding are already anticipated.</p>	1	

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Refer to accompanying recommendation summary for full text of each Scope of Work Objective and corresponding recommendations.

<sup>2</sup> Scale of 1-5, with 1 being “easiest” and 5 being “hardest.”

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Disposition

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objective No. – Recommendation No. <sup>1</sup>	Organization(s) Responsible for Implementation	Anticipated Implementation Timeframe / Estimated Cost	Magnitude of Difficulty <sup>2</sup>	Implementation Status / Comments
Neighborhood Planning (cont.)	No. 3-3 Public/Private Student Housing	Oregon State University	Timeframe: If project is feasible – 2 years for project completion. Cost associated with project delivery will be based on partnership agreement.  In-kind staff / Major effort	Requires legal counsel involvement, market analysis, financial agreements. Requires significant planning and review at each stage: 3	UHDS has completed the first phase - Exploration of Interest:  UHDS has developed a first draft of a Request for Proposal (RFP) as the second phase.
Parking and Traffic	No. 3-1 Increased TDM marketing	Oregon State University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Division of University Relations and Marketing</li> <li>• Campus Operations</li> </ul> City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Works Department – Transportation Division</li> </ul>	6 to 12 months.  Beginning March, 2013, the OSU Sustainability Office and URM will be working collaboratively to increase TDM marketing. Specific costs need to be confirmed with Steve, but it would be reasonable to invest at least \$1000 winter quarter and \$3000 spring quarter.  If City's assumption that OSU takes the lead is correct, the cost for the City would be characterized as minimal.  OSU anticipates increased TDM marketing as early as this fall if tiered parking is implemented. \$20,000 for marketing materials.	Difficulty of effort to increase marketing (City): 2  OSU: 3	Programs included will be the bike rental program, Drive Less Connect (carpool system), use of CTS and OSU Shuttle, and bicycle and pedestrian options. Methods will begin with print and social media, continued events targeting bicycle and pedestrian commuters and incentive/awards for those using alternatives to the single occupancy vehicle.  Recommendations are targeted to the OSU campus population so assume OSU will take the lead. City will provide support/information to OSU for their efforts on campus.  <b>Get There, two week promotional campaign to encourage alternative transportation for commuters, was held in May.</b>

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Refer to accompanying recommendation summary for full text of each Scope of Work Objective and corresponding recommendations.

<sup>2</sup> Scale of 1-5, with 1 being "easiest" and 5 being "hardest."

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Disposition

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objective No. – Recommendation No. <sup>1</sup>	Organization(s) Responsible for Implementation	Anticipated Implementation Timeframe / Estimated Cost	Magnitude of Difficulty <sup>2</sup>	Implementation Status / Comments
Parking and Traffic (cont.)	No. 3-2 Fund on-campus bike share program	Oregon State University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student Sustainability Initiative</li> <li>• Department of Recreational Sports</li> <li>• Campus Operations – Sustainability Program</li> </ul>	Implemented Jan.7, 2013. Estimated startup costs (Brandon to confirm) were \$3,840 with \$2,000 coming from the Student Sustainability Initiative and \$1,840 (of \$4,000 max allocated) coming from the Collaboration via Steve Clark and Brandon Trelstad. Ongoing O&M costs will be covered by rental fees (\$35/term, \$10/week, \$3/day) and Rec Sports.	2	Operated by Recreational Sports, the bike loan program began operation Jan.7,2013. As of early February, two of the 14 bikes in the fleet were rented. Additional marketing and outreach will occur over Feb. and Mar.2013. Website: <a href="http://oregonstate.edu/ssi/feature/20130113-osu-bike-loan-program">http://oregonstate.edu/ssi/feature/20130113-osu-bike-loan-program</a> Contact Brandon Trelstad for more info. <b>Fully implemented as of May 8, 2013.</b>
	No. 3-3 Parking wayfinding signage	Oregon State University	OSU to lead. 6-9 months. In kind – Major \$10,000 for signage	OSU: 4	Oregon Department of Transportation controls signage on the State highway. ODOT follows strict guidelines for signage on highways and this may not be a permitted use: 4
	No. 3-4 On-campus variable parking permit pricing	Oregon State University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Campus Operations – Transit &amp; Parking Services</li> </ul>	12 months.  Cost – TBD	3	OSU intends to develop variable parking permit pricing with possibly a phased implementation to coincide with the City’s execution of parking districts around campus. The first phase could be implemented by Fall 2013 . <b>In process; report due by end of May from consultant; process of changing related OARs has been initiated.</b>

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Refer to accompanying recommendation summary for full text of each Scope of Work Objective and corresponding recommendations.

<sup>2</sup> Scale of 1-5, with 1 being “easiest” and 5 being “hardest.”

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Disposition

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objective No. – Recommendation No. <sup>1</sup>	Organization(s) Responsible for Implementation	Anticipated Implementation Timeframe / Estimated Cost	Magnitude of Difficulty <sup>2</sup>	Implementation Status / Comments
Parking and Traffic (cont.)	No. 3-5 Neighborhood parking mgmt.. program	Oregon State University City of Corvallis	TBD – based on City Council direction. Significant Costs TBD plus Inkind Staffing – Major Effort	5	City staff is recommending adjustments to the Steering Committee recommendations. Significant public process will need to be conducted. City Council referred recommendation to Urban Services Committee at May 20 meeting.
	No. 4-1 OSU funding for expanded CTS service	Oregon State University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Division of University Relations and Marketing</li> </ul> City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Works Department – Transportation Division</li> </ul>	Routes implemented September 2012  Cost: \$22,880  No specific agreements in place for FY14.	Difficulty of effort to expand operations: 2	The service expansions have been operational since the end of September 2012. The recommendations and expected outcomes may need to be refined as a result of discussions between OSU and the City on this item. OSU has committed to fund additional runs on three CTS routes (5, 6, and C1) for one year only (i.e. FY 12-13). The funding amount is \$22,880. OSU and the City of Corvallis are finalizing an intergovernmental agreement for one year of funding support for the additional runs. A commitment beyond that one year has not been determined. Based on the previous ridership of the affected routes, a more realistic target for the expected outcome is 8,500 trips (not 11,000). Continued funding for expanded routes has been identified by OSU.

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Refer to accompanying recommendation summary for full text of each Scope of Work Objective and corresponding recommendations.

<sup>2</sup> Scale of 1-5, with 1 being “easiest” and 5 being “hardest.”

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Disposition

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objective No. – Recommendation No. <sup>1</sup>	Organization(s) Responsible for Implementation	Anticipated Implementation Timeframe / Estimated Cost	Magnitude of Difficulty <sup>2</sup>	Implementation Status / Comments
Parking and Traffic (cont.)	No. 4-2 Improved CTS/OSU Shuttle coordination	<p>Oregon State University</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Campus Operations</li> </ul> <p>City of Corvallis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Works Department – Transportation Division</li> </ul>	<p>3 to 6 months.</p> <p>(depending on when work completed to set shuttle purpose and schedule)</p> <p>For City, cost is mainly in staff time and is expected to be moderate.</p> <p>OSU – In-kind / Moderate effort</p>	<p>Provided coordination of systems will actually result in expected outcomes (i.e., shuttle is best suited for getting folks around campus from south and west parking areas; CTS is best suited for getting folks to the north and middle of campus. May not be much overlap of riders: 3</p>	<p>Potential for coordination will depend on whether there is overlapping purpose between the two transit systems, on what is the proposed shuttle schedule, and on the specific shuttle route times and stop locations. First meeting to take place in early February 2013. Follow-up work assigned and next meeting to be scheduled by OSU in early March.</p> <p>OSU has implemented GPS units on campus shuttles. City to implement GPS by fall of 2013.</p> <p><b>OSU consultant is assessing optimal use of OSU Shuttle. Implementation of VIS for CTS and OSU Shuttle in process.</b></p>
	No. 4-3 OSU Shuttle emphasis as transport between campus fringe and core	<p>Oregon State University</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Campus Operations – Transit &amp; Parking Services</li> </ul>	<p>OSU - This should be completed by a transit specialist at \$10,000 - \$15,000; 3-6 months.</p> <p>OSU will need one to two more shuttles that are ADA accessible at \$100K each. OSU will need additional drivers from First Student at a cost of \$X.</p>	<p>OSU: 3</p>	<p><b>OSU consultant is assessing optimal use of OSU Shuttle. Implementation of VIS for CTS and OSU Shuttle in process.</b></p>

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Refer to accompanying recommendation summary for full text of each Scope of Work Objective and corresponding recommendations.

<sup>2</sup> Scale of 1-5, with 1 being “easiest” and 5 being “hardest.”

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Disposition

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objective No. – Recommendation No. <sup>1</sup>	Organization(s) Responsible for Implementation	Anticipated Implementation Timeframe / Estimated Cost	Magnitude of Difficulty <sup>2</sup>	Implementation Status / Comments
Parking and Traffic (cont.)	No. 4-4 OSU Shuttle implement Vehicle Info Service	Oregon State University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Campus Operations – Transit &amp; Parking Services</li> </ul>	3 to 6 months. OSU has implemented a GPS shuttle tracking system the initial cost for the equipment was \$900 and the recurring subscription costs are \$85 per month per bus. To fully implement the system we will need to update signage at all of the shuttle stop locations. Estimated cost for signage updates is approximately \$250 per sign location, anticipating 12 to 15 signs. This could be completed during the summer.	2	Transit & Parking Services staff initiated a VIS trial run in Nov. 2012 and intended to continue the test for several months to determine how to best configure the system. Final purchase and implementation is expected before the Fall 2013 term. (12-21-12)  <b>OSU consultant is assessing optimal use of OSU Shuttle. Implementation of VIS for CTS and OSU Shuttle in process.</b>
	No. 4-5 CTS implement Vehicle Info Service	City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public Works Department – Transportation Division</li> </ul>	September 2013 Part of a \$500,000 project	Significant workload to review proposals, secure vendor, configure and install product, and work through bugs: 4	Request for Proposals for VIS system <del>to be</del> published in February 2013. <b>Proposals received and reviewed; award expected in May 2013.</b> Expected Outcomes text “the shuttle’s location” should be replaced with “bus locations”.

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Refer to accompanying recommendation summary for full text of each Scope of Work Objective and corresponding recommendations.

<sup>2</sup> Scale of 1-5, with 1 being “easiest” and 5 being “hardest.”

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Disposition

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objective No. – Recommendation No. <sup>1</sup>	Organization(s) Responsible for Implementation	Anticipated Implementation Timeframe / Estimated Cost	Magnitude of Difficulty <sup>2</sup>	Implementation Status / Comments
Parking and Traffic (cont.)	No. 4-6 City implement CTS Marketing Plan	City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Works Department – Transportation Division</li> <li>• Oregon State University -- Division of University Relations and Marketing</li> </ul>	12 to 18 months.  September 2014 \$20,000	No CTS staff capacity or expertise: 5	The recommendation would ideally reflect a joint effort between the City and OSU to develop a marketing plan. CTS does not have the staff capacity or expertise to do this work. City to work with OSU Marketing resources to develop a plan to make progress toward the objectives. OSU has initiated a first meeting. After discussion with staff, a more realistic percentage of increased ridership in both the Recommendations and Expected Outcomes section would be 10% (vs. current 20%)  <span style="color: blue;"><b>Sept. 1, 2013, implementation deadline to coincide with VIS initiation.</b></span>

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Refer to accompanying recommendation summary for full text of each Scope of Work Objective and corresponding recommendations.

<sup>2</sup> Scale of 1-5, with 1 being “easiest” and 5 being “hardest.”

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Disposition

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objective No. – Recommendation No. <sup>1</sup>	Organization(s) Responsible for Implementation	Anticipated Implementation Timeframe / Estimated Cost	Magnitude of Difficulty <sup>2</sup>	Implementation Status / Comments
Parking and Traffic (cont.)	No. 4-7 City/OSU funding for Linn-Benton Loop	City of Corvallis City of Albany Oregon State University Linn-Benton Community College Benton County Linn County	May 2013 About \$210,000 needed to make up lost revenue sources for the Loop  Negotiations between City of Albany (who runs the Loop) and other partners is complete for FY14 funding amounts. OSU agreed to \$102,000 for FY14, a significant increase above the current FY13 funding level of \$81,900  Corvallis contribution proposed to increase from ~\$20k to \$125k, which means \$100k reduction for CTS service	Difficulty to establish 'fair' funding model among partners and to reallocate scarce funds from each agency's current services to Loop (City): 3  OSU: 2	Historical ridership statistics show 70% associated with either OSU or LBCC. All partner organizations listed have been meeting throughout the winter to discuss possible funding models. A final proposal is being reviewed for approval.  No additional support from OSU has been requested for the Loop for FY13. OSU has agreed to the increase noted to the left for FY14. Please contact Brandon Trelstad for more info.  <b>Stable funding formula has been established for FY13. OSU and City have increased funding levels.</b>
	No. 4-8 Evaluate OSU commitment for CTS funding	Oregon State University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Division of Finance and Administration</li> </ul> City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City Manager's Office</li> <li>• Public Works Department – Transportation Division</li> <li>• Community Development Department</li> </ul>	6 months.  To be discussed.	OSU: 2	As noted above, there is an agreement nearly final for supplemental funding for additional runs during FY13, but no commitments have been made for FY14.

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Refer to accompanying recommendation summary for full text of each Scope of Work Objective and corresponding recommendations.

<sup>2</sup> Scale of 1-5, with 1 being "easiest" and 5 being "hardest."

## Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Disposition

Workgroup	Scope of Work Objective No. – Recommendation No. <sup>1</sup>	Organization(s) Responsible for Implementation	Anticipated Implementation Timeframe / Estimated Cost	Magnitude of Difficulty <sup>2</sup>	Implementation Status / Comments
	No. 4-9 Evaluate need for on-campus transit hub	Oregon State University  Linn-Benton Community College  City of Corvallis  Corvallis Area Metropolitan Planning Organization	Study completed by July 2014  Cost to support MPO planning effort is major.	Significant work to evaluate need, determine location(s) and perform cost/benefit analysis: 5	City met with OSU in early February 2013. City sought MPO planning support and project is included in MPO proposed work plan for FY 13-14. More realistic schedule is July 2014.
	No. 4-10 Marketing to promote alternate modes of safe travel	Oregon State University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Division of University Relations and Marketing</li> <li>• Campus Operations</li> </ul> City of Corvallis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City Manager’s Office</li> <li>• Police Department</li> <li>• Public Works Department</li> </ul>	July 2014  Cost for City is moderate	Develop, implement, and manage a campaign with constrained staff resources: 4	Objective appears to be to market the changes made as a result of the Collaboration process; therefore timeframe moved to after an expected implementation of the feasible recommendations. City staff will provide support to OSU.

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Refer to accompanying recommendation summary for full text of each Scope of Work Objective and corresponding recommendations.

<sup>2</sup> Scale of 1-5, with 1 being “easiest” and 5 being “hardest.”



---

MEMORANDUM

---

**TO: Collaboration Corvallis Steering Committee**

**FROM: Eric Adams, Project Manager**

**DATE: May 28, 2013**

**SUBJECT: Draft Proposed Scope of Work for Housing Work Group**

---

The Collaboration project management team, in conjunction with leaders from the City of Corvallis and Oregon State University, have developed a proposed Housing Work Group charge for your consideration and comment. An outline is presented below along with potential membership interests. Also, some general considerations are identified.

There will be an opportunity to discuss this proposal and provide feedback to the project management team at the June 4, 2013, Steering Committee meeting.

Housing Work Group Charge

- Serve as an advisory body in assisting city of Corvallis' efforts to implement the study and policy review called for in the City Council's housing goal.
- Work collaboratively with Benton County to examine mixed housing needs in a regional context and as appropriate, engage regional partners in developing and recommending solutions to the county and Collaboration Project Steering Committee.
- Investigate best practices related to addressing housing needs, particularly in comparable university communities.
- Act as a housing sounding board; evaluate opportunities for OSU to increase student housing on campus, and to link student housing growth to the OSU Campus Master Plan and opportunities for the city of Corvallis and Benton County to increase the supply of affordable family housing.
- Review concepts and provide recommendations to the City and OSU related to incentives for off-campus student housing projects, e.g. those located in preferred areas or those projects that provide certain features that will be compatible for neighborhoods, downtown business district and/or provide enhanced services for students.
- Evaluate the housing needs of OSU faculty and staff – and other Corvallis employers -- and recommend actions that would address these needs.

## Potential Representation

- Local affordable housing advocate
- OSU Housing and Dining representative
- Local housing developer
- OSU student
- City of Corvallis Planning Commission member
- City of Corvallis Housing and Community Development Commission member
- Financial services industry (i.e., bank/credit union) representative
- OSU Faculty Senate representative
- Benton County representative
- Real estate professional
- OSU Human Resources representative
- Private sector employer representative

## Considerations

- The work of this housing work group will likely extend beyond the Collaboration Project's three-year timeline. It is to be expected that work will continue beyond this horizon and the City and OSU will need to support ongoing work in areas such as housing. It is contemplated that the Housing Work Group will typically meet on a monthly basis.
- Housing is a multi-faceted and complex issue that involves many local and regional interests. We need to ensure that the Housing Work Group's scope of work, representation and expertise and requisite staff support stands a good chance to result in a meaningful and actionable product.
- In that there are multiple entities engaged in housing related work and policy, we will need to be sensitive to real or perceived overlap of responsibilities, etc. As part of developing a specific work plan, the Housing Work Group will need to become familiar with the roles of other entities in order to develop a specific work plan that complements and enhances the existing housing related work within the community and region.

**COLLABORATION CORVALLIS  
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY  
March 18, 2013**

**Present**

Julie Manning, Mayor, Co-Chair  
 Ed Ray, President, OSU, Co-Chair  
 Roen Hogg, Councilor, Ward 2  
 Jay Dixon, Benton County Commissioner  
 Jim Patterson, City Manager  
 Mark McCambridge, Vice President for Finance and Administration, OSU  
 Steve Clark, Vice President for University Relations and Marketing, OSU  
 Jock Mills, Director of Government Relations, OSU  
 Patricia Daniels, Community Volunteer  
 Jim Moorefield, Executive Director, Willamette Neighborhood Housing Services  
 Dolf Devos, President and Principal, Investors Property Management Group  
 Amelia Harris, President, ASOSU  
 Lexie Merrill, Director Community Resources, ASOSU  
 Brendan Sanders, Interfraternity Council

**Absent**

Hal Brauner, Councilor, Ward 9  
 Dan Schwab, Director of Student Conduct and Community Standards, OSU

**Staff Present**

Eric Adams, Project Manager  
 Ken Gibb, Community Development Director  
 David Dodson, Campus Planning Manager, OSU  
 Terry Nix, Recorder

**SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION**

	Agenda Item	Summary of Recommendations/Actions
I.	Call to Order	
II.	Opening Remarks – President Ray & Mayor Manning	
III.	Review November 29, 2012, Meeting Summary Notes	Approved by consensus.
IV.	Brief Overview of Workgroup Recommendations	
V.	Public Comment Opportunity	
VI.	Project Management Update	
VII.	Selections for Recommendation Consent Agenda	
VIII.	Workgroup Strategy Recommendations	Accept the recommendations from the workgroups. Forward the recommendation regarding a Property Maintenance Code to the City Council for further work and consideration.
IX.	Spring Workgroup Meeting Schedule and June Steering Committee Meeting	The next meeting will be in June, date TBD
X.	Other Business	
XI.	Adjournment	The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

## **CONTENT OF DISCUSSION**

I. **CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Manning called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

### **II. OPENING REMARKS – PRESIDENT RAY AND MAYOR MANNING**

Mayor Manning expressed appreciation to all of the workgroup members for the remarkable amount of time and energy they have been willing to commit to this process and the thoughtful and thorough work they have been doing. She expressed appreciation to City and OSU staffs. She noted that the two tracking matrices in meeting packets were developed in response to a request by the Steering Committee; the development of these matrices was a significant work effort that will allow for the tracking of the workgroup recommendations as they move through the process.

OSU President Ray expressed appreciation to the workgroup members and staff. He said it is clear that an amazing amount of effort has gone into thinking these issues through. He appreciates the tracking matrices approach. He would like to also track specific outcomes for each item (what is happening, whether it is working, what additional steps are needed), and he would like to consider an appropriate timeline to report to the community with respect to those outcomes.

### **III. REVIEW OF NOVEMBER 29, 2012, MEETING SUMMARY NOTES**

The November 29 meeting summary notes were approved by consensus.

### **IV. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF WORK GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS**

Project Manager Eric Adams provided a brief overview of the third round of workgroup recommendations, as detailed in his memorandum dated March 13, 2013.

### **V. PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY**

Mayor Manning invited public comment on the recommendations from each workgroup.

#### **Neighborhood Planning Workgroup**

**Tom Jensen** said that the university decides what happens at the university; the City should decide what happens with the City. He said OSU's contributions to housing are still lagging; the university needs to build more housing and not put that burden on the City. Regarding the Parking and Traffic Workgroup's recommendations, he said that we don't need parking districts, certainly not nine of them. He asked that the City disband this group and start making decisions that are in the best interests of the citizens.

#### **Parking and Traffic Workgroup**

**Cathy Law** submitted and reviewed written testimony. She has lived at NW 16<sup>th</sup> and Polk for 14 years and parking has become a real problem for residents in her area. She is concerned about whether the proposal is fair and whether it will work. The proposal is not fair in that it puts the majority of the responsibility on residents, not OSU and the students. The parking problem is caused by students; there is no parking problem during school breaks. The workgroup's recommendations will just push the problem out and

alienate more residents. The solution to get students to park on campus is free parking and/or the inability for them to park in neighborhoods. Ms. Merrill asked how Ms. Law would define “residents”. Ms. Law said that she feels a resident is someone who plans to stay in the community and has an investment in community livability.

**Betty Griffiths** said she believes anyone who lives in Corvallis is a resident. She suggested that the recommendation regarding parking districts be send back to the workgroup for further work. The workgroup should work with neighborhood groups to develop a parking management system which charges for on-street parking during weekdays during the school year with free or low cost permits for residents and visitors. Her recommendation is provided in detail in her written testimony, previously distributed.

**Randy Chakerian**, Harding Neighborhood Association President, submitted and reviewed written testimony. He said that if the City decides to expand parking districts around OSU, it should implement them all at the same time in order to decrease administrative costs and generate more revenue which should then be applied to lowering the fee for the first residential permit. All parking district program costs and revenues should be made transparent with an opportunity for public review. The proposals do not address traffic issues; however, the City needs to begin planning aggressive traffic management efforts to accommodate expected increases in student housing density. The City and University need to give serious attention to how the rapid expansion of off-campus housing will impact traffic and safety on our streets.

**Matt Palm** said he has heard the suggestion that the fee for a parking pass at Reser be raised to \$130; he feels the fee needs to be \$80 or less if the goal is to increase parking at that location. He said half of the workgroup felt that the districts that touch campus should not have the two hour free parking that is proposed; he would suggest looking at tighter restrictions. In response to an inquiry from Mayor Manning, Mr. Palm said his recommendation regarding the parking pass fee is based on comparable institutions.

#### Neighborhood Livability Workgroup

**Richard Berger** submitted and reviewed written testimony on behalf of the Willamette Association of Realtors. The Association is strongly opposed to the recommendation regarding a Property Maintenance Code. The details have not been discussed or made available to the public and the City already has several regulations and codes. Adopting a new set of regulations would add complexity and make enforcement that much more difficult. Improvements to the existing complaint-based program will improve livability without new unneeded regulation. The Association agrees with the workgroup’s other recommendations.

Mr. Mills asked if Mr. Berger has a suggestion for how to deal with the issue of renters being hesitant to issue complaints for fear of repercussions. Mr. Berger recommended that the workgroup focus on a program of education for tenants and landlords; he noted that any repercussions by the landlord would be against state law.

**Betty Griffiths** referred to the recommendation that the City establish a goal of increasing the ratio of sworn police officers; she suggested that the last line, which states a specific ratio, be deleted. She referred to the recommendation that the City implement a Property Maintenance Code that applies to all properties; she expressed concern that this would include private property owners and she suggested that it be

sent back to the workgroup or forwarded with a statement that the City should work with property managers on a code for rental properties.

**John Wydronek** submitted and reviewed written testimony. He is in favor of most of the workgroup's recommendations but feels that the recommendation regarding a Property Maintenance Code should be sent back to the workgroup to define what the code would look like, the staffing and costs needed to support the code, and how that would be funded. He questioned the data cited by the workgroup and said it is important to understand the historical data in order to implement an effective system.

**Tom Jensen** said he is a renter and he doesn't want people walking through his rental unit. Problems could be addressed through modifications to current codes. We just need to provide assurances that renters who issue complaints do not get punished with eviction or higher rents. He does not want the recommendation related to a Property Maintenance Code to go forward until it is known exactly what will come of it.

**Matt Palm** said he is still paying for medical issues he had due to mold in his rental unit. It took several phone calls before the property manager inspected and began to address issues that were contributing to the mold. He had no idea there were rules to protect renter rights and he wonders how many other students, especially international students, might have trouble understanding their options.

## VI. PROJECT MANAGEMENT UPDATE

### Tentative April 11, 2013, Steering Committee Meeting

Mayor Manning said the April 11 meeting is only needed if the Steering Committee is unable to complete its review of the workgroup recommendations at this meeting.

### City/OSU Staff Involvement

Mr. Adams expressed appreciation to OSU and City staffs for their continued involvement. He thanked Community Development Director Gibb and Campus Planning Manager Dodson for their help in preparing the tracking matrices.

### Work Group Summaries

Mr. Adams briefly reviewed the progress of the workgroups. In the past year, there have been more than 70 workgroup meetings, with 46 recommendations completed for the Steering Committee's review.

### Overview of Recommendation Matrices

Mr. Adams drew attention to two matrices summarizing the recommendations that have been accepted by the Steering Committee. The matrices will be updated and expanded as needed. The "Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Summary" provides the full text of each recommendation in relation to the corresponding scope of work objectives, and the "Collaboration Corvallis Workgroup Recommendation Disposition" provides greater detail on cost, implementation timeframe, magnitude of difficulty, and implementation status of each recommendation.

OSU President Ray asked if there is a process by which public comments made at this meeting get back to the workgroups. Mr. Adams said the comments will be included in the meeting summary notes and it has been his practice to give an update at each workgroup meeting regarding the input received. President Ray suggested that the matrices be revised to include, not just the implementation status, but also a measurement of whether or not the implementation worked and to what extent.

## VII. SELECTIONS FOR RECOMMENDATION CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Manning proposed that the Steering Committee consider the workgroup recommendations using a “consent agenda” format. Members would pull any items for which they would like to have additional discussion and the remaining recommendations would be approved in one motion for each workgroup. There was consensus.

## VIII. WORKGROUP STRATEGY RECOMMENDATIONS

### Neighborhood Planning Workgroup

Mayor Manning noted that there are five recommendations having to do with amendments to the City’s Land Development Code.

**MOTION:** Ms. Daniels moved that the Steering Committee accept the recommendations from the Neighborhood Planning Workgroup. Mr. Moorefield seconded the motion and it **passed** unanimously.

### Parking and Traffic

Mayor Manning noted that there is one recommendation with 11 items that speak to that recommendation. Mr. Clark reviewed the recommendation as detailed in the written materials.

**MOTION:** Mr. Clark moved that the Steering Committee accept the recommendations from the Parking and Traffic Workgroup and move them along to the City Council. Ms. Daniels seconded the motion.

OSU President Ray asked how the City would proceed if this recommendation is forwarded. Mayor Manning said the City Council would likely assign the issue to a standing committee for further work, including public comment and staff work.

The motion **passed** unanimously.

### Neighborhood Livability Workgroup

Mayor Manning noted that there are eight recommendations which address three objectives within the workgroup’s scope of work.

Mr. Devos requested that the recommendation related to a Property Maintenance Code be held for further discussion.

**MOTION:** Mr. Clark moved that the Steering Committee accept the remaining seven recommendations from the Neighborhood Livability Workgroup. Ms. Daniels seconded the motion.

Ms. Merrill asked how not forwarding the recommendation regarding a PMC would impact the following two recommendations. Mr. Adams said that one of them could be carried forward on its own through existing codes; the other was intended to function in tandem with the PMC recommendation. Mayor Manning noted that discussion on the pulled item will commence after the vote on this motion.

The motion **passed** by a majority vote with Ms. Merrill noting no.

Mr. Devos said a Property Maintenance Code is an important topic that needs to be addressed in depth; his concern is that this is a large issue that needs a separate discussion outside of this process.

Mr. Mills said the question is whether the issue should be sent back to the workgroup for clarification or whether it should be forwarded on to the City to do the exploratory work. In response to an inquiry from the Mayor, Community Development Director Gibb said that if the recommendation goes forward, staff would likely propose to the City Council that the issue go through a public process that includes a stakeholder committee and Council standing committee to form a recommendation for Council consideration.

Rob Reff, sitting in for the workgroup Chair Dan Schwab, reviewed the workgroup discussion and process. He noted several themes emerged during testimony on this issue - prevention, education and enforcement. The recommendation was thought to be a first step in addressing the significant gap that exists in current regulations and codes.

Several committee members noted that the workgroup has worked exhaustively on this process and that it would be appropriate at this time to move it along to the City Council which can then move it through the appropriate review process.

**MOTION:** Mr. Clark moved that the Steering Committee forward to the City Council a recommendation that it review these issues and make a full evaluation to address the problems identified by the workgroup, not limited to rental housing but with a priority on rental housing at least initially. The motion was seconded and **passed** unanimously.

**IX. SPRING WORKGROUP MEETING SCHEDULE AND JUNE STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING**

Mr. Adams said the work groups will continue to meet over the coming months and additional recommendations will come back to the Steering Committee at its next quarterly meeting in June.

Mayor Manning and OSU President Ray requested that the June meeting include an opportunity to express appreciation and have social time with the workgroup members.

**X. OTHER BUSINESS: None.**

**XI. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.**